

THE
PRESBYTERIAN
QUARTERLY.

EDITORS: G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., AND E. H. BARNETT, D. D.

MANAGER: GEORGE SUMMEY.

VOL. I.

1887-'88.

JULY—OCTOBER—JANUARY.

Atlanta:

CONSTITUTION PUBLISHING CO

New York:

ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & CO.

COPYRIGHT, 1887,
By GEORGE SUMMEY, MANAGER.

X
Pw
P925A
V. 1

CONTENTS.

VOLUME I.

	PAGES.
Alexander's Problems of Philosophy	<i>John L. Girardeau</i> 186-189
Andover Renaissance, The.....	<i>Samuel M. Smith</i> 31-61
Armour's Atonement and Law	<i>Robert A. Webb</i> 372-375
Berkeley's Idealism.....	<i>John L. Girardeau</i> 1-31
Bible Study in College	<i>John B. Shearer</i> 524-529
Boards in the Northern Church	<i>R. K. Smoot</i> 416-432
Bowne's Philosophy of Theism.....	<i>Samuel M. Smith</i> 551-554
Briggs' Messianic Prophecy.....	<i>W. W. Moore</i> 198-200
Broadus' Commentary on Matthew	<i>C. R. Hemphill</i> 377-379
Bruce's Humiliation of Christ.....	<i>H. C. Alexander</i> 554-559
Bruce's Miraculous Element in the Gospels.....	<i>H. C. Alexander</i> 554-559
Bruce's Parabolic Teaching of Christ	<i>H. C. Alexander</i> 554-559
Certitude in Religious Belief, The Ground of.....	<i>B. M. Peabody</i> 87-106
Churches in Heathen Lands, The Organization of.....	<i>Henry M. White</i> 476-491
Criticisms and Reviews.....	174-204, 368-390, 545-571
Creation as a Doctrine of Science	<i>Geo. D. Armstrong</i> 106-128
Curtis' Creation or Evolution	<i>Geo. D. Armstrong</i> 384-387
Dawson's Story of the Earth and Man	<i>Geo. D. Armstrong</i> 563-566
Denominational Colleges	<i>W. M. Grier</i> 237-248
Doctrina Duodecim Apostolorum.....	<i>B. B. Warfield</i> 371-372
Drummond's Natural Law in the Spiritual World.....	<i>Robert A. Webb</i> 190-198
Fairbairn's Morality in its Relation to Redemption.....	<i>John L. Girardeau</i> 559-561
George Eliot, The Moral Character of	<i>James Henderson Smith</i> , ... 358-368
Harris' Self-revelation of God.....	<i>John L. Girardeau</i> 174-177
Hawes' Baptism Mode Studies	<i>H. C. Alexander</i> 375-376
Hebrew Movement, The	<i>W. R. Harper</i> 338-343
Hittite Empire, The	<i>W. W. Moore</i> 433-453
Jews, The Restoration of the.....	<i>A. W. Miller</i> 61-86, 249-279

	PAGES.
Kellogg's Abraham, Joseph and Moses in Egypt... <i>Geo. D. Armstrong</i>	380-384
Lowe's Hebrew Grammar	<i>W. W. Moore</i> 561-563
McCosh's Realistic Philosophy	<i>John L. Girardeau</i> 179-186
McGlynn Affair, The	<i>Jno. McLaurin</i> 332-338
Melchizedek, Who Was	<i>Jos. H. Alexander</i> 454-476
Morris' Is There Salvation After Death	<i>John L. Girardeau</i> 545-551
Müller's Science of Thought.....	<i>Henry E. Shepherd</i> 569-571
National Reform	<i>Robert P. Kerr</i> 534-540
Nineteenth Century Evangelism	<i>T. D. Witherspoon</i> 280-296
Northern General Assembly of 1887	<i>Thos. A. Hoyt</i> 154-159
Notes	129-173, 332-368, 524-545
Organic Union	<i>C. R. Vaughan</i> 296-331
Peabody's Moral Philosophy.....	<i>John L. Girardeau</i> 177-179
Personal Liberty Movement, The.....	<i>Mason W. Pressly</i> 540-545
Plumptre's Spirits in Prison	<i>John L. Girardeau</i> 368-371
Presbytery vs. Episcopacy.....	<i>Wm. C. Clark</i> 491-506
Prohibition, Relation of the Church to	<i>A. B. Curry</i> 169-173
Protestant Episcopal Basis of Church Unity ...	<i>C. R. Hemphill</i> 164-169
Pseudo-Scientific View of Miracles	<i>R. R. Howison</i> 343-349
Recent Publications	204-216, 390-398, 571-586
Reunion, Reasons for	<i>J. M. P. Otts</i> 349-358
Reviews	174-204, 368-390, 545-571
Revivals of Religion	<i>Thos. E. Peck</i> 399-415
Robinson's The Pharaohs of the Bondage and Exodus... <i>Geo. D. Armstrong</i>	380-384
Ruling Elders, Their Induction into Office ...	<i>Roger Martin</i> 159-164
Sabbath Observance, Legislative Enforcement of... <i>Samuel M. Shelton</i> ...	507-524
Sehрман's Ethical Import of Darwinism	<i>Geo. D. Armstrong</i> 566-569
Springfield, After, What?	<i>J. L. Withrow</i> 529-534
Spurious Religious Excitements	<i>R. L. Dabney</i> 217-237
Southern General Assembly of 1887	<i>C. R. Vaughan</i> 129-154
Strong's Our Country	<i>Robert A. Webb</i> 388-390
Thomson's Land and The Book	<i>W. W. Moore</i> 200-204

S. M. Casey
1871
Berkeley

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 1.—JULY, 1887.

I. BERKELEY'S IDEALISM.

A splendid edition of Bishop Berkeley's works was issued, in 1871, by Professor Alexander Campbell Fraser, the incumbent of the Chair of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh—the chair once illuminated by the genius of the illustrious Sir William Hamilton. The elaborate dissertations in which the accomplished Editor expounds the Bishop's idealistic system, and the fact that they have emanated from one who has succeeded the great exponent and defender of Natural Realism, have had the effect of calling attention afresh to the principles of Berkeley's philosophy. In proceeding to discuss them we deem it important to furnish a brief preliminary statement of the main features of Berkeley's system :

1. The Denial of Abstract Ideas.
2. The Denial of the Existence of Matter as Substance. There is no such thing as material substance.
3. The Denial of even the Phenomenal Existence of Matter, separate from and independent of spirit: denial of Natural Realism. Material things have no reality in themselves. Whatever reality or *casuality* material things possess, is dependent and relative.
4. *Esse est percipi*: the so-called material world depends for existence upon the perception of spirit. A thing exists only as it is sensibly perceived.

225038

5. Ideas, Sensations, and Sense-given Phenomena are the same. The material or external world of these Ideas, Sensations or Sense-given Phenomena depends for existence upon Perception—that is the perception of spirit. “The existence of our ideas consists in their being perceived, imagined, thought on.”

6. These external things or ideas constitute a system of symbols which (1) furnish a medium of communication between different spirits, (2) interpret to finite intelligence the being and casual efficiency of the Infinite Spirit. *causal*

7. There is no real causality in the external world of ideas. The only relation between them is that of antecedence and sequence.

8. The permanence of the sensible world of ideas is grounded to us in the fact that our present sensations are signs of the past and of the future. “Physical substance and causality” (so-called) “are only the arbitrarily constituted signification of actual sensations.”—*Fraser*. “Substantiality in the material world is permanence of co-existence among sensations. * * * Causality of phenomena is permanence or invariableness among their successions.”—*Fraser*. This permanence of matter (so-called) is in God. Sensations and sensible things are neither permanent, nor efficient. “The sensible world consists of significant sensations in perpetual flux, and sustained by the divine reason or will.”—*Fraser*.

9. We now see what Berkeley meant by *ideas*. They are what are ordinarily termed material things or phenomena. They are in the mind, but not of it. Their origin is subjective, but they become objective. Material phenomena are ideas objectified and externalized. What we call the law of nature is only the order of the succession of these ideas.

10. God calls forth in us our ideas in regular order.

11. Real ideas, that is, ideas externalized, do not depend on our will for their production. Imaginary ideas depend upon the will. Real or sense-ideas are caused by the Infinite Spirit.

12. We are prepared to understand what Berkeley meant by *externality*. It is simply externalized ideas: not a phenomenal reality independent of the perception of spirit.

13. What then is spirit? Berkeley says: “The Mind, Spirit or Soul is that indivisible, unextended thing which thinks, acts and perceives. * * * That which perceives ideas, which thinks and wills, is plainly itself no idea, nor like an idea. Ideas are things, inactive and perceived; and spirits a sort of beings altogether different from them.”—*Hylas & Philonous*.

14. We are directly conscious of the *substance* of our spirits. This consciousness he sometimes denominates reflection: we know, he says, our souls by reflection.

Thought, volition, perception,—these are properly constituents of the soul; they are in it and of it. But ideas, while they are in the soul as sensational impressions, are not of it. They are not elements which belong to its substance. They are not the self—the Ego.

Berkeley distinguishes between real ideas and imagined ideas. The real are phenomenal, sensible things; the imagined are purely mental and subjective—mere *entia rationis*. Now it is important to notice his doctrine of causality as applied to these two different sorts of ideas. The real, he contends, are not caused by us, but by the Infinite Spirit, who puts us in relation to them, or them in relation to us. The imagined are caused by ourselves. The nature of this causal relation between our minds and these imagined ideas he defines from the will. They are caused by the will. We can mentally construct, at will, unreal combinations of the real ideas which we have perceived.

We must also notice his doctrine of the immediacy of our knowledge of real ideas or phenomenal and sensible things. He was not a Hypothetical Realist, but rejected the doctrine of Representative Perception. Between perception and these real ideas, there is, according to him, no intervening modification of the mind, vicarious and representative of the so-called external reality—his real idea. We have an immediate knowledge of it by perception. But while he cannot be ranked as a Cosmothetic Idealist or Hypothetical Realist it must not be inferred that he was a Natural Realist or Absolute Dualist. There is in his doctrine, as Prof. Fraser, the interpreter of his system, endeavors to show, a species of dualism, but it was not that of the Scottish school. It is merely the dualism of the conscious spirit and its own ideas, conceived as external phenomena. The existence of material things separate from and independent of spirit, it was the very point of his philosophy to deny.

He is evidently to be classed with Monists, who affirm the existence of but one substance, and as he contended that this one substance is spirit, he must be assigned to the specific class of Idealistic Monists.

Let us now group the features of his system as they have

been enumerated, so as, if possible, to get a brief and comprehensive statement of his theory. If possible, we say, for any one who attempts to accomplish this will find himself balked by discrepancies and inconsistencies which it is difficult to harmonize, and which reveal the want of mature elaboration of the theory by its author himself.

There is no such thing as matter, according to the ordinary conception of philosophers and the common people. No material substance can be proved to exist. It is therefore to us nothing. Nor are the so-called phenomena of matter realities which have an independent existence as such. They depend for existence upon their being perceived by spirit: *Esse est percipi*—their very being is to be perceived. Abstract the perception of spirit from them, and they are zero. They are consequently ideas, not separate from the mind, but in it as impressed upon it through the media of sensations. Indeed, they are represented as sensations themselves. Phenomena, which are denominated external, are, therefore, but objectified ideas or sensations. The mind gone, they are gone. But these ideas are not limited to any one spirit. They are related to the aggregate of finite spirits, and ultimately to the infinite Spirit. Finite spirits being supposed to be out of relation through perception to these real ideas or sensible phenomena, they continue to find the reason of their existence in the perception of the omnipresent Spirit. In fact they are creatively caused by God—are God's ideas. The universe, consequently, is a collection of God's ideas. Whoever, then, perceives the universe, or any part of it, perceives God's ideas, and has presented to him by the ordinary experience of the perceptive faculty incontestable evidence of the existence of God as an intelligent and omnipotent Spirit. For, all phenomena constitute a symbolism of sense which is a medium of communication between finite spirits, and which signifies to us the divine attributes. As we put together letters to form a word, so we collect these sensible symbols to spell out the great name of God. These external phenomena, thus systematised, and having their unity in their relation to the Infinite Spirit as caused by him, have no other coherence in themselves but that which

springs from a divinely ordained antecedence and sequence. The only cause which operates in them and through them is that which originated them ; and as God's ideas they meet their continuity and persistence alone in his immediate efficiency.

It will be seen, from this brief and necessarily inadequate sketch of Bishop Berkeley's philosophical theory of idealism, that his pious purpose—as he himself avowed it to be—in its construction, was to resist and overthrow the prevailing Materialism of his times, and to vindicate the doctrine of God's existence, and of his immediate relation to the phenomenal universe as his product against the objections to it which Materialists were wont to urge. It remains to be seen whether, in the prosecution of this laudable design, he did not go far towards the opposite extreme of asserting, at least by logical consequence, an idealistic Pantheism, which cancels the difference between the Deity and his works, which makes God the universe and the universe God.

In proceeding to consider the theory let us understand, at the outset, what are *not* the questions to be discussed.

First, it is not the question, whether any so-called material things actually exist as unperceived by some spiritual intelligence, whether any unperceived or unperceivable matter exists. This cannot be made a question, since *it may be* that wherever matter in any form exists, there also finite spirits exist and are in perceptive relation to it ; and since *it is certain* that no material things can exist out of relation to God, as an omnipresent spirit.

Secondly, it is not the question, whether any finite thing can have the cause of its existence in itself. The existence of God being admitted, all matter (so-called) and all finite spirits must be regarded as caused by his infinite power. Separate being, as caused, they may have, but it is necessarily derived and dependent.

Thirdly, it is not the question, whether the material system depends for continued existence upon spirit. Every opponent of Materialism admits the fact that it depends for that existence upon God as the infinite Spirit. In this they all concur with

Bishop Berkeley. They may differ from him as to the mode of the divine *concursum* and support.

Fourthly, it is not the question, whether matter is an original and underived cause of any effects, whether it possesses an independent power to cause phenomenal changes. It may be a question whether matter (so-called) is endowed with properties which as second and subordinate causes are adapted to produce phenomenal changes, but it is not made a question in this discussion, whether it has the efficiency of a first and original cause. That the pure Materialist may affirm, but its denial is here assumed.

These, then, are not questions with which the present argument has to deal, and must consequently be thought away. What, then, are the questions about which it is concerned?

I. The first question which falls to be considered is, whether or not there be such a thing as Material Substance. Bishop Berkeley denies that its existence can be proved, and explicitly affirms the contrary. It is one end of these remarks to evince the incompetency of his hypothesis.

1. Berkeley begins by denying and ridiculing the alleged existence of what are termed abstract ideas. The substance of matter is one of these ideas. As there are no such things, there can be no material substance. It is a play upon words, a mere fancy and crotchet of philosophers. Now there are two kinds of ideas, denominated abstract, which are to be carefully distinguished from each other. An oversight of the distinction must involve the discussion in confusion. First, by the terms *abstract idea* is sometimes meant the idea or conception of a phenomenal quality which is common to several individuals, while at the same time they possess other qualities which as peculiar distinguish each of these individuals from the others. The question being, whether such a common quality can in thought be abstracted from its connexion with others and made a separate object of contemplation, Bishop Berkeley at times takes the negative, and at others seems to admit the affirmative. His ordinary doctrine is, that there can be no such quality, to which we can attach an idea. He contends that what we con-

ceive is an individual thing, in the concrete, whatever it may be, and that we make that individual the standard with which we compare others, in order to form a class. While pursuing this line of reasoning, he declares it impossible and ridiculous that there can be an abstract idea of a common quality in the sense of a quality containing in itself the general marks of different individuals. But, on the other hand, he sometimes speaks of a quality which, although particular and not general, sustains a common relation to several individual objects. He says, for example: "A man may consider a figure merely as triangular, without attending to the particular qualities of the angles, or relations of the sides;" and again he observes: "An idea which, considered in itself, is particular, becomes general by being made to represent or stand for all other particular ideas of the same sort."*

This looks very much like giving up the question as to the possibility of abstract ideas. Once admit that the abstract idea does not involve a general inclusion in itself of the ideas of all the qualities which belong to a class of individuals, but is a particular idea—that is, an idea of a single quality which holds a common relation to several individuals, and that is all that we care to contend for. And Sir William Hamilton, who concurs with Berkeley in his Nominalism, attributes to him, and himself holds, the doctrine of the possibility of such abstract ideas. The question is, What grounds the relation of resemblance between the individuals composing what is called a class? The answer is, and must be, Some quality which is common to them. And this is the answer which Hamilton gives, in expounding the Nominalistic theory.

When, in maintaining the first-mentioned of these views, Berkeley says that a general notion, or, what is the same thing, an abstract idea, is merely a name, and that we delude ourselves when we suppose it anything else, he loses sight of the obvious consideration that a name is significant, or it is an unmeaning cipher. It is the symbol of something. If then there be not some quality which is signified by what is called

* Principles of human knowledge.

a general term, the term is mere gibberish. We have seen that Berkeley stated the true doctrine when he granted the existence of ideas of particular qualities having common relations. It is precisely such ideas or concepts as are symbolized by general terms. If, then, there may be according to his own admission, abstract ideas of phenomenal qualities, his general doctrine is invalidated, that no such things as abstract ideas can exist. This argument, however, has no direct bearing upon the question in hand, namely, whether there can be the abstract idea of the *substance* of matter; for the abstract idea of phenomenal qualities being conceded, it does not follow that such an idea of substance may exist. The indirect office discharged by the argument—and it is a valuable one—is to break down the universal affirmation that no abstract ideas are possible.

Secondly, there is another kind of abstract idea which it is more pertinent, and indeed which it is vital, to the discussion, to consider. It is the abstract idea of things which are not phenomenal, but which it is common to infer as the substrates of phenomenal qualities, as their ground of manifestation and their bond of unity. Such an idea is that of cause, which it is usual with men, not biased by some philosophical hypothesis, to infer from phenomenal changes. Such an idea is that of substance which it is also common to infer from phenomenal qualities—the substance of the soul, the substance of God, and the substance of matter. Berkeley confines our knowledge of matter (so-called) to perception. As it will be confessed on all hands that we cannot *perceive* substance, it follows from his datum that we have no knowledge of material substance, or, to use his phraseology, we can have no abstract idea of it; the terms mean nothing. The thing signified by them is a chimera.

In the first place, the *argumentum ad hominem* may be employed against this view. Bishop Berkeley, as a Christian theologian, admitted the existence of the substance of God. That he, or any one else, could know that transcendent substance by perception, internal or external, is out of the question. How, then, did he construe the apprehension of it? The answer must be by one of those very abstract ideas of substance which he vehe-

mently rejects. He contends that we know God, apart from the direct testimony of revelation, though those phenomenal manifestations of himself which he denominates ideas—the objectified, externalised ideas of the Divine Being. Of course, then, he inferred the existence of the divine substance from these finite manifestations. As the substance is not, cannot be, perceived, it cannot be a concrete percept. What then? It can only be apprehended as an abstract idea. But the Bishop's position is that there can be no abstract idea of substance. This one, eminent instance to the contrary, negatives his assertion, and negatives it by virtue of his own confession. But, if we may have an abstract idea of the divine substance, why not of material substance? The alleged impossibility of such an idea will not answer. The argument from the incompetency of perception to furnish it palpably breaks down.

In the second place, Berkeley expressly admits the existence of the substance of the soul, but he contends that we know it by consciousness. Now consciousness is equivalent to immediate knowledge, and unless we utterly misconceive his doctrine, it is precisely, that consciousness involves such knowledge. But we may safely challenge the proofs from any quarter that we have immediate knowledge, or, what is the same, an intuition of the substance of the soul. If we have we can describe it, as we can, every object of immediate knowledge. Who ever succeeded in doing this? It is too obvious to require argument that what knowledge of the soul's substance we possess is not derived from a direct gazing upon it in consciousness; it is not an intuition, a percept. We immediately and necessarily infer its existence from its phenomenal manifestations of which we are conscious and therefore have immediate knowledge. The idea, then, which we have of the substance of the soul is an abstract idea. Here we have another instance of a knowledge of substance which is not directly derived from perception, a knowledge without which we must apprehend our mental being as a mere bundle of phenomenal qualities ligated by no bond of unity—appearances of something which has no existence, qualities of nothing to be qualified. If, therefore, the substance of God and the substance

of the soul cannot possibly be percepts, we have a knowledge of them through ideas which are abstracted from any concrete appearance. Why not—the question recurs—why not a similar abstract idea of the substance of matter? There is certainly nothing in the constitution of our minds to preclude such knowledge. It must be shown that there is something peculiar in the very nature of what is called matter, which exempts it from the possibility of being thus apprehended.

In the third place, unless there be some philosophical speculation which gives their minds a peculiar bent, men are accustomed to infer the existence of substance from perceived phenomena. This is well-nigh a universal law; it finds utterance and proof alike in the language which is almost universal in its employment. The term *phenomenon* has scarcely any meaning, unless there is something which grounds appearances, unless all reality is reduced to mere appearance, and everything around us and within us which is an object of perception is “mere shine.” The term *manifestation* implies that there is something which is manifested. *Quality* suggests something which is qualified; *property* something to which the thing so denominated belongs. *Mode* infers something which is modified. *Attributé* guarantees something to which somewhat is due. *Accident* probably signifies etymologically that which falls upon something else for support. The term *substance* itself, which belongs at least to the language of every cultivated people, would be a meaningless collection of letters, unless it signified something which is under other things and serves in some sort as their support. And we cannot here forbear remarking that although the Bishop makes great sport of the thing called substance, and facetiously asks what kind of pillars it has, he very naturally, like ordinary mortals, talks of the substance of the soul as supporting its qualities. We might have craved of him the favor to tell us what its pillars look like, and how they hold up qualities!

The terms which have been mentioned, used as they are almost universally, sufficiently indicate the common belief of the race in the existence of substance; and as all of them are more or less commonly applied to the substance of matter,

the common belief of the race in the existence of that kind of substance. Berkeley's endeavor to show that his theory really interprets this belief is only an ingenious attempt to quadrate his speculations with the convictions of mankind. It is certainly a powerful presumption against any opinion that it traverses universal conviction.

2. There pervades all Berkeley's reasoning in support of his theory the confusion of the knowledge of existence with existence itself. If this were an oversight it would certainly be curious, and all the more curious that it is not noticed by his distinguished commentator, Professor Fraser. If it were designed as an inherent element in his system, it behooved him to rebut the presumption which lies against it by an articulate consideration of it. Whatever may be thought of the doctrine of the Relativity of Knowledge, as expounded by Sir William Hamilton, as a whole, the position that, while all that is known by us must in some way be in relation to our faculties, still our knowledge is not the measure of existence, is so obviously true as to commend itself to an almost unquestioning acceptance. In this affirmation the great Scottish philosopher limits knowledge to perceptive knowledge, which is substantially Berkeley's position. But Hamilton admitted and contended for the doctrine that there are realities, transcending perception, which must be believed,—realities which are close to us, such as the occult substance of the soul and the equally occult substance of matter. But however close to us an alleged reality may be, Berkeley declares its non-existence, except it be perceived. Now, the doctrine is so astounding that perceptive knowledge grounds or even conditions real existence, that only arguments of the most demonstrative character could induce its reception. It is to violate common sense to say that knowledge is efficiently casual of existence. We necessarily attribute it to power as its efficient cause. Power is productive, knowledge apprehensive. It may direct power, but cannot be conceived as substituting it. And this is all the more remarkable, inasmuch as Berkeley holds — and attention is particularly invoked to the fact— that the sensible phenomena which he calls ideas and maintains to be

grounded for existence in perception, are caused by the creative power of God. Granted, that he admits realities which our perceptions cannot reach, and that they exist because God perceives them, how is that position to be reconciled with the other, that God causes their existence by His will? But if God may cause the existence of realities which, in consequence of their distance from us we cannot apprehend by perception, He may cause the existence of substance very near to us which may equally lie beyond the scope of the mere perceptive faculty. The truth is that neither our own knowledge, perceptive or not, nor that of other finite beings, nor that of God Himself, is the ground, or efficient cause, of existence. It is true that nothing exists without God's knowledge, but it is another thing to say that nothing can exist except it is produced by His knowledge. If this be true of the Infinite Spirit, much more is it true of our spirits. And if it be true of all knowledge, it certainly is of perception. The mere fact, therefore, that alleged material substance is out of relation to our perceptions in no degree affects the question of its existence. There may be and probably are a thousand existences around us of which we can have no knowledge by perception. God Himself is around us and in us, but we perceive Him not.

3. Berkeley's theory, in restricting the knowledge of material existence to perception, takes no account of the fundamental laws of belief, and the faith-judgments which spring from them when elicited into expression by the conditions of experience. It was one of the great offices discharged by Kant and the philosophers of the Scottish school, that they called attention to the fundamental forms of thought and belief which are imbedded in the very foundations of our nature. Perception furnishes the conditions upon which they emerge into consciousness and affirm themselves, but once drawn forth from their latency, they originate the grandest knowledges of the human soul. It is not our perceptions, it is our faith-judgments, which impart the highest import to our knowledge, and stamp the loftiest significance upon our duties, our relations and our destiny. It is such judgments as cannot be furnished by perception, judgments which give us cause and substance, God and immortality, that lend the

truest dignity to our being. To leave out of account these fundamental laws with their accompanying interferences is to sink out of view by far the most important elements of our knowledge. Now, it is exactly these principles which lead to the inference of substance, and it is no wonder that Berkeley, in overlooking them, has been led into the capital error of concluding that because perception cannot affirm the existence of material substance, therefore it cannot exist. This is the point at which his theory especially breaks down.

So far as to Berkeley's denial of the existence of material substance.

II. The second question which claims consideration is, whether phenomenal things, ordinarily termed material, are as ideas dependent upon the perceptions of spirit; for Berkeley's regulative principle is *esse est percipi*—to be is to be perceived. Let it be observed that the question is not now in regard to the substance of matter. That question is discharged. It is in respect to what are ordinarily termed the phenomena of matter. And in order that this question may be distinctly apprehended let us for a moment recall Berkeley's doctrine. He maintains the view that there are no material phenomena, as such. The phenomena so called are dependent for existence upon the perception of spirits. They have no separate, independent existence. There is no such thing as a material system. Materiality is denied and Immateriality affirmed. All sensible phenomena are ideas and these ideas are dependent upon perception, and are all *in the mind*. Properly speaking, they have no external objective existence, except so far as ideas in the mind can be said to have existence. All the so-called qualities of matter are contained under this denomination—ideas. These ideas, further, are sensations: for whatever is an object of perception is a sensation. Sensations include all the qualities of so-called matter—the primary as well as the secondary. Ideas, sensible things, real ideas, real things, sensible objects, sensible phenomena, sense-given ideas or objects, sensations—these all, however, Berkeley's phraseology and even his statements sometimes vary, are by him treated as the same. This may safely be

affirmed to be his catholic doctrine. The question before us is, then, in regard to the position that all so-called material phenomena, as ideas, are dependent for existence upon their being perceived by spiritual substance.

1. The theory is chargeable with the logical fault of wanting scientific coherence and self-consistency.

(1.) In stating the main principle which regulates it—namely, to be is to be perceived, it was absolutely necessary that the question be met, upon the perception of *what spirits* do material phenomena, or ideas, depend for existence? This question Berkeley answers by saying that some ideas depend upon the perception of human spirits, others upon that of non-human finite spirits, and all upon that of the Infinite Spirit. It would seem to be evident that he started out with the hypothesis that it is the perception of the individual human spirit which conditions phenomenal existence. And to this he adhered until the difficulties attaching to it shut him up to the admission, that all phenomenal existence cannot depend upon the perception of an individual finite spirit. This is made apparent from the way in which he dealt with the difficulty raised by the absence of the individual from certain phenomenal realities, and the impossibility, consequently, of his perception conditioning their existence. He states the case himself. While he was present in his study, the existence of the books it contained depended upon his perceiving them. But was their existence suspended, while he was absent, and could not perceive them? No, he replies, when absent I can imagine them, and the imagination of them conditions their existence.

Subsequently, he saw the absurdity of this position, and took the ground that their existence depended, in the absence of all human percipients, upon the perception of the omnipresent Spirit. This ought, in consistency, to have led him to the abandonment of the supposition that any phenomenal reality depends for existence upon the perception of human spirits, or even upon non-human finite spirits, and to the assertion of the view that all phenomenal reality depends for existence upon the perception of the Infinite Spirit. But this he did not do, and

the consequence is, that he jumbles the perceptions of finite spirits and of the Infinite Spirit as the ground of phenomenal existence. One or the other ought to have been affirmed, not both. They cannot possibly be made the conjoint or common ground of phenomenal existence.

(2.) Another evidence of inconsistency in the theory lies in the fact that Ideas and Sensations are treated as the same; for Berkeley says that sensations are internal feelings, and that ideas are external things. How can mental phenomena be at the same time internal and external? To escape this inconsistency it may be said that they are not at the same time both internal and external, but as the same things they are first one and then the other. Let us take that supposition. If they be first internal and then become external, the difficulty occurs that as sensations are necessarily subjective feelings, there would in the first instance be nothing to originate them; there would be no external reality to which they would correspond. Another difficulty would be, as ideas and sensations are the same, to account for their becoming external. For Berkeley holds that external ideas are not caused by the will. But their externalization could only take place in consequence of some mental effort or energy. They must therefore externalize themselves, which is absurd, since it is contended that they possess no causal force. These difficulties are fatal to the supposition that ideas or sensations are first internal and then become external.

But, on the other hand, let it be supposed that they are first external and then become internal. The difficulty then would be to account for the transition. As external they must be conceived as grounding themselves as internal, which is absurd; and besides, the supposition is inconsistent with Berkeley's main principle, that perception grounds ideas or sensations. It cannot be true that ideas or sensations as external ground themselves as internal, and that perception grounds their existence whether as internal or external. In addition to this, it is obvious that as a sensation, from the nature of the case, is a mental feeling and therefore subjective, it is incompetent to represent it as first external and objective and then internal and subjective

But whether this reasoning be correct or not, the principal feature of the inconsistency returns in force, namely, that ideas and sensations being treated as the same, it cannot be maintained that ideas are external phenomena and sensations are internal feelings. If ideas are not external phenomena absolute subjective Idealism is the result, and that Berkeley does not affirm ; if sensations are not internal feelings, but external phenomena, Materialism is the result, and that it is the main purpose of his philosophy to deny.

(3.) Still another element of inconsistency may be noticed. Berkeley contends that there can be no phenomenal realities, or what is the same, there can be no ideas, except there be the perception of them by spirit. Now this must mean, if it mean anything, that the perception of spirit grounds the existence of ideas. What else does the great maxim signify—*esse est percipi*, being is to be perceived? The being of ideas depends on their being perceived. Yet Berkeley explicitly says, that ideas are not caused by finite spirits, but caused alone by the will of God. Here the ground of the existence of ideas is declared to be God's will. There are then two grounds for their existence—the perception of finite spirits and the will of the Infinite Spirit. This is certainly a confusion of thought. If it be said that the ground of existence which is assigned to finite perception is different from the cause of existence, the distinction is unintelligible. And, further, if the ground of existence in perception is shifted from finite spirits to the infinite Spirit, inconsistency still emerges ; for it is inconsistent to say that the ground or cause of the existence of ideas is at the same time in the perception and in the will of God. Whatever may be thought of the hypothesis that God's knowledge is the cause of finite existence, it is not unintelligible. And it is certainly competent to say that God's will, on the other hand, is the cause of finite existence. But it is unmeaning to say that such a cause is to be referred in the same sense both to the knowledge and the will of God. Such are some of the inconsistencies which inhere in Berkeley's theory ; and if they have been proved to exist, they cannot but damage its truth.

2. 'Having pointed out the logical inconsistency of Berkeley's theory in its attempt to find a ground of phenomenal existence, first in the perception of individual finite spirit, then in that of a number of finite spirits, and lastly in that of the Infinite Spirit, or in the perception of both finite spirits and of the Infinite Spirit, we proceed to show that the theory involves real inconsistencies—inconsistencies not merely of arrangement, but of a metaphysical character. When, as was inevitable, it became apparent that no individual finite spirit could possibly be at all times in the relation of perception to any section of phenomenal existence however limited, or at any time to the whole of phenomenal existence, the view had to be abandoned that phenomenal existence is grounded in the perception of individual intelligence. This is conceded by the editor of Berkeley's works, and was substantially admitted by the Bishop himself. Recourse was then had to the view that the ground of phenomenal existence was to be sought in the aggregate perceptions of all finite intelligences. This supposed that there are no phenomenal realities which are not in relation to the perception of some finite spirits. But it soon became evident that this supposition could not be maintained. It is not only a fact which must be acknowledged that even that small part of phenomenal reality which at some time may be related to the perception of the individual is not at all times so related, but that there can be no proof of the relation at all times of the whole or even of a part of phenomenal reality to any finite perception. On the contrary, it is easy to suppose the existence of phenomenal reality apart from relation to the perception of any finite intelligence. If, for instance, the moon be uninhabited, its particular features would exist out of relation to intelligent finite beings, and their existence could not be said to be grounded in the perception of such beings. So, upon the geologic assumption that the world existed long before it became the home of intelligent beings, its existence could not have been conditioned by their perception. Nor can we resist the conviction that if this globe were now stripped by some dread catastrophe of all its intelligent occupants, it might continue to exist, although out of relation to all human perception.

The hypothesis of the existence of spirits, of whom the Bible alone speaks, is hyperphysical and, therefore, cannot enter as an element into a strictly philosophical argument.

Now, how were these obtrusive and admitted difficulties met by Berkeley's theory? In this way: the sensations which are at any given period of time experienced by finite intelligences, although they could not have been always experienced by them, nor can be in the whole future experienced by them, are while experienced signs of past and future sensations. It is easy to detect the insufficiency of this extraordinary hypothesis, framed to account for the existence of sensations or ideas when they stood or will stand in no immediate relation to finite perception. Let us not lose sight of the thing to be proved. It is that phenomenal existence abides when no finite being perceives it. The proof furnished is, that present sensations, which *are* perceived, are signs of the existence of past and future sensations. But it is, *ex hypothesi*, admitted that these past and future sensations are out of relation to perception, and are signified by present sensations which alone are in relation to perception. Now Berkeley's great principle is that perception grounds or conditions phenomenal existence. According to this principle, then, these past and future sensations or phenomenal realities being conceded to be unrelated to perception can have no existence. It is not sensations or ideas, according to Berkeley, which ground the existence of other sensations or ideas—that he denies; but it is always perception which is the reason of their existence. As then the only ground of past and future phenomenal existence which is assigned by this hypothesis is significant sensations or ideas, the hypothesis is signally out of harmony with the main theory.

Further, it is obvious to remark, that the supposition of these significant sensations in order to show that phenomenal realities may exist out of relation to finite perception, is a clear abandonment of the principle that any phenomenal realities depend for existence upon the perception of finite intelligences. If some confessedly exist apart from that relation, all may.

If, in reply to this reasoning it be urged, that these sensations

which are signs of past and future phenomenal existences, out of relation to the perception of finite spirits, are signs of phenomenal existence in relation to the perception of the infinite Spirit and having its ground of continuance in that perception, it must be rejoined that this would be to change the issue. If in an attempt to show that present sensations, as signs, prove the continued existence of phenomenal realities in relation to finite intelligence, it be at the same time maintained that their persistence in being is due to God's perception, the question is altered, and the procedure is illegitimate. This but serves to fortify the stricture already passed upon the theory, that it inconsistently tries to found phenomenal existence alike upon the perception of finite and of infinite intelligence. The theory ought to have been purged of this inconsistency, and to have sought the ground of phenomenal existence simply and alone in the divine perception. It would in that case have had, at least, the advantage and the merit of unity.

3. It is clear that in those cases, in which phenomenal realities or ideas are in immediate relation to our perception, Berkeley's doctrine is that they depend for existence upon that perception. There is an evident difficulty which lies in the way of this hypothesis. Most, if not all, of the phenomena which come within the scope of our perception operating through the senses are not simple, but compound. Now, it is certain that some of the fundamental elements of these complex realities are beyond the reach ordinarily of sense-perception. It is only the art of the chemist and of the microscopist which can avail to reveal to us their sensible existence. Nor can it be proved that there are not still simpler and more ultimate elements in existence than those which even that art has brought to light. These elements lying out of the reach of perception are, according to Berkeley's theory, destitute of a ground of existence. As they are not perceived by us, they do not exist. And yet these very unperceived and consequently non-existent elements are the ground-forms of those complex wholes which are obtrusively presented to perception.

4. Upon Berkeley's theory Representative Knowledge is

impossible. Let us remember certain of his principles : perception is immediate knowledge of ideas or phenomenal realities. All external phenomenal realities are known by perception. Their existence depends upon perception. It follows, that unless they be perceived, unless they be immediately known, they cannot exist. Now Berkeley distinguished ideas into two classes—real and imagined. Real ideas are sensible phenomena, which are not caused by us, but caused by God's will. Imagined ideas are mental phenomena of our own creation ; they are caused by our wills. From all this it is plain that Berkeley grounded the existence of all phenomenal realities in perception. The question then is, When we do not perceive these real phenomenal existences, how do we know them? The ordinary answer would be, by representing them in the imagination. Apprehending by immediate knowledge, that is by internal perception or consciousness, the representing images, we necessarily believe in the existence of the objects represented. We have a knowledge of the formerly presented objects which is mediate, it is true, but is, at the same time, valid and trustworthy. But Berkeley could not, consistently with his theory, thus answer. Nothing but perception, that is immediate knowledge, of the object can ground its real existence. Where that is wanting, the ideas we cognize are mere creatures of the imagination, in themselves unreal, and having no ground of existence. They represent no realities ; they are spectral and illusory. Representation is not perception : perception alone gives us real, objective existence ; consequently, the representative faculty cannot give us that sort of reality.

Let these remarks be applied to memory as a representative faculty. The external, phenomenal facts once presented are no longer in relation to perception. They have, therefore, according Berkeley's theory, lost their ground of existence. To be is to be perceived. They are not *perceived* ; consequently they *are* not. If we imagine them by the representative faculty, we can have no guarantee of their reality. All the past, as it has slid away from relation to our perception, is irrecoverably gone into the region of unreality. The largest section of our knowledge is

obliterated. The representative faculty as one furnishing the knowledge of the real is *nil*. This consequence may appear too absurd to be imputed to Berkeley's theory. Let him who thinks so apply the controlling principle, to be is to be perceived, to the processes of our faculties of representative knowledge, and he must be convinced of the legitimacy of the consequence.

5. It revolts common sense to say that a phenomenal reality would cease to exist, were there no finite spirit to perceive it; that a mountainous pile of rock for example, would not exist, if some spirit were not perceiving it. The case does not bear reasoning. It so traverses common conviction that its enunciation provokes derision, and deservedly provokes it. So sensible was Bishop Berkeley of this, and also his interpreter, Professor Fraser, that it was deemed necessary to invoke a hyperphysical ground for the persistence of objects not perceived by finite beings, and in that way to supplement the deficiencies of the theory. This retreat from the hypothesis that phenomenal existence is grounded in finite perception was its deliberate sacrifice. When its friends forsook it, what could be expected for it from the tender mercies of its foes? When the Israelites retired from Saul, the Philistines decapitated him and fastened his body to the wall of Bethshan. Why, then, it may be asked, attack an abandoned hypothesis? Is it not most conclusively refuted by the fact that its originators gave it up? The answer is, that they gave it up and they did not give it up. They confessed its insufficiency and continued to speak in defence of it, as one would mention some of the virtues of a forsaken friend. It is right to shut them up to its complete relinquishment and to the advocacy of another hypothesis—the grounding of phenomenal existence in God's perception.

No reasoning, however subtle, supported though it be by the genius of the accomplished Bishop of Cloyne, can succeed in practically convincing men that their sensations are the same with the external, phenomenal things by which they are surrounded, and which they are accustomed to regard as only the occasions of the sensations. They cannot be argued into the belief that the pain they feel is the very same with the fire to

which they attribute it—with the wood and the flame; that the sensation of hardness they experience is the same with the great iron pillar that helps to sustain a massive roof; that the sensation they feel when beholding the glories of the starry heavens is the same with the measureless systems that stud the amplitude of space. When, in the elegant dialogue in which Berkeley defends his theory, Hylas, the representative of the existence of matter, confesses his entire conversion to the views of Philonous the exponent of Immaterialism, he utters the confession amidst throes and misgivings which suggest the nausea and vomiting of a man who in the intervals of the spasms endeavors to land the virtues of the medicine which has sickened him.

That a powerful presumption lies against a philosophical hypothesis which is contrary to the common convictions and belief of men is explicitly admitted by Berkeley himself, and he exerts his power of argument to show that his view upon this subject is not opposed by the weight of that presumption. He succeeded, as was to be expected, in persuading his imaginary interlocutor, Hylas, of the tenableness of this view, but not much is risked by the statement that his argument would not meet with the same success if addressed to the mass of mankind. It is at least certain that the very need of such an argument supposes that the ordinary belief of men is opposed to the Bishop's doctrine.

7. That element of Berkeley's theory is incapable of justification, in which the doctrine of the school of Associationalism is maintained, that the only relation between sensible phenomena, ordinarily termed material, is one of mere antecedence and sequence. This view flows from his position that the will of God is the only cause which operates in the system of phenomenal relations, that ideas are caused alone by his will, and have their connection with each other determined by a causality which is entirely foreign both to their own intrinsic nature and to the will of finite intelligences.

(1.) This doctrine is paradoxical; it is out of harmony with the common beliefs of the race. Whatever philosophers may hold, it is idle to argue that men in general

do not entertain the conviction that there is the relation of cause and effect between sensible phenomena, and between the will of man and the objects of the external world. Even those philosophers who hold that the judgment which affirms the relation of cause and effect is not an original principle of our mental constitution but is the result of experience, maintain the view that it is a necessary judgment unavoidably arising from empirical conditions; while the drift of modern philosophical thought is towards the assertion of the law of causality as one of the fundamental and original elements of our nature. And it cannot well be denied that this tendency falls in with the ordinary belief of mankind. Is a phenomenal change observed? The natural inquiry which spontaneously arises is, What is its cause? Let it be observed, that this demand of reason is not made with reference merely to the origination of substantial existence or of phenomenal being, but also and most frequently in regard to changes which are recognized as taking place in the realm of simple phenomena. The hypothesis of antecedence and sequence does not satisfy this requirement; and, to the extent of its involving that hypothesis as an integral element, Berkeley's theory clashes with the instinctive judgments of men.

(2.) In regard to the position that the human will exerts no causal influence upon the relations of external phenomenal objects, we venture to take the ground that it contradicts consciousness; for consciousness delivers to us the fact that the will is competent to institute the relation of antecedence and sequence between external things. It can bring them together in that relation. And if so, the invariableness of the relation as a law which is not subject to voluntary control is disproved by a datum of consciousness. Nothing is more common than the collocation of sensible things by voluntary action for the purpose of securing desired results. And further than this, consciousness also delivers the fact that the continuance or interruption of the relation is within the power of the human will. This could be illustrated in numberless ways. The hypothesis, then, that there is a fixed relation of mere antecedence and

sequence between so-called material things, which cannot be affected by the free elections and the causal force of the human will, is evinced to be contradictory to the deliverances of consciousness, and they must be regarded as decisive, or there is no ground of certitude in existence, no ultimate authority an appeal to which ought to put an end to strife. Of course, there is no assertion here of the power of the human will to cause ideas, in Berkeley's sense of the word, as equivalent to phenomenal existences. What is affirmed is, that the relations between these ideas are, to a large extent, determinable by the causal efficiency of the will.

It might be objected to this view, that there is no causal power in the will itself, and that the only relation between mental phenomena themselves, including volitions, is that of mere antecedence and sequence. But however Berkeley may have prepared the way, by logical consequence from his hypothesis as to material phenomena, for this sceptical result, as he did not himself advocate or even intimate it, it would be irrelevant here to discuss the question. Were the doctrine of Brown, Hume and the Mills under consideration, the case would be different.

8. It is, however, legitimate to say that the theory of Berkeley logically led the way and conduced to the nescience of Hume, and to the agnosticism of the Positivist school of the present day. For, if the immediate inference from the testimony of consciousness to the real, substantial existence of matter as distinct from that of spirit be refused, the step is easy to the denial of the inference from its testimony to the real, substantial existence of spirit, as distinct from matter. The way is opened for the maintenance of any hypothesis which men may fancy, unembarrassed by the deliverances of consciousness. Hume took the path to the denial of the certainty of any substantial existence, and Spencer has taken that which led him to sink spirit in matter, and to affirm the unknowableness of God Himself. Sir William Hamilton is right, when he says that consciousness undoubtedly gives us in the same indivisible act the existence of spirit and that of matter, related in the synthesis of knowledge

and contrasted in the antithesis of existence. Any other doctrine must logically tend to absolute Idealism, or Materialism, or Nihilism; and we are disposed to think that there is no logical halting place between the acceptance of the deliverances of consciousness in their simplicity and integrity and the adoption of the desolating doctrines of Atheists and Nihilists. These remarks are reluctantly made in regard to the logical tendencies of Berkeley's theory. The pious Bishop would have repudiated with horror the consequences which a rigid logic in the unscrupulous hands of infidels has deduced from it; but still, in the light of the developments which followed his death, it must, in candor, be allowed that his theory was the egg from which was hatched the philosophical scepticism of David Hume.

9. There is another difficulty in Berkeley's theory which is so obvious, that it cannot fail to be noticed. How, it may be demanded, does it ground our knowledge of other personal spirits than ourselves? Berkeley holds that we know our own spirits, as thinking, willing, perceiving, essences—in a word, as personal substances, by self-consciousness. All that is objective to us must be known by the perception of ideas. These ideas he carefully distinguishes from the properties of spirit. As our own ideas are not part and parcel of ourselves as spirits, so neither are ideas part and parcel of other spirits than ourselves. How then do we know other spirits? As we cannot be conscious of them as spirits, our knowledge is limited to the perception of ideas. But perception is, in this case, restricted to bodily organisms, and the language spoken or written through the instrumentality of these organisms. Now, according to Berkeley, they and the words produced by them are non-spiritual; they are merely ideas. Granted then that we apprehend these ideas by perception, the question is, how we know the spiritual substances to which they seem to be related, and to which in the judgment of common sense they *are* related. Consciousness alone can give us spirit; perception only gives us ideas. This difficulty cannot possibly be met by saying that we infer the existence of other spirits from these ideas; for Berkeley vehemently denies that we can infer occult realities from phenomena. The ideas are

phenomena; consequently, we are not allowed to derive the inference from them to spiritual essences. If, inconsistently with the principles of the theory, it be admitted that we must infer their existence, that we must have a faith-judgment which affirms it, the logical consequence would be, that in the same way we might be entitled from phenomena, which Berkeley asserts to be non-spiritual, to infer the existence of non-spiritual substance—that is, in the ordinary language of men, to infer from material phenomena the existence of material substance. As this would contradict the very principles of the idealistic theory, there can be no resort to inference to ground the knowledge of any substance, spiritual or non-spiritual. It would seem, then, to be evident that, upon Berkeley's theory, we can have no knowledge of other personal spirits than ourselves.

In reply to this reasoning, it may be said that Berkeley regarded ideas or sensible phenomena as a system of symbols—a language by means of which spirits hold intercourse with each other. He did; but how that opinion or hypothesis of his helps the matter, it is difficult to see. For even in our own case, he holds that ideas do not ground the existence of spirit, but the contrary: the perception of spirit grounds the existence of ideas. We do not get the knowledge of our own spirits by ideas; we get it by the immediate testimony of self-consciousness. How, then, can the perception of ideas give us the knowledge of other spirits? We cannot be conscious of them; we cannot perceive them—we perceive only ideas, and they are non-spiritual. How then do we know them? The theory furnishes no answer to this momentous question. It fails to account for, nay, it renders impossible, the knowledge by the individual personal spirit of other spirits like itself, and so destroys the possibility of communion between spirit and spirit: of all society based upon the fellowship and reciprocal action of personal intelligences—of the family, the Church, the State. I know my own body only as a collection of ideas, from which it is illegitimate to *infer* the existence of my spirit. In the same way I know other human bodies: they are simply bundles of ideas from which I cannot infer the existence of other spirits. It would seem then that one personal spirit can know

the existence of other personal spirits neither by consciousness, nor by external perception, nor by inference from phenomenal qualities or acts.

No doubt it will be urged in answer to this grave allegation that there is another means of knowledge by which spirits may become acquainted with each other's existence, that has been left out of account in this indictment. What should hinder their knowing each other by the *testimony* of each to its own existence? But the difficulty is not removed. How is this testimony delivered? The answer must be: through words, either spoken or written. These words, however, are, according to Berkeley's theory, a part of those sensible phenomena which he calls ideas. Certainly they are cognized through sense, and thus become objects of perception. How then can we go beyond these perceptions to reach the existence of other spirits than ourselves? Shall we infer from them that existence? This we are debarred from doing by Berkeley's principles. From perceived phenomena to argue the existence of unperceived substance—this is in no case warrantable; if it were, we might be unphilosophical enough even to believe in the substance of matter as revealed by sensible phenomena! As therefore the testimony which other spirits than myself furnish must itself be a collection of ideas, I am shut off from depending upon it as a means of knowing their existence.

In order to turn the edge of this criticism, it may be charged with misconceiving Berkeley's doctrine; for he distinctly teaches that ideas are not caused by the personal will of finite spirits, and as testimony delivered in language is caused by personal will it cannot be considered as belonging to the category of ideas. To this it is obvious to reply, that the testimony must consist either of sounds or of written characters. As sounds are perceived through the sense of hearing they are, according to Berkeley, sensations. They could be perceived in no other way, and in no other way could they be cognizable by us. They are consequently to be classed with Berkeley's ideas. Written or printed characters are perceived through the sense of sight. They also are sensations, and therefore to be ranked among his ideas. We must return then to the assertion that as they are ideas they can,

upon the Bishop's principles, afford no ground for knowing spirit. If they be ideas they are not caused by spirit, and we are excluded from referring them as effects to a spiritual cause. But if it must be admitted that they are caused by the personal will of spirit, there are some ideas which are caused by spirit and Berkeley is made to contradict himself, since he affirms of all ideas that they have no such cause. The only escape from this contradiction would lie in holding that they are not ideas; and that would be to deny their phenomenality, which has been already shown to be impossible. To say that Berkeley proves the existence of God by the phenomenal world as his ideas, is no answer; for he holds that God's ideas are caused by his will. Consequently, it would be legitimate to infer from them as effects his personal existence. There is no analogy between the cases. It has thus been evinced that, upon Berkeley's theory, one spirit cannot know the existence of other spirits.

10. We come now, in the last place, briefly to consider that aspect of Berkeley's theory to which in the final analysis it was brought by himself—namely, that all phenomenal realities, commonly called material, are God's ideas. Let it be noticed that we do not depart from his own definition of ideas, as distinguished from thought, volition and perception which he is careful to designate as the properties of spirit alone. God's ideas, then, will be treated in accordance with his own notion of them, as distinct from God's thoughts and from his perception. His doctrine is that the so-called material universe is a collection of God's ideas, created by his will, and dependent for existence upon his perception. At the same time it must not be forgotten that Berkeley to the last also contended that there are phenomenal realities which are human ideas, not indeed caused by the human will, but dependent upon human perception for their existence. In regard to this final development of his theory we make the following observations :

(1.) God's ideas are represented as being identical with fleeting, sensible phenomena, which, if any meaning can be attached to the language, is shocking to common sense.

(2.) God's ideas are in part corruptible; for it is manifest that some

phenomenal realities, as, for instance, the human body, are corruptible. They dissolve, decay and rot, and what sense can be attached to the affirmation that divine ideas are thus corruptible it tasks the power of man to conceive.

(3.) As all phenomenal existences are God's ideas and some are man's ideas, some are both divine and human ideas at one and the same time. This involves a contradiction and an absurdity.

(4.) As all ideas are said to be sensations, God is said to have sensations.

(5.) As all ideas are God's ideas, and some ideas are our sensations, some of God's ideas are our sensations.

(6.) As all ideas depend upon perception for existence, for *esse est percipi*, God's ideas depend upon his perception for existence; yet Berkeley contends that God's ideas are caused by his will, which is the same as to say that they depend for existence upon his will. Now either his perception and his will are held to be the same, and that is absurd; or they are held to be different, and then the contradiction emerges that his ideas depend for existence upon his perception and at the same time depend for existence upon his will.

(7.) Either God's ideas are held to be a part of himself, or not. If they are not, the contradiction ensues that they are affirmed to be his ideas and not his ideas at one and the same time. If they are a part of himself, as the universe is said to be a collection of God's ideas, it is a part of himself and Idealistic Pantheism is the inevitable result.

(8.) God's ideas and his will are made one and the same. We cannot resist the conviction, forced upon us by the analogies of our own being, that force is an expression of will. But there are forces in operation in the so-called material system, and that fact Berkeley admits. Now that system being, according to him, nothing but God's ideas, it follows that its forces as phenomenal are parts of his ideas, and consequently that his ideas and his will are the same. But if they be said to be the same, a contradiction occurs. For, God's ideas are said to be caused by his will, and a thing cannot without a contradiction be said to be caused by itself.

(9.) Berkeley admitted the fact of creation. But the universe, he contends, is God's ideas. Consequently, God created his own ideas. But Berkeley, in his *Siris*, confesses his leanings to the Platonic doctrine of eternal ideas, and so Professor Fraser interprets him. We have then an eternal creation, which is a contradiction in terms, for that which is created had a beginning, and that which is eternal had no beginning. But if it be held notwithstanding, as Origen maintained, that an eternal creation is possible, and further, that the universe was eternally created, we have a Christian version of the old Greek doctrine of the eternity of matter, or, in Berkeley's phrase, of the phenomenal sensible system.

One fails to see how this congeries of absurdities and contradictions can be denied as logically involved in Berkeley's theory, if it comprise as integral elements the two positions, that sensible phenomena or ideas are dependent for existence upon the perception of finite spirit, and that they are at the same time dependent for existence upon the perception of the Infinite Spirit. If the first of these elements be eliminated from the theory, in order to save it from self-contradiction and reduce it to unity, it is confessed that the bulk of Berkeley's writings, in which it is defended, are nothing worth; they have lost their significance and their interest. If it be retained, it must be granted that his most ardent admirers would find it an office which would task their utmost ability to adjust it to his latest thinking. What his latest thinking was we collect from his *Siris* which was the production of his age. In that remarkable speculation we find him speaking in terms of approbation of Plato's eternal ideas, the only true realities in conformity with which the universe of unreal and fleeting phenomena was brought into being. It cannot be denied that this subjects him to the criticism of changing the meaning of his terms. The term *ideas* which plays the most important part in his previous reasoning as representing created phenomena of sense, is now made to signify the uncreated thoughts—the eternal ideals and archetypes of the Infinite Mind. Formerly ideas were treated by him as phenomenal objects, sensible things, dependent for existence upon finite perception; now they are magnified as the concepts of the eternal intelligence.

There are two hypotheses, each maintained by a writer of genius, upon one of which it is conceivable that an attempt might be made to relieve this inconsistency. One is that of the elder President Edwards who was a contemporary of Berkeley, was preaching at Northampton when the Dean was sojourning in Rhode Island, and held an idealistic theory which to a remarkable extent coincided with that of the latter. The other is that supported in his work on *Metaphysics* by Professor Borden P. Bowne, of Boston University. Much as we would like to examine these hypotheses, the limits of this article forbid it.

This discussion of the Idealism of Bishop Berkeley, however

inadequate it may be, cannot well be deemed untimely. The main current of thought at the present time, in consequence of the prodigious advance of the physical sciences, and the absorption of many acute investigators in the contemplation of outward phenomena, may be setting in the direction of Materialism. But as one extreme of speculation tends to produce another, it is probable, it may almost with safety be predicted, that there will come a powerful re-action towards Idealism. The distinguished editor of Berkeley's Works not obscurely intimates his leaning to the theory they maintain*; and the brilliant Reviewer of Herbert Spencer's Philosophy† declares himself an "Objective Idealist." As in the past the philosophical intellect has vibrated between the opposite extremes of Materialism and Idealism, it is to be expected that there will be a similar oscillation in the future.

Meanwhile the sober student of the facts of consciousness, and the Christian Theist who accepts the obvious teachings of the Bible, will be content, as heretofore, to tread a middle path. They will continue to affirm the difference between the indissoluble and deathless spirit with its grand endowment of intellectual beliefs and moral intuitions, on the one hand, and divisible, corruptible matter, on the other; and holding to the doctrine of Creation as the only safe moorage they will refuse to sublimate the world to unity with God, or sink God to identity with the world. Of any other theory, whatever may be its prestige, the similitude may be used, which was beautifully employed by Cardinal Pole, in a letter to the elegant scholar Sadolet, with reference to the Platonic philosophy since the introduction of the divine system of Christianity :

*"Est in conspectu Tenedos, notissima fama
Insula, dives opum, Priami dum regna manebant ;
Nunc tantum sinus, et statio malefida carinis."*

JOHN L. GIRARDEAU.

*In this opinion we are sustained by Dr. Noah Porter: App. to Ueberweg's Hist. Phil., vol. ii. p. 438. †Prof. Bowne.

II. THE ANDOVER RENAISSANCE IN THEOLOGY.*

We have watched with interest and curiosity the growth of this youngest born of the theological family.

Its venerable mother, with natural partiality, baptized it *Benjamin*, but many of her best friends have challenged the fitness of the name, and predict in the child a veritable *Ben-oni*.

The infant has been somewhat slow to acquire the faculty of coherent thought and facility of connected statement; an interval which has proved a period of more than ordinary anxiety, because there were from the first, in its features, certain traces of resemblance that boded ill for its future influence. There was something suggestive of its Aunt, *Unitarianism*; now somewhat *passee*, but in the heyday of her youth quite a belle in her immediate neighborhood. There was also a suspicion of likeness to another relative, also a female, *Universalism*; an amiable and placid old lady, never very vigorous at her best and now decidedly decrepit. But perhaps the most pronounced and

* 1. OLD FAITHS IN NEW LIGHT.—By Rev. Newman Smyth, author of "The Religious Feeling." One vol., 12 mo., Pp. xii, 391. Second Edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

2. THE FREEDOM OF FAITH.—By the Rev Theodore T. Munger, with a prefatory essay on "The New Theology." 16mo., Pp. vi 397. Thirteenth Edition. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

3. THE CONTINUITY OF CHRISTIAN THOUGHT: A STUDY OF MODERN THEOLOGY IN THE LIGHT OF ITS HISTORY.—By the Rev. A. V. G. Allen, Professor in the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge. 12 mo., Pp. xviii 438. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

4. THE ANDOVER REVIEW. A Religious and Theological Monthly under the editorial control of Egbert C. Smyth, William J Tucker, J W. Churchill, George Harris, Edward Y. Hincks, Professors in Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass., with the co-operation and active support of all their colleagues in the Faculty,—Professors John P. Gulliver, John P. Taylor, George F. Moore, and Frank E. Woodruff; and a large staff of contributors. Volumes i-vi, inclusive. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

5. THE HOMILETIC REVIEW, Vols. xi and xii. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

6. THE CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, Vol. ix. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph.

distinctive resemblance was that of a cousin, *Rationalism*; member of a larger family, though like its aforementioned kin, chiefly local in its influence; a still lusty lad and surprisingly popular for one so full of pertness and self-assertion.

These indications added anxiety to the interest with which the world waited for the first *articulate* utterances of the babe, and now that it has made its voice heard, we take opportunity to examine the message it brings us.

In some respects it talks well. Its advocates usually wield a facile pen; we know of no circle of writers who are more generally and uniformly fresh and entertaining. Even when differing most from them, we are constrained often to acknowledge that they have a very good way of saying a very bad thing; while their light is unquestionably often eccentric, it is with as little question sometimes attractively brilliant; nevertheless though men admire the comet, as a phenomenon, they decidedly prefer to set their watches by the sun.

It has proven itself apt in the appropriation of *taking* titles, *e. g.*: The New Theology; The Real Theology; The Theological Renaissance; Progressive Orthodoxy; Old Faiths in New Light; The Freedom of Faith; The Continuity of Christian Thought.

It is noticeable that each of these phrases embodies an argument, or more strictly speaking—and what to a large class is more effective—*veils an assumption*; a feature characteristic not of the titles only, but of much also that follows them. Closely akin to this *petitio principii* contained in its names and titles, is another characteristic with which we, in common with most critics, find grave fault, *viz*: a habit of using stereotyped phraseology in new senses. These writers ordinarily speak the dialect with which the church is familiar, they regularly employ terms with which the concensus of theological thought has associated certain definite, fixed ideas; but they use these old names in a way

“That palters with us in a double sense;
That keeps the word of promise to our ear,
And breaks it to our hope,”

A use misleading and deceptive to the general reader. One unversed in theology, unfamiliar with the reticulation, so as to

speak, of its correlated doctrines, is taken unawares and finds nothing objectionable in these "restatements of truth;" whereas those accustomed to view the truth as a system—like its blessed author's robe, one piece, without seam, woven throughout—and thus trained to foresee the inevitable raveling in the smallest rent, being competent to calculate the consequences of these apparently slight "readjustments," such persons astonish the general reader by the vehemence of their criticism; but they are vehement because indignant at a course which, pursued by theological writers, leaves a critic only the ungracious option of imputing culpable ignorance or willing dishonesty.

The error is generally negative, consisting not so much in what is said as in what is left unsaid. Sometimes there is nothing objectionable in the lines when there is much that is so between the lines. Occasionally when speaking most fair, the implication is most foul; we are greeted with all the elaborate courtesy of Joab, but like Amasa, we find concealed under it that subtlety which stabs under the fifth rib. This alas! is sometimes evident in its noblest and loftiest statements, *e. g.*: when setting forth its motive and its mission. It pleads for a theology less distinctly doctrinal and more devotional; a more distinctively *biblical* theology founded upon the plain and obvious teaching of Scripture naturally interpreted and taken in its natural connections; for an orthodoxy less formal and dead, more decidedly Christian, evangelic and aggressive; for liberty in candidly investigating and discussing vital questions; for readiness to receive and weigh the results of scholarship as exercised in the critical, exegetical and historical criticism of the Scriptures; for willingness to recognize and consider thoroughly the developments of physical science, etc., etc.—to all which we respond, Amen. There is nothing objectionable in it and, we may add, nothing novel or original. But what must we read between the lines? Nothing except the implicit charge that the *Conservative Theology has failed in all these respects*; that the distinctively doctrinal theology from Augustine to Hodge, is not biblical but the rather a wresting of Scripture to sustain a preconceived system; that it is hostile

to the devotional and practical, a dead conservatism imprisoning in the trammels of tradition the aggressive evangelism of a struggling, rebellious Christianity; that its policy is one of silence amid the pressing problems of the present, a blind idolatry of the past, a cowardly and servile adherence to a devotion which is the child of ignorance, the opposition of a superstitious fetichism to all the achievements of modern scholarship and the results of recent science!

If a man were to buttonhole you on the street and pour into your reluctant and astonished ear an earnest homily on the lasting and sacred obligation of the eighth commandment, unless grace were stronger in you than muscle, you would probably knock him down; nor could you, for so doing, be justly considered a foe to honesty. Just so; *the very raison d'être of this so-called Renaissance is an indictment against the theological thought of the world*; its soaring aspirations, its lofty manifestoes, are an insult, as gratuitous as it is insolent, to the sense and piety that have instructed and consecrated generation after generation; a theology that has proved its faith—the old faith and in the old light—by its works; sufficiently “spiritual” to develop scores of such characters as Rutherford, Payson, Newton, McCheyne; “evangelical” enough to bear, with large liberality and patient self-sacrifice, the banner of the Cross in a world-wide “aggressiveness;” with “sincerity” and “conviction” deep enough to seal its testimony with its blood; “Christological” enough to live with the Master and if need be to die for Him.

It would add a needed emphasis to the elevated claims of the New Theology to produce a few of its martyrs and missionaries!

This brings us to another characteristic, viz: The quarrel that these writers invariably have with systematic Theology. There is something amusing in the uniformity with which they lose their equanimity in the presence of this, their universal *bête noir*. They rarely lose an opportunity to throw a fling over or covert at it. This disposition was the first thing that attracted our attention and aroused our curiosity. We suggest a possible explanation in the fact that Systematic Theology inexorably clips

the wings of their erratic flight ; proves the plummet which sounds the shallows of their argument, the inevitable and pitiless detective of their sometimes brilliant, often illogical and inconsistent, always fragmentary, half-truths.

Of course Calvinism, being unquestionably the back-bone of all vertebrate theology, concentrates their hate. There is something really and richly ludicrous in the intensity with which the most advanced Liberals lavish the choicest epithets in their vocabulary of vituperation upon it ; their hatred of it is a very reliable gauge of their progress, so much so that we have long regarded Calvinism as a sort of theological *udometer* to show how much any article of the kind has been *watered*.

A third very marked feature of these various discussions, common to them all, is a conspicuous absence of that resort to the Word of God so characteristic of the Old Theology. "The sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God" is little wielded by these champions of a more spiritual and Christian Theology. This absence of Scripture citation seems passing strange in a school which claims, as one of its distinctive *differentia*, a pre-eminently biblical basis. We have some argument, many assertions, a multitude of assumptions, but rarely ever a Scripture text. The spirit of the Scriptures seems to be held in great reverence but there is scant appeal to its letter. They appear to write under the conviction that "the letter killeth ;" and not without cause, for so far as we have seen, there is not a single restatement, readjustment or reconstruction of theirs that can survive an appeal to the letter of God's Word.

We think that the exaggerated assumptions and wild assertions of the New Theology deserve more than a mere incidental allusion. What are we to think of the honesty of an author who writes and prints, in the *thirteenth* edition of a volume such an assertion as that "the theories of verbal, dynamic, plenary inspiration, concerning all historical and scientific reference, are none of them any longer insisted on?"

Now surely these writers know that the overwhelming majority of Christian ministers still hold this doctrine in its integrity ; that the deniers of it are the fussy few who are the

ecclesiastical Ismaelites of their respective Denominations, whose elastic Freedom of Faith allows them to interpret their creeds with the same liberality they exercise in the use of the stereotyped phraseology to which we referred a few paragraphs back ; whose "deepening sincerity" and lofty "spirituality" suffer them to draw the stipend of a church whose windows they break from the inside. Mr. Munger knows, or he ought to know, that such a statement published by a Presbyterian, or Methodist, or Baptist minister would cost him his ecclesiastical head.

As the last characteristic to be referred to here, we note the many indications that this theological renaissance is largely influenced and colored, if not actually dominated, by Evolution.

The new light in which Dr. Newman Smyth views the old faiths is "The new light of the scientific truth of development ;" * or as the same writer says in another place, "We are gaining along the heights of faith broader views of redemption, in which we may hope to comprehend and harmonize the new scientific truths of the correlation of all things, and the laws of the development of the universe."† According to Mr. Munger, "It accepts the theory of physical evolution as the probable method of physical creation, and as having an analogy in morals."‡

Another representative writes as follows :

"The New Theology," says President Bascom, "identifies the government of God and history. It unites the past, the present and the future. One law, one method, one movement are in them all. Herein it feels the true force of the great thought of our time, evolution, the inner coherence and consistency of the divine procedure. The doctrine of a physical evolution has, thus, its completion and fulfillment in the spirit. * * * * The new theology is not revolutionary, but evolutionary."§

As a critic has well said, "It shows a strongly naturalistic temper much inspired by the scientific theories and culture of the day, which, in some respects, it seeks to express in theo-

(*) "Old Faiths &c.," p. 349. (†) "Cath. Presbyterian," vol. ix, p. 202. (‡) "The Freedom of Faith," p. 27. (§) "The Hom. Review,"

logical accomodation. It aims to harmonize, if not to identify, natural law with spiritual grace, to unite redemption and evolution, broadening the basis of the Christian verities by viewing them as part of the primeval order of creation."*

In pursuance of this purpose the new theology considers Revelation a process, Atonement a process, Incarnation a process, Regeration a process, Probation a process, Judgment a process. Love and grace are by law.

Professor F. H. Johnson gives us a very interesting series of articles on such subjects as Co-operative Creation, Theistic Evolution, Evolution of Truth, Revelation as a Factor in Evolution, The Evolution of Conscience.

To borrow an illustration: This "Real Theology," like another Aaron seeking to improve religion, has cast the golden ornaments of fancy into the moulds of exact science, and there has come out this — evolutionary. theology.

Before proceeding further we raise a question which the
 vol. xi, p. 206. (*) Ibid, vol xii, p. 281. See also p. 287. Cf. also, "Old Faiths, &c.," pp. 18, 33, 117, 231, 387. "Hom. Review," vol. xii p. 14.

The New Theology emphasises very much something which it calls the "The Immanence of God." Prof. Allen, in his *Continuity of Christian Thought*, makes it the central, fundamental doctrine of his Theology. "Deity indwelling in outward nature, but more especially in humanity, and above all in Christ;" "Deity revealed as an immanent in the life of nature;" "a living, spiritual presence, a God who is with us and in us, who is allied to humanity by an organic relationship;" "a relationship between God and humanity which had always existed indestructible in its nature, obscured but not obliterated by human ignorance and sin;" "a constitutional kinship with Deity, the image of God * * * * an inalienable heritage, a spiritual, or ethical birth-right which could not be forfeited."

Another writer (Hom. Rev., vol. xii, pp. 14 ff) discusses at some length the same topic in a sort of semi-scientific jargon, calling God the *anima mundi*! His lucubrations are, for some reasons, well worth reading.

On the whole this "Immanence" seems to squint towards a mild type of Pantheism.

See "Continuity of Christian Thought," pp. 47, 177. Hom. Rev., vol. xii, pp. 14-16. "The Freedom of Faith" p. 60.

Andover Renaissance assumes is settled in the affirmative, which indeed lies at the basis of all their discussion :

Is there any such thing as Progress in Theology? That theology is a science we suppose few readers of this article will question ; of course analogy would lead to the conclusion that in this, as in other sciences, progress may be expected and should be desired. Not denying to theology progress in every sense of the word, and without delaying to discriminate carefully between development possible and impossible, legitimate and illegitimate, it will suffice the purposes of this paper to say somewhat summarily that, in the sense contemplated by the school of Thought under review, there can in our judgment be no such thing as Progress in Theology. For while theology is unquestionably a science, yet both its source and its method distinguish it from all other sciences. The sources of other sciences are hidden, to be sought out by diligent inquisition of nature with much toil and patience ; their method mainly inductive, to be tested, verified or corrected by manifold and repeated experiment. The source of theology, on the contrary, is a revelation the very purpose of which requires in the main clearness, and in all vital particulars simplicity ; its method is not inductive but hermeneutic or, more strictly, even exegetical. It is not only a revelation but an inspired revelation. The influence of this characteristic is decisive ; theology is a constant quantity because it is a supernaturally revealed and divinely inspired fact or system of facts. *Supernatural revelation and divine inspiration differentiate theology from all other sciences.* An incidental illustration of this fact, and at the same time test of its decisiveness, is to be seen in the invariable disposition of all advocates of progressive theology to kick against Inspiration. You will infallibly find that without exception every such writer must offer a "restatement" of the doctrine of Inspiration.

Another difference, and not unimportant either, between theology and other sciences, is the fact that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God : for they are foolishness unto him ; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." *

* 1 Cor. ii. 14 of the whole of the chapter.

If mention be made of Natural Theology as a source affording opportunity of progress, we answer :

1. Natural Theology, as an independent source, is too fragmentary and defective to have any appreciable weight in this connection. As subsidiary to, and confirmatory of, revealed theology it is important and valuable. As a co-ordinate source, it is insignificant.
2. Natural Theology is not only fragmentary and defective, but apart from Revelation, it is entirely untrustworthy and even dangerous. It only embodies the views and "objectifies" the characteristics of its adherent, enlarging the scale to heroic size. The God of Natural Theology is simply a deified *man* with his errors, passions, prejudices, projected upon an infinite scale; as witness the gods of the Mythologies.
3. In the spiritual realm there is no such thing as *race* progress. In science, art and knowledge, we stand on the shoulders of centuries but in all that concerns our relations to God each man stands on his own feet, and his progress is strictly individual. The Progress of Society has never necessitated a reconstruction of Anthropology. Paul's anthropology is every whit as just, as exact, as *complete* in this "great and glorious nineteenth century" as it was in the dawn of the Christian age. The human race will never outgrow the Epistle to the Romans. This fact is strangely ignored in the abundant and eloquent references to the demands of general Culture and the necessities of advancing Progress.

To the charge of restraint of liberty, the claim for greater Freedom of Faith, our answer is that we see nothing narrow and feel nothing humiliating or restrictive in our view of this question.

$2 \times 2 = 4$. That is a fact; moreover, it is a *finished* fact; to believe it does not abridge the liberty of any mathematician; it would only lead to confusion to hold that in the advance of science 2×2 may equal five, and possibly, in the greater progress of the future, might actually reach the magnitude of *six*!

$2 \times 2 = 4$ is a finished fact, and no man can develop any other product than four out of it; but the applications of this finished fact are practically infinite; thousands of calculations daily illustrate it, from the child conning the multiplication table to the astronomer calculating the orbit of a star.

So of Theology; in exhibition, illustration and application, there has been, there ever will be, progress; in reconstruction, none may be expected, and we add, none is needed.

According to the New Theology, however, there seems to be not only abundant possibility of progress, but the most urgent need of it, and of a vast deal of it, too. It discerns a large field and occupies it with great confidence. Its claims are decided and its charges—for, as we have already intimated, the obverse of every claim is a charge—none the less so. These claims and charges are collected from a variety of sources; the Renaissance adopts no authoritative standards and calls no man Master; the school forms a sort of cave of Adullam, whereunto every man that is discontented with the established, conservative theology, or who hath any quarrel with his creed, hath gathered. As this fact may in all likelihood exaggerate the natural inconsistency of error, we need not be surprised if we should find a lack of absolute harmony. However much these various spokesmen may differ from one another in minor details, in one thing they are in loud and unanimous accord; they agree that theology is in a very bad way indeed, in exigent want of a renaissance, that there is urgent call for improvement. They confidently claim also that their Renaissance answers this call to the echo. Hear them describe it:

First and in general;

“It is a tendency towards a complete reconstruction of theology along the lines of a new science, a new interpretation and a new conception of human life. * * * * A protest against the despotism of all systems of theological thought that are based, and are now with increasing clearness seen to be based on a crude idea of revelation, a partial and defective exegesis, an *a priori* logic, and an inadequate apprehension of human nature. * * * It is an attempt to construct a theology that shall accord with the most spiritual deliverances of the Christian consciousness, and shall be adequate to all the facts of history and life.” (*)

“A movement which seeks to bring all theology up into a higher and purer light. * * * The endeavor to readjust to changed points of view, and to reform certain particular doctrines of the traditional Protestant theology.” †

“It rejoices in the emancipation of Christian thought from scholastic methods;” “brings home to our Christian life and literature a more confident belief in the immanence and nearness of the living God; *

(*) Hom. Rev. Vol. xi, p.202. (†) Cath. Presbyterian Vol. ix,

* * * a more truly human, a more divinely human, Christ-like sense of the character and infinite loveableness of God." (*)

"It is an endeavor to put all theology upon a Christological centre. It will work down, reforming all doctrinal statements, from a Christological conception of God."*

More specifically :

1. It claims for itself a somewhat larger and broader use of reason than has been accorded to theology. (†)
2. It seeks to interpret the Scriptures in what may be called a more natural way, and in opposition to a hard, formal, unsympathetic, and unimaginative way. (§)
3. It seeks to replace an excessive individuality by a truer view of the solidarity of the race. (¶)

It is historical and comparative rather than individualistic and provincial. (**)

It seeks *adequacy* in theology; that is, for breadth of view and comprehensiveness of statement. The theologies of the past are provincial in sympathy, if not in terminology. The essential unity and solidarity of the race has become a profoundly influential element in religious thought. A theory of God's relation to the world must be as broad as the world, or stand condemned by defect. (***)

4. This theology recognizes a new relation to natural science; but only in the respect that it ignores the long apparent antagonism between the kingdoms of faith and of natural law—an antagonism that, from the very nature of things, cannot have any basis in reality. (††)
5. The New Theology offers a contrast to the Old in claiming for itself a wider study of man. (††)
6. The New Theology recognizes the necessity of a restatement of belief in Eschatology, or the doctrine of Last Things. (§§)
7. It is more ethical, evangelical, spiritual and biblical as opposed to political, scholastic, rationalistic and dogmatic. (|||)
8. It is characterized by increasing frankness in the utterance of religious conviction; a deepening sincerity; a deepening spirituality; hopefulness, optimistic while the old theologies are pessimistic; "in them the doctrine of grace is overshadowed by a sharply defined and positive doctrine of despair—starting from the assumption that the world is a scene of a primitive moral defeat and disaster, they carry that assumption, with certain appalling dogmatic consequences, to the bitter end." (¶¶)

p. 199. (*) Cath. Pres. p. 202. (†) Freedom of Faith, p. 11. (§) *Ibid*, 16. (¶) *Ibid*, p. 22. (**) Cath. Presbyterian, Vol. ix, p. 200.

*** Hom. Rev., Vol. xi., p. 204. †† Freedom of Faith, p. 25. †† *Ibid*, p. 28. §§ *Ibid*, p. 35. ||| Cath. Presbyterian, Vol. ix., pp. 199, 200, 201. ¶¶ Hom. Rev., Vol. xi., pp. 202, 203, 204.

It magnifies the love of God rather than his justice, emphasizes the humanity of Christ and eulogizes the beauty of his example and the perfection of his life; concerns itself with social questions, in the effort to apply the principles of Christianity to the problems of modern civilization. It seeks to conciliate much earnest thought and life, which have been driven from the fold of ecclesiastical organization by the harshness of older tenets and the dogmatic severity with which they have been enforced. *

Upon reading such claims our first feeling is an impression of the wide and grand mission of this Progressive Orthodoxy; a feeling fast followed by wonder; wonder that there has been *any* piety or progress possible under the Old Theology. For, according to the necessary implication of the foregoing paragraphs, there has been scarcely sufficient salt in it to preserve it from corruption; how it has managed to survive long enough to become "Old" remains a mystery.

Let us, however, pass on to see how these claims of the New Theology are fulfilled, to compare the performance with the promise. We are furnished with some specimens of improved doctrinal statements, which shall be now submitted to the reader's judgment, and submitted in the exact language of the Reformers.

I. THE DOCTRINE OF SACRED SCRIPTURE.

We begin with this doctrine not because it is intrinsically and absolutely the most important, but because it is relatively most influential; it is elementary and fundamental; all other doctrines are governed by it, and are by it determined in both matter and form; determined by the degree of authority allowed to the Scriptures as compared with the *a priori* presumptions, conclusions, inductions of the human reason, the prejudices and passions of the human heart. On this account it is always economical to ask of any Theology first, what is its doctrine of Sacred Scripture. It will be found often a saving of much needless criticism and useless, because fruitless, argument. Under the guidance of this conviction we begin an analysis of the Renaissance by asking what is its doctrine of the Bible.

* Hom. Rev., v. xi.

The first symptom to be noticed in the study of this question is a disposition on the part of the Progressives, to compare, possibly to co-ordinate, with the Word of God, certainly to emphasize unduly, other methods of revelation. E. g. Of some subjects.

"God has taught us more from the slowly-unfolding Scriptures of His Providence than He has taught us in the Book of Revelation."*

"We should speak not so exclusively of the revelation of will, and the 'sheer authority' of an inspired word from God, etc., * * * and we dare not reason, from any Christ-inspired Scripture, upon the mysteries of grace and the hereafter in such a way, and with such unshrinking logic, as to establish the government of God upon the ruins of the thought of God which the childlike heart receives from the Gospel."†

Such expressions, though they might in themselves mean little, are nevertheless symptomatic; and when construed in connection with other statements, they become exceedingly significant, as the reader will at once have opportunity to judge.

We shall now present some extracts *in extenso*; ‡ and neces-

(*) Cath. Presbyterian, vol. ix. p. 197.

(†) *Ibid.* p. 201. See also, *Freedom of Faith*, pp. 47-69.

(‡) For the views hereafter to be discussed we are mainly indebted to a series of articles appearing as *editorials* in *The Andover Review* under the title of "Progressive Orthodoxy," afterwards published by Houghton Mifflin & Co., Boston, in a volume entitled and described, as follows:

PROGRESSIVE ORTHODOXY, 16mo., a Contribution to the Christian Interpretation of Christian Doctrines. By the Editors of "The Andover Review," Professors in Andover Theological Seminary,

CONTENTS: I. Introduction; II. The Incarnation; III. The Atonement; IV. Eschatology; V. The Work of The Holy Spirit; VI. The Christian; VII. Christianity and Missions; VIII. The Scriptures; IX. Conclusion—Christianity Absolute and Universal.

The papers collected in this volume appeared first as editorial contributions to *The Andover Review*, a religious and theological monthly conducted by Egbert C. Smyth, William J. Tucker, J. W. Churchill, George Harris and Edward Y. Hincks, Professors in Andover Theological Seminary. They are republished substantially as first issued, with the exception of the first and seventh articles, portions of which only had previously appeared.

sarily so, because, in the absence of clear-cut definition—a virtue which the new theology abhors—we are compelled to extract its position on any doctrine from the general drift of its discussion; this and a desire to satisfy the reader that our judgment is not hasty or ill-founded, force us to be somewhat prolix in citation. We invite attention to the evident, though gradual, “progress” illustrated in these extracts. The attentive reader will be aware of decided and continual advance as he proceeds from paragraph to paragraph.

1. (The Bible) is not a revelation, but is a history of a revelation. (*) Revelation is not a disclosure of things to be done, or of bare facts pertaining to eternity, but it is rather an unveiling of the thought and feeling of God to men, in response to which they become sons of the Most High. (†)

(It is) a prime feature of revelation that it is *of* and not *from* God, a coming of God into the world by a process paralleled with human development, and the source of it. (‡)

Neither is the Bible a collection of sacred oracles. (||)

We have, in short in the Old Testament, the growing life, the maturing thought, the ripened fruit, of the Hebrew mind, and the Hebrew History. (§)

We must seek, then, knowledge of the distinctive quality and value of the Scriptures by studying God’s revelation given in history. (¶)

They (the Apostolic Epistles) belong to the apostolic teaching, and had for their immediate readers, and all future ones, just the claim which their authors had. Whatever is peculiar in their composition, or extraordinary in their value, is to be found in the apostolic teaching generally. For there is not a scintilla of evidence that God assumed to the minds of the apostles a new relation as soon as they sat down to write, and that, in consequence, what they wrote had a different quality from what they said. (**)

He (Paul) takes pains to assure the Corinthian church that he uses an apostle’s spiritual force quite as resolutely and effectively in bodily presence as through the pen. (**)

We should not dwell on what seems to be so obvious but for the fact that the assumption of a special activity of the Divine Spirit upon the apostles and other writers of Scripture in the act of composition, endowing what came from their pens with qualities possessed by no other Christian teaching, is a most fruitful source of confusion in the endeavor to find out what Scripture is. (**)

(*) The Freedom of Faith, p. 18. (†) *Ibid.*, p. 13. (‡) *Ibid.*, p. 68, cf. also p. 59. (||) Old Faiths, etc., p. 36. (§) *Ibid.*, p. 41. (¶) Andover Review, Vol. iv, p. 458. (**) *Ibid.*, p. 459.

A new type of teaching begins with Peter's Pentecostal sermon. The essential elements of all distinctively Christian teaching are found in it. They are said to be the fruits of the new life. * * * Paul says that the revelation of Christ, the source of his preaching and the ground of its authority, was given in his conversion. * * * The light into which he was born was that from which he taught; the revelation of which each apostle was the bearer is not, therefore, to be thought of as a set of religious ideas made over to him to be held as an external possession. He could not be himself without having it; he could not give it without giving his life with it. For it was in essence the personal experience of Jesus Christ in and through which he lived. (*)

The quality which chiefly distinguishes Scripture from all other Christian literature is the vitality of the teaching. Nothing else ever written shows personality so penetrated by the truth of Christ. (*)

2. It (the truth) must, at least, be expressed in words which man has made to convey his ideas, and which partake, therefore, of the limitations and imperfections of those ideas. Now if it had pleased God to produce a book of oracles by sheer and stark miracle, or to dictate the contents of one to a scribe or number of scribes, the teaching would not come more directly from Him than when a soul in vital contact with Him freely gives out, under the leading of his Spirit, the truth which is the element in which it lives. (†)

We can hardly believe, indeed, that the truth as it passed through the Apostles had such absolute purity as we must suppose it to have had if perfect beings had been the media of revelation. (‡)

Not that they alone (the Apostles) possessed the Spirit of wisdom and revelation. He is the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in every soul in which He dwells, and there have been some souls in ages since the apostolic into which He has so abundantly shed the radiance of God's truth that they have been the spiritual luminaries of their own and following centuries. (§)

(The Apostles, however, must remain the chief teachers.) We can see that their (the apostles') situation and their exceptionally exalted life make following teachers dependent upon any predecessor except Christ.

(Such advantages e. g. as—) their historical relation to the Incarnation; their relations to the previous history of the world and to its cotemporaneous life; their knowledge of Judaism from the inside; their pre-eminent endowment of the Holy Spirit.

We would gladly cherish the thought that other teachers might arise, from whom should flow even more copious streams of living water than those which welled from the hearts of the apostles. But we are

* Andover Review Vol. iv, p. 461. "The Freedom of Faith," p. 65. "The Continuity of Christian Thought," pp. 59, 60. † Andover Review, Vol. iv, p. 462. ‡ *Ibid*, p. 464. § *Ibid*, p. 465.

compelled to regard the circumstances of their lives as excluding such a hope. We cannot think the gift of the Spirit a sheer miracle of power. * * * * And we cannot help believing that the conditions of its bestowment existed in a degree absolutely unique in the days just following the Incarnation.

(Among those conditions are noted—) the amazing act of divine love just consummated; a surpassing influx of divine life into the world; the historic contact of the divine humanity of Jesus, etc., etc. *

The Synoptic gospels contain the apostolic tradition about Christ, gathered from various sources and wrought into narratives. * * *

Of purely miraculous communication, to these writers, of any other material there is no evidence. * * * We have ample guarantee of essential accuracy in the spiritual exaltation of the apostolic circle; preternatural vividness of their recollection; their spiritual sympathy with Christ's teaching.

(So much for the Synoptists and the Epistles; beyond a passing compliment to the fourth Gospel, the rest of the books of the New Testament are not discussed further than to say that—). The general consensus of the church has placed them in the Canon, and this consensus has the strongest claims to respect, though this judgment cannot add anything to the intrinsic value, etc., etc. (†)

3. (We are now prepared to hear Mr. Munger say—) The Theories of a generation ago are fast disappearing, verbal, dynamic, plenary, an inspiration covering all historic and scientific reference; none of them are any longer insisted on. * * * We are getting to speak less of the inspired *book*, and more of the inspired *men* who wrote it; the quality or force of inspiration lying not so much in the form, or even matter, of the thing written, as in the writer himself,—his relation to his age, the clearness of his thought, the pitch of his emotions, the purity of his spirit, the intensity of his purpose. (‡)

The mind accepts revelation because it accepts the substance of revelation, * * * it enters into the material of revelation and plants its feet there. The reason believes the revelation because *in itself* it is reasonable. Human nature—so far as it acts by itself—accepts Christianity because it establishes a thorough *concensus* with human nature; it is agreeable to human nature in its normal action. (§)

It is as legitimate for the reason to pass judgment upon the *contents* of revelation as upon the grounds of receiving it. (||)

This fulness of citation supercedes the necessity of formal statement, on our part, of the Doctrine of Sacred Scripture as held by the New Theology. Moreover, the progress is so decided and

(*) Andover Review Vol. iv. pp. 465-6. (†) *Ibid*, pp. 466-7. (‡) "The Freedom of Faith," p. 65. (§) *Ibid*. p. 12. (||) *Ibid* p. 13.

so great as to show for itself and thus renders detailed criticism a matter of supererogation. It may not be amiss, however, to remark very briefly :

1. That this doctrine as taught by the Church and set forth in the various standards of Christendom, has been decidedly "restated," much "readjusted," even radically "reconstructed." Whether such a *renaissance* deserves to be called "progress" or not, the reader may judge.
2. Revelation has been "historically developed" to such a wonderful extent that its oldest acquaintance would be excusable for failure to recognize it.
3. In this development Inspiration has vanished. In its place we have vitality, personality penetrated by the truth, exaltation of emotions, intensity of purpose, clearness of thought, spiritual sympathy, vividness of recollection.
4. As the inspiration was limited to the *men* and does not embrace the *book*, of course there is no guarantee of accuracy, even "essential accuracy," beyond that furnished by the foregoing characteristics. The book is not more perfect than the character, nor more accurate than the knowledge of the writers of it, nor more trustworthy than their memory.
5. From which result, necessarily, limitations, defects, imperfections; and a lack of such "absolute purity as the truth might have if proclaimed through the media of perfect beings"—(or, let us add as a possible alternative overlooked by the Progressive Orthodoxy, if proclaimed through the media of imperfect beings *guided and governed by the spirit of God*).
6. This Revelation having, then, no more claim than its writers had; and their claim based only on such qualifications as we noted above in (3); and these writers not alone possessing the spirit of wisdom and revelation, who is the same in every soul in which he dwells, and who has dwelt so abundantly in some souls since;—all this being true, it follows of course that, though these writers must from their peculiar circumstances remain the chief teachers, yet many successors may be expected as in some sense modifying, restating, readjusting, reconstructing and reforming their statements of truth and doctrine.*
7. If now, in addition to all these elements of limitation and defect, reason be authorized "to pass judgment upon the *contents* of the Revelation;" "to enter into its material and plant its feet there;" "to accept it only so far as it establishes a thorough concensus with human nature and is agreeable in its nature to human nature;"—

* E. g. *Schleiermacher*! See "Continuity of Christian Thought," pp. 383 ff. "*Schleiermacher* still utters the truth to which all that is highest in modern Christianity continues to respond," p. 397.

then the inevitable consequence is that whatever is mysterious to the mind or unwelcome to the natural heart may be, nay, *must* be rejected. In short, every man becomes virtually the maker of his Bible.

Surely this is "progress" enough to satisfy any one, but this is not all. We must digress a little at this point in order to consider the functions and influence of the *Christian Consciousness* according to the views of this Progressive Orthodoxy. Much emphasis is laid upon it by the advocates and representatives of our Renaissance. The Professor of Theology in Andover writes :

We can go farther and claim not only that the Christian Consciousness is the organ of increasing knowledge, but also that all statements and interpretations of truth, to be accepted, must commend themselves to the Christian consciousness. * * * * * It therefore has a kind of authority. Its authority is co-ordinate, but none the less real. Its function, then, may be considered both the development and testing of progressive theology. (*.)

The Christian Consciousness of to-day, which is itself a product of the gospel, cannot be contradicted by the gospel. Hence any theories which claim to be confirmed by the Bible, yet against which Christian sentiment protests, should not be accepted. †

Now all this sounds very clear—and if Progressive Orthodoxy will pardon us, very *dogmatic*—but before considering its functions we pause to examine this Christian Consciousness itself. What is it? We are familiar with Consciousness as set forth in Metaphysics and we have always recognized its authority, but *Christian Consciousness* is something new.

Surely it does not purpose profiting by a mere similarity of sound to gain custom through the credit of an established trademark of Psychology! It cannot denote simply the consciousness of a Christian; on the contrary it is referred to, and deferred to, as a sort of spiritual intuition; with those *semper, ubique, ab omnibus* attributes, which indeed could alone constitute it such. But if so, then how happens it that in the Professor of Theology at Andover the Christian Consciousness should differ so diametrically from its very identical self as exercising its

* Andover Review, Vol. ii, p. 345.

† *Ibid*, p. 348.

authority in the Professor of Theology at Princeton? In Andover e. g. it protests against Election, Original Sin, Imputation, Inspiration, &c., &c., while in Princeton it protests not less vigorously against Andover! Now between the two, who shall judge? Whose Christian Consciousness is to be depended upon? If, however, only the general *concensus* of Christian feeling is meant—which seems probable from the substitution of “sentiment” as a synonym in the close of the second extract—what then becomes of Progressive Orthodoxy? For it is a system which contradicts the overwhelming consent of Christianity, against which the predominant sentiment of Christians protests, and which has on its side only a beggarly minority in comparison. Verily it looks as if progressive Orthodoxy, in introducing this Christian Consciousness, had put a torch to its own tenement.

Without further criticism than the foregoing challenge of its right to any consideration at all, we return to our discussion by noting the influence of this so-called Christian Consciousness upon the Doctrine of Sacred Scripture. Plainly in it we have the introduction of another arbiter. If not only “interpretations” but “statements of truth,” and *all* of them, must commend themselves to this Christian Consciousness before acceptance, it has ceased to be simply “co-ordinate,” it has become the ultimate appeal, the final authority. Hence we read a little further on, that nothing which contradicts it is to be accepted as biblical. For example: the doctrine of Election is under discussion, or that of Future Punishment; if objection is made, of what avail is it to cite Scripture, even though most clear and decided! If the Christian *sentiment* of your disputant protests, it ends the matter; your theory claims the confirmation of the Bible, but his Christian Consciousness cannot be contradicted by the Gospel; therefore whatever contradicts it, is not Gospel. Q. E. D! Anything against which Christian sentiment protests is thereby proven unscriptural. It need not be added that Christian sentiment will practically be always and only the sentiment of the individual concerned; and to argue with a sentiment is much like bailing out a cellar with a pitchfork.

If the reader will at this point refer to our *seriatim* summation of results, he will appreciate more fully the effect of this Christian Consciousness. Having divested the Scriptures of all authority save that which inheres in the character and position of its writers, their piety, intelligence and memory, their historic situation and associations; having weakened even its very credibility by the infinite possibilities of limitation, defect, imperfection and inaccuracy; it is demanded by Progressive Orthodoxy that *such a Scriptures* be further submitted to the arbitrament of human reason and the Christian Consciousness. When both of these judges "plant their feet in the material of Revelation," we fear the Word of God will spare the fate of the unhappy traveller between Jerusalem and Jericho.

And so we end our analysis of this doctrine of the Renaissance by adding to our summarized list a last result, viz:

8. There is no Bible.

With such views of the Scriptures it is evident that speculation will be unbridled in dealing with particular doctrines. Having gotten rid of the Old Theology's "unimaginative way" of interpreting the Scriptures, we may expect many and great improvements; for fancy is fertile, and an imaginative way of interpretation, which is moreover soft and sympathetic, can perform wonders. The way is now clear for any reconstruction that rationalism may demand, depravity desire, prejudice prefer, or a sublimated Christian Consciousness crave. From this point our pursuit will be after an *ignis fatuus*; but perhaps the reader's curiosity has been aroused sufficiently to awaken a desire to see how the Christian System fares under readjustment; what improvements are suggested by the Christian Consciousness; what Reason proceeds to do when it gets its feet planted in the material of Revelation.

If so, let us examine

II—THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE RENAISSANCE.

(The Incarnation is) the entrance into the world through a person of a moulding and redeeming force in humanity. (*)

(*) "The Freedom of Faith," p. 9.

The divine gift to humanity is the Incarnation. (*)

The self-revealing, self-communicating Love of God, the Word and Son of God who created in the beginning, creates in "the fullness of the time" a nature which is the perfect counterpart of his own, its human side and means of realization, in order that divine revelation and impartation may reach their highest possible completeness, and may not be hindered even by the malevolence and guilt of human sin. (†)

Christ is not only the earthly culmination, but also the eternal source and principle, of revelation. He who created all things is *ipso facto* the Revealer. In the Incarnation He has carried revelation to its highest conceivable stage and mode, however augmented it may be in degree and power. (‡)

(The doctrine of the Incarnation) is seen in its truest light when it is regarded as the final and complete work of the first element, or energy, of God's love—the giving of self to the utmost. (§)

The Incarnation has absolute worth in itself, and is for God's own sake as well as for our sakes. It is not, in this view, an accidental truth of history, but a necessary truth of the divine love. (¶)

(The Incarnation is) the central and broadest fact of theology. (**)

Christian Theology * * * * finds its living centre in the Incarnate Word. Not God's sovereign will, not God's eternal decree, but God Himself—God in Christ—is the central truth and glory of Christian life and thought. From this return to the Christological centre of Christian Theology we are to gain, also, enlarged views of the fact of the Incarnation; of its central significance in the idea of moral creation; of its possible cosmical relations. (††)

The Incarnation, moreover, according to the New Theology, was more than all this; it was a "moral necessity" irrespective of man's sin and need. It forms a link in the great Evolution that plays so prominent a part in our Progressive Orthodoxy; the prophecy of nature and the prophecy of the human soul combine in one growing Messianic hope.

* * * If the divine creative process, ever advancing to more perfect works, should stop before He came, who is God's own image, Immanuel, God with us,—then the creative love of God would seem to fall short of its own purpose from the beginning, and fail of its own divinity. The necessity of love which began the work would not be satisfied to leave it unfinished and uncrowned. The creation without

(*) Andover Review, Vol. iii, p. 556. (†) *Ibid*, p. 559. (‡) *Ibid*, p. 562. (§) "Old Faiths," &c., p. 278. (¶) *Ibid*, p. 285. (**) "The Freedom of Faith," p. 9. (††) Cath. Presbyterian, Vol. ix, p. 202.

its supreme end, the creation without the Christ, would it not be a disappointment to God himself, for God is love? *

The opinion, therefore, has reason in it that there would have been the Incarnation even if there had been no sin. †

It is evident that the Incarnation occupies a different and much more prominent place in the New Theology than in the Old. The character and the extent of this change will be more clearly seen in connection with its view of the Atonement. On the first page of the discussion of this doctrine we read :

The starting-point from which inquiry has usually set forth has been the sin of man. Man sinned, and the race became corrupted. Therefore, Jesus was born, suffered, and died, in order that man might be saved from sin. But this view is too narrow. It puts part of the truth in place of the whole. It virtually declares that if there had been no sin, we should not have known God in Christ. * * * * *
* * * * * The principal defect, however, is that Christ is made contingent on sin, and that sin, therefore, appears to be not only more fundamental than Christ, but an absolute necessity, in order that God might reveal himself in Christ. †

Here we have at once the genesis, and the character, and the content, of the great distinctive feature of alleged progress in the New Theology, its so-called Christological basis,—the sense in which it is Christo-centric as opposed to a sin-centric Theology ; and the sum of the whole change, the amount of the mighty advance, that which is to prove the regeneration of existing Theology, is just simply and solely this, viz : *a substitution of the Incarnation for the Atonement.*

Progressive Orthodoxy lays its greatest emphasis on the *life* of Christ, whereas apostolic doctrine and preaching has surprisingly little to say of the life ; in it and in the Theology developed from and by it, the *death* of Christ is “the great central fact ;” in other words, the atonement, not the incarnation. Paul’s theme and his glory was not the manger but the cross. There is something astonishing in the persistency and perversity with which the writers of the Renaissance reverse the position and promi-

* “Old Faiths, etc.,” p. 279. † Andover Review, vol. iv, p. 58.
‡. *Ibid*, p. 56.

nence of these two doctrines. They have suspiciously little to say of the death of Christ. Dr. Newman Smyth (*) has a very interesting chapter on the uniqueness of Christ, his character, his mission, his method; but though he instances eight suggestive particulars, he fails utterly to mention that great peculiarity which distinguishes Christ most, according to our judgment, from all the sons of men, viz: *that he came to die*; that which in all other men was but the supreme, the inevitable catastrophe, was in his life the prime purpose, that for which he came into the world. One would never imagine this from the Real Theology's presentation of Christology, because in it the Incarnation has been substituted for the Atonement; and this substitution is born out of a low, inadequate perception of sin. *Here is the heart of the Renaissance.* The plausible pretext of this conception is the alleged incidental or accidental character of sin.

But granting that sin is incidental rather than fundamental, accidental rather than essential, it nevertheless remains true that an accident may very readily and necessarily become fundamental in the plans of life, and regulative of its habits. A man, *e. g.*, may fall and injure his spine; if so, the accident shapes the rest of his life in every particular; it is just as "fundamental" as if it had been premeditated.

Now it happens that by the Fall man's moral backbone, his spiritual spine, was broken; on this account a sin-centric Theology, if you choose to call it such, is ever afterwards the only sort adapted to his life. Man is a sinner. All his relations with God are determined, all his intercourse with Him, is governed by that fact. This is what brought Christ into the world. What might have been done, had there been no sin, we are not competent to determine, nor are we concerned to inquire; what we *are* concerned with, is the actual relation of the world to God; and the self-evident truth witnessed on every page of the Scriptures is, that what our author calls a "too narrow view," is precisely the view taught line upon line and precept upon precept in the Bible; the Bible is God's Revelation to sinners—man's ruin and God's remedy.

(*) "Old Faiths, etc." pp. 185-231.

If this is "too narrow," it is at least as broad as the Word of God, and that is broad enough for us. "It is a faithful saying and *worthy of all acceptation* that Christ Jesus came into the world to *save sinners.*"

As to the atonement more specifically, our author says:—

It is no longer believed that personal merit and demerit can be transferred from one to another. It is not believed that an exact quantity of punishment can be borne by an innocent for a guilty person. It is not believed that the consequences of sin can be removed from the transgressor by passing them on to another. (*)

There are two lines of approach toward the Atonement. One view considers Christ's relation to humanity as identified with it. This is "an organic relation"—"the race with Christ in it is essentially different in fact, and therefore in the sight of God, from the same race without Christ in it." He has so identified himself with humanity that its burden of suffering rested on Him. * * * When Christ suffers, the race suffers. When Christ is sorrowful, the race is sorrowful. Christ realizes for humanity what it could not realize for itself. * * * Thus we can regard Him as our substitute * * * because He is so intimately identified with us, and because in essential respects the life of every one is, or may be, locked in with his. * * * The entire race repents or is capable of repenting through Christ. It renders in Him a complete repentance. He is the Amen of humanity to the righteousness of God's law, to the ill-desert of sin, to the justice of God's judgment. †

The other line of approach is from God to man. The punishment and consequences of sin make real God's abhorrence of sin, and the righteousness of law. The sufferings and death of his only Son, also realize God's hatred of sin, and the righteous authority of law; therefore punishment need not be enacted. **

God does not become propitious because man repents and amends, for that is beyond man's power. He becomes propitious because Christ, laying down his life, makes the race to its worst individual *capable* of repenting, obeying, trusting; and he does this in such a way that God's abhorrence to sin is realized, the majesty of the law honored, the sinner and the universe convinced of the righteousness of the divine judgments. ††

His death is a new fact, an astonishing, revealing, persuasive, melting fact, in view of which it would be puerile to exact literal punishment of those who are thereby made sorry for sin and brought in penitence to God. ††

* Andover Review, Vol. iv, p. 60. † *Ibid*, pp. 61, 2. ** Andover Review, vol. iv. p. 63. †† *Ibid*, p. 64.

Starting from the human side we may say that God is the reconciled God, the forgiving God, because man in Christ, seeing God as He is, and sin as it is, is the penitent man, the believing man, the Christian man. Or reversing the order, and advancing to the ultimate fact that redemption originates with God, we may say that man is the penitent and obedient man because God in Christ is the reconciling and forgiving God. *

In the Atonement Christ the Son of man brings all humanity to God. No member of the race is separate from him who thus offers himself. In the Atonement God provided redemption for the world by realizing his holy love in the eyes of all the nations. †

Mr. Munger says of the Atonement: We are struggling towards St. Paul's and the Christ's own statement of it as containing the law and method of life for every man: "He that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." We are getting to read this truth as meaning Christ formed in us, a law and way of life ‡

We are now prepared to appreciate this readjustment of Christology. The Atonement is the Incarnation; the Incarnation is a revelation; and this revelation, a moral necessity. There is nothing transacted in the court of heaven; there is no transfer of merit or demerit; no exact quantity of punishment borne by an innocent for a guilty person; no removal of the consequences of sin from the transgressor by passing them on to another. What the sufferings and death of Christ accomplish is a revelation of the righteousness of God against sin, and at the same time a revelation of His love for the sinner. The Atonement "provides redemption for the world by realizing God's holy love in the eyes of all nations." The sufferings and death of Christ "realize God's hatred of sin, and the righteous authority of law; *therefore punishment need not be exacted.*" This moreover is done for the whole race, and as a race. Christ's relation to the race is organic. The Atonement affects its purpose through its astonishing, persuasive, revealing, melting influence, which influence leads man to adopt it as his law and method of life. It teaches man how to redeem himself, and the moral influence and effect of it render him capable of doing it.

And here we see the unmistakable features of our old acquaintance *Socinus*, peering through this "restatement;" our

* Andover Review, vol. iv. p. 65. † *Ibid*, p. 68. ‡ "The Freedom of Faith," p. 61.

boasted progress has landed us in the sixteenth century and the reformed theology of the nineteenth century is the discarded Socinianism of the sixteenth. Surely it is needless to cumber our pages with a refutation of it.

This reconstruction of Soteriology casts some light on the phrase "solidarity of the race," and paves the way, by means of "the cosmical relations of the Incarnation," for some readjustment of Eschatology.

In conclusion, let us see how our Renaissance provides for

III. THE APPLICATION OF THE REDEMPTION PURCHASED BY CHRIST.

The formal discussion of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit is so very general and vague as to be entirely unsatisfactory; but there are here and there various hints, references and allusions, which, when combined, may serve our purpose.

If we start with the limitations of an arbitrary election we have a limited atonement and a limited work of the Spirit. * * * * Universal atonement comes in to break up the narrowness of the scheme. * * * * A universal atonement necessitates a universal work of The Spirit. *

It (the New Theology) does not differ essentially from the Old Theology, in its treatment of regeneration, but it broadens the ground of it finding its necessity not only in sin, but in the undeveloped nature of man, or in the flesh. It is disposed also to regard it as a process, involving known laws and analogies, and to divest it of that air of magical mystery in which it has been held; a plain and simple matter, by which one gets out of the lower world into the higher by the Spirit of God. †

It has been held simply as a moral necessity, having its basis in sin; but we are beginning to see that the Christ taught it also as a psychological necessity. We must be born again, not merely because we are wicked, not because of a lapse, but because we are flesh, and need to be carried forward and lifted up into the realm of the spirit, a constructive rather than a reconstructive process. ‡

Man may be translated from the dominion of merciless necessity into the life of freedom and love. The new and higher force is the revelation of God in Christ, through which the power of sin is broken and the penalty of sin remitted, * * * * ethical ends are secured by

* Andover Review, Vol. iv., p. 257. † "The Freedom of Faith," p. 33. ‡ *Ibid*, p. 61.

the revelation of God in Christ, and secured in such a way that God energizes in man and society for a moral transformation so radical and complete that it may be called salvation, redemption, eternal life, divine sonship.*

Christ suffering and sympathizing with men is able to awaken in them and express for them a real repentance.* * * * * Now the power of repentance, which, so far as it exists, is the power of recuperation, is superior to the necessities of past wrong-doing and of present habit. †

Our readers will in all probability differ essentially from Mr. Munger when he states that such a view does not "differ essentially" from the doctrine of the Old Theology; they will think the ground of it so "broadened" that it includes the territory of *Pelagius*. Such a view evidently dispenses with the necessity of supernatural regeneration. The influences on the sinner are merely those of co-operative grace; regeneration is man's own change of purpose with reference to sin and holiness, wrought in him by moral suasion exercised through the influence of Christ's sufferings and sympathy; these sufferings and sympathy induce a repentance which is a power superior to the necessities of past wrong-doing and present habit—a recuperative power. There is certainly no "magical mystery" about this, it is indeed "a very plain and simple matter;" there is no occasion for any one to ask, How can *these* things be? nor any reason for saying "thou canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth."

What has the *Renaissance* to say of Justification?

It holds to Justification by faith in the sense of a faith that, by its law, induces an actual righteousness—a simple, rational process realized in human experience. ‡

The same writer is reported as representing (in his published *Statement of Belief*, § iv) saving faith as consisting in a practical recognition of the fact revealed in the Incarnation, viz, that we "belong to the eternal order of God," and not to "the illusive order of the world;" defining faith as "the sum of those faculties in man through which he gets out of evil and the life of the world into the life of God."

* Andover Review, Vol. iv., p. 60. † *Ibid*, p. 62. ‡ "The Freedom of Faith," p. 9.

The secret, essential relation of the Christ to humanity, and of humanity to God, flows to us along this channel of obedient, inspiring love, and so we come to love our neighbor as ourselves, and God supremely. *

The great problem set before the faith * * * * the imperative need of every man is to get over from the natural and evil side of life to the Christ side, to give up worldly ways of feeling and acting, and pass into the Christly way; to die unto self and let Christ be formed in him. * * * * It is the secret of life, the key of destiny. How to bring it about is the question. It is an achievement, for it is nothing less, wrought, so far as we are concerned, by love to Christ, and by the service of love. * * * * Let us not strive to find any other path for individual or social regeneration; there is no other path. * * * * We must go by the eternally ordained path of love to Him * * * * and suffer his love to charm us into a kindred love. †

From these extracts it is perfectly clear :

1. That the ground of Justification is not the merit of Christ alone, perhaps not even chiefly; but, on the contrary, the conversion, virtue, obedience, service, of the believer.
2. Its condition is not faith, receiving and resting upon Christ alone for salvation, but love; we are justified not by faith, but by love.
3. Justification is not forensic effecting a change in man's legal relations, but reformatory; a revolution in his character inducing an actual righteousness realized in human experience.
4. It is a *process*, not "an act of God's free grace.
5. It comes, therefore, nearer to sanctification than justification; with, however, this decided difference,—that while a work, it is not a work of *God's* free grace, but of man's.

The reader has doubtless anticipated the Eschatological improvements of the Renaissance. A cosmical Incarnation, a universal Atonement, a universal work of the Spirit, the solidarity of the race, and Christ's organic relation, and essential identity, with the race, all demand imperatively *a probation after death* for every human being who has died in ignorance of the Gospel; and, we think, for some others besides; but our concern at this time is not with the entire logical results of the foregoing doctrines; we discuss only such readjustment as the elastic facility of the New Theology feels called upon to furnish, and

* "The Freedom of Faith," p. 124. † Ibid, p. 126.

at this present writing, so far as heard from, they limit their *post mortem* probation as above indicated.

There is no evidence whatever that the race is divided into two great sections, one of which is dealt with on the basis of the Gospel, and the other on the basis of law and natural conscience—one on a basis of justice, the other on a basis of grace. (*)

Christianity itself starts the question * * * * what can the God and Father of men, who has revealed Himself in Jesus Christ, be expected to do for His children before He deals with them in judgment?(†)

We may go so far as to say that it would not be just in God to condemn men hopelessly when they have not known Him as He really is, when they have not known Him in Jesus Christ.(‡)

The conclusion which most naturally suggests itself is that those who do not know God's love in Christ while they are in the body, will have knowledge of Christ after death.(‡)

Such views are the natural, even necessary, consequence, the logical consistent outcome, of preceding positions. They only emphasize the departure of the New Theology from the system of grace; they *reverse* the Gospel in making the purpose or effect of the work of Christ not that God might be just and the justifier of him that believeth; but that God might be just and the condemner of him that disbelieveth. Redemption thus becomes a matter of *debt*, not of grace, something which is due to man before he can be justly condemned.

This probation has received more attention than anything else in the Renaissance. We the more certainly therefore pass it by. Besides this, our criticism of the general principles of the movement establishes clearly, we believe, the fact that the roots of this feature, which attracts so much public notice, are grounded in the very heart and soul of the whole system. We shall be greatly surprised if still more startling results are not reached.

From the character of its theology, we predict for this movement a progress, more or less rapid, through Unitarianism, Universalism, Rationalism, into *Agnosticism*. Thus far there has been a reconstruction of Inspiration, Incarnation, Atone-

(*) Andover Review, vol. iv. p. 67. (†) *Ibid*, p. 259. (‡) *Ibid*, p. 67. (‡) *Ibid*, p. 155. See, also, Hom. Rev. vol. xi. pp. 281 ff.; "The Freedom of Faith," pp. 23, 24, 36; 41 to 43; 335 to 341.

ment, Original Sin, Depravity, Election, Regeneration, Justification and Probation.

The New Theology is plainly not only evolutionary, but revolutionary. Our work has been mainly expository, only secondarily, and to a very limited degree, elenctic; we shall nevertheless rest here; and we lay down our pen with the confident conviction that no man having tested the Old will straightway desire the New, for he will say **THE OLD IS BETTER.**

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

III. THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS.

PART I.

This wonderful people, wonderful in their punishment, are still more wonderful in their preservation. It was declared that God would make an end of all the nations that oppressed them, but that He would not make an end of them. And this has happened. Where are their ancient oppressors the Assyrians, Chaldeans, Egyptians, Macedonians, Romans, Goths and others? Gone, forever gone! But the Jew still lives! It was long ago predicted by Balaam: "Lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations." And how strictly has this been fulfilled from the beginning until now! They have lived under every sort of rule, mixed with every people under heaven, and yet kept wonderfully distinct, showing that God has not yet done with them as a nation. To repeat a figure, first used by us over 30 years ago: *Like the gulf stream in mid-ocean, projecting its current in a contrary direction to it, and preserving its waters in distinction from it.* "They have been spread over every part of the habitable globe; they have lived under the *regime* of every dynasty; they have shared the protection of just laws, and the proscriptions of cruel ones, and witnessed the rise and progress of both. They have used every tongue and lived in every latitude. The snows of Lapland have chilled, the suns of Africa have scorched them. They have drunk the Tiber, the Thames, the Jordan, the Mississippi. In

every country and every degree of latitude and longitude, we find a Jew. It is not so with any other race. Empires, the most illustrious, have fallen, and buried the men that constructed them ; but the Jew has lived among the ruins, a living monument of indestructibility. Persecution has unsheathed the sword, and lighted the fagot. Papal superstition and Moslem barbarity have smote them with unsparing ferocity ; penal rescripts and deep prejudices have visited on them most unrighteous chastisement, and, notwithstanding all, they survive. Like their own bush on Horeb, Isreal has continued in the flames, but unconsumed. They are the aristocracy of Scripture, reft of coronets, princes in degradation. A Babylonian, a Theban, a Spartan, an Athenian are names, known in history only ; their shadows alone haunt the world, and flicker on its tablets. A Jew walks every street, dwells in every capital, traverses every Exchange, and relieves the monotony of the nations of the earth. The race has inherited the heirloom of immortality, incapable of extinction or amalgamation."

"Oh tribe of ancestry, be dumb—thy parchment roll review !
 What is thy line of Ancestors, to that which boasts the Jew ?
 The ancient Briton, where is he ? The Saxons, who are they ?
 The Norman is a fleeting shade—a thing of yesterday.
 But he may boldly lift his eyes, and spread his hands abroad,
 And say '4000 years ago my sires on Canaan stood,
 And back in one unbroken line, my ancestors I trace,
 Till Adam stood, a sinless soul, before his Master's face.'
 O ! who shall dare despise the Jew, whom God has not despised ;
 Nor yet forsaken in His wrath though long and sore chastised ?
 From many a distant land the Lord shall bring his people forth,
 And Zion be the glory yet and wonder of the Earth !"

—ARCHDEACON ROWAN.

The Jew has been the standing miracle of the Christian church in all ages and dispensations—a miracle which the infidel has never been able to get over. No imposter would have hazarded the predictions respecting him ; for no imposter, with the least common sense, would have risked the prophecy that so strange a state of things would continue for centuries.

Consider what a mighty miracle is the preservation of the

Jewish people! When a people are driven from their fatherland, and instead of being kept together in their banished state, are dispersed among the nations, and denied the privilege of possessing land or any fixed property whatever; when their efforts to acquire moveable property have been again and again thwarted, their goods seized and themselves subjected to insult and persecution even unto blood—there is no instance of any nation long surviving treatment like this—under such usage, persevered in for any length of time, tribes and peoples melt away by degrees, either becoming extinct altogether, or mingling with and merging in the nations among whom they reside. But though this is the treatment the Jews have met with, this is not the end to which the Jews have come. For they number at this time about seven millions.

How shall we explain this wonderful phenomenon—the Bush ever burning and yet not consumed? Because God is in it! “God hath not cast away his people” Israel. The greatest blessing that God has promised to the church is yet future, viz, the restoration to her bosom of the wanderers of Israel. This is declared again and again by both the Prophet and Apostle. “And the Lord said unto Abram, I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and I will make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing. *And I will bless them that bless thee and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.* Unto thy seed will I give this land.” (Gen. 12: 2, 3, 7.) “Lift up thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed forever.” (Gen. 13: 14, 15.) “I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God.” (Gen. 17: 7, 8.) “I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore, and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies: and in thy seed

shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." (Gen. 22 : 17, 18.) "And the Lord said unto Moses, speak unto the children of Israel : If ye will not hearken unto me and will not do all these commandments, but walk contrary unto me, Then will I walk contrary unto you also in fury ; and I, even I, will chastise you seven times for your sins. And ye shall eat the flesh of your sons and the flesh of your daughters shall ye eat. And will I destroy your high places, and cut down your images and cast your carcasses upon the carcasses of your idols, and my soul shall abhor you. And I will make your cities waste and bring your sanctuaries unto desolation, and I will not smell the savour of your sweet odours. And I will bring the land into desolation ; and your enemies which dwell therein shall be astonished at it. And I will scatter you among the heathen and will draw out a sword after you : and ye shall have no power to stand before your enemies. If they shall confess their iniquity and the iniquity of their fathers, with their trespass with which they have trespassed against me, and that also they have walked contrary unto me, and that I also have walked contrary unto them, and have brought them into the land of their enemies ; if then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, and they then accept of the punishment of their iniquity : then will I remember my covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember, and I will remember the land. The land also shall be left of them and shall enjoy her sabbaths, while she lieth desolate without them : and they shall accept of the punishment of their iniquity : because, even because they despised my judgments, and because their soul abhorred my statutes. And yet, for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them to destroy them utterly, and to break my covenant with them : for I am the Lord their God. But I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt, in the sight of the heathen, that I might be their God : I am the Lord." (Lev. 26 : 14-45.) There we see that the Mosaic or Sinai covenant recognizes its subordination to the pre-existent Abrahamick covenant, which is here proclaimed to be still in force and to be forever in force.

“And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee, and shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey His voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thine heart and with all thy soul, that then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee. And the Lord thy God *will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it*; and He will do thee good and multiply thee above thy fathers. And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live. And the Lord thy God will put all these curses upon thine enemies and on them that hate thee, which persecuted thee.” (Deut. 30: 1-7). “Blessed is he that blesseth thee, and cursed is he that curseth thee.” (Num. 24: 9).

Thus saith the Lord God: “Although I have cast them far off among the heathen, and although I have scattered them among the countries, yet will I be to them as a little sanctuary in the countries where they shall come.” (Ezek. 11:16.) “He shall cause them that come of Jacob to take root: Israel shall blossom and bud, and fill the face of the world with fruit.” (Isa. 27:6.) “I will sow her unto me in the earth.” (Hosea 2:23.) *Abraham and his seed were to be “the seed sown in the earth;” through whom salvation should be extended to all the ends of the earth.* “Behold the day’s come, saith the Lord, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel, and to the house of Jacob.” (Jer. 33:14.) “Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be said, The Lord liveth, that brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt. But, The Lord liveth that brought up the children of Israel from the land of the north, and from all the lands whither He had driven them; and *I will bring them again into their land that I gave unto their fathers.*” (Jer. 16:14, 15.) “Be-

hold, I will gather them out of all countries whither I have driven them in mine anger, and in my fury, and in great wrath; and I will bring them again unto this place, and I will cause them to dwell safely. And they shall be my people and I will be their God." (Jer. 32:37, 38.) "O Israel, fear not, for I have redeemed thee. I will bring thy seed from the east and gather thee from the west. I will say to the north, Give up, and to the south, Keep not back; bring my sons from far and my daughters from the ends of the earth." (Isa. 43:1, 6.) "And ye shall know that I am the Lord when I *shall bring you into the land of Israel*, into the country for which I lifted up my hand to give it to your fathers." (Ezek. 20:42.) "I will take you from among the heathen and gather you out of all countries, and will *bring you unto your own land*. Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them. And *ye shall dwell in the land* that I gave to your fathers; and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God." (Ezek. 36:24-28.) "Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen whither they shall be gone, and will gather them on every side, and *bring them into their own land*. And I will make them one nation in all the land upon the mountains of Israel, and one king shall be king to them all, and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all. And they *shall dwell in the land* that I have given unto Jacob my servant, they and their children and their children's children, forever. I will be their God and they shall be my people. And the heathen shall know that I, the Lord, do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them forevermore." (Ezek. 37:21-28.) "I am sanctified in them in the sight of many nations." (Ezek. 39:27.) "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah:

Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith the Lord. But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know ye the Lord, for they shall all know Me, from the least of them to the greatest of them, saith the Lord. For I will forgive their iniquity, and will remember their sin no more. Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinance of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea, when the waves thereof roar; The Lord of Hosts is His Name. If those ordinances depart from before Me, saith the Lord, then shall the seed of Israel also cease from being a nation before Me forever. Thus saith the Lord, If the heaven above can be measured, and the foundation of the earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the Lord.” (Jer. 31 : 31--37).

This new covenant is but the renewal, expansion and enlargement of the Abrahamick covenant, the provisions of which require the regenerating and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit for the restoration of Israel to the church, and the wonder-working movements of God's Providence for their restoration to Palestine, and reconstruction as a nation. “And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's House shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the House of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways and we will walk in His paths: *for out of Zion shall go forth the Law, and the Word of the Lord out of Jerusalem.* And He shall judge among the nations and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not

lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. O House of Jacob, Come ye and let us walk in the light of the Lord." (Isa. 2: 2-5). "Thy watchmen shall lift up the voice; with the voice together shall they sing: *for they shall see eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion.*" (Isa. 52: 8). Not until the Lord bring again Zion, will the watchmen see eye to eye. "When the Lord shall build up Zion, He shall appear in His glory." (Ps. 102: 16). The Lord will not appear in His glory until Zion be built up.

These numerous citations from the writings of the prophets one would think should forever settle the question as to the restoration of Israel to the Church and to the Land. But yet multitudes of Christians, and even of ministers of the Gospel, hold that the Jew has forever forfeited his former position, by his infraction of the covenant, and that all covenant relations between Jehovah and the nation of Israel has been abolished by the introduction of Christianity, never to be revived any more! But to what covenant do they refer? They take it for granted that there was but one. Whereas the Scriptures plainly distinguish between the Abrahamick covenant and the Mosaic or Sinai covenant, or, as it is sometimes styled, "the old covenant." Was the "old covenant" the only national covenant of the Jew? Was it, pre-eminently, *the* covenant of Abraham's race? Did the removal of the "old covenant" at all effect the great National Covenant which preceded it? Why, so truly inferior is that covenant compared with the other that the Apostle Paul expressly states that the introduction 430 years after, *did not disannul the Abrahamick covenant.* (Gal. 3). Who, then, will dare to assert that the Abrahamick covenant is abolished? On the contray, we are taught that the introduction of the New Testament dispensation *unfolds* and *confirms* the Abrahamick covenant. That covenant cannot surely be abolished which, in its first and principal articles, embraces the redemption of man by the Lord Jesus Christ. "Christ," says the apostle, "hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, *that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ.*" (Gal. 3:13, 14). When the Jewish nation, in the expectation they entertain

respecting a coming Messiah and a coming salvation, connect such expectations with the covenant of Abraham, they are but following the example of that pious Jew whose words were dictated by the Holy Ghost, and who, in the prospect of the coming Saviour, was moved to exclaim in holy rapture: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed His people, and hath raised up a horn of salvation for us in the House of His servant David, as He spake by the mouth of His holy Prophets which have been since the world began, that we should be saved from our enemies and from the hand of all that hate us. *To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember the holy covenant, the oath which he sware to our father Abraham.*" The Apostle, speaking of the Sinai covenant, says: "If that covenant had been faultless, there should no place have been sought for the second. For, finding fault with them, He saith, 'Behold the days come when I will make a new covenant with the House of Israel and with the house of Judah.' In that He saith, 'a new covenant,' He hath made the first old. Now, that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." (Heb. 8: 6-8, 13). The Apostle's quotation is from the thirty-first chapter of Jeremiah, which chapter shows that the new covenant spoken of is the very same covenant which God made with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—styled "new" because of its renewal and enlargement—and the chapter shows that this same "new covenant" guarantees the restoration of Israel to their own land, and abundant temporal, as well as spiritual blessings therein.

It is a singular blunder to bring forward a prophecy which establishes the *perpetuity* of Israel's great national covenant, in support of the assertion that "their national covenant is abolished." It is truly a strange notion, that the covenant of the gospel annihilates the covenant of Promise! Take heed how you abolish the covenant of Abraham, for, in so doing, you abolish the covenant of the Gospel! This notion not only forms no part of Christianity; *it is destructive of Christianity.* No wonder that the Jew is repelled by it. The wonder is, that every Christian is not repelled by it! The covenant that is abolished is *the Sinai covenant.* That was temporary and condi-

tional, dependent on the free will of the people. The Abrahamic covenant, on the contrary, was not dependent on popular caprice, but absolute and abiding, secured by the free grace of God, which secured the free will of the people. The consent of the people to the Sinai covenant in the words: "All that the Lord hath said, we will do, and be obedient," was of very short duration. At the foot of Sinai, the covenant of Sinai was broken in its fundamental articles. "They made a calf at Horeb." "They have turned aside quickly out of the way which I commanded them," is the solemn charge against them by God Himself, from Mount Sinai. "Their heart was not right with Him, neither were they steadfast in His covenant." "They kept not the covenant of God and refused to walk in His law." At the very Mount of the covenant, they forfeited the benefits of the covenant and incurred its penalties. Idolatry and other sins of which, under the covenant, they were guilty, were sins for which there were no sacrifices. Hence the covenant was remedilessly broken. Why, then, did not the God of Israel at once withdraw His gracious presence, and take away the pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night? Why did He still "lead them about and instruct them, and keep them as the apple of His eye?" Nay, why did He not let His heavy judgment fall upon them and immediately exterminate them? The answer is, it was owing to the pre-existent Abrahamic covenant—that unconditional, absolute covenant, that held Jehovah bound to Israel by an everlasting tie—that the nation was not consumed at the foot of Horeb. This was the plea of Moses, when he "stood before the Lord in the breach, to turn away His wrath," in the matter of the calf—his only plea, a sufficient and effectual plea—the *covenant with Abraham*. "Lord, why doth thy wrath wax hot against the people? Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel thy servants, to whom thou swearest by thine own self, and saidst unto them, I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven, and all this land which I have spoken of will I give unto your seed, and they shall inherit it forever." (Ex. 32: 13.) For this reason, the full effect of a broken covenant did not immediately fall upon Israel. The wonderful forbearance of God was exer-

cised for many generations, but it was abused, and “for all that they sinned yet more and more.” “Many times did He deliver them, but they provoked Him with their counsel, and were brought low for their iniquity. Nevertheless, He regarded their affliction, when He heard their cry,” (and why?) “*He remembered for them His covenant.*” Yet Israel turned back and dealt unfaithfully, as their fathers did, filling up the measure of their guilt, until, by the rejection of God’s own Son, their own Messiah, the measure of their own iniquity overflowed, and “the wrath of the Lord kindled against His people, insomuch that He abhors His own inheritance, because they believed not in God and trusted not in His salvation.” (Ps. 78: 21, 22.)

And now was fully displayed the justice of a holy God, by the entire desolation of the Jewish economy, the disappearance of the national temple, the ruin of the Holy City, and the dispersion of the twelve tribes of Israel—followed by a series of unexampled persecutions and punishments in all lands for ages, which have not yet altogether ceased.

“Tribes of the wandering foot and weary breast,
How shall ye flee away and be at rest!
The wild dove hath her nest, the fox his cave,
Mankind their country—Israel but the grave!”

What other nation ever fell from such a height to such a depth? Their present long-protracted punishment has exceeded in intensity and duration all that ever befell them in their previous experience. What could be the cause of this? What national sin, transcending the guilt of all the past, procured a punishment of eighteen centuries? If it be not the rejection of Christ their Messiah, what was the adequate cause? Let them specify any other if they can.

[But a remarkable exception is found among them in

THE SPANISH JEWS INNOCENT OF THE CRUCIFIXION.

In the notes to Southey’s “Don Roderick,” there is a letter relative to the Jews, so remarkable and so curious that I have attempted a translation, although the original is in quaint old Spanish, differing as much from modern Castilian as the English

of our days does from the English of Chaucer's. Mr. Southey prefaces this letter in the following words :

“ When Toledo was recovered from the Moors by Alonzo VI., the Jews of that city waited on the conquerer, and assured him they were part of the ten tribes whom Nebuchadnezzar had transported into Spain, not decendants of Jeresulem Jews, who had crucified Christ. Their ancestors, they said, were entirely innocent of the crucifixion : for when Caiaphas, the high priest, had written to the Toledan synagogues to ask their advice respecting the person who called himself the Messiah, and whether he should be slain, the Toledans returned for answer that, in their judgment, the prophecies seemed fulfilled in this person, and, therefore, he ought not, by any means, to be put to death. This reply they produced in the original Hebrew and in Arabic, as it had been translated by command of King Galifre. Alonzo gave ear to the story, had the letter translated into Latin and Castilian, and deposited among the archives of Toledo. The latter version is thus rendered by Sardeval.”

Here follows the letter in the old Castilian tongue, of which the following is a translation :

“ Levi, chief of the synagogue, and Samuel and Joseph, honorable men of good report in the congregation of Toledo, to Eleazer Nugad, high priest, and to Samuel Canud, and to Anus and Caiaphas, good and noble men of the congregation of the Holy Land, health in the God of Isreal. Your messenger, Azarias, a master of the law, has brought us your letter, by which you inform us of the signs and acts of the prophet of Nazareth. A certain person of the name of Samuel, the son of Amacias, lately passed through this city, and he related many good deeds of this prophet ; that in his conduct he is very meek and humble, freely conversing with the miserable, doing good even to his enemies, while he does injury to no one. To the proud and wicked, he is unyielding ; and because he tells you your sins to your faces, ye are his enemies and bear him ill-will. We inquired of the man the year, month and day of his (the prophet's) birth, and we remember that on the day of his nativity three suns appeared in the heavens, which, by little and little,

formed themselves into one, and when our fathers beheld this sign, they were astonished, saying to the assembly, ‘Messiah will soon be born, or mayhap he is already come into the world. Beware, therefore, brethren, lest he (Messiah) be come, and ye did not recognize him.’ Moreover, the same man told us that one of his shepherds said about the time of the nativity, certain Magi, men of great wisdom, came to the Holy Land, inquiring the place of the holy child’s birth; and also that Herod, your king, was astonished, and sent for the wise men of the city, asking them where the child should be born. They inquired of the Magi, and they said in Bethlehem of Judah. The Magi said that a star of great brilliancy led them from far to the Holy Land. See now if the prophecy be not fulfilled which says, ‘Kings shall behold, and shall walk in the brightness of his nativity.’ Beware lest ye persecute him whom ye ought to receive in honor. But do whatsoever to you shall appear right. For our parts, neither by our advice, neither by our will, shall this man be put to death: For should we do such a thing, in us might be fulfilled the prophecy which says, ‘They gather themselves with one consent against the Lord, and against his Messias.’ And, although you be men of much wisdom in such matters, this advice we give you, lest the God of Isreal be angry with you, and destroy your temple a second time; and know this for a certainty that it soon will be destroyed. This is the reason why our fore-fathers escaped from the Babylonish captivity. Pyrro being their captain, empowered by King Cyrus, laden with much riches, in the sixty-ninth year of the captivity, dwelt at Toledo, being there received by the Gentiles; and not willing to return to Jerusalem to build the temple, which was again to be destroyed, they built one in Toledo.”—*From the “Ladies Companion.”*

Here is one honorable exception to a nation’s guilt and a nation’s judgments.]

But have fearful apostacy and fearful ruin disannulled the Abrahamick covenant? Clearly not; for the Mosaick covenant had as truly been broken before, as at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. And yet, long after the breach at Sinai, with

guilt accumulated upon them, Jehovah still declares the existence, the strength of His covenant with Abraham. He expostulates with them: "Where is the bill of your mother's divorce-ment whom I have put away? Or which of my creditors is it to whom I have sold you?" (Isa. 50: 1). You have broken your marriage vow—but have I changed my mind? Is my love diminished? "I am Jehovah: I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed." (Mal. 3: 6.) "In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment, but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the Lord, thy Redeemer." (Isa. 54: 7-8.) "Turn, O backsliding children, saith the Lord; *for I am married unto you.*" (Jer. 3: 14.) The marriage relation between Jehovah and Israel will abide for ever. Woe to those who come between this husband and this wife! If a mighty king should wed the humblest maiden of his realm, how unnatural for this queen, forgetful of her origin, to arrogate to herself the glory of her king and even to resist his authority, rebel against him, and even to conspire against him, or even to conspire against his life! Such has been again and again the course of Israel. The fewest among the nations, the King of Kings has been pleased to wed her to Himself, and to elevate her to the highest throne on earth. But this queen, forgetting that, like the moon, she shines only by reflected light, appropriated to herself the glory of her King which He will not give to another, and rebelled against her Sovereign, and proved unfaithful to the marriage covenant. Hence, He says to her: "You only have I known of all the families of the families of the earth; therefore, I will punish you for all your iniquities." (Amos. 3: 2). The queen acts unseemly, disgracefully, and the King must visit her transgressions with the rod; but the marriage covenant is not thereby dissolved, for He has wedded her to Himself in an everlasting union. God employs the agency of wicked nations to correct the backslidings of his chosen people, and then justly brings upon these wicked instruments the punishment they inflicted upon Israel. "I will curse him that curseth thee." The Apostle affirms the same truth with the Prophet. Notwithstanding their awful guilt, with its terrible

consequences, "They are still beloved for their fathers' sakes." The unfaithfulness of man never can nullify the unconditional promise of God. "God gave it to Abraham by promise." The interests of mankind require their continuance as a nation. With the destiny of Israel inseparably united the destiny of the church, the destiny of nations, the destiny of the very earth we live on. "When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the people *according to the numbers of the children of Israel.*" Even in their dispersion, they have been made to minister to the moral, as well as physical, interests of the nations. "Lo, I will command, and I will sift the House of Israel among all nations, like as corn is sifted in a sieve, *yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth,*" says the Prophet Amos (9:9). And the Prophet Ezekiel declares that fallen and scattered Israel should become "*an instruction to the nations where Jehovah hath executed judgment upon them*" (5:15). They were "sifted among all nations," exhibiting in their own persons, to every nation, "the *severity of God,*" as for ages past they had declared to Assyria and Egypt, to Greece and Rome, "the goodness of God." (Rom. 11: 22). The branches were broken off, indeed, not to be cast into the fire to be consumed, but to be scattered over the face of the earth, there to spread the knowledge of the one true and living God, from one end of Heaven even to the other.

Moses declared to his people that the wisdom of their laws should make the Hebrew system the admiration of the world. "Behold I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God has commanded me. Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations which shall hear all these statutes, and say, surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people." There is no reference to be found in any book, ancient or modern, to any system of laws answering to those of Moses. The renowned Plato drank of the sacred fountain of inspiration. He confesses that all laws came from God, and that no mortal man was the founder of laws. Diodorus Siculus says: "Moses was the

first who persuaded the people to use written laws, and to abide thereby, and this Moses was commemorated to have been a man of great soul and a well-ordered life." Servanus, in his preface to Plato, asserts that this philosopher received his symbolic system from the Jews. Aristobulus of Alexandria says of Plato: "He followed the Jewish Institutes and closely and diligently examined the several parts thereof." Numenius, the Pythagorean, asks in derision: "What is Plato but Moses Atticizing?" Clement, of Alexandria, styles Plato the Hebrew Philosopher, and frequently asserts that the Greeks stole their chief opinions out of the books of Moses and the Prophets: "Whence, O Plato," says he, "did you thus darkly set forth the truth? Truly I well know your teachers, though you may wish to conceal them. *From the Hebrews you have borrowed both all your good laws and your opinions respecting the Deity.*" Pythagorus, as his biographer Hermippus testifies, translated many of the Jewish laws into his own philosophy, "and that he was an imitator of the Jewish opist." Porphyry also states that Pythagorus had conversations with the Hebrews. Clearchus, a distinguished scholar of the immortal Aristotle, says that he heard his master speak of a certain Jew with whom, when he resided in Asia, he had held frequent conversations. This person Aristotle described as of wonderful learning, wisdom, temperance, and goodness, and said that he had received more knowledge from him than he was able to impart in return. With truth and justice could Tertullian exclaim: "Which of the poets who did not drink altogether of the prophets' fountain? Thence also the philosophers quenched their thirst; so what they had from our Scriptures, that we receive again from them."

Josephus informs us that the Jews held that the Shepherd Kings, who for so long a period reigned over Egypt, were their own ancestors, who brought with them from the East the doctrine and the discipline peculiar to their race.

In European countries the impress of Jewish Institutes is found, particularly on the Germanick and Anglo-Saxon Constitutions, the model of which, as Sir Henry Spelman, in his "Ancient Government of England," and other Antiquarians observe,

was found in that fundamental rule recommended by Jethro to Moses. "Appoint rulers over thousands, over hundreds, over fifties, over tens,"—the decimal arrangement obtaining throughout. The ten wards, into which villages were divided, being styled *Tythings* or *Decennaries*, ten of these Tithings constituted a hundred, governed by elders, *eldermen* or *aldermen*. The terms "hundred," "tything," still denote the civil divisions of the English people. Limited monarchy, constitutional law, representative government, an efficient civil police, and trial by jury, are easily traced to an Israelitish origin. Moses wears not one only, but many crowns upon his honored brow. Not only in the department of legislation, but also in literature, philosophy and science, the obligations of the world to the Jews are unspeakably great. Not to multiply instances in proof, take but one. The name of Lord Francis Bacon is one of the most illustrious on the roll of Genius. But a far abler man than he was one but little known, his namesake, Roger Bacon, who preceded him by three hundred and fifty years. The charge which Francis Bacon unjustly brought against Aristotle, that he concealed his obligations to previous philosophers, and only mentioned their names for the purpose of reprehending their doctrines, is justly brought against him. For whilst he merely mentions the name of Roger Bacon once, he never acknowledges his obligations, direct and indirect, and very extensive, to that pre-eminent and wonderful genius, whose utterances, sentiments, style, expressions and doctrines, he both imitated and appropriated. Induction and experimentation, and the repudiation of all research into occult causes, have been regarded as the characteristic triumphs of the Baconian method, but the true Baconian method is the method of Roger Bacon, which was caught up, devoured, and appropriated by Francis Bacon. The famous *dictum* of the latter respecting the four species of idols or fallacies which beset the human mind, viz: the idols of the Tribe, of the Den, of the Market, of the Theatre, is not original with him; for though the quaint designations are Lord Bacon's, the division itself is Roger Bacon's. It is not going too far to say that in all probability the *Novum Organon* of Lord Bacon would never have been

written, had he not had access to the *Opus Majus* of Roger Bacon. The latter never seeks to conceal, but always proclaims his authorities. The former is careful to hurl out of sight the ladder on which he mounts to fame. He announces himself as the herald of a new philosophy, he promulgates a reform in his own name, in these lofty, towering words: "Thus thought Francis of Verulam, and this method he adopted himself, the knowledge of which by his contemporaries and posterity, he deems of interest to themselves." This is the tone of a monarch, the utterances of a king, the decree of an autocrat, the voice of a solely self-sufficient legislator. Whether this haughtiness of expression should be admired as the fruit of sublime confidence, or censured as the strut of arrogant pretension—whether Francis Bacon was the discoverer and founder of the system he promulgated—whether he was the author of what he thought, or merely the sonorous mouthpiece of another man, whose name he left to languish in cold obscurity—whose torch lighted his way, but the light and the guide both unacknowledged by him whom they illuminated—will be determined when the Avenger, Time, shall have brought about a strict, rigid, and thorough investigation of his claims.

An eminent French scientist (Figuier) pronounces Roger Bacon the vastest intellect England ever produced, and says: "He studied Nature as a natural philosopher, rather than as a chemist, and the extraordinary discoveries he made in those branches of science, are familiarly known: the rectification of the errors committed in the Julian calendar, with regard to the solar year; the physical analysis of the action of lenses and convex glasses; the invention of spectacles for the aged; that of achromatic lenses; the theory, and perhaps the best construction of the telescope. From the principles and laws laid down, or partially apprehended by him, a system of unanticipated facts was sure to spring, as he himself remarked; nevertheless, his inquiries into chemical phenomena have not been without fruit for us. He carefully studied the properties of saltpetre, and if, in opposition to the ordinary opinion, he did not discover gunpowder, which had been explicitly described by Marcus Græcus

fifty years before, he improved its preparation by teaching the mode of purifying saltpetre, by first dissolving the salt in water, and then crystalizing it. He also called attention to the chemical action of air in combustion, 'And seems to have suspected the polarization of light.'" Such were some of the achievements of this wonderful genius of the 13th century. Where are the actual scientific discoveries of Francis Bacon which can be compared to this brilliant array? There are none. The philosophical theories of the two are identical; only the one is succinctly given, the other luminously expanded and magnificently expressed. The superb motto of Francis Bacon, "*Aut viam inveniam aut faciam,*" is a delusion; he neither invented nor made the road he travelled; he followed in the path beaten by the footsteps of a far mightier forerunner—of a leader as remarkable for ingenuousness and candor as his follower was for craft and dissimulation. And what aid and advantages did this master-mind enjoy? He frankly tells us, Roger Bacon has placed on record, *that he was indebted for much of his extraordinary knowledge and achievements to the libraries of Jews, so rich in science, philosophy and historic lore, which on their expulsion from England, they were compelled to leave behind.* Here, then, is the origin of the true Baconian Philosophy, and of the inestimable benefits it has conferred upon modern society! The brilliant crown which adorns the brow of Francis Bacon, the more brilliant crown which adorns the brow of Roger Bacon, are but borrowed crowns, and belong, of right, to the *brow of the Jew!*—the *Crown of Law, the Crown of Literature, the Crown of Philosophy, the Crown of Science, the Crown of Art—the universal Crown, placed by the hand of God upon the brow of the world's great leader, the world's great benefactor, THE JEW!*

And so are fulfilled the words of Micah, (v. 7, 8.) "The remnant of Jacob shall be in the midst of many people, as a dew from the Lord, as the showers upon the grass, that tarrieth not for man, nor waiteth for the sons of men. And the remnant of Jacob shall be among the Gentiles in the midst of many people, as a lion among the beasts of the forest," an Imperial Race, even in their captivity, the born kings and leaders of men, capturing

their captors, the sources of beneficent influences, refreshed and fructifying society, born to command and born to bless,—as a people, distinguished above all nations of the earth, for brotherly kindness. And yet, many point to Shakespeare's Shylock as the representative Jew! Justice demands that the origin of this character be given. Shakespeare and the writers of his day were accustomed to draw upon a famous work called *Gesta Romanorum*, for many of their characters. It was a collection of legends by the monks of the Middle Ages. The original of Shylock is there. But mark! he is not a Jew, but a *Christian*! A Knight has borrowed money from a so-called *Christian Merchant*, the condition being that in the case of any inability on the part of the former to repay the loan, the whole of his flesh be forfeited to the latter. The *Christian Merchant* stands before the court also on his bond. Then the wife of the Knight enters, disguised in man's clothing, and in a manner similar to Shakespeare's play, over comes the letter by the letter. She says to the judges, "You know that the Knight never literally bound himself to anything, but that the merchant should claim to cut his flesh from his bones, but without shedding of blood, concerning which nothing was agreed to. May he lay hands on him immediately? If he should shed blood in doing so, the King has to judge him." Thereupon the merchant replies, "Give me my money, and I relinquish all claims." But the money is forfeited, and he is obliged to depart shamefully. Here, then, this *Christian merchant* claims not only a pound, but the whole flesh, and insists on it as stubbornly as Shylock does. And the only motive prompting him is a blood-thirsty and demon-like insisting on his bond. This, then, is a more horrible picture than Shakespeare has drawn. This, however, is but a fable. But what we next mention is not a fable, but a fact, which occurred in Shakespeare's time, in the year 1587, recorded by Gregorio Letti, biographer of Pope Sixtus V. Paul Mario Sechi, a rich Roman merchant, communicated to Simono Cenede, a Jewish merchant, the news that the Admiral Francis Drake had conquered St. Domingo. The Hebrew merchant disputed the truth of the report, and, in the heat of debate, exclaimed: "I bet a pound of my flesh that

the report is untrue." "And I lay a thousand scudi against it," rejoined the other, and in a haughty and unrelenting temper caused a bond to be drawn up, signed by two witnesses, a Jew and a Christian, to the effect, that in case the report proved untrue, the Roman merchant is bound to pay to the Jewish merchant the sum of one thousand scudi, and if proved true, the Roman Catholic is justified and empowered to cut with his own hand, with a well-sharpened knife, a pound of the Jew's flesh, of that part of the body it might please him. The truth of the report having been established, the Roman Catholic insisted on the fulfilment of his bond. In vain did the Jewish merchant offer 1,000 scudi in lieu of that which he staked. The Romanist was immovable and relentless. He swore that nothing would satisfy him but the literal fulfilment of the bond. In the anguish of his soul, the Jew ran to the Governor, and the Governor communicated this unprecedented affair to the Pope, who condemned both parties to the galleys, from which they were obliged to release themselves by paying a fine of 2,000 scudi each, to the hospital of the Sixtine bridge. A German writer remarks, there can be no doubt that Shakespeare was acquainted with this fact, occurring in his day, so closely connected with a natural event, in which the greatest man of the age, the Pope, figured conspicuously. Here, then, is something that is not fiction, but fact, a horrible fact, where the Jew was not the persecutor, but the victim. Let the name of Shylock then disappear, and that of Sechi, the fiendish butcher, the devil's "Christian," take its place!

We have spoken of the impress of the Jewish polity and Jewish literature upon English legislation and English civilization. Because of the striking parallelism between the two, a wild theory has been broached and championed by a zealous, but weak advocate, a Mr. John Wilson, and is in our day revived, viz: that the ten lost tribes of Israel are the Anglo-Saxon race; that they were transformed into wild, predatory Saxon hordes, and in the fifth century established themselves in Great Britain, Germany and the North of Europe. But a death-blow to this theory is the testimony of the learned Jerome, who

affirms as a matter beyond contradiction that at the very period of the alleged transformation, "the ten tribes still remained in the land of their original deportation, having never collectively or universally departed from it, whatever colonies or insulated detachments might have gone forth;" and he adds that "they were servilely captive!" Observe the unmistakable marks which separate them from all other nations. A distinguished physiognomy—an accepted separation from all other people—the rite of circumcision—ceremonial laws and observances—keeping of the seventh day—expectation of Messiah as natural King and Deliverer—acceptance of and trust in the Talmudical traditions—trust in their own righteousness for acceptance with God—expectation of ultimate restoration and return—attachment to the Hebrew language. Are these the characteristics of Englishmen? When God's time has come and the hidden ones shall be manifest, then the ten tribes and the two tribes, Ephraim and Judah, shall, we are told by the prophet, be re-united in their own lands. Are Englishmen to be removed from England and settled in Palestine?

But enough of this idle notion which merits the ridicule it receives in England by the appellation, "The Anglo-Israel Craze." It is time that the roll of early English history gives us the honored names of many ancient Jews almost all of whom were Christian Jews and some of whom were dignitaries in the Church, who were fully amalgamated with the English people, such as these: Adam le Jeu, Mansell, Abel, Benet, Briton, Blount, Hamon, Chattuck or Shattock or Chittock, Sampson, Jacob, David, Jordan, Adamson, Bartholomew, Seth, Paul, Morrell, Andrews, Ansel, Wolf, Ricardus, Michel, Goldsmith, Francis, Symon, Lovetot, and many others. (So, too, in modern times and various countries Disreali, Simon, Gambetta, Casteear, Bismarck and Todleben. The descendants of some of the ancient English Jews are now in the United States, and the purity of their blood is dependent entirely on the proportion of Jewish blood that flows in their veins.

Thus we see that the scattered Nation has been "sifted among all nations," for a benefit to all. "Now, if the fall of them be

the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulness?" If Israel banished be the source of so many blessings, what will Israel restored be?

Another inconsistency in the interpretation of Scripture has placed an additional stumbling-block in the way of the Jew, and wrought no little harm among ourselves. The strange *doctrine* has come to be generally accepted, that as Israel typifies the fortunes of the Church, so when Israel is spoken of, the *Christian Church* is always meant—at least when promises and blessings are treated of. How such accommodation of the terms "Israel," "Jerusalem" and "Zion," for the elucidation of God's purposes, in the present dispensation, can destroy their original and obviously intended primary signification, we are at a loss to see. Especially, when the "Christian Church," or, more properly speaking, the *Gentile Church*, for the Church of God has been "Christian" in all ages, has been incorporated with the Church of Israel, and made partaker of its blessings. If the national covenant has been abrogated and Israel extinct, and the name now designates the "Christian Church," as many hold, then consistency requires that *all* that is said touching Israel be made to apply to the Christian Church. But this is by no means done. A middle wall of partition is still run between the two, and a convenient and comfortable principle of division obtains, by which all the *curses* are distributed to "Israel," and all the blessings are appropriated by ourselves. Israel *cursed* is the *literal* Israel, but Israel *blessed* is the *figurative* Israel, *i. e.*, the *Christian Church*. Israel *scattered* is quite *literal*, but Israel's *restoration* is *conversion* to the Christian faith! The *threatenings and curses*, the evils of their present misery and dispersion, we give them cheerfully, but the *promises and blessings* of restoration and wondrous national glory, we take to ourselves! "This is simply public plunder as to the property of your neighbor, and infidelity as to the interpretation of Scripture." Trodden down by the Infidel Gentile literally, and by the Christian Gentile figuratively, Zion has reason to groan beneath her afflictions, longing for the "times of the Gentiles to be fulfilled." (Luke

21: 24). No wonder that the Jew is disgusted and repelled by this false representation of Christianity, and cannot think it to be of God, if it involves a denial of the repeatedly confirmed promise made to the fathers. The wonder is, how any honest mind can tolerate this double-dealing with prophecy, and how any sensible person can adopt so inconsiderate and puerile a principle of interpretation.

The misapprehension of another passage of Scripture, which treats of the abolition of the ceremonial law because fulfilled in Christ, and the reception of Gentiles into the Church of Israel, and making them one with Jews, in the participation of the blessings of the Gospel, has led to the unwarranted inference, that henceforward all distinction between Jew and Gentile ceases in the Church, the superior position of the former no longer obtains, and in fact God has no further use for him as a Jew, when, individual by individual, he is brought into the Church. This is to confound things that are distinct. The scope of the Apostle's argument is to prove a title to Gospel blessings *for Gentiles*. He is not pleading for Jews; their claims he assumes as beyond dispute. The question is not, May the Jew come into the Church, for he is in; but may the *Gentile* come in? May he draw near to a covenant God, and, with the Jew, enter into his privileges and enjoyments? Yes, the Gentile may now come nearer to God than he did when under the Temple, for there "the Court of the Gentiles" was provided for him. He may now be a fellow-heir with the Jew, and of the same body, grafted into his olive tree; but if at any time disposed to assume an air of superiority to his elder brother, he is reminded that it is contrary to nature to graff a wild branch into the good olive tree, and so it does not become him to boast against the natural branches, for he does not bear the root, but the root bears him! He does not bring anything to the olive tree, but receives everything from it! He is grafted in, *among*, not instead of, the natural branches, partaking *with* them, not in their place, of the roots and fatness of the olive tree. And the root and the natural branches, must always take precedence of *foreign grafts*. To quote the words, as many do—and, strange to say, Dr. Hodge among them—"In

Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Gentile," is to quote what has no bearing on this question. The New Testament expressly asserts the continuance of the national distinction between Jew and Gentile: "What advantage hath the Jew? or what profit is there in circumcision? *Much every way.* What if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? *God forbid:* yea, let God be true and every man a liar." The profit of circumcision still remains, because the faith of God cannot be made without effect. But one profit of circumcision was the grant of the land of Israel: (Gen. 17: 7, 8.) That grant, therefore, still continues in force. Though their forefathers at the Exodus never possessed it, but died in the wilderness through unbelief, yet the land remained the property of the nation, and was in due time given to them. So, likewise, their present unbelief does not render ineffectual the faith of God to the whole nation, which, in God's own time, shall make good to them the promise of restoration.

The Apostle, when asserting that the Jews are still beloved for the fathers' sakes, lays down as a general principle, "that the gifts and callings of God are without repentance." Now, one of God's gifts to the fathers, and through them to the nation, was the land of Canaan. Nothing ever bestowed upon them was more freely an act of God's grace, or more solemnly confirmed by covenant, than the land of Israel: "In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying: Unto thy seed have I given this land." (Gen. 15: 18). "I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan *for an everlasting possession.*" (Gen. 17: 7-8.) "Unto thee and thy seed I will give all these countries, and *I will perform the oath which I swore unto Abram, thy father.*" (Gen. 26: 3.) If "the gifts and callings of God are without repentance," then the gift of the land is without repentance, and therefore, when Abraham's children shall have his faith (which their covenant secures to them), they shall have his land also.

The asserters of amalgamation rest, principally on these two passages: "There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor

uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all in all." (Col. 3: 11.) "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3: 28.) Here, it is said, the Apostle declares that all distinction between the Jew and Gentile is at an end. Yes, but only in the same sense in which he asserts: 1. That all distinction between Greek and Scythian had also ceased. Did he mean to say that a believer born a Greek ceased to be a Greek, and that a believer born a Scythian ceased to be a Scythian, and that now there is no *national* distinction between them? 2. That all distinction had ceased between slave and freemen. Did he mean to say that a slave by becoming a Christian ceased to be a slave, and that a freeman becoming a Christian ceased to be a freeman? 3. That all distinction had ceased between circumcision and uncircumcision. Did he mean to say that a believing Jew ceases to be circumcised, and a believing Gentile ceases to be uncircumcised? 4. That all distinction had ceased between male and female. Did he mean to say that the distinction of the sexes is done away with by Christianity, that a believing male ceases to be a male, and a believing female ceases to be a female? He teaches no such nonsense. He teaches that in Christ Jesus before God, with reference to eternity, all these distinctions have ceased, but that in time, and in this world, the difference between Greek and Scythian as to nationality,—the difference between bond and free as to liberty,—the difference between circumcised and uncircumcised as to state,—the difference between male and female as to sex, all do combine. It is evident, then, that the national distinction between Jew and Gentile in this world is not effected by these passages.

According to the true sense of the apostles' words, Jew and Gentile are one in Christ Jesus, and yet the national distinction between them continues and will continue ever.

A. W. MILLER.

IV. THE GROUND OF CERTITUDE IN RELIGIOUS BELIEF.

The comparison often instituted between the External and Internal Evidences of Christianity, as to their relative value, would seem to be an impertinence, when it is remembered that they are co-ordinates of one and the same argument. Two parties, for example, range themselves respectively in defence of the *apriori* and the *aposteriori* demonstration of the being of God ; each undervaluing, if not exactly denying, the validity of the reasoning upon the other side ; while in point of fact they are both "members one of another," and as strictly complementary as the ascending and descending curves of a single arch. These two branches of evidence can never be fairly disjoined, simply because they distinctly involve and support each other. It is inconceivable that miracles should be wrought, or that prophecies should be uttered, to attest a system which carries within itself no traces of its divine origin. On the other hand, a system whose lineaments are clearly supernatural cannot but be heralded to the world by credentials which shall challenge attention with superb authority.

There is, however, a distinction between the two, which possibly grounds the comparison in which they are so often weighed. The External Evidences, as the term indicates, break into the mind from without ; are therefore more obtrusive, and carry their whole weight of proof at once to those who are roused to consider them at all. Their significance is more easily apprehended, as they require no special culture of the affections to be appreciated. The Internal Evidences, on the other hand, are drawn from the genius of the system itself, and demand a measure of sympathy with the truths communicated. The evidence, is not, as before, like that of light falling upon the eye, which needs only to be opened in order to perceive. It is rather like that of heat, which can be felt only where a corresponding sensibility exists. In the one, the demonstration is *seen* ; in the other case, it is *felt*. In the one, the landscape is lighted up to the eye ; in the other, its beauty is disclosed to the sensibility and the taste.

Strictly co-ordinated as the light and the heat, they are like these communicated to us by different rays. The External Evidences authenticate Christianity viewed as a whole, and sweep away every cavil and doubt in the overwhelming presumption of its truth. The Internal Evidences verify this conclusion by a detailed examination of its parts, and rivet the conviction through the combined impressions which have been made singly by each. It follows, of course, that this line of proof is almost infinitely various. It is in fact kaleidoscopic: the same principles and facts, like so many colored stones, falling into new and changing combinations before the mind.

It will be the object of this paper to present one of these diversified proofs in the fact that CHRISTIANITY IS THE ONLY SYSTEM WHICH, DEPENDING WHOLLY UPON MORAL EVIDENCE, UNDERTAKES TO CONDUCT ITS ADVOCATES TO UNQUALIFIED CERTAINTY OF ITS TRUTH. Moral or probable reasoning, as it is variously termed, does not in its philosophic sense stand opposed to *certainty*, as though it were inferior in degree—but only to *demonstration*, from which it differs in kind. Its peculiarity is that it deals not with *necessary* truth, or the truth which must be at all times; but with *contingent* truth, that is with facts which exist as they are, but which might have been disposed differently by the Ruler of the Universe. It is plain that this is the species of evidence upon which we depend in the common affairs of life, upon which history is written, and by which the natural sciences are established. Upon it far the greater part of our knowledge and of our duty must rest. It is the only method under which character could be built up, or a moral system be conducted. It differs from demonstration, in that it admits of degrees from the lowest probability to the highest certainty: and our conviction is strong or weak according to the amount of evidence, after sifting and weighing the facts, which we accumulate in this scale or that.

Here, then, is Christianity, from its very nature, moving upon a plane of evidence which is not necessarily exclusive of doubt; yet producing, in all who surrender themselves to its influence, an unwavering assurance of its truth. What increases

the wonder, it works this conviction in all the faculties alike, and at every point where it touches the interests of the human soul. This, too, notwithstanding the immense range of its disclosures; stretching far beyond the limits of the human reason into the region of the Infinite and the Eternal; bringing the high mysteries of a supernatural world and lodging them as articles of faith and knowledge in the experience of the humblest saint, whose privilege it is to be taught of God as the truth is in Jesus. These are immense propositions. If they can be sustained, we find ourselves in a temple whose splendid dome is supported by pillars of beauty and strength grander than the Jachin and Boaz of Solomon's porch; and filled with a glory shining above the brightness of a thousand suns, from the self-illuminated pages of the inspired word.

The Scriptures speak of a three-fold Assurance: of *understanding*, of *faith*, and of *hope*. These may be thus distinguished: the *assurance of understanding* being the full conviction that we clearly perceive the meaning of Holy Scripture, and that we rightly interpret the principles of Grace as revealed therein; the *assurance of faith* being the firm persuasion of the reality and truth of all the Scriptures make known, embracing it with the heart, and acting upon it as each particular truth may require; *assurance of hope* being the well-grounded conviction that we are personally accepted before God, and shall never come into condemnation. The articulate discussion of each of these three topics, would show how this certainty is wrought within all the faculties of the soul; reciprocally strengthening each other, as the separate strands are wound together into the strength of the rope. The limits of a single article will not allow so wide a range. It will be necessary, therefore, to combine them, as far as possible, in one comprehensive view.

Let us, then, in the outset, note the emphasis with which the Apostle affirms the certainty of Christian knowledge and faith. In Colossians 2: 2, he pours out his prayer for all who had not seen his face in the flesh, "that their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding." There is no caution in his step, as

though doubtful of the ground upon which he treads; no hesitation in his tone, as though uncertain of the truth which he announces. On the contrary, the emphasis rings with the blast of a clarion in a four-fold intensification of language. After his gigantic fashion, he piles together his massive words, which, like separate beams, undergird the weakness of human speech and render it capable of sustaining the burden of his thought. These Colossians may not only have *understanding* of the truth, but the **ASSURANCE** of understanding also; and beyond this, the **FULNESS** of that assurance and then the **RICHESS** of that fulness: until, rising to the fifth degree of his emphasis, he adds the **ENTIRENESS** of these riches themselves. Such is the majesty of this Apostolic prayer, ascending the stairway of a splendid climax, that Christians may possess *all* the **WEALTH** of the **FULNESS** of **ASSURANCE** of **UNDERSTANDING**. This is far from being the only passage of Scripture which affirms the certainty of Christian knowledge. Let us blend into a constellation a few of these blessed testimonies, beginning with that of our Lord: "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou has sent." (John 17: 3). So, too, that of the Apostle: "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ." (2 Cor. 4: 6). Well may he embody the same testimony in his prayer for the Ephesians (1: 17, 18): "that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him; the eyes of your understanding being enlightened," etc. And again, in his prayer for the saints at Colosse, (1: 9): "that they might be filled with the knowledges of His will, in all wisdom and spiritual understanding." Finally, the beloved Mystic speaks from the depths of his own consciousness: "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know Him that is true; and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son, Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." (1 John 5: 20).

If in any case this grand result be not attained, the cause of

failure is not ambiguously exposed. "If any man will do his will," says the Master, "he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." (John 7 : 17). So the Apostle : "Neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." (1 Cor. 2 : 14). Christ says to Peter : "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." (Mat. 16 : 17). And again in his parting counsels to his disciples : "When He the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth." (John 16 : 13). If from want of grace in the heart we are not in full accord with the system of grace, how shall we perfectly understand its nature ? If the unsanctified reason will repose upon the deductions of logic rather than upon the demonstration of the Spirit, what basis of conviction remains but the value of the syllogism ? If the reliance be upon "flesh and blood" for what the Father alone can reveal, where is the spiritual discernment upon which this certainty of knowledge rests ? We have unwittingly changed the ground upon which this holy privilege is established ; and fail of assurance, simply because "the eyes of the understanding" have not been "enlightened" through "the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of God." When it is remembered that this "assurance of understanding" is not only a spiritual gift, but a spiritual grace wrought in the soul, it will be seen that a complete surrender to the influence of the Gospel becomes the condition upon which this certainty of conviction shall be enjoyed.

What then does the apostle mean by this "assurance of understanding," and within what limitations must the phrase be restrained ? Evidently he does not imply that reason is competent to measure all "the deep things of God;" for in the very next line, and in continuation of his thought, he speaks of the mystery that must be acknowledged, "the mystery of God and of the Father and of Christ." Nor again is it of every kind of assurance that he speaks ; but an assurance of the thinking, reasoning faculty in man, the intellect through which he perceives and is convinced of truth. The "full assurance of understanding," then, is THE FIXED PERSUASION THAT WE HAVE GOD'S

MIND IN THE WORD, AND THAT WE RIGHTLY UNDERSTAND IT. The clear apprehension of truth by no means involves its full comprehension. We may touch that which we may not be able to embrace: and the one is as truly a ground of certainty as the other. Like the "stupendous mount" of Coleridge's hymn, whose "sunless pillars sank deep in earth" and whose "breast was veiled in the depth of clouds," the awful mysteries of Revelation may still be known as the mount itself was known. We may lie upon the bosom of the one, as upon the grey breast of the other; and know them both with a certainty, which is not disturbed by the darkness which hides the base and peak alike from sight.

The great question now presses, *what principles determine "the assurance of understanding" and render it possible to the Christian?*

1. We answer that DIVINE TRUTH IS RECEIVED SIMPLY AND ALONE UPON DIVINE TESTIMONY. It cannot be doubted that reliance on testimony is an elementary principle of our nature. It is seen in the credulity of childhood, which opens its faith to all that is communicated; withholding no part of its confidence, until later experience of error and falsehood imposes a necessary caution and reserve. Even when this restraint has been imposed, the natural tendency is to accept without suspicion every statement which is not in itself violently improbable, or where no reason appears for distrusting the veracity of the witness. It must needs be so. God having designed man to exist in society, there would be no cohesion of its parts without confidence in the veracity, one of another. All the transactions of business repose upon obligations and promises, which derive their value from faith in the integrity and truthfulness of those by whom they were given. The whole administration of justice is estopped, and society is left without protection, if facts cannot be established through the depositions of a credible witness. So limited, moreover, is the range of individual observation and experience, that there can be no generalized knowledge without the confluence of many experiences flowing through the channel of a common testimony. In short, all progress is locked, and

fellowship is barred, if the evidence of even human testimony is excluded as worthless.

Provision, therefore, is made for certainty of conviction in regard to Divine truth, in this principle which compels repose upon unimpeachable testimony; for the reason, that Divine truth is not offered to acceptance except upon Divine testimony. There are many propositions in the Bible, no doubt, so level to the natural understanding as to receive a ready assent without the need of any affirmative evidence. Let it be noted, however, even in regard to these, that a true faith grounds not upon the intrinsic probability of the case, but upon the Divine verity which guarantees the statement. Just here lurks the fatal crevice, through which the desired assurance leaks out of the heart that is left in darkness. There is always danger that our conviction will rest upon the suitability of the proposition to our natural apprehension, rather than upon the authority of a revelation. The certainty which seemed sufficient in the lower sphere, fails entirely in the sphere of supernatural truth. It fails, because it rests upon a faith that is human and not Divine—which is built upon the authority of reason, and not upon the competency of testimony. For be it remembered, Divine faith wrought in the soul by the Holy Spirit accepts the plainest truths precisely as the most difficult, upon a “thus saith the Lord.”

The principle is now in hand, which lifts us over the paradox of claiming to understand that which is in itself incomprehensible. It will not prejudice our case to admit that the staple truths of the Bible are mysteries which transcend the measure of human thought, mysteries solemn and vast as the Divine World from whose bosom they are drawn. Consider, for example, the Eternity and Omnipresence of God; what finite conception goes beyond the mere negative removal from Him of those limitations of time and space which so obstruct our own being? But who grasps all the positive elements which enter into them, as known to God Himself? There is, again, the adorable trinity in unity of the Godhead; what angel of the upper world can lift the veil which covers the mysterious mode of the Divine subsistence?

There is also the truth of the Incarnation, so pleaded for by all the instincts of a created nature that it is postulated in every religion upon the earth. Yet who can trace the seam at which the two natures are brought together in the unity of an individual person? We refer only to the mysteries which are undisputed and which no finite reason has attempted to fathom. How then, it may be asked, can such a system of transcendental truths claim to be understood at all, much less with the assurance that it is rightly understood? The answer is, because it depends alone upon the testimony of one whose infinite knowledge renders Him competent to make the revelation. I have never been to Rome; you have, and your declaration is sufficient evidence to me that such a place exists. So, reason's short line may not take the soundings of God's infinitude, and her dim sight may not explore the recesses of His immensity; yet if He throw the covering from His throne in a revelation of His own purposes and thoughts, the solemn secrets are known to me as things that are, though never measured in their boundless extension or in the exhaustion of their mighty issues. The Divine origin of Christianity is conspicuously shown, in that all its truths rest upon the same plane of evidence. The deepest mystery is received with the same unhesitating assurance with the plainest fact of history, or the simplest principle in ethics, for the obvious reason, that everything is alike told to us, and the veracity of the witness is the guarantee of our faith. All opposition of the heart being removed by Divine grace, the Christian is perfectly willing to accept the Divine testimony. He only needs to know that his grammatical construction of the record is correct, to be fully persuaded of the truth which is revealed. As all its statements rest upon the same authority, he has no more difficulty in accepting the inexplicable than the demonstrable.

If, then, the Divine testimony be the *objective* ground of certainty, there must be a corresponding *subjective* ground in the actualizing power of faith, making real to us the spiritual world. Our contact with matter is close through the five senses by which it continually obtrudes itself. Yet there are pauses in life when the soul retires within its own chambers, to learn that it belongs

to a sphere that is not material. Often in the silence of night, as in the pause of some grand music, the soul hears "a still small voice" from beyond the stars pleading for that which is not "of the earth, earthy." Now, if God give us five senses to recognize the world of matter, shall there be no power by which to discover the world of spirit? Observe that our bodily senses not only convey impressions from without, but they verify as real the objects which make them; as when, against all the whimsies of the Idealist, the sight of a tree is accompanied with the fixed belief of its substantive existence. Hence Isaac Taylor calls the body an organ of the soul; and the senses he terms open paths, by which the soul goes forth and takes possession of a world foreign to itself. In the intellectual sphere, also, the same provision is made for certainty of conviction. Our logic, if the links but hold together, will conduct to conclusions as certain as any that are yielded through the senses. Arguing, then, from analogy, there should be a certifying power in faith ensuring the same satisfaction and repose in the spiritual sphere, which sense-perception ensures in the material, and demonstration in the intellectual.

We do not, however, rest upon the presumption created by this analogy. The truths of Christianity must be verified as the foundation of duty and worship. They must be *certainties*, not mere *probabilities*. Reason cannot make them such, for they are out of its reach. Even if it could, the process would be too slow. They must antedate reason, and furnish that on which she may proceed in her deductions. The principles of duty cannot be settled in the stir and strife of actual temptation, when they should be at hand and ready for use. How then shall these be certified to the Christian, unless there be in faith an apprehensive power by which they are seized and verified? This is that actual power, which the Apostle emphasizes as characteristic of true faith. In Hebrews 11:1, it is described as the "substance of things hoped for." But hope respects the future (Romans 8:24, 25) made up of expectation and desires as its constituents. There must then be in hope an underlying conviction of some good not yet in possession, though actually

existing. This realization is by faith; which is thus the substance, the actualization of what is future. Again, it is "the evidence of things not seen:" that is, by a spiritual apprehension of these through the testimony of God, there is an actual seizure of them in their felt reality. How they are demonstrated, we may not in all respects comprehend: but a conviction of their truth is produced by a faith Divinely implanted, which tests and embraces them all.

These observations have almost anticipated the second ground of certitude in Christian belief:

2. There are SPIRITUAL INSTINCTS IN MAN TO WHICH THE GOSPEL DIRECTLY APPEALS, AND THROUGH WHICH ITS CLAIMS ARE BOTH RECEIVED AND VERIFIED. Just as the axioms in Mathematics are the wheels upon which the demonstration proceeds—just as there are primary beliefs from which all discursive reasoning takes its departure, and to which it recurs for verification—so there are principles in the moral constitution to which Divine truth is congenial. There must be a nexus between the object and the subject, a ring-bolt by which the *without* may be fastened to the *within*. If a revelation be given, what can it avail without the points in man himself to which it can be attached? And if man's true glory lies in the Divine image in which he was created, there must be voices in the soul responding to the Divine Original speaking through the word. Eight and twenty years ago when the building in which the writer has so long been permitted to minister, was nearly finished, a crowd was assembled in the open square opposite to witness a triumph of Mechanical Science in lifting the lofty spire to its place upon the tower of which it was intended to be the crown. For convenience it had been built upon the ground, completely hid within the tower it was hereafter to surmount. It was curious to see its tapering point, as it emerged above its prison walls; rising with a slow but steady movement towards the bright sky, until its huge bulk swung free in air one hundred and fifteen feet from the ground beneath; then poising for a little, like a bird upon the wing, it settled with an easy motion downward, the strong protruding beams falling into great iron

sockets within the tower,—in whose giant clasp it has been held from that day to this, swinging in the breeze higher than the tall pine of the forest. Will the reader spare us the illustration, if we now put forth the hand to find the sockets in man's moral structure, in which the massive truths of Divine Revelation secure their lodgment forever?

(1). For example : how are we to explain *the universal conviction that there is a God* ; not dislodged from its seat in the bosom of the professed Atheist himself? Incredible as it might at first sight appear, there is not in the whole compass of Revelation a formal affirmation of this pre-existent and ultimate truth, which forms the bed-rock on which all religion, natural and revealed, is founded. Can the strange omission be accounted for, if there were not some provision in man's nature to receive and retain a truth which is nevertheless folded within the implications of Scripture language throughout? How, then, does the knowledge come? Is it innate, born within us, when we ourselves are born? woven into the texture of the soul, as the bright threads form the pattern upon the canvas? On the contrary, no formulated truth of any kind lies originally in the mind as a part of its necessary furniture. There are capacities, indeed, for the receiving of truth ; faculties wonderfully sensitive to its approach ; but knowledge comes only from contact of these with the external truths which wake them into action. Does it come, then, by intuition—the mind having an immediate apprehension of God, similar to the perception of natural objects through the organs of sense? There can be no such outlook upon Him of whom it is written, “No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him.” (John 1 : 13). Does the knowledge come finally through demonstration of the reason? It is a sufficient answer that no line of argument adds a particle to our antecedent conviction of this truth, or serves any other purpose than to vindicate it as a truth already known at the bar of human reason, and to paralyze any assault upon it as a great faith in the soul. The solution is to be sought in that religious nature wherein man's true likeness to God consists, and to which the

fact of the Divine existence presents itself with a self-evidencing power. The truth is no sooner proclaimed than it awakes its own echo in the soul, like the voice returning from the hills. In the one case we find in the configuration of the landscape that which rolls back the wave of sound; in the other, it is the congeniality of the spiritual nature which responds to the call addressed to it by "the Father of Spirits." Or, to vary the figure, the soul of man is like a mirror which reflects the August Being who stands before it. The thought which is awakened in the one, like the image upon the surface of the other, is the shadow which the truth has cast from the reality of its own substance. The naturalness of this truth to the human soul, renders the conviction both universal and ineradicable. Wherever man is found, he is susceptible of religious ideas; which are definitely formed and expressed, just in proportion as mind itself has been developed. The universal acceptance of the doctrine of a God is simply the instinctive response of man's spirit to the truth as soon as it is presented. Hence, too, the ludicrous imbecility of Atheism in attempting to expunge the idea of God from human thought. It must use the idea, in order to argue against it; which only needs bare presentation to authenticate itself. Every line of the discussion, therefore, like each stroke of the hammer, only chisels deeper the immortal inscription upon the tablet of memory.

(2.) Let us find another of these sockets, in *the indestructible persuasion of God's conversableness with His creatures*. You can build up a presumption against it which shall seem impregnable as another Gibraltar. It is easy to ask whether an Infinite Spirit, whose mode of being and every attribute transcend the limit of human reason, will or can condescend to creatures who in the comparison are less than the mites of the Microscope? Add to this the distance which widens ever between the holiness that consumes in its brightness and the impurity which defiles a sinner, and we stand appalled at the estrangement which would seem to be final. Yet with all the sense of littleness as contrasted with the immensity of God, with all the shame of guilt that cowers beneath the wrath and scorn of the Lawgiver, there

remains beneath it all, as a live coal hidden in the embers, a sustaining conviction that even this God will be found accessible to those who seek Him. It is an amazing paradox, this faith of the race in the most improbable suggestion which could be offered to the naked reason. But in the midst of our surprise let it be remembered that through this instinctive persuasion of God's conversableness the great truths of a Divine Revelation and Incarnation find their lodgment in the human soul. It is here, and here alone, that the one doctrine and the other are mortised into the belief of the race.

(3.) What shall be said further of *the decision of conscience, the soul that sinneth shall die?* Men of quick sensibility, like John Foster, shudder at a destiny too fearful for them to contemplate without a half-denial: and others less scrupulous, in the frenzy of their affright, seek to wrench themselves out of the grasp of a doctrine which binds them over to a doom so terrific. Yet, by a strange fascination, the faith of mankind has been held to the necessity of the just punishment^e of the wicked hereafter. To what is it due, but to that sense of justice in the soul of man which answers to the justice that dwells in God? Aside from this, there would be no operation of conscience fastening upon the transgressor the conviction of ill-desert and blame, and responding to the supremacy of law as vindicated in the penalty.

(4.) Will these specifications suffice, or shall they be confirmed by the addition of a fourth? What shall we say then of the *sweet and invincible persuasion of the Divine mercy and love?* Reference has been made to the dictum of conscience which responds to the authority of law as enforced by the penalty, and would seem to fill with despair the sinner who is convicted of guilt. And so it would, but that side by side with the clear view of God's holiness before which angels stand veiled in adoring awe,—side by side with the sense of guilt which lies upon the conscience of the sinner “a vast oppressive load,”—there runs parallel with both an ineradicable conviction that this just and holy God may be propitiated. Even when not embodied in a formal proposition, it exists as a sentiment in the heart, sustaining the sinner from the collapse of despair. It looks like a won-

derful contradiction, until we push deep enough into what is fundamental in man's religious nature. There is another side of the Divine character, besides that of holiness, justice and power. He is crowned also with the attribute of mercy and grace. If He has fashioned us after His own likeness, He must have put the stamp of His own image of love, by which He provides for the soul's spontaneous recognition of the Father as well as the Judge. It is this conviction which lies at the root of all our ideas of atonement and sacrifice, redemption and forgiveness. In this is laid the basis for the recognition of a Mediator, as before for the recognition of a God. When Jehovah stands before the soul in the reality of His being, it responds by pronouncing the name of its God; when the Mediator stands before the soul burdened with guilt, it responds by pronouncing the name of its Redeemer. The same subjective ground exists in the nature of man, as a creature and as a sinner, for the recognition of both—just so soon as, in a full-orbed revelation, Jehovah is disclosed in the complement of all His attributes and relations.

3. It is time, however, to rise to a higher plane, in that THE MOST DIFFICULT TRUTHS OF THE BIBLE ARE SO TAKEN UP INTO CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE, AS TO RECEIVE THE MOST PRACTICAL AND SUBSTANTIVE VERIFICATION. This will be made clear by illustrations drawn from the knowledge of every child of God.

(1.) We have seen that when the conscience aroused by the denunciations of the law binds the sinner under a sense of guilt, it is through this conviction the doctrine of Redemption finds entrance with its proposed relief; for "they that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." But observe the long train of other truths which must enter with this—truths, at first sight, the most abstract and the most transcendental; yet absorbed into Christian experience, as the most healing in their practical application and influence. If there is a Redemption, there must first be a Redeemer. He, as Mediator between two estranged parties, must be the equal, and be partaker of the nature, of both. Thus we are lifted at once to those strange heights, the distinction of Persons in the God-head, and the incarnation of the Only-Begotten of the Father. Then follow

by necessary implication the Covenant between the Persons of the Trinity, the distribution of offices between them in the same, the substitution of Christ under the law for His people, His expiatory suffering and death, His vicarious obedience, the imputation of His righteousness, and through it the complete justification of the believer before God. Here is a cluster of doctrines, interlacing and inter-dependent, a solar system of truths revolving around a common centre. They come before us, not as speculative abstractions; but as potential factors of a practical scheme, through which we are to be saved from eternal death. The soul, in the agony of despair, cries out for a Redeemer; who, when He comes, implicates in His person and work the deepest and darkest of all the mysteries of Revelation; and imports every one of them into the experience, as the most vital and efficient of all practical truths. I may not comprehend any one of these enumerated doctrines, in their intrinsic glory and manifold ramifications; but I may know them as substantive facts entering into the matter of my personal salvation, and verified to me in the unfoldings of my own experience.

(2.) So it is in the actings of faith and repentance, and in the delicious peace which settles upon the troubled thoughts through a sense of pardon sealed upon the conscience. Will any say that the Christian has not the knowledge of all this, from the testimony of his own experience? But see how it involves the entire office-work of the Holy Spirit, the surpassing mystery of the new birth, and all that pertains to the spiritual conflict and progressive sanctification of the believer. The whole discipline of grace, with its blessed effect in mellowing the character and life, draws into it and along with it the most insoluble of problems—how spirit is able to act directly upon spirit—how it shall act upon free spirit with an invincible efficacy, and yet not disturb the spontaneity of its action nor blunt the edge of its responsibility; but like the spirit within the wheels of Ezekiel's vision, animating and directing, without impeding their movement. I cannot know the Holy Ghost in the awful communion of the Godhead, nor of the deep secrecy with which He dispenses the Divine life and the Divine

power to the children of men; but I may know Him in the spiritual life which He has given me, and in the holy calm which, as the Comforter, He diffuses through the soul.

(3.) In the use of prayer we ascend the mount of worship, and learn the secret of communion with the Most High. Who can solve the mystery, even of human intercourse, when, through conventional symbols, one pours the whole contents of his being into the bosom of another? But here is intercourse without the intervention of sign or sound; the creature kneeling before his God in the silence of thought, or in the sultry stillness of unutterable emotion, whilst the eye of the Omniscient rests upon the secret movement of the soul itself. Where is the Christian who, in the office of prayer, does not go up into the cloud, as Moses did, and talk face to face with the thunder? "Shall we, who are but dust and ashes, take upon us to speak to the Lord?" Yea, verily; and He will answer back to us, "as a man speaketh with his friend." Thus, in the daily acts of the daily Christian life, the electric circuit is complete, and there are flashes of light between heaven and earth. All that is incomprehensible in the communion of soul with the Infinite Spirit, is taken up and verified in the experience of the most unlettered saint who, under a sense of his adoption, is able to say, "our Father who art in Heaven."

(4.) Once more: "How much of the inscrutable is taken up in the Christian grace of Hope? "We are saved by hope," saith the Apostle; "but hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?" What, then, are the unseen things which hope anticipates through the prophetic power of that faith of which it is born? What, but the triumph of the soul over death, the resurrection of the body, and "the far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory?" Mystery upon mystery; mysteries dark as the grave from which its victim is delivered; mysteries bright as the joy of angels, and stretching through the eternity of ages; mysteries bursting away from the comprehension of reason, yet implicitly contained, as the oak within the acorn, in the experience of the humblest saint who can say "I know whom I have believed." Thus does the Christian swing around the whole circle of revealed

truth, each doctrine fitting into his experience, as the key into the wards of a lock. The verification of the highest mysteries of faith is complete, through the sympathy with which they are embraced, and become the mould into which the whole Christian life and character are fashioned.

It should not be overlooked that the faith which embraces and assimilates this system of truth, is the expression of every faculty alike. Every power of the human soul is brought into play. The mind is employed in understanding the propositions of the Bible, and knowing the method of grace in restoring men to the favour of God. The affections are drawn out to the Lord Jesus as "the chiefest among ten thousand." The will, through its volitions, must render into act the decisions of the judgment and the reason. Even the imagination must present the Gospel in the vividness of its reality; and the moral taste must appreciate the "beauty of holiness," which is so large an element in our sanctification. It is scarcely necessary to point out the bearing of all this upon the certitude of faith. The concurrence of these different powers gives cumulative force to the conviction reached. The aberrations in one will be corrected in the others, affording safeguards against the possibility of error in the final result. We have thus the verification which is claimed in science, under every variety of test and especially of experience.

4. This assurance of understanding has its final support in THE DIRECT INFLUENCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, ILLUMINATING THE TRUTH HE HAS INSPIRED. It is unnecessary in this connection to discuss the doctrine of Inspiration, or to go beyond the simple fact that "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." In the free use of their own faculties, they were so quickened and guided by this Divine Agent as rightly to apprehend and safely to communicate Divine truth. Correlative with this is the other office of the Holy Ghost, in illuminating the minds of those to whom this truth is to be a saving efficacy. The word is not the Divine word, except as it is given by the Divine Spirit: it is not read in a Divine light, except it be opened to the understanding by a Divine exposition. This illumination is distinctly promised by Christ,

to His disciples: "but the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you." (John 14 : 26). The promise is repeated in language slightly different: "when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth; for He shall not speak of Himself: but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak; and He will show you things to come. He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you." (John 16 : 13, 14).

There are seasons with us all when a cloud settles upon the mind, as when night draws its pall of darkness over the earth. We open the Scriptures, but the Oracle is dumb. Its words are cold and unsuggestive, and reason fails to break the shell in which the Divine comfort is hidden. Again, this shell parts asunder apparently of itself, and our "souls are satisfied as with marrow and fatness." This alternation of light and darkness in the soul of the believer, like the day and night in nature, is due to the same cause, the appearance and withdrawal of the irradiating sun. The logical propositions may be understood well enough by the natural understanding through a light, so to speak, *outside* of the word; but we want a light *within* the word, which shall reveal the import and blessing it has for us. It may be likened to those skeleton signs in the streets of our cities, made up of innumerable points vague and unimpressive in the diffused glare of day; but when lighted at night by a jet of gas, the name written in fire blazes into the darkness with the splendor of a distant star. And so the Holy Ghost dwelling within us quickens every faculty and brings to a clear insight of the truths, as He lights up before us the word in which it is deposited.

These then are principles upon which rests that assurance of understanding, which the Scriptures declare to be the privilege of every Christian. Let them be massed together in a sentence, that they may be seen in their combined strength. First, we have the unimpeachable testimony of Jehovah himself; over against which there is the actualizing power of faith, making real to us all that is revealed. Second, there are the moral

instincts of our nature, to which the truth directly appeals, and in which it finds a secure lodgment. Third, these truths, even the most abstract and difficult, are taken up and verified in Christian experience, subjecting them to a practical test. Fourth, the Holy Spirit dwells in the believer, for the declared purpose of "guiding him into all truth." His illuminating work stands over against His work of Inspiration, as its necessary complement and correlative. All these converging to a common end, bring to an assurance which can never be shaken by the combined assault of earth and hell. The argument is complete in itself; but when coupled with the assurance of Faith and of Hope, it becomes a three-fold cord not easily broken. The certainty of conviction is seen to be borne not only to the understanding to perceive truth, but to the heart to embrace it, and to the will to practise it; in short, to all those qualities of man's nature which cause him to live by anticipation in the future, as well as memory in by the past.

The object of this discussion is not simply apologetic, but chiefly experimental. There is probably no topic of practical religion involved in so much obscurity, as this grace of assurance. Singular confusion of mind exists from not distinguishing the kinds of assurance, and failing to recognize the principles upon which they are grounded. Thus the comfort of believers is often marred, and one of the most powerful incentives to personal holiness is weakened. It will be helpful to many, if the mist and haze surrounding this entire subject could be dispelled—if with the beloved John we could be brought to feel; that God "has given us an understanding that we may know Him that is true," and beyond this, "that we are in Him that is true." As one of the internal evidences of Christianity, it gives an immense advantage to go before the world with a bold challenge to compare this wonderful certainty of supernatural truth with the cloudiness of doubt enveloping all the systems of Ethics and Religion which depend upon human reason alone. How much like a wail of despair is the confession of Cicero, that while reading the arguments of Plato for the immortality of the soul, he seemed to be

convinced; but as soon as he laid down the book, they slipped from his grasp and vanished into air? Yet what conviction needs more to be rooted within us, than this which underlies all worship and obedience to God, and all hope of enjoying the presence of His glory? To serve the purpose of religion, it must cease to be a probability resting on the shifting sands of finite speculation, and become an ascertained reality to us through a Divine revelation. Yet this is but one of many topics upon which certainty is brought to the soul by the Inspired Word.

We live in an age when freedom of inquiry is scarcely free from the insolence of trampling with scorn upon the faiths of the past, and construing their age into a presumption of error and superstition. It is necessary then to go down to the bottom facts of Christianity, as they rest in the ineradicable instincts of a spiritual nature—those internal evidences which come up from the depths of the system, and with its own voice proclaim it to be Divine and true. Our Christian beliefs will then be like the everlasting mountains, which seem to grow from the central granite of the earth itself. Their foundation will be laid in a Divine testimony mortised into the deepest necessities of the soul itself; and the structure which rises from that base will be as enduring as the nature from which it springs.

B. M. PALMER.

V. CREATION AS A DOCTRINE OF SCIENCE.

Until very recently the theory of Creation has been generally accepted by thoughtful men as giving the only credible account of the origin of our Cosmos, *i. e.* "Our world in all its beautiful order." This general acceptance of the theory is owing, largely, to the fact that it has been believed to be taught in the Scriptures, regarded by most as given by inspiration of God,—and by such as rejected this idea—as embodying the oldest and most authentic traditions of our race. Its general acceptance, however, has not been altogether for this reason. In part, it is owing,

doubtless, to the fact that the only competing theory which claimed attention was that of the eternity of the present order of things; a theory clogged with so many and such serious difficulties as to find favor with few.

Within the last half of the present century the hypothesis of Evolution has been brought forward, and its claim to supercede the old theory of Creation has been earnestly and persistently urged in the name of modern science. In the present article I propose to examine this claim.

In the Scriptures the word creation is used in two senses: 1st, in the sense of making out of nothing, causing to begin to be, and 2d, making out of pre-existing materials. By common consent, it is in the first of these senses the word is used in Genesis 1:1. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." That it is used in the second of these senses in Genesis 1:27: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them," is placed beyond all question by the record contained in Genesis 2:7-22: "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." "And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman."

On the doctrine of Creation, in so far as the creation of the heaven and the earth out of nothing is concerned, I have two remarks to make, viz:

1st. It concerns a matter confessedly beyond the range of investigation of human science. "It appears to me," writes Huxley, "that the scientific investigator is wholly incompetent to say anything at all about the first origin of the material universe. The whole power of his organon vanishes when he has to step beyond the chain of natural causes and effects." (*Order of Creation*, p. 152.) When the author of the epistle to the Hebrew wrote, "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear," (Heb. 11:3.) he gave utterance to a profound philosophical truth, pointing out to us the only trustworthy source of information respecting this matter. If we are to know anything on this subject, it must be through a revelation from God the Creator.

2nd. It concern matters with which the hypothesis of Evolution, as that term is understood by such scientists as Darwin and Huxley, has nothing to do. That hypothesis assumes, not only the existence of matter, but, as expounded by its ablest advocates, the existence of one or more primordial beings, from which all others have been evolved. "The inquiry respecting the causes of the phenomena of organic nature, resolves itself into two problems: the first being the question respecting the origination of living, or organic beings; and the second being the totally distinct problem of the modification and perpetuation of organic beings when they have already come into existence. The first question, Mr. Darwin does not touch; he does not deal with it at all." (*Huxley's Origin of Species. Lect. VI.*)

As science has, and can have nothing to say about the original creation of matter out of nothing, and the hypothesis of Evolution does not propose to supersede the old doctrine, in so far as the original creation out of nothing is concerned, I dismiss such creation from further consideration in the present article; and when I speak of creation, must be understood to mean creation of materials already in existence.

THE DOCTRINE OF CREATION.

The doctrine of Creation, as now held by thoughtful men, and as believed to be taught in the Scriptures, embraces the following particulars, viz:

I. Creation was *immediate*; *i. e.*, effected without the intervention of any natural second causes. This idea the Westminster Divines express in the phrase, "making by the word of God's power." "Evolution supposes that * * * preceding the forms of life which now exist, there were animals and plants, not identical with them, but like them; increasing their differences with their antiquity, and, at the same time, becoming simpler and simpler; until, finally, the world of life would present nothing but that undifferentiated protoplasmic matter which, so far as our present knowledge goes, is the common foundation of all vital activity. The hypothesis of Evolution supposes that in all this vast progression there would be no breach of continuity, no point

at which we could say, 'This is a natural process,' and 'This is not a natural process;' but that the whole might be compared to that wonderful process of development which may be seen going on every day under our eyes, in virtue of which there arises, out of the semi-fluid, comparatively homogeneous substance which we call an egg, the complicated organization of one of the higher animals. This, in few words, is what is meant by the hypothesis of Evolution." (*Huxley's New York Lectures, Lecture I.*) If, with Darwin, we choose to speak of Evolution as "a mode of Creation," that creation must be a *mediate creation*, wrought not directly by "the word of God's power;" but—with the exception of the "one or more primordial forms" mediately created—through the intervention of living forms already in existence.

II. Creation, as the doctrine is understood by those who hold it, is not a single act of Almighty power, by which our world, embracing organic as well as inorganic nature, was brought into being; but a continuous work, or succession of acts, extending, probably, over a long period, and terminating with the creation of man. After giving in detail the work of six days, Moses adds: "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God rested from all his works which he had made." (Gen. 2: 1-2.)

One of the best established truths of geology is, that a long time was occupied in the work of creation. Without going into an examination of the evidence upon which this conclusion rests, it is sufficient for my present purpose to remark, that modern commentators, without exception, accept it as in no way inconsistent with the testimony of Scripture. This long time, this age, this era, which closed with the creation of man, may properly be styled the age, or era of creation. The present era, the era of providence as it may be termed, is one in which God, "resting from all his works which he has made," is preserving and governing his creation. And, it is the same God that in the beginning created, that is now preserving and governing.

1. Spencer objects to the theory of Creation in the words: "Among the unthinking there is a tacit belief in creation by *miracle*, which forms an essential part of the creed of Christen-

dom." (*Popular Science Monthly*, 1886, p. 754.) A miracle is an event out of the ordinary course of things. Now, if there was an era of creation, an era in which creation was God's ordinary, every-day work, just as in this our era of providence, the preserving and governing his creatures is his every-day work, an act of creation then was no more a miracle than an act of providence is now.

2. Prof. Huxley writes :

"A section of a hundred feet thick," of a certain rock stratum of England, "will exhibit, at different heights, a dozen species of ammonites, none of which passes from its particular zone of limestone or clay into the zone below it, or into that above it; so that those who adopt the doctrine of a special creation must be prepared to admit that at intervals of time, corresponding with the thickness of those beds, the Creator thought fit to *interfere with the natural course of events*, for the purpose of making a new ammonite. It is not easy to transplant one's self into the frame of mind of those who accept such a conclusion as this on any evidence short of absolute demonstration." (*Lay Sermons*, p. 281.)

In the creation, at certain intervals of time, of a certain number of ammonites, during the era of creation, when creation was God's every-day work, there is no interference, but perfect accord with what may properly be styled "the natural course of events." An illustration of the nature of God's providence we have from our Lord's lips in the words: "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered." (Matt. 10: 29-30.) This continual attention, in ten thousand particulars, to the wants and necessities of his creatures is the necessary outcome of such a nature as the Scriptures ascribe to God. Passing now from the consideration of God's work of providence to his work of creation, such a course in the creation of several species of ammonites as Huxley describes—bringing each into being as the medium in which it is to live becomes best adapted to it—is just what analogy would lead us to expect.

III. According to the theory of creation as commonly received, God created each particular species of plant and ani-

mal, endowing it with the power of propagating its kind, and so filling the portion of the earth intended for it. As Prof. L. Agassiz has expressed this truth in the language of science, "Breeds among animals are the work of man; species were created by God." (*Methods of Study in Nat. History*, p. 14.) This is believed to be taught in Gen. 1:11: "And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed; and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth; and it was so." See also, vv. 20, 22 and 25-29.

That each particular species of plant and animal, as a matter of fact, and in our day, possesses the power of propagating itself, and in this way alone can continue its existence on the earth, has long been known, in so far as the more perfect species are concerned. Careful scientific investigation has now demonstrated beyond all reasonable question, that this same law which governs the propagation of the higher species governs that of the lower also, even that of the lowest. On this subject Huxley writes:

"That the grubs found in galls are no product of the plant upon which the gall grows, but are the result of the introduction of the eggs of insects into the substance of the plant, was made out by Vallisnieri, Raumer and others, before the end of the first half of the eighteenth century. The tape-worms, bladder-worms and flukes continued to be the stronghold of the advocates of xenogenesis for a much longer period. Indeed, it is only within these last thirty years that the splendid patience of Von Siebold and other helminthologists has succeeded in tracing every such parasite, often through the strangest wanderings and metamorphoses, to an egg, derived from a parent actually or potentially like itself; and the tendency of inquiries elsewhere has been in the same direction."—(*Lay Sermons*, p. 367.)

IV. At their Creation, the different species of plants and animals were not brought into being as single individuals, or as pairs at the most—man, the species *Homo*, alone excepted—but when God spake, he said: "Let the waters bring forth abundantly (swarm with swarms, n. v. marg.) the living creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven." (Gen. 1:20.) As the result of such a work of creation as this, the air, the earth, and the seas were at once peopled with many individuals, or pairs, of every species designed to inhabit

them. To such a creation the fossiliferous rocks clearly testify. Not at one point alone does a particular species appear, but at many points at the same time, and these points often far distant from each other. This peculiarity in the mode of creation accounts for the observed wide distribution of certain species, possessing little or no power of locomotion, e. g., the oyster:—an order of things which Darwin confesses to be a very serious objection to the hypothesis of Evolution, as he held it.

According to express testimony of Scripture, man forms an exception to the general law. Not only does the account of Creation, in the opening portion of Genesis, tell of the Creation of one man and one woman only, but the plan of human salvation, as revealed in Scripture, postulates the unity of the human race as an essential element. The philosophy of that plan is set forth, in brief, in the words, "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. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." (Rom. 5 : 18, 19).

V. The efficient cause in Creation was the power of an almighty God. "And God said, let the earth bring forth grass." "And God said, let the waters bring forth abundantly." "And God said, let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind." "And God said, let us make man in his own image." (Gen. 1 : 11, 20, 24, 26.)

Huxley remarks that Creation, according to this view, is a "supernatural work," (*See Lay Sermons, p. 279*) and he would have us, therefore, consider it, if not incredible, incapable of proof. To this, I reply, Creation is supernatural only on the condition that we banish God from nature. As the Duke of Argyll has well said: The term supernatural, as used by Spencer, Huxley and other writers of the class to which they belong, is

"In the highest degree ambiguous and deceptive. It assumes that the system of nature in which we live, and of which we form a part, is limited to purely physical agencies, linked together by nothing but

mechanical necessity. There might, indeed, be no harm in this limitation of the word nature, if it could possibly be adhered to. But it is not possible to adhere to it, and that for the best of all reasons, because even inanimate nature, as we habitually see it and are obliged to speak of it, is not a system which gives us the idea of being governed and guided by mechanical necessity. No wonder men find it difficult to believe in the supernatural, if by the supernatural they mean any agency which is nowhere present in the visible and intelligible universe, or is not implicitly represented and continually reflected there; for, indeed, in this sense no Christian can believe in the supernatural, in a creation from which the Creator has been banished, or has withdrawn himself. On the other hand, if by the supernatural we mean an agency which, while ever present in the material and intelligible universe, is not confined to it, but transcends it, then the difficulty is, not in believing it, but in not believing it." (*Unity of Nature*, p. 274.)

VI. The work of Creation has been governed throughout by the intelligent purpose of the Creator. There is a plan which runs through it from beginning to end. At the close of each separate day's work, Moses tells us that "God saw that it was good," and he closes the whole account with the words: "And God saw everything that he had made; and behold it was very good." (Gen. 1: 31.) The result of the whole work of Creation was a Cosmos, not a Chaos.

"A phenomenon," writes Huxley, "is explained when it is shown to be a case of some general law of nature; but the supernatural interposition of the Creator can, by the nature of the case, exemplify no law, and if species have arisen this way, it is absurd to discuss their origin." (*Lay Sermons*, p. 282.) And, in this way he would summarily dismiss the theory of the creation of species from scientific consideration. Of the misuse of the word supernatural by Huxley, and others of his school, I have already spoken. On his assertion that creation is necessarily without law to govern it, I remark:

Creation, if it be the work of a Creator, perfect in wisdom and power, and, especially, if wrought after a plan, and with a definite end in view, and such, beyond all question, is the Creation of which we have an account in the Scriptures—it is as completely subject to law as any form of Evolution can possibly be. The proof of this is found in the fact that it furnishes us as sim-

ple and complete an explanation of "the gradual advance in the type of living creatures, and the natural grouping of plants and animals," as any form of the Evolution hypothesis professes to do. Adopting this theory, "in our study of nature, we are approaching the thoughts of the Creator, reading his conceptions, interpreting a system which is his, and not ours." (*Agassiz' Study of Natural History*, p. 14.)

"Let us examine a case of creation as closely analogous to that of the origin of species as our limited experience can furnish us, viz: the various forms of habitation or home which man has made for himself. The bark hut, the log cabin, the substantial farm house, the brown stone city residence, and the marble palace have succeeded each other in regular order, from 'the primordial to the most perfect,' as civilization has advanced. But these are not the only varieties we meet with. In Russia, houses are built with thick walls, and with openings small and few, and capable of being tightly closed. In the Southern United States they are built with many and large doors and windows, and open piazzas. In Venezuela, they are often built on piles, so as to be safe from floods. In China they are slight structures of bamboo and paper. In some parts of Africa they are hollow hemispheres of dried mud. There are all varieties determined by 'environment.' Man's wants have led him to build houses for other purposes than his own inhabitation; and hence, we have barns, and warehouses, and cotton factories, and railroad depots, and churches and court houses, and forts, each differing from all others in certain particulars, the exact nature of the 'differentiation' being determined by the purpose each was intended to serve. In all these structures there are certain 'homologies' which arrest our attention, such as their all possessing floors, and walls, and roof and openings of some kind or other; and, there are, at the same time, 'differentiations' which adapt each of them to some particular end or use. There is an order which pervades the whole; and the homologies and the differentiations they present would furnish a proper classification of houses, were we disposed to make such a classification."

“How shall we account for all this? Had we no knowledge of the way in which this result has been produced, some might say—the bark-hut ‘evolved’ the log-cabin, and the log-cabin ‘evolved’ the substantial farm-house; and the Venezuela house, built upon piles, was the result of ‘the survival of the fittest;’ and they might say this for many of the same reasons that similar assertions are made respecting order and species in the organic world. In this instance, however, none will say this, because we all know that this orderly variation is the result of human power, acting under the guidance of human intelligence, and for the attainment of definite ends. All these different structures are the product of man’s creative power, and not of Evolution, natural or artificial. And there is evidently a law which has governed this Creation throughout, viz: the law of adaptation to a specific end; that is just as truly a law, and just as certain in its operation, as the law of ‘the survival of the fittest,’ or any other law which the evolutionist has imagined to govern the origin of species.” (*Nature and Revelation*, pp. 146, 147).

Such is the theory of creation, in the sense of a making out of pre-existing materials, as it is held by the great majority of Christian scholars in our day, and as it seems to be set forth in Scripture. Turn we now to an examination of the hypothesis of Evolution, which it is proposed, in the name of science, to substitute for it.

THE DOCTRINE OF EVOLUTION.

What is Evolution? In attempting to answer this seemingly plain question, we are greatly perplexed, at the outset, by the many and essentially different senses in which the word is used by its advocates. In the words of Dr. McCosh, “the term is used to cover all sorts of meanings—is like ‘the great sheet, knit at the four corners,’ which Peter saw, ‘wherein were all manner of four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air.’” (*Development*, p. 1). To the disgrace of modern science, a term which should have but one, definite meaning, is habitually used in this indefinite way; and

what is more, but yet a natural consequence of such a such a use, that which is predicable of it in one sense, is constantly assumed as true when the word is used in an entirely different sense.

I. When we turn to such definitions as that of Spencer, "Evolution is the transformation of the homogeneous, through successive differentiations into the heterogeneous," they do not help matters. These very terms might be used to define the word Creation as appropriately as the word Evolution. Darwin's definition is somewhat better: "Descent with modifications." And yet, this definition covers particulars the truth of which no man questions, along with others which are the very matters in dispute. In the production of new varieties there is "descent with modifications," as truly as in the production of new species.

As illustrating the confusion of thought hence resulting, take the following paragraph from Spencer's recently published "*Progress, its Law and Cause*:"

"It is settled beyond dispute that organic progress consists in a change from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous. Now, we propose to show that the law of organic progress is the law of all progress, whether it be in the development of the earth, in the development of life upon its surface, in the development of society, of government, of manufactures, of commerce, of language, literature, science, art—this same evolution of the simple into the complex through successive differentiations holds throughout. From the earliest cosmical changes down to the latest civilization, we shall find that the transformation of the homogeneous into the heterogeneous is that in which progress essentially consists."

Take, now, two of these cases of development or Evolution particularly mentioned, and examine them. 1st. That of the Earth, with which Spencer heads the list. Here "the homogeneous" in which the Evolution takes its rise, is a vast nebula, a mass of star-dust; the immediate agent in the "differentiation" which ensues, is a correllation of mechanical forces, such as gravitation and heat; and the "heterogeneous" is our Cosmos: this earth with all the vast varieties of plants and animals which have their home upon its surface. 2nd. Take now the case of Evolution of "Commerce," which is mentioned near the end of

Spencer's list. Here the "homogeneous" in which commerce originates, must be—

"Arrow-heads of chalcedony,
Arrow-heads of flint and jasper,
Smoothed and sharpened at the edges,
Hard and polished, keen and costly."

with a few—

"Bowls of bass-wood," and perhaps, occasionally,
"A deer-skin dressed and whitened,
With the gods of the Dakotahs
Drawn and painted on its surface."

The immediate agent in the "differentiation" which ensues is the free-will greed of man; and "the heterogeneous" which results is the babel which may be witnessed at the wharves, or in the crowded thoroughfares of a great commercial city. Is there anything worthy the name of law, which has governed in common these diverse evolutions? But for great confusion of thought, could Spencer have asked us to accept as a sound, philosophical generalization such an olla-podrida as this?

In the *Popular Science Monthly* for 1886, Spencer publishes a series of articles under the title of "The Factors in Organic Evolution," in which there is the same confusion of thought, the same confounding of things which differ. In these articles he discusses, not separately, but as if they were one and the same thing, (1) development as manifested in the growth of the individual plant or animal; (2) the development manifested in the production of improved varieties of plants and animals; and, (3) a development resulting in the origination of new natural species; and he treats them all as if subject to the same laws, and under the common title of "Organic Evolution."

1. The evolution of the mature plant or animal from its germ in the seed or egg, is often very wonderful, *e g.*, in the case of the silkworm moth, which exists first as an egg, then as a caterpillar, then as a chrysalis, and lastly as a perfect winged moth. The reality of this growth-development no one questions; and the study of it in all its particulars falls properly within the domain of science. But this kind of development is governed

by a peculiar law, which places it in a category entirely distinct from the other two, viz: that it is rigidly confined to the limits of a single life. In the case just cited, the egg, the caterpillar, the chrysalis and the moth, complete a series, and at the end we must go back to the starting point again. There is no abiding progress from a lower to a higher form of life. The silk-worm moth of to-day, although in its genealogy this series of changes has been gone through a thousand times, is just what the silk-worm moth was a thousand years ago. Such is the implicit testimony of science. Such an evolution can in no possible way account for the existence of the numerous species of moths known to Entomologists; nor can it take the place, or do the work of creation, in accounting for the origin of the moth population of to-day.

2. The evolution manifested in the production of new varieties of plants and animals, is an evolution, like that we have just considered, the reality of which no man can question. There is hardly a plant cultivated for use or ornament, that there are not numerous varieties known to cultivation; and these varieties sometimes differ so greatly from the original stock, that it is difficult to determine that stock with certainty.

But all this variation is governed and limited by two well ascertained laws, viz: (1). The variation, great as it may be, never extends beyond the boundary line of species; e. g., the rose never becomes a geranium, nor does the geranium ever become a rose. And (2), the law of reversion to type, as it is called, dominates the existence of all new and improved varieties. An intelligent interference on the part of man—artificial selections, as it is called—is as necessary in preserving these varieties as in producing them in the first instance. An evolution limited by these two laws—and science pronounces these laws inexorable—can furnish us with no explanation of the origin of species; and so can never come in conflict with, or take the place of the theory of creation, in accounting for our existing Cosmos.

3. Of an evolution resulting in the production of new natural species, and this is the only kind of evolution which is

in controversy, we know nothing from actual observation—absolutely nothing. On this point the Duke of Argyll writes :

“The founding of new forms by the union of different species, even when standing in close natural relation to each other, is absolutely forbidden by the sentence of sterility which Nature pronounces upon all hybrid offspring. And so it results that man has never seen the origin of any species. Creation by birth is the only kind of creation he has ever seen ; and from this kind of creation he has never seen a new species come.” (*Primeval Man*, p. 40.)

And Mr. Etheridge, whose connection with the British Museum has given him the largest range of observation on this point of any living scientist, says :

“In all this great Museum there is not a particle of evidence of the transformation of species. Nine-tenths of the talk of evolutionists is sheer nonsense, not founded on observation, and wholly unsupported by fact.” (*Central Presbyterian*, September 16, 1885.)

To confound these several kinds of Evolution is inexcusable :—and, from the acknowledged truth of one to infer the truth of another is but specious sophistry. And the fact that Spencer has selected a title for his essays which will cover all three, “The Factors in Organic Evolution,” is evidence, either of great confusion of thought on his part, or of a sophistry utterly at variance with the spirit of sound scientific investigation.

II. Prof. Huxley is not chargeable with the confusion of thought which characterizes much of what Spencer has written on this subject. His definition of Evolution is :

“The so-called transmutation hypothesis considers that all existing species are the result of pre-existing species, and those of their predecessors, by agencies similar to those which at the present day produce varieties and races ; and, therefore, in an altogether natural way ; and it is a natural, though not a necessary consequence of this hypothesis, that all living beings have arisen from a single stock.” (*Lay Sermons*, p. 279.)

Charles Darwin, the author of the hypothesis of Evolution in its modern form, distinctly recognizes its proper limitations : (1.) in the title he gives his book in which he proposes and

depends the hypothesis, *viz*: "The Origin of Species;" and (2.) in the nature of the agency to which he traces it, *viz*: "Natural Selection." This term is defined by Huxley in the words "The process of Natural Selection is essentially identical with that of Artificial Selection, by which man has originated the races of domestic animals, the struggle for existence taking the place of man, and exerting in the case of natural selection that selective action which he performs in artificial selection." (*Lay Sermons*, p. 292.)

As thus understood, Evolution concerns itself, (1.) With living organic nature alone, and has nothing to do with that development out of Chaos which the inorganic world has undergone, and which is the special study of the geologist; nor (2.) has it anything to do with the development of the individual plant or animal from the gem-cell; nor (3.) does it concern itself with the development of new varieties, under the operation of "artificial selection;" *i. e.*, the fostering care of free, intelligent man. These three several kinds of development differ essentially from that to which Darwin and Huxley apply the name of Evolution, in the laws by which they are governed, the agencies by which they are effected, and by the fact that they are taking place to-day, in the world around us, and so are proper subjects of scientific study. It is Evolution, in this sense alone, that comes in conflict with the old theory of creation; and, as already remarked, it is to the disgrace of modern science that the term is used, or rather *abused*, to designate kinds of development differing essentially one from the other.

III. The hypothesis of Evolution, as originally proposed by Darwin, has since been seriously modified by its ablest advocates. To an examination of such of these modifications as bear upon its claim to supercede the old theory of Creation, I will, briefly, ask the reader's attention.

1. Darwin taught that of each particular species of plant or animal there was produced by evolution but one individual or, at most, one pair, and that all others of the species were descended from these by natural generation. To the hypothesis in this form two serious objections were urged, *viz*: (1), It was

difficult, if not impossible to reconcile it with the wide distribution of certain species of animals, e. g. the oyster, which possesses little or no power of locomotion. Darwin himself confessed that this was an objection he did not know how to answer. And (2), The testimony of the fossiliferous rocks was found to be that many species appeared in great numbers, and widely distributed at, or about, the same time. To meet these objections the original hypothesis was modified, so as to embrace the idea that as the immediate product of evolution, many individuals of each new species were produced at the same time;—and those scientists who regarded man as evolved from the anthropoid ape, began to write about Pre-Adamite man, and of the negro race as originating in a different country, and at a different time from the Caucasian. Thus, Carl Vogt writes:—“We cannot see why American races of men may not have been derived from American apes, Negroes from African Apes, and Negritos from Asiatic apes.” (*Recent Origin of Man* p. 52.)

If the hypothesis be accepted with this modification, it is in irreconcilable conflict with the doctrine of the unity of the human race, and yet, the whole trend of modern scientific investigation is toward the establishment of that doctrine as one of the settled truths of science. “I cannot see,” writes Huxley, “any good ground whatever, on any tenable sort of evidence, for believing that there is more than one species of man.” (*Origin of Species*, Sect. 5.) In man, the world over, we find the same grand physical characteristics; the same number of teeth, and bones, and muscles; the same system of respiration and circulation, digestion, secretion; nerves, veins and arteries on the same plan. Man is everywhere capable of living on all kinds of food, in any climate; liable to the same diseases; grows to maturity slowly, and lives to the same average age. To say nothing of the identity in his intellectual and moral faculties, unity in such and so many particulars ought to place the unity of the human race beyond all further question.

2. Darwin taught that all living beings were subject to the operation of “natural selection,” the efficient cause of evolution; and so, that evolution affected all, if not to the same extent, in

identically the same way. To the hypothesis in this form, it was objected from the beginning, that the forms of plants and animals preserved in the Egyptian tombs, some of which were several thousand years old, when compared with those of the same species of the present day, showed no change whatsoever. Later investigation has brought to light facts of a similar character yet more remarkable. Huxley, speaking of the *globerigena*, the skeletons of which form, in large part, the English chalk, writes:

“These *globerigena* can be traced down to the *globerigena* which live at the surface^o of the present great oceans, and the remains of which, falling to the bottom of the sea, give rise to a chalk mud. Hence it must be admitted that certain existing species of animals show no distinct signs of modification or transformation, in the course of a lapse of time as great as that which carries us back to the cretaceous period.”

And, in the same lecture, speaking of the *Lingula*, he says:

“At the very bottom of the silurian series, in the beds which are by some authorities referred to the cambrian formation, where the signs of life begin to fail us—even there, among the few and scanty animal remains which are discoverable, we find species of molluscous animals which are so closely allied to existing forms that, at one time, they were grouped under the same generic name. I refer to the well known *Lingula*, of the *Lingula* flags, lately, in consequence of some slight difference placed in the new genus *Lingulella*. Practically, it belongs to the same great generic group as the *Lingula* which is to be found at the present day upon our own shores, and those of many other portions of the world.” (*New York Lectures on Evolution, Lect. II.*)

“Facts of this kind are undoubtedly fatal to any form of the doctrine of evolution which postulates the supposition that there is an intrinsic necessity, on the part of animal forms which have once come into existence to undergo continual modification; and they are as distinctly opposed to any view which involves the belief that such modifications as may occur must take place at the same rate in all the different types of animal and vegetable life. The facts, as I have placed them before you, indirectly contradict any form of the hypothesis of evolution which stands in need of these two postulates.” (*Huxley's N. Y. Lectures on Evolution, Lect. II.*)

This second modification of Darwin's hypothesis, made by Huxley in view of controvertible facts, is, in a scientific point of view, a very serious one, because, 1st, it admits that evolution, if it be a law of nature, is not a universal law. It is operative in

the case of some species and not in the case of others ; and this is hardly consistent with Darwin's conception of it as a mechanical law, *i. e.*, a law " acting without thought and independent of judgment." And, 2nd, it postulates the creation of a large number of primordial forms, some of which have remained unchanged from the beginning, *e. g.*, the globerigenæ and the lingula ; whilst others only, have by evolution given rise to new species ; and thus the hypothesis of evolution is exposed to the very objection urged against the theory of creation, *viz* : that it involves the idea of an extravagant expenditure of divine power in bringing our Cosmos into being.

3. A further modification of Darwin's original hypothesis has lately been proposed by Grant Allen, and seems to have been accepted by Prof. Huxley. Grant Allen, in so far as I know, is the only evolutionist who has ever attempted to carry this hypothesis out into the field, and apply it in detail to explain the phenomena there presented, to use it as " a working hypothesis," and then given the results of his attempt to the public. One of the conclusions to which this attempt at a practical use of the hypothesis has led Allen, I will give the reader in his own words. Speaking of the wood-rust, he says :

" Our fields are full of such degenerate flowers, with green or brown corollas, sometimes carefully tucked out of the way of the stamens, so as hardly to be seen unless you pull them out on purpose ; for, contrary to the general belief, evolution does not, by any means, always or necessarily result in progress and improvement. Nay, *the real fact is, that by far the greater number of plants and animals are degenerate types ; products of retrogression rather than of any upward development.* Take it on the whole, evolution is always producing higher and still higher forms of life ; but at the same time, stragglers are always falling to the rear, as the world marches onward, and learning how to get their livelihood in some new and disreputable manner, rendered possible by nature's latest achievements. The degraded types live lower lives, often at the expense of the higher, but they live on somehow ; just as the evolution of man was followed by the evolution of some fifty new parasites on purpose to feed upon him." (*Vignette's from Nature, Art. II.*)

Respecting the crab, which Allen regards as a degenerate lobster, he says :

“The crab, on the other hand, lives on the sandy bottom, and walks about on its lesser legs, instead of swimming or darting through the water by blows of its tail, like the lobster, or still more active prawn or shrimp. Hence, the crab’s tail has dwindled away to a mere historic relic, whilst the most important muscles in its body are those seated in the network of shell just above its locomotive legs. In this case again, it is clear that the appendage has disappeared because the owner had no further use for it. Indeed, if one looks through all nature, one will find the philosophy of tails eminently simple and utilitarian. Those animals that need them, evolve them; those animals that do not need them never develop them; and those animals which have once had them, but no longer use them for practical purposes, retain a mere shrivelled rudiment as a living reminiscence of their original habit.” (*The Evolutionist at Large*, Art. VI.)

I have said that Huxley seems to have adopted Grant Allen’s conclusion, “that by far the greater number of plants and animals are degenerate types, the product of retrogression, rather than of any upward development.” In his late controversy with Mr. Gladstone, he writes:

“If whales and porpoises, dugongs and manatees are to be regarded as members of the water-population, (and if they are not, what animals can claim that designation?) then that much of the water-population has as certainly originated later than the land-population, as birds and bats have. For I am not aware that any competent judge would hesitate to admit that the organization of these animals shows the most obvious signs of their descent from terrestrial quadrupeds.” (*Order of Creation*.)

The only meaning I can attach to these words of Huxley is, that he, and all others who, in his estimation, are competent judges, consider the whale and porpoise degenerate evolutes of terrestrial quadrupeds; having lost their limbs as, according to Allen, the lobster in becoming a crab has lost its tail. On the hypothesis as thus modified, I remark:

(1). If evolution results in retrogression as often as in “upward development,” and we have no certain means of determining, in any particular instance, in what direction the evolution has taken place,—and neither Grant Allen nor Huxley suggest any way of settling this point,—the hypothesis introduces inextricable confusion into the department of science which it covers.

If Grant Allen's "philosophy of tails"—"that those animals that need them evolve them; and those animals that do not need them never develop them; and those animals that once had them, but no longer use them for practical purposes, retain a mere shrivelled rudiment, as a living reminiscence of their original habit"—be adopted, it will not help matters. Take Allen's own illustration, the case of the lobster and the crab:—He decides, but gives us no reason for such decision, that the lobster is the original, and the crab its degenerate evolute. That is, applying his philosophy that at some time in the long-passed—millions of years ago, as Darwin would say—there lived an indolent old lobster "that did not use his tail for practical purposes," as most other lobsters did, and so his tail shrivelled somewhat, that his offspring inherited not only the shrivelled tail, but also the indolent spirit of their progenitor, and so, in the course of time, the tail in this family of lobsters became a mere historic relic, and they themselves were transmuted into crabs. But why may not the evolution have been in the opposite direction—the crab being the original and the lobster the evolute? We have but to suppose that "once upon a time" a frisky crab lived who, dissatisfied with his original means of locomotion, and feeling the need of a tail, began to use the posterior segment of his shell as a tail, and so started its development; and then, that his offspring inheriting not only his rudimentary tail, but his frisky disposition—and dispositions are subject to the laws of heredity—this tail gradually developed, and in course of time, the crab became a lobster. On what ground has Huxley decided that the whale is a degenerate quadruped? Why may it not be that the terrestrial quadruped is the product of an upward development from the whale? And yet, the whole force of his argument in answer to Gladstone depends upon his gratuitous assumption as to the direction in which the evolution has taken place.

(2). If evolution is as often downward as upward, as often a degeneration as an advance in the scale of being, if we have an illustration of its true nature, as Allen says, in the fact that "the evolution of man was followed by some fifty new parasites to feed upon him," the evolution of man taking place from the

upper end of the existing series, while that of the "fifty new parasites" must have been from the lower end of the same; then, it follows as a necessary consequence, that the original starting point of organic nature was not "some one or more primordial beings," some low "speck of protoplasm," but some living organism, in structure about half way between that and the most perfect animal, man. But this conclusion cannot be admitted, for it is in hopeless conflict with "the testimony of the rocks." If there is anything about which geologists are agreed, it is that the most ancient forms of organic living beings were the most simple and rudimentary. No one has spoken more emphatically on this point than Prof. Huxley:

"Preceding the forms of life now existing were animals and plants, not identical with them, but like them; increasing their differences with their antiquity, and at the same time becoming simpler and simpler; until finally, the world of life would present nothing but that undifferentiated protoplasmic matter which, so far as our present knowledge goes, is the common foundation of all vital activity." (*N. Y. Lectures on Evolution, Lecture I.*)

Several other modifications of the original hypothesis of Darwin have been proposed by later writers, but none of them affecting points in which it comes in conflict with the theory of "Creation"; and for this reason, I pass them without particular notice in the present article.

Let us now place these two competing doctrines side by side, and carefully weigh their respective claims to our acceptance—premiering this one remark of Argyll:

"It would be well for those who speculate upon this subject to remember that whenever a new species or new class of animals has begun to be, something must have happened which is not in the ordinary course of nature as known to us. Something, therefore, must have happened which we have a difficulty, probably, an insurmountable difficulty in conceiving." (*Primeval Man, p. 48.*)

The doctrine of CREATION, as already set forth in this article, embraces the following particulars: (1) Creation was immediate, *i. e.*, effected, not through the intervention of natural second causes, but by "the word of God's power."—(2) It was not an

act, but a work, extending in all probability over a long period of time.—(3) God created species, endowing each with the power of propagating itself by natural generation.—(4) Of each species many individuals were created at one and the same time, man alone being an exception to this general law.—(5) The efficient power in creation was the power of an Almighty God; and—(6) This power was put forth under the guidance of a perfect intelligence, and throughout his work of creation, God was working upon a plan, and with a specific end in view. As thus understood this doctrine assigns for all the phenomena under examination a *true cause*, *i. e.*, a cause which has a real existence for all but the atheist;—a *sufficient cause*, *i. e.*, a cause commensurate with the effect;—and a *rational cause*, *i. e.*, a cause with which reason is satisfied, not only for the origin of our Cosmos, but for the beautiful order which characterizes it throughout.

To the hypothesis of EVOLUTION proposed by Darwin and defended by Huxley, I object that—

1. In assigning “natural selection” as the efficient cause in the origination of species, it assigns a cause which does not possess the character of a *true cause*; it has no real existence. Not only is all evidence of its existence, outside a few strained and far-fetched analogies, wanting; but the postulation of its existence is in conflict with the well established “law of reversion to type,” the practical effect of which is to preserve the “*status quo*” in organic nature. The fact that free, intelligent man has the ability to disturb this *status quo* within the narrow limits of species, and by continued care to maintain for a season results thus secured in opposition to this law of reversion to type, surely does not authorize the conclusion that a merely mechanical force, *i. e.*, a force destitute of intelligence and free will, has maintained a disturbance for ages, and of such an extent as to have modified the whole order of creation.

2. It is not pretended that the evolution of any new species of plant or animal has taken place in our day; or in the past, so far as authentic history can give us any information on the subject. Old species are from time to time disappearing, but the originator of a new species has no man seen. The most that can

be claimed is that, in the changes which occur in growth-development and in the production of new varieties by "artificial selection," possibilities of change are demonstrated such as evolution demands. On this point De Quatrefages has well said :

"When we get upon the ground of possibilities, I know not where we shall stop. Everything is possible except that which implies contradiction. Consequently, we are no longer on the ground of science, which demands positive, precise facts. We are living in the land of romance." (*Natural History of Man*, p. 82.)

If "natural selection" is limited in the range of its operation as "artificial selection" is—and I can see no reason why it should not be so limited—it does not furnish a *sufficient cause* for the effect which evolution ascribes to it.

The hypothesis has been modified, I may be told, so as to obviate many of the difficulties it encountered in its original form. True, I answer, but 1st, these modifications do not concern the two fundamental objections stated above; and 2nd, in the modifications which have been proposed, in avoiding one difficulty, another, often a greater, is encountered, as we have seen. The hypothesis of Evolution would seem to be one of those "crooked things" of which Solomon tells us, they "cannot be made straight." Immediate creation, it has been said, is inconceivable. This I do not admit; but even granting that such is the case, I reply: "An hypothesis which escapes from particular difficulties by encountering others that are smaller, may be tolerated, at least, provisionally. But an hypothesis which, to avoid an alternative supposed to be inconceivable, adopts another alternative encompassed by many difficulties greater, or quite as great, is not entitled to provisional acceptance." (*Argyll's Primeval Man*, p. 48.)

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG.

VI. NOTES.

I. THE SOUTHERN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States met on the 19th of May, 1887, in the Grand Avenue Presbyterian Church, St. Louis. About one hundred and fifty commissioners were in attendance. It was opened in the usual manner by a sermon from the retiring Moderator, Dr. Bryson, of Alabama, and was organized by the election of Dr. Strickler, of Georgia, as Moderator, and Rev. Messrs. I. P. Smith, of Virginia, and G. T. Storey, of Mississippi, as Temporary Clerks. The business proceeded with promptitude and dispatch. The discussions were marked by great courtesy and good feeling, even when the leading subject evoked marked differences of judgment and convictions, upon one side at least, of the most decided character. The conclusions reached on the bulk of the subjects disposed of appeared to be received as satisfactory, although on one or two of the issues determined, they were only satisfactory to the majorities which secured them. The importance of one of these issues, that of organic union with the Presbyterian Church of the North, and the possible importance of the policy adopted in reference to it, will confer an importance upon the Assembly of St. Louis itself, which can only be appreciated in years to come. Circumstances prevent such an exposition of the action of this body on more than one grand matter as would be adequate in thoroughness; we can only sketch hastily the leading features of the work accomplished, leaving to the future a more complete analysis of the course pursued and the consequences which are likely to follow. We may state briefly touching the surroundings of this meeting that in everything they were up to the highest water-mark of comfort and convenience. The Grand Avenue Church in which the Assembly met is a noble building of stone, richly ornamented and furnished with all the modern conveniences for the various branches of Church work. It has only the one defect, that its acoustic properties are not good. The arrangements for the convenience of the Assembly were well-nigh per-

fect, and the entertainment in the homes of the citizens of St. Louis gave the highest impressions of the cordial and elegant hospitality of the great Western Metropolis. On the second day, the Standing Committees were appointed, the Reports of the Executive agents were received and suitably referred, and the Assembly drifted steadily into the work before it. A Special Committee of twenty-six, one minister and one elder from each of the thirteen Synods of the Assembly, was appointed on what was felt to be the great matter on which action of some sort must be taken. A painful anxiety, which seriously marred the enjoyment usual in the sessions of the highest of our courts, was created by the serious issue placed in the hands of this Committee to be shaped for trial. As we do not propose to attempt to follow strictly the order of events in the Assembly, owing to some defect in the documentary record of them in our hands, and to our unwillingness to trust to memory, we shall group the transactions which we do propose to notice under distinct heads, without special reference to the order of their occurrence.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The Standing Committee of Foreign Missions reported substantially as follows through their Chairman, Dr. Palmer :

The Standing Committee of Foreign Missions reported substantially, through their Chairman, Dr. Palmer :

1. Recommending in answer to overtures the enlargement of the Missionary, and authorizing the increase of the price to correspond.

2. Recommending the postponement for the present of the transfer of the Indian Missions from the Foreign to the Home department.

3. Recommending the formation of a Synod in Brazil composed of the Presbyteries of Campinas and Western Minas recently formed under the auspices of our Church, and the Presbytery of Rio Janeiro belonging to the Northern Presbyterian Church ; this Synod to be entirely independent, free from foreign control.

4. Recommending the continued support of the Mission in Northern Brazil in spite of the discouragements arising from the brutal opposition of the Roman Catholic Church in that region.

5. Recommending in answer to the overtures of the East Hanover Presbytery that the transfer of a Missionary to a Foreign

Presbytery be decided as the constitutional severance of his connection with the Presbytery at home.

6. Recommending the commendation of the diligence and fidelity of the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions, and in view of the superior openings in some parts of the Foreign field, that the distribution of funds be left to the discretion of the Committee.

7. Recommending in answer to renewed overtures touching the Foreign Evangelists, that in view of the wide differences of judgment upon the principles involved and the failure to harmonize upon any settled view, none of the proposed amendments be sent down to the Presbyteries. The solution of the difficulties in the Foreign field sought to be reached by the powers of the Evangelist will come with the progress of the work, and the establishment of a self-governing Church in the field.

8. All the members of the Executive Committee were renominated, including the four who had sent in their resignations, with the addition of three new members.

This report was adopted. As the Report of the Executive Committee will soon be in the hands of all, we only extract from it the financial statement of its work, which makes an encouraging exhibit. The receipt from all sources amount to \$84,072 65. This is \$10,902 38 more than the receipts of any previous. The contributing Churches were 465 more than of the year before. The number of Ladies Societies contributing increased by 70, of Sunday-Schools by 82. These figures show marked progress in the Foreign Missionary work.

HOME MISSIONS.

The Standing Committee's Report on Home Missions was received, amended and adopted. It recommends,

1. That the Committee's diligence be commended and the First and Central Churches of Atlanta be cordially thanked for their generous action in defraying all the expenses of the removal of the Committee from Baltimore to Atlanta.

2. That the overture of the Presbytery of Eastern Texas in reference to the Committee's aid in the erection of churches by *loans* as well as by donations, be answered by reference to the action of the Assembly of 1885, and to the action of the Committee in giving such assistance.

3. That no change in the amount of the Treasurer's bond be allowed.

4. That inasmuch as the contributions to Sustentation fell short last year, and the sum of \$10,000 in addition to all that the Committee has a right to expect previous to the January collection, is necessary to prevent debt at the close of the year, the Committee is authorized to apportion this amount among the Presbyteries, and invite special attention to it at their fall meetings. The Presbyteries are also requested to use efforts to secure from all the churches a collection on the first of January.

5. That the Executive Committee be authorized and directed to encourage the formation of Home Mission Societies in Congregations and Sabbath schools.

6. That in view of the necessities of the Evangelistic branch of the Home Mission work, the Presbyteries which are doing their own evangelistic work, be urged with great earnestness to adhere to the plan of co-operation outlined in the Manual of Home Missions, and to secure *one* annual collection from all their churches for the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is authorized to appropriate funds thus contributed to the several causes under their care, as necessity may require. It is also authorized to divide legacies in the same way.

7. The Invalid Fund is again recommended for a liberal support.

8. The Colored Evangelistic Fund is recommended to liberal support in view of the existing need, and in order to extend the work. This fund supports the Tuscaloosa Institute and evangelistic work by both white and colored ministers among the Negro Population.

9. The Assembly repeats its interest in the work among seamen, and recommends it to the sympathy, prayers and support of Christian people.

10. The great need of this great Home Mission enterprise is *money*. The way to secure it is by cultivating the grace of giving. The principle of recognizing the regular officers of the Church as the agents for securing funds ought to be recognized.

11. In view of the great need of money, the Executive Committee are enjoined to economy in the administration of its sacred trust.

12. The officers and members of the Committee, with thanks for their past zeal and fidelity, were re-appointed.

The Report of the Executive Committee will soon place the

figures of their work in the hands of the Church. The grants to Sustentation and Evangelistic work were *less* than for last year. The grants for Invalid Fund were considerably more. The funds for the Colored Evangelistic work were sufficient for its demands.

PUBLICATION.

The Report of the Standing Committee of Publication is not accessible to us, owing to the defect in the documentary records to which we alluded in the outset. No one could have heard the Report of the Executive Committee of Publication without being struck with the results achieved under the administration of the modest and most efficient Secretary, Dr. Hazen. Taking charge of this work in a time of eminent peril, finding it overwhelmed with debt and heavily handicapped with something more dangerous than debt, the want of confidence in the Church—with assets amounting to only a little over \$20,000—the new Secretary has had to provide for the payment of over \$108,000, principal and interest. This enormous liability has been met, until only \$5,650 remain unpaid, and for the payment of this balance the funds are in sight. In the meantime the work of the Committee has gone steadily forward, improving from year to year. The excess of the assets over the liabilities of this Committee are now over \$64,000. This splendid result calls for the gratitude of the Church to God and to her efficient servants, and in simple justice demands the restoration of the full confidence of all our people. The Publication work of the Church is one of inestimable importance and capable of indefinite extension. It places that wonderful instrument, the press, in the hands of the Church to forward its great enterprise. It will be a source of incalculable disaster not to turn it to full account. Let the Church restore its confidence and give a just and generous support to our efficient Committee.

EDUCATION.

The Standing Committee of Education reported :

1. That the entire debt of this Committee to the full amount of \$3,447.15 had been paid off, and all its obligations to candidates had been met.

2. That the result had been accomplished by the special collection in June, 1886, by a special legacy, by a small increase in its regular revenues, and by reducing the appropriations to candidates.

3. That the management of the Committee be commended.
4. That in view of the fact that these happy results were the fruit of special circumstances—not of the regular development of the revenues of the Committee—in view, also, of the increase of candidates and the necessities of the beneficiaries of the Committee, it be recommended to the Assembly to modify the time allotted to the collections for all our various enterprises so as to conform more fully to the great principle that giving is an ordinance of the regular public worship of the Church.
5. That the change of the schedule of time be made so as to substitute *months* for *days*, and so to arrange these months as to cover the whole year. *
6. That the Assembly *enjoin* upon the Presbyteries to see that the vacant churches be required to worship God in the use of all the ordinances available to them.
7. That the Presbyteries be urged to raise \$25,000 for this cause, and the Committee be authorized to apportion this sum among the Presbyteries, and the Presbyteries be requested to apportion this allotment among their churches.
8. That the overture of the Presbytery of Missouri in reference to the expenditure of candidates be answered in the negative.

This report was adopted with the exception of the 5th recommendation in relation to the change of *certain days to certain months*. This Report of the Standing Committee of Education was considered, by agreement, along with the Report on Systematic Benificence, and the schedule of time recommended by that Committee was adopted in place of the change recommended by the Standing Committee of Education. That schedule is the same, or substantially the same so far as the *time* allotted is concerned with the schedule in use for several years past. It really nullified the 4th recommendation of the Committee of Education which was adopted by the Assembly. The very point of that recommendation was a change of time to conform more fully to the principle that giving is an ordinance of worship in the *regular* worship of the Church from Sabbath to Sabbath. It was designed to break down the dangerous policy of *conditioning* the revenue of the Kingdom of Christ on the incidents of a single day, and to condition on the *time* allotted to the regular worship of God, whatever that might be. This we are required to do by the principle that giving is an ordinance of regular worship. No other insti-

tute on earth conditions revenue on the incidents of *one day* in the year. The whole purpose of the recommendation was to bring the Church to make *its principle the guide of its policy*. When this is done and the revenue law of the Kingdom is fully carried out, there will be no more trouble about deficient funds. The substitution of the schedule of time recommended by the Committee of Systematic Beneficence really stultified the recommendations of the Committee of Education. But it is a step forward that the Assembly adopted the recommendations of the committee, though it failed to see the practical adaptation of them to the schedule of time. That will come hereafter. It is a *seed*, though, which is bound to germinate; it is the thought of the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures; and it will be a happy day for the revenues and the work of the Church when it is practically applied.

SYSTEMATIC BENEFICENCE.

The Committee on Systematic Beneficence reports :

1. That 57 Presbyteries out of 69 report showing that out of upwards of 2,100 churches 1,153 have contributed to Sustentation; 1,136 to Evangelistic Fund; 1,121 to Foreign Missions; 1,062 to Education; 913 to Invalid Fund; 851 to Publication; 575 to Tuscaloosa Institute.

2. They recommend that the authorization of the last Assembly of free-will offerings to supplement the funds of the Committee of Foreign Missions, be renewed and that Committee be permitted to appeal for free-will offerings in October and February.

3. That a similar privilege be granted to Education, to be made in April, to the Evangelistic work in June, and to Sustentation in August.

4. That the distinction between the free-will offerings and the regular stated collections be clearly maintained by setting forth again the schedule of time in use for years past.

5. That the Assembly further explain touching the free-will offering, that these offerings are not enjoined as a supplementary collection, but as really what they claim to be, *free-will* offerings.

This Report was adopted. We call deliberate and thoughtful attention to this system rather timidly put forward to meet the necessities of our work, as compared with the suggestions of the Standing Committee of Education. Let the Church boldly obey the law of the Kingdom, and trust in the love and obedience of

the King's children; then she will be under the wisest guidance and she will have no more trouble. Her revenues will grow with the spirit of worship. The King's legislation can be also fully trusted to secure the revenues of the Kingdom.

We must condense more rapidly the Reports of other Committees in order to preserve space for the question of organic union.

The Committee on the Centennial Celebration reported on various points connected with the subject. The invitation of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, and of the Second Church of that city, to the Assembly to hold its next stated meeting within their bounds was declined with hearty recognition of the courtesy and kindness displayed in the proposal. Baltimore and the Church on Franklin Street were selected, upon invitation, as the place of the next Assembly. It was provided that the business of the court be suspended on Memorial Day to allow visitors to go to Philadelphia to witness and take part in the ceremonies. Speakers were appointed and subjects assigned to them, to represent the Southern Assembly and Church on the occasion. A Local Committee to fill vacancies and attend to all details of preparation necessary was appointed. All necessary steps, so far as the Assembly could make them, were taken to secure the creditable participation of our Church in the celebration of the centennial of the Church of Presbyterians in the United States.

The Committee on the Sabbath reported the progress of its work encouraging on the whole, yet developing enough of the stubborn difficulties in the way to show the need of a sustained effort to secure the observance of the day reserved to sacred uses by the Divine Law. Adopted.

The Committee on Foreign Correspondence reported:

1. A letter of fraternal salutation to the General Assembly of the Northern Church, giving a brief account of our affairs and expressing an interest in their own.

2. A recommendation of continued interest in the Pan-Presbyterian alliance, and appointing the usual number of delegates.

3. A response to the Declaration and Resolutions of the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Church, expressing hearty sympathy in the hope of Christian unity, but suspending all definite response to the proposal of specific unity, on the basis of the historical Episcopate, until formulated by the Episcopal Convention in 1889.

4. A letter in the usual form of hearty Christian sympathy, addressed to Rev. Henry M. Cox, representative of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America. Adopted.

The Special Committee to examine and report on the report and recommendations of the *Ad Interim* Committee to bring the Book of Order into consistency with the lately recognized right of the Ruling Elder to hold the Moderatorship of any Church Court, reported, recommending that the suggestions of the Committee be not sent down to the Presbyteries. This report was referred, and the suggestions of the Committee ordered sent down.

Several overtures were sent up asking that the tenure of office by the Clerks of all the Courts of the Church be changed from the tenure *quamdiu bene gesserint* to a specific term of years. The motion to answer in the affirmative was lost by a single vote.

A single judicial case, that of Rev. D. P. Robinson, suspended from the ministry for disobedience to the mandate of a civil court, came up on appeal from the Synod of North Carolina. It was referred to a Commission. The Commission finally reported to sustain the appeal: 10 to sustain, 4 to sustain in part, and 9 not to sustain. The finding was confirmed, and a protest admitted to record, which ended the matter.

ORGANIC UNION.

As soon as the Assembly was organized, Dr. Smoot took steps to take hold at once on the issue which dominated every other in interest which could come before the body. He moved promptly for the appointment of the Special Committee heretofore named, to which all overtures or other papers concerning organic union with the Northern Church should be referred, with instructions to report to the Assembly as soon as practicable. This Committee was announced with suitable dispatch by the Moderator, with Dr. Smoot as its chairman.

It appeared that overtures from three Synods, those of Alabama, Missouri and Arkansas, and from some ten or twelve Presbyteries, had been sent up requesting the Assembly to take measures looking to some form of *closer relations* with the Northern Church. Some favored organic union, some a co-operative union, and all some form of closer relations than now existed. It soon appeared in the deliberations of the Committee that a wide difference of opinion prevailed. A few among the party favoring a move

towards closer relations, were in favor of organic union, but not unconditionally—not, as some of them afterwards expressed it, at the expense of the Southern Church. A number of others—it was difficult to tell exactly how many—preferred merely a co-operative union. Yet another section were in favor of a conference on the subject with a representative Committee of the Northern Church—as due to the Courts of the Southern Church which had sent up the overtures before the Committee—as demanded by the public sentiment of the Christian world—but not as committing us to any irrevocable step. On the other hand, a compact section of the Committee were opposed to any step whatever in the direction indicated by the bulk of the overtures, and favored compliance with the overtures from three of the Virginia Presbyteries to refuse all compliance whatever with the suggestions made. Among this section of the Committee some held that a Committee of Conference was an irrevocable and dangerous step, whose consequences could not be resisted. Others, believing that all tentatives after closer relations whatever, meant ultimate organic union, and that organic union could not be gained without the abandonment of the principles and autonomy of the Southern Church, and consequently that organic union was not an open question at all, felt that candor forbade the treatment of it as a question apparently open. Consequently, when the Committee, unable to agree, divided into two sections, each retired to itself in order to prepare separate reports to the Assembly.

The majority report, concurred in by sixteen of the Committee, recommended a Committee of Conference to meet a similar Committee to be appointed by the Northern Assembly, to confer upon the subject of organic union, co-operative union, or any other modification of closer relations. The minority report, made by ten members, recommended that inasmuch as any form of closer relations than those now existing was unadvisable, the Assembly should decline taking any step whatever to modify the existing relations between the two Churches. The exact issue made was on the appointment or non-appointment of a Committee to confer. Upon this the conflict was fought.

The debate was opened by Dr Smoot in an address of admirable vigor. He is a smooth, rapid talker, thoroughly self-possessed, quick, bright and ready, using little or no action, but holding attention by the steady, unfailling stream of clear and dis-

criminating thought, poured out in sentences as complete as if written for the press. His strong and striking arguments lay along the line of the constitutional and legal principles involved in the history and in the merits of the question. We regret extremely that the defect in the documentary records of the debate includes an absolute loss of Dr. Smoot's able argument. We cannot rely upon memory to restore it, and must refer our readers to the pages of the Assembly Reporter, of Farris, Smith & Co., 999 Olive street, St. Louis.

Dr. Smoot was followed by Col. Livingston, an Elder representing the Presbytery of Atlanta. Col. Livingston is a man of strong native mind, accustomed to the transaction of business in popular assemblies, and was put forward by his party in the majority of sixteen as one of the most reliable champions of organic union. The first part of his address is unfortunately not before us. We are compelled to confine our brief analysis of his argument to the latter part of his speech. Col. Livingston made the point that the purpose of the majority report was misunderstood, even by members of the majority which introduced it. It was supposed to concern organic union; but it is nothing of the kind. It proposes simply the *appointment of a Committee to confer*. It does not force organic union upon the Church; it is not an irrevocable step. He then alluded to the assertion that the Northern Assembly as the larger body ought to have taken the initiative. In ordinary circumstances, he would have approved this objection; but the overtures from so many of our Church courts, coupled with the action of the Omaha Assembly in approving and adopting the action of the Missouri Synod, compels us to action.

He referred to the cause of separation in 1861, the passage of the Spring resolutions. Those resolutions settled for us that the United States was entitled to our allegiance. He quoted Dr. Thornwell as saying that this, in itself, was no sufficient cause of separation. Col. Livingston justified it on the ground that separation was necessary under the *de facto* government of the Confederacy. But the objection was now removed, because the Omaha Assembly had repudiated the anti-spiritual character of the Church and we were bound to rely upon their honesty, and that the action set at rest the doubt at the South whether the Northern Church was not as much a political as an ecclesiastical body.

He argued for a conference as due to the overtures of the Synods of Alabama, Missouri and Arkansas, and from the superior ability of the Northern Church to push its way into our territory. Our Church was beginning to disintegrate under this influence: churches unable to support themselves were going over to them. This process would go on with all classes of our churches until four-fifths of all our Synods and Presbyteries would go from us, and leave us unable to make terms, when the remnant will have to go. It was wise to yield in time, as Gen. Lee would have been wise to have yielded before he did.

He argued that the majority report recommending a conference was right because only by a conference we could understand the differences between us and the Northern Church. This Committee was for peace. Another advantage of the proposition is that it is a slow process and will give time to make enquiries and form conclusions.

He then proceeded to attack the minority report. It was all in a tangle. How did the minority find out the differences between the two Churches were numerous and not to be overcome? Another objection to it was its assertion that no suggestion had been made or could be made to remove these difficulties. What right had the minority to make such an assertion? The minority report charges an attempt to compromise fundamental differences. They assert this conclusion as based on a careful examination of the whole question. How could they make such an examination without a conference? Another objection to the minority report was the assertion that the further agitation of this question would hinder the progress and endanger the unity of our own Church. Yet we have learned from her representations on this floor that Florida is trembling like an aspen leaf under the terror of disintegration, and if we refuse to confer, the Synod of Missouri will proceed to take care of her own interest on an independent line.

Col. Livingston was followed by Rev. W. H. Parks, of the Synod of Missouri, in opposition to the project of organic union. He opposed it because there was no suitability in the parties proposing this union. No stress had been laid by the preceding speaker upon any *principles* involved—his main appeal was to the fear of disintegration. The Northern Church had pronounced their work in the South to be *war*: they intended to carry it into Africa: they did not intend to give up the Southern territory to the Southern

Church. This war was inaugurated at once and carried on around our feeble churches with a long purse. But the speaker remembered when Gideon won a great victory over enormous odds by a very small force. He did not fear for our cause in spite of disintegration, superior numbers, wealth and national prestige.

Dr. J. M. P. Otts, of Alabama, then took the floor. He is a man of ability, heavily built, a very fair speaker, aguing his points with a good deal of tact, ready in reply, enlivening his discussion with wit and humor, and animated with a good spirit in his advocacy of this question. He is a native of South Carolina, a graduate of Columbia Seminary, served ten years in the Southern Church, removed North and served eleven years in the Northern Church and returned a few years ago to Alabama. Dr. Otts occupied more time than any speaker on either side, his address covering thirty-four columns of the Assembly Reporter. The first part of his address was adjusted as a reply to some positions of Dr. Smoot. We pass over this, as our space only admits of a brief analysis of his argument in favor of organic union. He presented two propositions under the form of a question: First, "Is the reunion of the Churches *desirable*;" and Second, "Can their *reunion* in any way by their closer relations be now effected on terms and conditions alike safe and honorable to both sides?" He affirmed both.

1. The reunion was desirable because on general terms the unity of the Church was expedient and required as far as possible. The only reason that justifies the separate organization of churches of the same faith and order was to be found in the limitations of human governments and the differences of race and language. Under the Confederate States government the Southern Church had a right to a separate existence; but when she was brought under the government of the United States she ought to become "the Church of the United States." The causes that threw us apart were differences in opinions and sentiments that came into existence during the period of great political strife, known in our history as "the war period." Dr. Otts emphatically repeated this assertion "because some deny it." The "war period" covered twenty years of strife preceding the four years of bloodshed and the twenty years of strife that followed them. Our political, commercial and social relations have been restored. The Church of God alone is unreconciled. Some parts of the Church have come

together: the Episcopal Church has been reunited and the Baptist Churches as far as their system admits of it. The Methodists and Presbyterians alone stand apart. The origin of our differences was political and the tap-root of our existing divisions strikes into a political soil. The words North and South are no longer descriptive of geographical but political distinctions. These political differences ought to give way to union between the Churches because they are effective in controlling the immigration which comes into the South from the North. The South is filling with people from the North and West. Many of them are Presbyterians; but very few will join the Southern Church, because they do not wish to be connected with a sectional Church—sectional in its boundaries and supposed to be sectional in its sympathies. Many go into the Methodist and Episcopal Churches in preference. On the contrary, Southern Presbyterians, going North, find no difficulty in entering Northern Presbyterian churches. This is the line along which things are working; and the result will be—if we do not enter into closer relations, organic or co-operative union—the final, and not far off, result will be the ultimate absorption of the Southern Church into the Northern Assembly. The disintegration has begun. The growth of the Southern Church is small at best, as proved by a paper of our Stated Clerk, Dr. Wilson. On the contrary, the growth of the Northern Church in the South is wonderful, their Synod of Atlantic numbering 13,159 communicants; their Synods of Kentucky, Missouri, Tennessee, Texas, and the Presbyteries of Baltimore and Washington City give over 100,000 communicants. We are also losing ground before the new element of Congregationalism recently introduced into the South.

2. Can reunion be effected now on safe and honorable terms? Dr. Otts thinks so, but does not know, and wants this Committee of Conference to find out. The paper of the minority says the obstacles are so serious they cannot be removed. How do the signers of that paper know? I do not know whether a solution can be found. I think so, but do not know. The difficulties have been widely discussed. *First*: The changes which have been made in the Book of Church Order and Form of Government have been construed as an obstacle. This might be met by both parties going back to the Book as it was in 1860, qualified by such changes as have been made in common by both Churches. *Second*:

It has been suggested that the numbers of the Northern Church are so overwhelmingly superior to our own, it would not be safe to trust matters vital to us to their control. To this it may be replied, no important change has ever been made in that Assembly by a unanimous vote, and the Southern element in the reunited Church would hold the balance of power. *Third*: The political deliverances of the Northern Assembly are objected. I do not say that enough has been done in reference to these. They are acknowledged to have been made in the heat and passion of the war. Let us appoint a Committee and see if what was done at Omaha the other day was sufficient. I do not take the ground that the differences have been removed so far as to justify organic union. *Fourth*: Another difficulty is found in the presence of the brother in black. He is our brother man: the law of nature has settled that. He is our fellow-citizen: the law of the land has settled that. He is our brother in faith and in Christian rights: the law of Christ and the law of our Southern Assembly settles that. But no equality before the law in Church or State can bring about social equality. That is an impossibility—recognized in Boston and Chicago, as well as Richmond or Charleston. In my opinion, the quickest way to force the negroes into an independent organization would be to put them into mixed Presbyteries where whites and blacks would be about equal. Even if the blacks were seventy-five to twenty-five, they would go to the wall. They would be always as they are now. If it were *possible* it would not be *wise* to organize the whites and blacks in the same churches. *Fifth*: The woman question is objected. In my eleven years' stay in a Northern connection, I never heard of a woman preaching, and I do know the General Assembly of that Church has four or five times condemned woman preaching.

In conclusion Dr. Otts asked permission to define his position. "I do not want re-union until the churches want it, and by the churches I mean the people as well as the ministry: I mean the majority and I mean a fair majority: and I believe it will come."

Dr. C. R. Vaughan of Virginia.—The first reason why I am in favor of the minority report is that the Church at large is not ready for so significant a step as the appointment of a Committee to confer. This grave question has been suddenly sprung; no one was looking for it; the Church has had no time to investigate it with the thoroughness indispensably necessary in such an issue;

and I am not prepared to move in advance. It is all important that in the first place we go slow, and in the second place, from the lights before me now, it is probable we ought not to go at all. I oppose this Committee because it is altogether premature—a step too far in advance of the intelligent public sentiment of the Church at large. A few Synods and Presbyteries have no claim to compromise the vast majority of our courts and people.

2. I oppose this appointment because there are grave and radical difficulties, religious and ecclesiastical, in the way—difficulties which are in my judgment unremovable. Yet we are accused of being actuated in our opposition by political feeling. I was surprised in listening to the speech of Dr. Otts to hear him assert, what is often asserted on the street corners and in other places of popular resort, that we Southern Presbyterians are actuated by political partisanship. He joined in the common reproach that while business men and politicians have affiliated, Christians are the last to be reconciled. But why is there more slowness on the part of the Church? It is simply because business men are not under the requirements of any positive law, but the Church is under law. When questions like the present are raised between Churches, they are bound to inquire how the issues proposed square with the law of their King. I deny that the root of opposition to this fusion with the Northern Church is in political prejudice. I deny it for myself and for my brethren. Yet Dr. Otts seemed to present a view of the essential relations between the Church and the State, which brings us, in spite of our personal resistance to the imputation of political disloyalty, into the position of positive rebellion against the State. If I understood him aright he stated that the Church stands in such a relation to the State, that its *lawful* and *right* existence was somehow defined by its relation to the government. Our Church had a lawful existence under the Confederate government; but as soon as that government broke down, and the United States government took its place, we then became dependent on that government for a lawful existence, and when we refuse to become the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, we are placed in the attitude of rebellion. Is it true that there is such a relation between the Church of Christ and the human government under which it lives, that the lawful existence of the Church is controlled by the government? As a Church we stand in no special relation to human gov-

ernments, much less in such a relation as that our lawful existence as a Church depends upon it. In the Church we know no master but Christ: He is our King. Why should any difference in religious opinion affect the question of our loyalty to government? The Methodist Church at the North, and the Presbyterian Church at the North stand on religious grounds opposed to each other; but that religious difference is not supposed to affect the loyalty of either of them to the government. If then we differ from both of these Churches, how does that possibly affect our standing as obedient citizens and servants of the United States government? This issue is not based upon political grounds at all. It rests upon four grounds, each of which is exclusively religious and ecclesiastical. It rests upon differences in *creed principle*, in *doctrine*, in *morals*, and in *many points of pure ecclesiastical administration and policy*. Under this classification of differences in policy and usage are found, *first*, the issue of a *mixed Church*; *second*, the recognized relations of women to the public work of the Church; *third*, the issue as between Boards and Committees; and *fourth*, as to the use of wine in the Sacrament of the Supper. These are only a part. In regard to the latter item, we cannot and will not tolerate the bitter reflection implied on the character of our Lord. In regard to the distinction between Boards and Committees, I recall to mind, that while our brother Otts made small of that distinction, such men as Thornwell, Stuart Robinson, and Robert Breckinridge, regarded it as of high importance. In regard to the relation of *woman* to the public work of the Church, it is beyond question a matter of fact that women, however prohibited from preaching, are admitted to relations to the public work of the Church which we do not approve. But I pre-termit any formal discussion of these to lay emphasis on *three* points only.

1. Dr. Vaughan prefaced his remarks on the issue of doctrines by reading the list of the sixteen errors formulated by the Convention of May 11th, 1837, and adopted by the Assembly a few days afterward. This statement is probably new to many of our younger ministers and elders. It is a fearful arraignment. It is asserted to us by Dr. George Baxter, Robert Breckinridge, Archibald Green and the whole Old School Church. Yet it was formally denied by the New School, and from the time of the disruption their denials were wrapped up in orthodox phraseology

even down to the period of the reunion negotiations. The protest of Dr. E. P. Humphrey, Robert Breckinridge, Charles Hodge, Archibald Alexander Hodge, and upwards of fifty Old School men in the Assembly of 1869 reads like a duplicate of the Memorial of May, 1837. Now, we are invited to join a body against the formation of which such a protest was offered by such men as these. Does it not become us to go slow in view of such a past? Ought we not to make diligent and deliberate inquiry if we wish to avoid a betrayal of our covenanted doctrine? No doubt these men were honest on both sides; who was *right*? We do not impeach their integrity, but we do impeach the correctness of the N. S. interpretation of the Standards, their agreement with us in doctrine, and the soundness of the principle on which the O. S. Church consented to a fusion with the N. S. in 1869.

2. On the question of a mixed Church of whites and blacks, we are in absolute and unalterable opposition to the Northern Church. This doctrine, in the words of the *Herald and Presbyter* is, "an independent African church is not proposed." Our doctrine, in full accord with the views of colored brethren themselves, is, "an independent African Church." Colored ministers are now received into our Presbyteries *provisionally*, waiting for the independent organization in due time. Colored ministers are in full and permanent union with the Northern Church courts. Now this question can never be any menace to the peace, or property, or social life of the Northern people, because the negro is not a factor of any importance in Northern society. With us it is different. The numbers of the colored race in the *South* will often give them the constitutional control of the property and the constitutional government of the Church, if organized on the principle of a mixed Church. There will be no possible avoidance of this result. It will also be followed by a certain amount of social mixture, which, in the lapse of time, will be followed by a mixture of blood, with all its degrading and disastrous consequences. It is absolutely inadmissible to place our relations to the negro race in the hands of a Northern body, as organic union will do. The necessity is so imperious that we cannot even discuss it so long as their principle of a mixed church is maintained. The pretext on which that principle is asserted will not bear investigation. It is not required by the unity of the Church of Christ. The unity of the Christian Kingdom is precisely conditioned on the same thing

with the unity of any other kingdom. The principle of unity in every kingdom *is submission to the Crown*. The Roman Church conditions unity on a single official under the crown. The Episcopal Church conditions it on an order of officials under the crown. These theories are as absurd as it would be to condition the unity of the British Empire on the Prime Minister or the clerks in the War Office. The unity of the Kingdom of Christ is in the crown of her King, and not in any form of organization of its human subjects. If this be so, then the organization of human beings into a part of the Kingdom preserves its unity untouched by means of its adherence to the crown, and the method of the organization is a matter merely of expediency, not of essential principle. No Christian ought to allow his conscience to be disturbed by the thought that he violates the unity of the Church by insisting on an independent organization for the colored race. The distinctions of race are drawn by God himself, for reasons not known to us, but worthy of His wisdom. His reasons for fixing them are better than any reasons man can have for breaking them down, and any design or policy which leads, however remotely, to destroy them, is both foolish and wicked. He has enforced them by consequences which no wise man can disregard, and by personal antipathies which can never safely be denied.

3. The difference on the moral element in slavery is also an absolute bar to organic union, unless we are prepared to abandon the testimony of our Church and refuse any longer to obey the voice of the Holy Ghost in I Tim. 6:1-5. Slavery as a civil institution has perished; it is as dead as Julius Cæsar. I have in my place in this court no word of approval or disapproval of the State policy which destroyed it. But the moral element in it remains the same. The Scripture teachings on it are not changed. The paragraph in Timothy still commands: "These things teach and exhort"—still commands "if any man teach otherwise," "from such withdraw thyself." The Old School Church of the North stood with us on this testimony in 1845. The New School always refused to do this and drove out the United Synod for their faithful adherence to the teachings of Scripture. Will either party agree now to "teach and exhort" with us on this subject? It is our duty to abide by our testimony on this subject. That testimony always embraced the statement that slavery was a part of the curse upon humanity, as well as that it was a lawful relation.

There is no inconsistency in the two Bible declarations—the curse upon Ham and the lawfulness of the relation in which it placed him. The Scriptures discriminate clearly between a condition of servitude which it pronounces to be a curse, and the relation it creates. There are many examples of it. War is a part of the curse; but the relations of soldier and diplomat are right. Disease and death are parts of the curse; but the relations they create—those of physician and nurse—are right. Civil government itself is another example. The condition of servitude is a part of the curse, but the relation it creates—the relation of slave and the relation of hired servant—are right. The differences of view among Christian people on the subject are due to one class of them looking only to the character of servitude as part of the curse and failing to discriminate between it and the relation it creates.

It is certain the Northern Church will not concur in our testimony on this subject; but that testimony we must bear or rebel against the command in Timothy. It is useless and misleading to appoint a Committee to inquire about it. In closing, let me say to all, go slow; the New and Old School took years to come together. There is no use in our getting into a hand-gallop. Let us stop and think.

Rev. Dr. Palmer, of New Orleans—Mr. Moderator: I may truly say I never rose to discuss a question with a deeper sense of responsibility than now. The fate of this Southern Church in the hands of this Assembly. As I look round me and see the apparent state of feeling the gloom thickens. It is said the only issue before us is the appointment of a Committee of conference; but organic union is the ultimate outcome of all the movements proposed, whether of closer relations, or co-operative union, or of a Committee to confer. We must put these issues together and discuss them as a whole.

1. The first objection I make to any closer relations with the Northern Assembly, of any sort, is that the old issue of 1861 is the issue of today, and we cannot approach that without involving certain of the principles which, as a church, we have maintained for six and twenty years.

In 1861 the General Assembly passed what are known as the Spring Resolutions. These resolutions undertook to decide a political question—a political question which involved all other political questions—a political question so difficult it had been

left undetermined by the framers of the Constitution in 1787. These resolutions decided it with a sharpness which could not be exceeded by a decree of the Supreme Court of the United States. They determined where the paramount sovereignty lodged; whether allegiance is first due to the State or to the General government. They enjoined it as the decision rendered by the highest court of the Church, upon the consciences of all the members of the Church, North or South. Under the circumstances it was simply a writ of ejection of the whole Southern part of the Church. All the Presbyterians of eleven Synods were compelled to withdraw and integrate themselves into the Assembly of which this is the lineal successor. Now, the point I make is this: that decision of 1861 is the law in the Northern Church to-day. It is claimed by them as a decision righteously rendered, in discharge of duty. Now, recall certain facts. After the failure to bring back the Church of the South by the dragooning policy pursued from 1866 to 1869, they came to us in 1870 with overtures of reconciliation. But the first words uttered by their delegates, through the lips of Dr. Van Dyke, were: "We are not here to say *peccavi*. We cancel nothing: we withdraw nothing." Consequently no reconciliation was effected.

Immediately after this was the famous Baltimore Convention. During that Conference every effort was made to adjust this very question. Every effort failed. Things dragged along until the Atlanta Assembly made the effort by a hypothetical crimination of themselves to induce the Northern Assembly to confess their fault in the same terms. But the proposition, as forwarded by us, was not put to the vote until a rider was placed upon it which held fast to certain deliverances. They withdrew the insulting imputations of blasphemy, heresy and schism, but said distinctly they withdrew no other deliverances and no other expressions concerning the rebellion and the war. From that time until now those deliverances have been treasured as precious testimonies which are never to be touched. The *right* in the Church to decide the political allegiance of its members is still asserted as the law of the Church. Our testimony that the Kingdom of our Lord is not of this world, as He himself hath said, has been held up before the world in opposition to this asserted claim. To go into a union with the Northern Church while that law remains upon their statute book is to surrender this testimony. Is it necessary to

appoint a Committee to find out whether the Northern Church has changed its mind, and is ready to surrender this unlawful claim? Is it necessary to appoint a Committee to inquire whether the Roman Catholic Church has changed its doctrines? Are not the deliverances of the Church testimony enough? I hold it to be imbecility in us to ask such a question. If they have changed, it is their part to approach us with the statement of the change. It is not ours to ask by a Committee whether they have changed or not.

But, it is said, telegrams have come from the Omaha Assembly stating that they have approved and adopted the action of the Missouri Synod last Fall. Why, Moderator, I say it in no disrespect, that the deliverance which comes from Omaha is not worth the paper it is written upon, so far as qualifying this question is concerned. The paper of the Missouri Synod simply quotes the paragraphs in the Confession asserting the spiritual character of the Church. Yet Christian men of the highest intelligence for twenty-five years have asserted their right to pass the Spring resolutions, though bound by the paragraphs quoted by the Synod of Missouri. How could they do it? Simply because they held the paragraphs consistent with the right to pass the resolutions. It is mere folly to quote the paragraphs as sufficient to repudiate the resolutions. No *in thesi* deliverance can have more authority or extend farther than the Confession itself, and if they construe the Confession as consistent with the right to determine a political question, they will feel at liberty to construe an *in thesi* deliverance in a similar way whenever it suits them. The principal claim of the Northern Church is that when politics rise into the sphere of morals they have a right to take the matter in hand. The moral distinction may attach to every possible matter about which human energies are concerned, because whatever man does he must do either in a right or wrong way. Their claim abolishes all limitation upon Church power, and renders the spirituality of Christ's Kingdom a dead letter. If we go into organic union we surrender all our testimonies for the last five and twenty years.

2. My second objection to treating organic union as an open question is, that we have entered into a covenant obligation with a constituent portion of our existing Church. The Synod of Kentucky came to us holding in their ungloved hand their "Declaration and Testimony." They submitted it to our body, and in the

letter in which the conveyance was made, they asked a guarantee from this Church into which they proposed to enter, that they would be sustained and upheld, and never betrayed in reference to these matters. The General Assembly passed a minute in which they declared their entire sympathy and concurrence with the principles of that Declaration and Testimony, and gave in express terms to the Synod of Kentucky just the guarantee that they desired. I do not know the opinion of the Synod of Kentucky on the issue of organic union, but it would be a painful issue for this Assembly to have the Synod of Kentucky hold up this document, saying, "you entered into a solemn covenant with us in reference to this matter." The Northern Assembly still stands on the same issues as in 1861, and I enforce my argument by pointing to our solemn covenant with the Synod of Kentucky.

3. The third objection to any kind of union with the Northern Assembly is that by the terms of reunion between the two branches of the Church in 1869, all the testimonies of the great controversy of 1837 and 1838 were destroyed. The great issue then was a *strict* or a *lax subscription* to the symbols of the Church. That point divided them then and was surrendered by the Old School in 1869. They tried for two years to find the sense of the symbols; they failed to come to a common construction; and finally came together simply upon the Standards, leaving to both bodies to put what construction they pleased upon them. No rule formerly of authority in either body was to be of authority in the united body unless re-enacted. The *index expurgatorius* cut all the the testimony of 1837 and 1838 from the history and law of the Church. Now, this Committee of Conference is said to be a measure of peace. As you listened to that heavy indictment of doctrinal error tabled by the Old School against the New School in 1837, as read by Dr. Vaughan, did you think of the danger of reopening all the issues of that tremendous controversy by raising this issue of organic union? Did any one remember the *ipso facto* struggle over that most iniquitous piece of legislation that ever went upon an ecclesiastical record? Did you think what would become of peace, if both of these controversies are reopened by this negotiation about union? Our good brother, Dr. Otts, was so inadvertent as to say, if we go into that body we shall probably hold the balance of power. In the very act of the fraternal embrace we are to be an element of disturbance. Is that for peace? Moderator,

the burden of years is upon me, and I cannot allow my declining life to be spent in contention and strife. The only home I have known for the last five and twenty years is the Church of God: it will be a sad day to be banished from it. But there can be no peace if this measure is pressed. Not only this Church, but the Northern Church will be precipitated upon stubborn controversies which will last for five and twenty years, unless Christian men can learn to swallow their convictions. The meetings of the Assembly before the rupture were stripped of all pleasure, by the taunts and revilings in open Assembly of the partisans of abolition. It was bad enough to endure through all these years.

4. This thought brings me to the *fourth* objection to this movement towards organic union. The Negro is in position to-day to be far more an element of strife and contention than he was then. Enfranchised, equal with us before the law, animated by an aggressive spirit, in all matters it is impossible for our relations with him to be determined for us by the Northern Church, without endangering the whole social structure, throughout the whole Southern land. You cannot put men side by side, equal Presbyters in courts, and equal teachers in pulpits, without involving social relations. So long as only two or three are there it makes no difference; but as soon as the thing enlarges its proportions, ecclesiastical relations draw after them social relations and social equality. The color line is distinctly drawn by Jehovah himself; it is drawn in nature and in history in such a form as to make it a sin and a crime to undertake to obliterate it. Before the flood, when there was but one family, wickedness rose to such heights it could only be purged by universal destruction. After that judgment, it was necessary to restrain sin within tolerable bounds. This was done by the confusion of languages. Race distinctions were probably developed at the same time, and for the same purpose. The attempt to obliterate the color line by amalgamation of the white with the Negro or Mongolian or Malay race is a crime against the wise orderings of God. The very moment it is advertised through the country that this organic union is accomplished and the power is placed in the hands of a Northern body to control our relations to the Negro race, you will endanger the very existence of the Southern Church. We cannot confide in the Northern people on this subject. As some of their ecclesiastical leaders have expressed it, "Do not press us on this

point and on that, for we have an unmanageable constituency." We cannot trust that unmanageable constituency. The moment it is even seriously threatened, you will find your people not yielding to the threatened absorption into the Northern Church, but bolting bodily into the Methodist and Episcopal Churches. We trust they will not be precipitate. The Southern Presbyterian Church is going to be continued, if it is reduced to a single Presbytery and a bare quorum. We shall be able to stand alone as the Wisemans and the Fishers did in the Old Scotch Church, and planted in their weakness and isolation the seed of a true and strong Church in the future. We shall be able to raise our testimony to the last for Christ's Kingdom and for Christ's Crown.

It will be impossible to report the discussion in full. Dr. Bryson spoke in favor of the Committee, without committing himself to any relations whatever to the Northern Church, other than those now existing. His argument lay chiefly along the legislative and administrative line of discussion. He was succeeded by Dr. Thos. L. Preston, of Virginia. Dr. Preston is one of the most ready and adroit debaters in the Church. His able and effective address told weightily. His argument rested on the great essential considerations involved in the issue. Rev. Mr. Luckett made a temperate and judicious speech in favor of the Committee, but held himself uncommitted on the remoter issue of organic union. Dr. King, of Texas, made a strong and decisive speech against the whole issue. Rev. T. M. Lowry, of Georgia, explained his views very much to the same purport with Mr. Luckett. Rev. G. W. Firley, of Virginia, opposed the whole issue decisively, in accordance alike with his own views, and the settled convictions of his Presbytery. Dr. John S. Moore, of Texas, favored it. Rev. Mr. Caldwell, of Memphis Presbytery, and A. M. McPheeters, of North Carolina, a ruling elder, favored it. Rev. P. H. Hoge, of the Synod of North Carolina, then offered a paper as a substitute for both reports of the Special Committee on organic union. This paper provided for a Committee of Inquiry in place of a Committee of Conference. It was accepted as relieving the policy of sending a Committee at all of that character of an irrevocable step which had been so formidable to many. It was adopted first over the Minority report, and then over the Majority report, by a vote of yeas 80, nays 57.

The attitude in which the St. Louis Assembly left the question

of closer relations to the Northern Church is substantially this: A Committee of Inquiry was appointed to seek information from a Committee of Conference appointed by the Northern Assembly on all matters of difficulty in the way of closer relations. The effect of the revelations made in the debates upon the question was marked. New light on the grave obstacles in the way of union was thrown on the minds of many. The notion that nothing but prejudice stood in the way, was effectually disposed of by the strong array of matters of principle and religious fidelity to creed and testimony against the project. The ruinous consequences of fusion were clearly brought out. The good spirit prevailing on both sides was eminently happy in its effects. On the whole, the deep anxieties of the opposers of the union in the beginning gave way, at last, to the strong hope that the independence of the Church could be saved without division or serious loss.

C. R. V.

II. THE NORTHERN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

The General Assembly at Omaha consisted of nearly five hundred members, and represented a Church composed of about seven thousand ministers, twenty-five thousand ruling elders and three-quarters of a million communicants. That it met so far west is a sign of the large dimensions of the Church, which is a great body, with a vast work, and which is growing with prodigious rapidity. Its activity is admirable in all the departments of its labors. Its Boards of Home and Foreign Missions, of Education and Publication, of Aid for Colleges, and of Ministerial Relief, and others, display marvellous skill and energy.

There was apparent in this Assembly a curious combination, often noticed in other Assemblies, of practical good sense and even shrewdness, with an almost fanatical enthusiasm. The former qualities were conspicuous in the affairs of the Boards. On the other hand, the action on Temperance was the fruit, not of the best judgment of the Church, but of a wild excitement, similar to that which carried the Spring Resolutions of 1861, against the protest of Dr. Chas. Hodge and many other thoughtful men.

The action of the Assembly on Temperance was three-fold. First, it refused to discharge the Standing Committee on Temper-

ance, although many consider it mischeivous, and many more think it useless; Second, a resolution was adopted, invoking the strong arm of law, leaving it ambiguous whether the passage of the new laws, or the enforcement of those already in existence, was meant; but the third step was clear and decided: it in effect pronounced in favor of prohibition as a political measure. The facts are these: The Synod of Pennsylvania had taken action in favor of a Constitutional amendment in the State, prohibiting the sale of intoxicating beverages. Complaint was made to the General Assembly; this was referred to a Committee, which reported the caseready for trial; yet the Assembly tumultuously dismissed the case without trial: thus virtually committing the body to prohibition as a political measure.

While this enthusiastic and almost unreasoning method of carrying important measures seems to be unworthy the deliberations of a Church Court, and incompatible with wise action—yet it must be admitted in extenuation, that on the matters thus carried, members had their minds already made up from discussions elsewhere; and also, that this rapid motion gives immense momentum to the body, and thus enables it often to accomplish apparent impossibilities. So that, “If it be madness there’s method in it.” Still, it is impossible to condone this manner of conducting the business of so reverend a body, in which shoutings, clappings, stampings, and even hisses, play a part. It represses full discussion, stifles legitimate opposition, destroys the rights of the minority, and determines grave questions, not by reason, but by the fickle passions of the hour.

In the matter of Church unity, presented by the Episcopal Church, the action of the Assembly was judicious. While no immediate practical results are expected, this promises to become a great question of the future; meanwhile, Christian courtesy demanded such response. A critic might call this “fencing,” or a move for advantageous position before the world; just as political parties strive to make capital by appealing to latent sentiments among the people, without intending serious action. But such criticism would be partial, for there is far more implied in the action of the Assembly. It is not the separate existence of the several Churches which is a grief and scandal, but the degree of estrangement among them. Now the desire among Christian people to affiliate is deep and wide-spread. Nothing less could

have evoked an overture from such a body as the Episcopal Church, and though many in its communion regard the movement with scorn and rage, yet they were compelled to yield to the pressure of opinion in their Church. It was a tidal wave which swept this well anchored Church from its moorings, and upon the crest of which other Churches must ride, or sink into the trough of reaction. Hence, when the general assembly gave its reply, and appointed a Committee of Conference, while it did not look for immediate union, it is not to be charged with insincerity. What it said is true; what it did, was right. It simply re-affirmed the historical position of the Presbyterian Church, from the days of the Reformers: when Calvin and Cranmer were friends and correspondents, and when the Church of England and the Protestant Churches of the Continent dwelt together as members of the common Household of Faith.

The subject of greatest interest to our readers, is the action of the Northern Assembly on its relations to the Southern Church. A large number of delegates went up with the purpose of taking some decided step towards re-union. This purpose was the offspring of a growing desire in the Northern Church. It has long been the conviction of many that no real reason existed for longer separation. The most prominent cause, hitherto assigned, viz: political differences, was obviated by the adoption by the Assembly of the text of the Resolutions of the Synod of Missouri on the subject. Whether the action of the Assembly on Prohibition, above described, be inconsistent herewith, is a mooted question. The "Philadelphia Presbyterian" says it is; while the Editor of the "Presbyterian Journal" of the same city, who was counsel for the Synod of Pennsylvania in defense of its action, and also a member of the Committee of Conference between the Churches, and warmly in favor of reunion, contends that there is no inconsistency in the two deliverances. He maintains that Prohibition is a moral question, upon which the Church has a right to pronounce, without regard to its political bearings. It is to be apprehended that many in the Southern Church will find here a fresh obstacle to the re-union of the Churches.

The Omaha Assembly requested the appointment of a Committee by the St. Louis Assembly to confer with a similar Committee of that body, on the terms of re-union. Their enthusi-

astic action gave expression to the longing felt for the possession of the whole country as the field of the united Churches.

The response and debates of the Southern Assembly seemed to them in part, ungracious. Still it is better to have the whole mind of the Southern Church, however bluntly presented. And when we read the bitter and burlesque utterances of so influential a journal as the *New York Evangelist*, we cannot but feel that candor demanded the expression of those views on the floor of the Assembly, provided they were held by any of the delegates.

The Negro question is a difficulty suggested by the St. Louis Assembly, and at once assumes the gravest importance. Were everything else out of the way, it will be hard to surmount this obstacle. It is, however, a question of policy, not of constitutional rights. The Atlanta Assembly decided, in the case of Parks, that ordination entitles to a seat in Presbytery. Hence there can be no charge of depriving negro Ministers of their ecclesiastical privileges. The practical question arises, whether it is wiser to organize a separate Colored Presbyterian Church. In the North there is no such pressing need for it as exists in the South. The few negro Ministers and Elders, even in large cities, do not materially affect the composition of ecclesiastical bodies. But Southern Presbyteries will not consent to be swamped by the swelling tide of negro induction.

Some leading papers in the Northern Church have intimated as a possible solution that each Presbytery and Synod shall determine for itself the status of the Negro in its bounds: should the Presbytery prefer to have them organized separately, it shall be done; but should the Presbytery choose to admit them to its floor, it may do so. When the colored Presbyterians in the South shall have been formed into a separate body, with its own Presbyteries and Synods, it is thought that the Presbyterian negroes of the North will gravitate toward organic union with them. It is doubtful, however, whether this attraction of gravitation will be sufficient to detach them from the larger body, which now holds them on its surface.

The crucial test of this plan will be in the General Assembly. Should the negro be admitted there, it would be a bar to re-union with the Southern Church; and the current of opinion indicates that the Northern Church will not consent to their exclusion.

If, on the other hand, the Churches North and South can agree on the organization of a separate and distinct colored Church in the United States, with its own General Assembly, then, and not otherwise, will the negro question as an obstacle to re-union be removed.

Such is the present state of the relations between the two bodies. The sentiment in favor of closer union is at high water mark in each, but the obstacles increase and multiply. The feeling at Omaha was intense and practically unanimous. When we turn to St. Louis, the opposition was formidable in the standing and eloquence of the speakers. But a large majority voted the other way, and in estimating the force of a current, the obstacles overcome by it must be taken into account. How impetuous, then, must have been the stream which swept away the influence and oratory of Palmer, Vaughan and Smoot! The vote, when analyzed, exhibits surprising results. Eight Synods voted "aye," five voted "no;" but two of the five gave very small majorities so that, practically, the opposition is confined to three Synods—Virginia and the two Carolinas. Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky and Memphis, were unanimous in the affirmative, while not one Synod was unanimous in opposition, although South Carolina was nearly so. These facts show how general and determined is the opinion of the Southern Church in favor of efforts towards union.

When we face the difficulties, we find old ones augmented and new ones created. As has been shown, the old obstacle of political deliverances has received a fresh impulse from the action of the Northern Assembly on Prohibition. The Negro question has assumed larger proportions and a darker hue. Many in the North are irritated by the caustic speeches and halting response of the St. Louis Assembly. The resolute attitude of some of the ablest and most venerated ministers of the Southern Church, will have a triple effect; they will alarm the Southern Church with the fear of schism; they will dishearten the friends of re-union at the North; while its opponents will be elated.

Is re-union, then, hopeless? If not, how can it be ultimately effected? We may learn a lesson from the history of the junction of the Old and New School Churches. The arguments against re-union were apparently invincible: many of the strongest men in both bodies opposed it; yet the tide in its favor rose higher

and higher until, at length, it rushed in like a mighty flood, bearing all before it. It may be so in this case. In spite of argument, obstacle, personal influence, and individual antagonism, the hearts of sundered brethren may flow together; and in the fusion, problems may be solved, opposition may be melted, obstacles may sink to the bottom; and these long divided Churches may yet coalesce in fraternal love and organic union.

THOS. A. HOYT.

III. THE INDUCTION OF RULING ELDERS INTO OFFICE.

The theory of our Presbyterian polity is good, excellent, eminently scriptural. But our practice is often bad, sometimes very bad. Take, for example, our doctrine in reference to office-bearers (elders and deacons), and compare it with the methods that so generally prevail in choosing and inducting them into office.

In theory we believe that these are spiritual offices; that the elder and deacon are just as much called to their work by the great Head of the Church, through the agency of the Holy Spirit, as is the minister of the Gospel. In reference to the elder, we believe that the Scriptures plainly teach that he is one in office with the minister; that while his functions differ in some respects from those of the minister, nevertheless he is of the same *ordo*. In rule he is the same; in authority he is the same. The minister is simply an elder, to whom the duty of teaching and preaching is, by general consent, specially assigned in addition to his usual functions as an elder. This does not exclude the ruling elder altogether from the function of teaching. It is clearly his duty to do so upon all proper occasions, and that he may be enabled to be faithful in this respect, he ought most carefully and conscientiously to seek to qualify himself by a course of diligent and prayerful study. He ought most earnestly and importunately to pray Him who gives gifts to men to bestow upon him, by the working of the Blessed Spirit, the grace and the ability to magnify his office, and wisely to teach the people. But it has been found eminently wise and prudent by the pious minds of the Church, guided as we firmly believe, by the Holy Spirit, in the rapid development of the Church, and in the ever increasing magnitude of her work,

and because of the attitude of the world toward her, and the ever-varying nature and the frequency of the world's assaults upon her, to set apart certain of the elders, and to assign to them especially the duty of public and authoritative teaching, and of defending the Church from all forms of false doctrine, and from all the assaults of infidelity and a hostile, worldly philosophy; and for this purpose, to subject these elders to a protracted, laborious and comprehensive course of training so that they may be thoroughly furnished, workmen who need not be ashamed, that they may most successfully not only instruct the people in sound doctrine, but also repel all assaults from without. And this, we conceive, constitutes, according to Scripture, the difference between the teaching and ruling elder.

Now, since the ruling elder stands exactly upon the same level with the teaching elder, and since his functions are in so many respects the same with his, we cannot easily overestimate the importance of his office and of his work to the Church. In fact, what mainly differentiates Presbyterian polity from other Church polities is just this element—the eldership. And if this, which is now a mere sleeping energy, were fully awakened and developed into what the Scriptures teach that it should be, our Church would soon become equal to all the exigencies that might at any time surround her, would be enabled to occupy and possess every opening field, would hear no more of decay, of fields abandoned, of shortened cords and weakened stakes, but would soon take the world and capture it for Christ. This feature of our polity, if made what it ought to be, and what the great Head of the Church designed it to be, would give our Church an adaptive to all the varied wants of human society which no other Church possesses.

But we think it is not saying too much to affirm, that by our practice we have virtually neutralized to a large degree this great element of power in our Church. We have taught more by the way in which we act, by our methods, by our practice, than by any formulation of doctrine, that the eldership is a sort of fifth wheel, a figure head, an appendage which we must have for the sake of consistency or form, but on the whole a rather unimportant affair. Methods teach; actions teach more efficiently than formularies, and leave impressions upon the popular mind deep and permanent. There is an inexorable logic in actions; and

because of our methods, mode of procedure, and ways of action, the popular impression on the mind of the Church in reference to the nature and duties of the office of the elder, is simply deplorable. This is shared alike by the officers and the people. Generally the elder himself has no adequate or proper conceptions of his office, and so too with the people. They do not look upon the elder as one *called of God, one invested with authority from the Great Head of the Church*, one occupying a spiritual office, one to whom grave and sacred trusts are committed, one occupying a position of the greatest importance and of the most solemn responsibility. They do not look upon him as one entitled to great respect, reverence and obedience for his work's sake. In many cases, perhaps in most cases, the elder differs from the other members of the Church simply in the fact that he hands round the elements on communion occasions, meets with the Session when convenient, and at rare intervals attends one of the higher courts of the Church. He is not pre-eminent for piety; he is not a spiritually minded man; does not hold family worship; does not make himself familiar with the Doctrine and Government of the Church; does not visit the people; does not expound scripture; does not conduct prayer meetings, nor pray in public. He is not an active, conscientious, devout, spiritual overseer of the flock, burdened with a sense of his sacred trust and of his solemn responsibility, and wrestling continuously with God in prayer for grace and strength to make full proof of his ministry, to magnify his office, to be faithful to his great trust, so that at last he may render up his account with joy. He does not always by his example lead the people in upholding the hand of their pastor, or in affording him that sympathy, love, reverence and obedience, which it becomes the people of the Lord to afford to their spiritual guides and rulers. It is very true, and we acknowledge it with pleasure and gratitude, that among our elders there are many honorable exceptions. But it is equally true that comparatively few approach the scriptural standard of fidelity, spirituality and efficiency.

Now why is this? Why is there so much dead wood among our elders? So little activity, efficiency, spirituality and piety? It becomes the Church to cast about and see why this is; to ascertain the cause, and seek to remove it. We answer that, in our judgment, *it is the result of the Church's teaching*. It is true that

she does not so teach by any dogma, by any formal statement, or by any of her formularies. But by her methods and modes of procedure, tolerated and sanctioned within her pale, she certainly does thus teach—that is, the present low state of efficiency, and piety, and usefulness among our officers is the logical result of the methods and ways of doing which she allows; all of which, we believe, are utterly unscriptural, illogical, and eminently unwise and hurtful. Let us illustrate:

If it be true, as we affirm, that this great importance, solemn responsibility, and sacred trust attach to these offices; if it be true that their functions are spiritual, just as much so as those of the minister; if it be true that our doctrine of Vocation applies just as fully to these officers as to the minister, then it is perfectly clear that they ought to be inducted into office in such a way as to make it most apparent to them and to the people that it is a real call from God, and not the result of any human agencies or plans. There ought to be the introduction and interposition of as little human agency as possible. It ought to be done in such a way as to make it most manifest to all that God, by His Holy Spirit, is calling the man to office. The great aim should be to choose men that God wants and that God is calling, rather than those whom the people want and whom the people call. The *will* of God rather than the *wishes* of the people should be sought and consulted.

If these things be so, then in choosing officers for the Church, there ought never to be any *nominations*, no, not even by the Session. This is doubtless the most prudent way of making nominations, namely, for the Session to propose to the people suitable names for election. But we deny that the Session has this right. Concede it, and you make the Session virtually a self-perpetuating power. Moreover it looks as if the Session were suggesting to the Holy Ghost whom He should make overseers. Now this is exclusively His prerogative, to say who should hold office in His Church, and the idea of suggestion or dictation to Him from *any quarter* ought not to be tolerated for a moment. That the Session has no right to do so, and ought not to make any nominations, we could show even more conclusively, if we had room more fully to elaborate this point. It is utterly inconsistent with our doctrine of Vocation, and experience has shown that it is unsafe and hurtful. And if it be wrong for the Session to make nominations,

much more is it so for any others to do so. *There ought to be no nominations.* For, just as soon as nominations are made, there is an interposition of unnecessary human agency, that makes it uncertain whether the election is the result of human means or of a clear and direct call from God. Much less should men offer themselves as candidates, or should there be any canvassing, or comparing of merits and claims. All these things are abominations, and are human agencies that vitiate and neutralize a real call; and by the toleration of which so universally in our Church, these offices have been filled to a sad degree by incompetent persons. Nor ought members to confer with one another, to know for whom others are going to vote, nor should they seek counsel of one another. This is emphatically a case in which we ought not to "confer with flesh and blood," but we ought to commit ourselves solely to the divine guidance, and in prayer to God implore Him to show us by His Holy Spirit alone for whom to cast our vote. When men choose their fellows to temporal offices, it is by these human methods of candidates, caucuses, canvassing, nominations, &c.; and then the election is the result of these human means, and the men are elevated to office not by the voice or call of God, but by the voice and will of their fellow men. But in inducting men into office in God's House it is entirely different. The offices are not temporal but spiritual. The *will of God* is to be sought and not the *wish of man*. It is the sole prerogative of the great Head of the Church to say who is to bear rule in His House. And we have no right to use any such methods as may make it possible that the man is put in office by the agency of his fellow man, and not by the will of God. And we repeat, that the general toleration and practice of these man-devised methods have wrought immense harm in our Church, and are gradually changing the very character and genius of our Presbyterian body. If some arrest of these unwise and hurtful methods be not made, then another generation or two will find us an emasculated body, differentiated but very slightly from other denominations.

Now, when a Church proposes to elect officers, if the minister in charge would explain to the people fully and carefully the nature and duties of these officers, and the character and qualifications of the persons who should fill them, and would then advise them to take the whole matter to God in prayer, and in their closets seek earnestly and importunately the guidance of the Holy

Spirit, and in their prayer ask God to enable them in casting their votes to do His holy will, and if he should then allow a sufficient interval before the election, for this importunate secret prayer, warning the people not to "confer with flesh and blood" in the meantime, but to consult God only; and if when they come together for the purpose of voting, he should lead them again in prayer as a congregation, that God would guide them by His Holy Spirit to choose men whom He is calling, and then without any nominations whatever, the people should prayerfully cast a silent ballot, then the result might be fairly interpreted as an indication of God's will in the premises. Then, if those elected were allowed time to examine their own hearts, and also to ask God by earnest prayer to enable them to do His will, and should then find in their hearts a corresponding call, it might be fairly inferred that these men were *called of God's Holy Spirit* to bear rule or do service in His House. There being no human methods or agencies introduced, it would be plain to all that the result was the will of God.

If this simple committing of the Church to the sole guidance of God's Holy Spirit in the choosing of officers were the general method in our Church, we would have a far different and more encouraging record to make, and our Church would acquire a vigor, a spirituality and a progressive and aggressive power which she has not known for many years.

ROGER MARTIN.

IV. THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL BASIS OF CHURCH UNITY.

The readers of this Review are familiar with the basis of Church Unity, set forth by the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, at the meeting of the General Convention in Chicago, in October last. It is not my purpose to discuss at any length the feasibility of such Church Unity as is proposed, or the adaptation of the Creed propounded by the Bishops to the end they have in view. I have it in mind rather to place this proposition in its relations to the general tendencies of the times, and the teachings of the Holy Scriptures in the matter of Church Unity. Observant Christian men will agree with me in the affirmation that the idea of Church Union is among the conspicuous and influential forces that control the Christian world of to-day. All signs

ndicate that its power and prominence are increasing, and it promises to become for some years the dominant principle in shaping the history of the Kingdom of Christ. In this respect as in many others, the development of the Church is kindred to that of Society and the State. However distinct from the State the Church may be, and of right ought to be, yet inasmuch as the elements constituting the two are so largely identical, and the controlling conditions so nearly the same, it is found that the prevailing tendencies in the one at any given period exert great influence upon the character of the other. Social, political, and governmental ideas intertwine with ecclesiastical, and all combine to give tone and color to the history of an Epoch. A notable proof of this statement is passing under our eyes in ecclesiastical government. The characteristic democracy of our era in social and political life is modifying the Prelatic system and methods of the Protestant Episcopal and Methodist Episcopal Churches, and a degree of power and control asserted by the laity that threaten to nullify the whole theory of Prelacy. The general statement I have made is justified, also, in the disposition that obtains so widely toward some outward, if not organic, union of Christendom. In the political world, this century is eminently characterized by a movement towards consolidation and centralization. Illustrations occur to my readers as I write. Your memory recalls the dream of centuries fulfilled by the genius of Bismarck in the achievement of the German Empire. Then comes the recollection of the Union of Austria and Hungary, and the establishment of the Kingdom of Italy. Then strikes upon the ear the tramp of the Slavic hordes, as with Russia at their head, they march to the attainment of the mightiest of modern Empires. And the American of this generation has witnessed a gigantic struggle of States to rend the bonds that united them to their sister States, and has seen the seceding States forced back into an indissoluble Union. This principle, so potent in building up and binding together Kingdoms and Empires and Republics, asserts for itself a wider dominion, and by means of International Codes of law and Courts of Arbitration is endeavoring on this broader field to bring into union and co-operation independent States. When we pass into the ecclesiastical sphere, we find the air charged with very much the same influence, we discover the operation of the same force. My readers readily recur to the union of the Old School and New

School Presbyterians, North and South; the union of all Presbyterians in Canada; on a larger scale, the formation of the Pan-Presbyterian Council and similar organizations among Methodists and Episcopalians; and more inclusive than any of these, the Evangelical Alliance. None can fail to see that the same tendency is at work in the efforts now making to unite Northern and Southern Presbyterians, and United Presbyterians and Associate Reformed, as well as other movements among different bodies of Christians, both in this country and abroad.

As the Missionary work in foreign lands grows in extent and success, the necessity for closer union among native Christians becomes imperative, and in Brazil, Japan and other countries, much is already accomplished, and more is contemplated, toward obliterating lines of division that exist in Christendom, and uniting all Evangelical Christians in one organization. Without multiplying illustrations, or stopping to discuss facts apparently antagonistic to my assertion, I venture to think that no one will dispute the statement that the idea of Church Union is a potent factor in current thought and life. The brief review of familiar events I have made makes it clear that, though there may be eddies in the current, the stream sets strongly in the direction of consolidation and union, throughout Evangelical Christendom. This obvious fact springs upon the Christian and the Church questions that are worthy of profound and prayerful consideration. Is this tendency to be held good or evil? Is its origin divine or human? Is its sympathy with the spirit of our Lord and in harmony with His instructions and the principles of His Kingdom? Shall we foster and guide, or shall we discourage and repress? Regarding the tendency in the general, I believe it to be the fruit of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of Christian people. No devout student can doubt that the desire for the real unity of His disciples pervades the life and teachings of our Saviour, and penetrates His most ardent longings for them and for His own glory in them. To think lightly or to speak flippantly of any honest effort to carry into effect this supreme wish of our Lord, is to run grave risk of wounding the Master in the house of His friends.

While, therefore, I believe the temper of our times, has to a large extent, absorbed the spirit of Christ, and while I honor and welcome any sincere effort to further the union of God's people, it

must not be supposed that I am committed to the position that the tendency is wholly good, and that the methods of Church union that are proposed meet my approval. It is greatly to be feared that many have a false conception of Christian Unity, and that many Protestants have gone over, it may be unwittingly, to the Romish theory on this subject. It is of the utmost importance that it be seen that true unity, the unity for which our Lord prayed, is a spiritual unity. It is grounded in a participation of the life of Christ. It is visible, but it is visible most of all in the graces that are the product of this life. Unity of this kind, based on community of life, rendered visible to the world by a common character, resembling that of Christ, has power to convince man that a new principle, transforming and assimilating, resident in Jesus Christ, has entered into human history. Apart from this spiritual unity, identity of creed, ritual, and government has nothing in common with Christ's idea of the unity of His followers.

It does not concern me to deny that the ideal of the Church is found in this spiritual unity, underlying and penetrating outward and mechanical unity in creed and worship and order. My contention is that the spiritual unity is primary, the ecclesiastical secondary. The Romish doctrine makes that first which is last, and has thereby destroyed, as far as in her lies, the real unity of Christians. It is of vital moment to ascertain how far this tendency towards the union of Christ's disciples is vitiated by this false doctrine of Rome. I cannot enter upon this question, but record my apprehension that there is grave reason to believe that the Romish doctrine has attached itself to the movement. In support of this opinion, I content myself with remarking that it is principally the exclusive and High-Churchly element in the Protestant Episcopal Church that is active and prominent in efforts to achieve "Church Unity." It is well-known that their doctrine of the Church is, to all intents and purposes, that of the Church of Rome.

In the light of these general remarks on the prevailing disposition towards Church Union and the good and evil there may be in his tendency, I submit the proposition of the House of Bishops:

"As inherent parts of this sacred deposit, and, therefore, as essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom, we account the following, to-wit:

I. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the revealed Word of God.

II. The Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

III. The two sacraments, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, ministered with unfailling use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

IV. The historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church.

Furthermore, deeply grieved by the sad divisions which afflict the Christian Church in our own land, we hereby declare our desire and readiness, so soon as there shall be any authorized response to this Declaration, to enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian bodies seeking the organic unity of the Church, with a view to the earnest study of the conditions under which so priceless a blessing might happily be brought to pass."

Upon this proposition I offer but few comments, feeling confident that if what I have already said be true and just, the attentive reader can easily form his own judgment. The kindly spirit that prompts this proffer to the Christians of America should not fail of recognition. The present writer does not sympathize with the disposition some have shown to treat the Bishops and their efforts with ridicule or indifference. Every movement that has in it any promise of bringing Christians more closely together, and leading them to discover and to exalt their points of agreement above their points of difference, should meet with encouragement. It is to be hoped, therefore, that all the Churches will appoint Committees of Conference. While I have no idea that much can be done at present to advance the kind of union in contemplation, yet such a conference may lead to other important results.

I venture to add that the fourth proposition of the Bishops seems fatal to the whole scheme. If I understand it correctly, it sets up the claim that the Diocesan Episcopacy, with Apostolic Succession, is an essential element of the Church, and a necessary plank in the platform on which we are all invited to stand. The insertion of this plank appears not only to render impossible the desired Church Union, but to indicate the influence the High Church party had in the manufacture of the Basis of Union.

At any rate, the logical result of this fourth article is to require all such Churches as the Presbyterian and Congregational to deny the validity of their ordination, and all ministers in these churches to receive ordination, at the hands of Diocesan Bishops. All this makes on the mind of the present writer the impression that the Bishops are strongly tainted with the Romish doctrine of the Church and Church Unity, and, however kindly intended, the effect of agreement on this basis would simply be the absorption of all other Churches in the Protestant Episcopal Church. Conference may lead to a withdrawal of this article.

Meanwhile, let all recognize the true spiritual unity that already exists: let every Christian exalt its importance, emphasize its reality, and increase its power. In this way we shall best answer our Lord's petition and haste the consummation of the ages. In this way we shall most truly advance any outward union that may be either possible or desirable.

C. R. HEMPHILL.

V. THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH TO THE PROHIBITION MOVEMENT.

Intemperance in drink is a great evil. To be convinced of this fact, we have only to look at the many families misery-stricken, homes desolated, hearts broken, individuals ruined in body and soul, crimes committed, poverty entailed, and the millions of money wasted, all through intemperance in the use of intoxicating drinks. It is also a prevalent evil; indeed, it has been on the increase for several decades, and still is, with a few local exceptions. It is reliably stated that not less than one hundred thousand persons die yearly in the United States from the effects of strong drink alone. This is appalling. It is not strange that all humane persons should rise in determined opposition to this evil. They are impelled thereto by sentiments of patriotism, humanity and religion. The methods of opposition have been various; scores of Temperance Societies have arisen; Local Option, High License, Scientific Temperance Instruction, and various other means have been tried, with a degree of success not altogether encouraging to the friends of temperance.

Public attention is now being directed to a more radical method, viz: Prohibition, by which is meant the interdiction by Constitutional law of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor as a beverage. The State of Maine was the first to add a prohibitory article to her Constitution; her example has been followed by four or five sister States, and several others have the matter under consideration. Wherever faithfully tried, the experiment has proved satisfactory to its friends, and Prohibition is growing in popular favor; indeed, it has become a factor of ever increasing strength in the politics of our country.

At this juncture, the eyes of many are turned toward the Church. They rightly judge that she is not indifferent to the great evil of intemperance, which is destroying so many souls. Will she not then, unite in a movement which aims to pluck up this evil by the roots? This she is asked to do, and there are those who deem her unfaithful to her mission on earth when she refuses. Under this pressure we notice that the Synod of Pennsylvania has entered into league with this movement, by officially praying the Legislature of their State to pass a prohibitory amendment to the Constitution; and when this action was appealed from, the General Assembly at Omaha dismissed the appeal, thus sustaining and endorsing the action of Synod. In view of this state of things, a brief restatement of the principles governing the relation of the Church to this, and all similar movements, may not be out of place.

The Church, as such, may not espouse the Prohibition cause, or any similar enterprise, or league herself to it in any way whatever. The soundness of this position will appear if we consider the following simple truths:

1. The functions of the Church are *judicative* and *administrative*, not *legislative*. The Church is a Kingdom whose laws are all made for her by her King. The code is placed in her hands finished and complete in every respect. No power is given her to alter this code; on the other hand, all such power is carefully withheld from her. She cannot take from it, nor can she add to it without incurring the King's curse. (Rev. xxii. 18, 19.) In other words, she cannot make new laws, but simply expound and declare those given her by her King; her power is not legislative but simply declarative. This is her commission, received from the King's own lips: "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all na-

tions, * * * * teaching them to observe all things, *whatsoever I have commanded you.*" Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

Now is Prohibition one of Christ's laws? On examination of the code we find it is not there. If it were there, we may be sure He would not have water into wine for a beverage at the marriage-feast of Cana. It is hard, too, to conceive how Timothy could "use a little wine" even, as the inspired Paul directs (1 Tim. v. 23), unless somebody had manufactured it. But if Christ has not prohibited its manufacture and sale, the Church cannot do so. There is no such thing as her adding a prohibitory amendment to her Constitution, as given her by her King: we have seen this to be entirely beyond her province. If Christian men are convinced that Prohibition is good "for the present distress," and if Christ has not forbidden it, then may they as citizens, patriots, philanthropists, espouse and work for it. But they cannot do it sitting as a court of the Church: for here they can only speak by "commandment of the Lord." To do otherwise is disloyal to the King, and, in the end, hurtful to the Church.

2. The Church is a *Spiritual Kingdom*. "My Kingdom is not of this world," says the Church's King and Head. This settles the question. Three things are implied in this statement.

(a.) The Church's *ends* are Spiritual. The great end of the Church is to "preach Christ and Him crucified" to a perishing world, that through Him men may be reconciled to God, and saved from sin and hell. Says the King: "Go ye into all the world and *preach the Gospel* to every creature." The Church cannot depart from this to preach Prohibition or aught else. And so the Presbyterian Church has embodied in her Confession of Faith this principle: "Synods and Councils are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical." But is Prohibition a Spiritual and ecclesiastical question? Is it not confessedly a political, a civil question? Is not the State asked to create the prohibitory law, and expected to enforce it? Is it not a State matter from beginning to end? Then the Church cannot "handle" it; she is precluded therefrom by her own Constitution, and by the very end of her being as explained in the Word of God. Nor is it sufficient to urge the wholesome moral effects of Prohibition, as a reason why the Church should espouse it. Every question in political economy has a bearing, directly or indirectly, on the morals of the country. On this ground, the Church might

“handle or conclude” such matters as the Demonetization of Silver, the Fifteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution, the Burlingame Treaty, the Canadian Fisheries question, and, in short, any and every civil question. This doctrine, carried to its logical consequences, leads inevitably to the Supremacy of Church over State. It is precisely the doctrine of Rome. It is on this ground that she claims the right to meddle with political matters, because of their bearing upon the morals of men, and the Church’s interests.

(b) The Church’s methods are Spiritual. It is not enough for the end to be Spiritual; this end must be accomplished by Spiritual means. This is the law of the King: “Though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds.” (2 Cor. x: 3, 4.) But Prohibition is pre-eminently a “carnal weapon;” it is a direct appeal to the civil arm; it is “taking the sword” and wielding it lustily too. Let the State do this; for this end was she ordained of God. But the Church may not touch the sword on penalty of perishing thereby. When the Synod of Pennsylvania says to a man: “If you manufacture or sell liquors as a beverage, we will ask the State to fine, imprison, punish you,” wherein does she differ from the Romish Apostasy, when it says to a man: “If you hold to heresy in doctrine or practice, we will ask the State to fine, imprison, punish you?” Surely it would take the traditional “Philadelphia lawyer,” who, we may suppose, was a member of that Synod, to detect the difference. Christian men may advocate the use of the sword as citizens of the State, but not as members of the Church, much less as members of a court of Jesus Christ. And this is a distinction often overlooked. While a Church Court, acting exclusively in the name of Christ, cannot “handle” Prohibition, or other civil matter, yet immediately after the adjournment of the court, the same persons composing it may assemble in mass meeting, as citizens of the Commonwealth, and handle lawfully Prohibition, or any other civil matter.

(c) The Church’s *power* is Spiritual only. Her King says: “Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” (Matt. xviii, 18.) Hers is the power of the keys only, a purely spiritual power. Now, it is vain for a body to adopt a law which

it has no power to enforce. This the Church does whenever she utters a command or passes a recommendation on civil or secular questions. She cannot enforce it, for she has no secular power, only spiritual, and this drives her, as it did the Omaha Assembly when in this predicament, to advise an appeal to "the strong arm of the civil law," (viz. this Assembly's action on the report of her Temperance Committee).

Is the Church, then, to stand aloof from the temperance question altogether? By no means. Temperance is a spiritual grace, a "fruit of the Spirit;" the Church must teach and enforce it; drunkenness is a spiritual evil, a "wart of the flesh;" the Church must go the full length of her power to resist and eradicate it. But she must use Spiritual power, the only kind she possesses, and the mightiest power committed to mortal man. In the exercise of this power, she must so imbue her members with an abhorrence of evil, with sentiments of temperance and humanity, with an unselfish love to God and their fellow-men, in short, with the Spirit of Christ, that they will go forth into the world, intelligent, patriotic, God-fearing citizens, who can be trusted to do all that philanthropy, humanity and patriotism can suggest for the amelioration of the race. But, chiefly, the Church must declare the law of her King in this matter. She must say to men: "You must not be drunken;" for Christ has said: "Drunkards shall not inherit the Kingdom of Heaven." (1 Cor. vi. :10.) She must say to men: "You must not make your neighbor drunken;" for Christ says: "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy bottle to him and maketh him drunken also." (Hab. ii. :15.) And she must do this with authority, and enforce it, when needful, with the divine power of the Keys given her for this purpose. This is the Church's way of dealing with the Temperance question. It stands in favorable contrast to Prohibition. The latter is based upon the popular will, which is one thing to-day and may be another to-morrow, and is enforced by the penalties of human law; the former is based upon the immutable will of God, and is enforced by the sanctions of His eternal law. Let the State, let individuals, do what they may; the Church must adhere exclusively to this one way. If she will do this, she will be loyal to her King, she will keep herself from entangling and always damaging alliances with the world, and will save the souls as well as the bodies of men, which, after all, is her great mission on earth.

A. B. CURRY.

VII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

HARRIS'S SELF-REVELATION OF GOD.

THE SELF-REVELATION OF GOD, *By Samuel Harris, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale University.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1887. 8vo.

In this elaborate work of 552 pages, we have a discussion of the profoundest and most interesting questions with which the human mind can come in contact. It was to be expected from the author's reputation, and his distinguished position in the Oxford of New England, that the treatment of these themes would be marked by great ability, and this expectation is fully met. The book is divided into four parts: I. God revealed in experience or consciousness as the Object of religious faith and service; II. God revealed in the Universe as the Absolute Being; III. God revealed in the Universe as Personal Spirit through the constitution and course of nature, and the constitution and history of Man; IV. God revealed in Christ as the Redeemer of man from sin.

The chief value of the work, in the judgment of orthodox Christians, will be found in its polemical discussion of Anti-theistic theories. In this sphere the author evinces signal ability. We must say, however, that like many other Christian writers, he concedes far too little influence to the Scriptures as regulative of doctrine in the department of Natural Theology. It is impossible to construct a natural theology without reference to the supernatural revelation of himself which God has furnished in the Bible. Nor can the speculative conclusions of reason be regarded as co-ordinate authority with the deliverances of such a revelation. The former must submit to be verified or condemned, expanded or corrected by the latter. One of the great points, for example, which the author establishes, is the personality of God as a Spirit. But if reason should rest in the doctrine that God is unipersonal, it would maintain a false doctrine. The Bible reveals him as Three Persons. If it be said, that reason never could have discovered the Trinity, the answer is that it was originally revealed to reason, and, therefore, reason has no right to speculate about God's personality, independently of that revelation when it is accessible. If it does, it revolts against God's authoritative guidance, and must needs plunge into error. Now, this primal revelation the Bible confirms. Reason, we believe, can of itself reach the doctrine of God's personality, but it ought to expand that doctrine into that of his trinal personality under the regulative teaching of the Scriptures. The onliness of God as contradistinguished to many pretended divinities, and to the universe, is the onliness of a Triune God. Any other doctrine as to the divine personality is really as misleading as those which altogether deny that God is a person. We speak here of the authority of the Bible in the sphere

of natural religion and not of supernatural or redemptive. The great assumptions of the former are justified and corroborated by the Scriptures which, like magnifying glasses, reveal them afresh. To say that the authority of the Bible upon these questions cannot be pleaded with the sceptic amounts to this: that historical evidence is of less value than speculative. He who fails to be convinced by the clear evidence upon which the Bible grounds its claims will be apt to remain unsatisfied by all the reasoning, however valid, which is founded upon ontological premises. The two sorts of proof are complementary, but it is not reason which must confirm the Bible; it is the Bible which confirms the deductions of reason. A verbal revelation must be more definite and authoritative than one which depends upon the influences either of thought or of faith.

While we thoroughly agree with Dr. Harris in his doctrine that the knowledge of God is intuitive, and springs necessarily from the constitution of man and the spontaneous processes of the human soul in connexion with the facts of experience, we are compelled to dissent from his view that God is directly known in consciousness. If by consciousness he simply meant its data, together with the immediate and necessary influences which attend them, we would have nothing to object. But he distinctly defines consciousness—and in this he is correct—to be the equivalent of immediate knowledge—that is, the knowledge of presented objects. That God is the object of such a knowledge would appear to be impossible by a single consideration. The infinite as an object cannot be presented to a finite subject. What we immediately know in presentation we can describe. If God be thus known we can describe his infinite essence. The consequence refutes the theory. We immediately know his finite manifestations, and from them we necessarily infer the attributes manifested, and by another step necessarily infer the substance to which these attributes belong. But even then we are conducted to a Being not necessarily infinite. The universe itself is finite, and the contents of the conclusion cannot *logically* transcend those of the premises. What then? The original aptitude for the knowledge of the infinite—and Dr. Harris, we are glad to notice, acknowledges it—elicited from latency and developed into concrete form by empirical conditions, takes the shape of a definite faith-judgment, and positively affirms that the Being to whom thought has, by its valid processes, conducted us is the Infinite Being. Now this “belief” in the Infinite Being is a knowledge, a real, genuine and regulative knowledge. We know his finite manifestations by consciousness, sense-perception and the inferential processes of thought; we know him as infinite by faith. Reason is the generic source from which flow the specific functions of thought and faith, for thought is reason thinking and faith is reason believing; and knowledge is the generic result of thought and faith. Thought has its knowledge, faith has its knowledge, and as he who thinks and he who believes is the same indivisible unit,

the knowledge of the Infinite Being is blended into unity as the joint product of the thinking and believing powers of the one human person. It is therefore, we conceive, a great mistake to contradicting faith to reason on the one hand, and to knowledge on the other. It is a special function of reason and results in knowledge. To say that our apprehensions of God, of the substance of our own souls, of the substance of matter, and of our immortality are mere beliefs which are not knowledges, is to sink the grandest and most operative cognitions of our minds beneath the level of those which spring from our sense relations to the phenomena around us. Strictly speaking, there is no "God-consciousness." In consciousness we immediately know the finite things which reveal him; by faith we mediate but validly know him as infinite.

We have not room to discuss other positions taken in this work from which, if we correctly apprehend them, we must dissent. We only advert to some of them. The author's conception of supernatural revelation we confess that we cannot understand, except upon the hypothesis of Rationalism. Not to pause upon the loose definition of the supernatural, as that which is over and beyond the mere physical, we construe him as implying that God reveals himself alone in action. He furnishes an historical manifestation of himself progressively in nature, providence, the constitution of man, and redemption. It is the province of rational thought to apprehend and state in verbal propositions this historical revelation. But, God himself has done this for us in his Word. That Word is a verbal and authoritative Rule of Faith and Practice. Theology gets its facts from that external Standard, and systematizes them. To take any other ground is to depart from the primary canon of Protestantism.

The author's account of God's revelation of himself in nature, providence and redemption, has one signal defect which must exercise a controlling and disastrous effect upon the scientific theology which it is the office of rational thought to construct. It is that the fundamental attribute of Justice is left out. The revelation is of power, wisdom and love. Of course, from these premises the theologian, Reason, will get the ultimate restoration of the race to God's favor. A future probation is the logical result. But every form of God's self-revelation, non-biblical and biblical alike, asserts justice as well as love. This changes the premises and therefore the conclusion.

The author appears to have embraced the hypothesis of Evolution as a whole. Besides the consideration that a Christian theologian should refrain from affirming what science itself has not yet established, he cannot forget the fact that the scheme of redemption was to some extent revealed, externally and verbally revealed, just after the Fall, and that it has not been evolved by the natural action of the human faculties, interpreting God's historical manifestation of himself, nor by any inherent power in the early revelation to expand itself, but developed by supernatural additions in the form of new, verbal and authoritative

communications. And so far as God's historical action is concerned, was Christ evolved by the progress of events? Even Schleiermacher, Semi-pantheist as he was, admits that he was a new and separate beginning of humanity.

The author's doctrine of miracles is of a piece with this general view. They are denied to be contra-natural. Consequently their apologetic worth is reduced to naught. No extraordinary divine interposition could be proved by them; and indeed no such interposition would be deemed necessary by an evolutionist. We have no hesitation in saying, that according to this view, Christianity could not be proved at the bar of the human reason. It stands or falls with credentials which God alone could furnish.

From all this it does not surprise us, however it may pain us, to learn that the author's doctrine of redemption rises no higher than that of pure Arminianism as to its conception of grace, and no higher than that of Universalism as to its eschatology. He uses the phraseology of the evangelical school, but under its uniform he represents another. We should be happy to find that in this we are mistaken. But he who teaches that man is the determining factor in receiving the grace of salvation, and that God in redemption is simply evolving his purposes of love, appears to be half an Arminian, and half a universal Restorationist. If so, we know where Yale theology stands. It is not the theology of Dwight!

J. L. G.

PEABODY'S MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

MORAL PHILOSOPHY. *A series of Lectures, by Andrew P. Peabody, D. D., L. L. D., Emeritus Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University.* Boston: Lee and Shepard, Publishers, No. 10 Milk street, 1 vol. 12 mo. pp. 337. 1887.

The author has not in this work pointed out with sufficient clearness what would seem to be an obvious distinction—between Moral Philosophy and Ethics. The former we conceive to be concerned about the analysis of our moral nature, and the treatment of the fundamental laws of morality or rectitude, which lie at the root of that nature, and are brought into consciousness by the actual cases of experience. Butler reduced these principles to Truth, Justice and Benevolence. To these perhaps Purity should be added. These principles becomes standards (when the facts of experience occur) by which we spontaneously perceive the right or wrong qualities of actions. In this way all men, who are not imbecile, acquire a spontaneously formed body of rules. Ethics, we take it, is the result of a reflective process by which these rules are examined in comparison with the laws of morality, corrected, and digested into scientific and formal shape. Dr. Peabody without indicating this distinction at the outset, proceeds at once to consider Human Freedom, one of the elements of moral agency.

When he comes to consider the nature of Virtue, he defines it to be "conduct in conformity with the right, or, more briefly, rightness or righteousness." Had he broadened this definition so as to make that to be virtue which is the element in our moral principles and states as well as our conduct, that is conformed to the right, he would have furnished a completer and more accurate one. But in considering rightness as the specific and distinguishing mark of virtue we believe him to be correct. What then is the Right? How is it grounded? These are questions of fundamental importance, and he breaks down in the answer he renders to them. Early in the work he has these words which carry us back to the theory of Samuel Clarke: "What characteristic is it that renders an act right or wrong? In other words, what is the ground, or the rule, of right? Were I to say, 'The right is what it is fitting to do; the wrong, what it is unfitting to do,' I might seem to be uttering a mere truism; yet in my belief I should be announcing the fundamental principle of Moral Philosophy—a principle, too, which has by no means the universal, or even the general, consent of ethical philosophers. I regard fitness as the ultimate and sole ground of right."

But, in the first place, fitness implies a standard. What is that standard? In the second place, a thing may be fit which is not right. In the third place, the standard of fitness would be as mutable as the perceptions of moral agents. In the fourth place, virtue would be reduced to moral taste. The author is greatly opposed to making the will of God the ground of moral obligation, but the reasons he urges for this opposition would all be met by signaling a distinction upon which his eye did not seem to rest, but which is of vital import, namely, that between the ground of moral obligation, and the ground of moral distinctions. The will of God obliges me to be and to do right. This furnishes the ground of obligation. But the ground of moral distinctions is in the eternal nature of God as right. That is to say—to be more specific—the requirements of God's will constitute a formal rule of right, because they represent the whole moral nature of God, including his will itself. We know that God's will requires only what is morally right, because it is his will, and must be conformed to the unchangeable norm of right in his nature. In regard to this, Dr. Peabody employs most extraordinary language for a Christian teacher in high places: "In maintaining that his (God's) acts are right because they are his, we virtually ascribe to them no moral attributes, but merely apply to the Majesty of Heaven the maxim outgrown on earth, unless at the court of Ashantee or Dahomey, 'The King can do no wrong.'" It follows, then, that man's perception of fitness is the ultimate standard by which God's acts are to be judged. And this Dr. Peabody explicitly maintains! In connection with this impious moral philosophy he cannot resist the temptation to give us a specimen of an equally impious theology. After emphasizing the "atrocious tyranny and cruelty" of Zeus in his fabled treatment of Prometheus, he proceeds to say: "A

conception analogous to that of Zeus has been rife even in New England within my memory, though now almost obsolete. In some of our churches it was currently said that the natural man hates God; and converted men and women, in their (so-called) experience meetings, were wont to say that they used to hate God. * * * Theologians of this type maintained the damnation of the heathen, and sometimes, of infants; believed that God arbitrarily elected certain members of the human race for salvation, and decreed, from all eternity, the wickedness of the wicked as well as their horrible doom; ascribed to his direct command the slaughter of the Canaanites, with their women and children, and represented his wrath as unappeasable, except by an innocent being's bearing the full punishment due to the guilty. Men's natural sense of fitness and of its equivalent, the Right, recoiled from such a God; and a great deal of the infidelity which prevailed two or three generations ago sprang from the impossibility, on the part of ingenuous minds, of believing in such a Governor of the universe, while its better forms were really more nearly Christian than the type of Christianity which they replaced."

One knows not which the most to wonder at in this passage, the palpable denial of doctrines and facts affirmed in the Bible, or the misrepresentation of the Calvinistic theology, or the abuse heaped upon the Deity revealed in the Scriptures, or the arrogant claim that miserable sinners have the right, in conformity to their sense of fitness, to determine what sort of God they will have, if any God it all. The radical principle of the work being what it is, we are indisposed to criticise its details. We recommend our readers to examine the book for themselves, in order to ascertain what type of moral philosophy and theology is inculcated in Harvard University.

J. L. G.

MCCOSH'S REALISTIC PHILOSOPHY.

REALISTIC PHILOSOPHY, *Defended in a Philosophic Series, by James McCosh, D. D., LL. D., Litt. D., (etc.), President of Princeton College. In two volumes; I. Expository; II. Historical and Critical.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons: 1887.

In a notice like this no more can be done than to make some general remarks concerning a work which deserves an extended review. The illustrious author evidently does not despair of a science of Philosophy. It is true that, like Theology, it has to deal with infinite elements, and that fact seems to render its reduction to scientific form impossible. But Dr. McCosh has the merit of showing that our knowledge transcends the facts of perception and the mediate conclusions of the logical faculty, and embraces what he felicitously terms faith-elements. If this latter kind of knowledge be valid, there is nothing to hinder its being imported from the believing into the thinking faculty,

and employed by the latter in its logical processes. Whether, on abstract grounds, this be affirmed to be impossible or not, the fact is that, in the concrete, it is constantly done, and must be done, unless we refuse to reason at all about the grandest and most significant of all our knowledges.

In connexion with this, the work affords a disproof of the common but unwarranted assertion, that Metaphysics is not a progressive science. A few considerations are suggested as illustrative of this remark.

First, For a long time the deductive method almost exclusively prevailed; but the inductive has come to be very generally employed, not as extruding the former, but furnishing the data upon which it competently proceeds. The interrogation of consciousness, for the purpose of ascertaining the facts upon which the fundamental principles of the science ought to be based, is certainly an indication of progress.

Secondly, There has been a decided advance in the enunciation and development of the original Laws of Thought and Belief in relation to the processes of the understanding, and of the original Laws of Morality in relation to the processes of the moral nature—relations indicated by psychological investigation.

Thirdly, For ages philosophers adopted the hypothesis of Representative Perception. Since the rise of the Scottish school, the tendency of philosophical thought has been marked in the direction of adopting the contrary theory of the Immediate Knowledge of the external world.

Fourthly, There has been notable progress in the evolution of the doctrine of Presentative and Representative Knowledge.

Fifthly, There has been, in some degree, progress in fixing the certainty of principles and doctrines, arising from the conflict of opinions, somewhat analogous to that which, in theology, has resulted from controversies in the Church. The Absolutist controversy, for example, has tended to settle the limitations of the mental powers and the boundaries of thought, at the same time that it has enhanced confidence in the existence of native principles in the mind, which while they ground the possibility of experience, depend upon it in turn for their development. It has contributed to make more distinct the divisions between the domains of Faith and Conception, and so has classified the obscure inquiries of Ontology by assigning the restrictions under which Thought proceeds, and determining the proper office of Faith and the sweep of the peculiar judgments which it necessitates, in contradistinction to those which are the appropriate results of the Comparative Faculty.

Sixthly, There has been progress in the matters of the Duality of Consciousness as affirming matter and spirit—to use the exquisite language of Hamilton—in the synthesis of knowledge and the antithesis of existence, and of its testimony to the certainty of Objective Reality.

If to these and like considerations, it be objected that the progress of physical science is more certain and its results more trustworthy, the question arises as to the ground of certainty in the respective spheres.

To us it seems clear that, in the last analysis, that ground is one and the same—that is to say, the veracity of consciousness. Physical science proceeds through the medium of the senses as its instruments of observation. But reliance is placed upon the testimony of the senses by virtue of consciousness. In perceiving an external object we are either conscious of the perceiving act, or immediately of the object perceived. On either supposition, we trust in the veracity of consciousness. Now as the relation of consciousness to mental phenomena is far more direct—there being no sensible medium intervening—it is fair to infer that its deliverances as to them cannot be less trustworthy.

In the respects which have been mentioned, and others, Dr. McCosh is justly entitled to the praise, and it is no mean praise, of furnishing by his labors a refutation of the charge that philosophy is unprogressive. He is safe in placing himself in the ranks of those who maintain the Common Sense philosophy, which in the hands of his distinguished countrymen has been developed with conspicuous ability, and we think, has by his own inquiries been pushed forward on the path of further development. In this he has rendered important service, not only to speculation, but to religion. For religion, considered comprehensively, embraces natural as well as supernatural truth. Christianity itself, as a peculiar because redemptive scheme, assumes the great pre-suppositions of nature, and incorporates them into itself.

These remarks are made, not especially with reference to the work before us, but to the drift and genius of all his productions. The point at which he seems to us to have advanced the Scottish philosophy—and in this it is likely he will not agree with us—is not so much his persistent and laudable assertion of Natural Realism, for he has himself acknowledged that of that doctrine his great compeer, Sir William Hamilton, was a pronounced and exceptionally able advocate, but in his explicit vindication of our faith-judgments as real and valid knowledges. In this he has gone farther than Hamilton, who, while he held distinctly the transcendent power of faith as contradistinguished to conception, and maintained the necessity of our believing much that we are utterably unable to think, unhappily restricted, at least too severely restricted, the appellation of knowledge to the results of perception and positive thought. In this he erred, and the error in his nomenclature has exposed him to grievous misconstruction of his real positions. From this defect, Dr. McCosh is free. The transcendent facts of God's existence, of the infinity of space and duration, and of immortality, which the thinking faculty cannot grasp, he characterizes not only as beliefs, but knowledges. We own ourselves indebted to him for profound suggestions in connection with this vitally important subject. Nor do we know of another writer who has contributed as much as he to a careful analysis and pains-taking classification of those original principles of both the intellectual and moral nature, which he prefers to call intuitions, but which, on account of the ambiguity of

that term and its consequent liability to misapprehension, we would rather, with Dugald Stewart, designate as fundamental laws of thought, belief and morality. Mansel, for instance, uses the term *intuition* in its primary sense, as indicating an act of presentative knowledge in which we directly gaze upon an object now and here present to the perceptive faculty, external or internal. In this sense it cannot, without a concession of the outrageous position of the Absolutists—Schelling's Intellectual Intuition for example—be held that we have an intuition of God and of substance. But as to that, *de gustibus*, etc. Dr. McCosh has done signal service in ranking the judgments of faith, elicited by the conditions of experience into formal expression, and overpassing the scope of the perceptive and discursive faculties, as the grandest and most salutary knowledges of the human soul.

While, however, we accord this tribute to Dr. McCosh, we think that he has needlessly confused the subject by making, as he does in his *Intuitions of the Mind*, some experimental knowledge always precede faith. The true statement, enforced by his own principles, is that the fundamental laws of belief antecede all the processes of experience and exercise a regulative influence upon them, but that the thought-knowledge acquired by those processes goes before and conditions the articulate judgments of faith.

We are disposed to think also that he has not with sufficient accuracy noted the *criteria* of these original principles. He has in this, his latest work, given them as Self-evidence, Necessity and Universality. One fails to see why he omitted Simplicity, or—if we might venture to employ so unusual a word—Ultimacy. These principles are to psychological investigation what ultimate facts or primordial elements are to physical; when discovered by analysis, they ground all logical synthesis. Consciousness reveals them as incapable of resolution by analysis into any simpler elements, and they are therefore entitled to be accepted as fundamental. Universality can hardly be assigned the place of a separate and co-ordinate test. It is rather the proof of Necessity. What all men everywhere and always believe must be so believed because it is necessary. It may, indeed, be doubted whether all tests may not be reduced to unity upon that of Necessity. But enough upon this point.

In the work before us, which appears to be to some extent a recapitulatory statement of the results of his previous investigations, the author, in the first volume, didactically expounds his own philosophical system, and in the second, states and criticises the prominent systems of the past and the present. By the way, it is somewhat curious that, in commenting upon that of the Scottish School, he does not signalize the position of Hamilton, who holds the seat of the Tachmonite among the mighty three, the others of whom were Reid and Stewart. Was it because of his determinate opposition to Hamilton's doctrine of the Relativity of Knowledge? This leads us to say a few words about that matter.

The capital feature of the present work is, as its title indicates, a defence of Realism. By this must not be understood that Scholastic Realism which affirmed the existence of substantive entities represented by general notions or common terms. It is mainly, if we understand it, what is now known as Natural Realism, but with certain, specific elements different from those of the doctrine designated by that name. Dr. McCosh maintains the leading characteristic of the Natural Realism of the Scottish School—namely its affirmation that we immediately know the external world in an act of sense-perception. He criticises Hamilton for attempting to incorporate with this doctrine the principles of Kant. Now it is evident that whereas the German regarded the subjective forms of the mind as furnishing no certain guarantee for the independent existence of objective reality, the Scotchman held precisely the contrary. In what then does Dr. McCosh condemn Hamilton's concurrence with Kant? In this—that they both affirm that we cannot know things absolutely, we know them only relatively: we cannot know them “in themselves.” Let it be borne in mind that the question now is in regard to the perceptive knowledge of external things. Hamilton contends that we know phenomenal qualities immediately, when they are related to our faculty of perception. There is no apparent difference here between Dr. McCosh and Hamilton. They both hold to the immediate knowledge of phenomenal reality, for Hamilton did not deny that a phenomenal quality is a real, existing thing. But he denied that we know, *by an act of perception*, the thing so perceived in itself. What does he mean? Why, that perceptive knowledge does not and cannot give the occult substance of the thing, the phenomenal qualities of which we perceive. The thing in itself is the thing considered as a substance, grounding the phenomenal qualities, manifested by them and constituting their hidden bond of unity. But Hamilton also affirmed that this defect in the immediate knowledge furnished by perception is supplemented by an inferential judgment enforced by belief. We necessarily believe in the substance—that is, the thing in itself—in consequence of our perceiving its phenomenal qualities. But this inference to the substance from its qualities, is made with so magical a swiftness that only reflection can detect a distinction between the two spontaneous acts. They seem to be one and the same, but are really distinct. The one involves immediate, the other, mediate knowledge. This mediate knowledge of the thing, substantially considered, is a relative knowledge because it could never be given by the thing, phenomenally considered, but only through the relation between phenomena and substance. These two acts of apprehension appear to synchronize, but one is in order to the other: that of immediate knowledge, by perception of the phenomenal qualities, in the order of production antecedes and conditions that of mediate knowledge, by faith, of the substance supporting the qualities and phenomenally manifested by them. This is the doctrine of the Scottish School, foreshadowed by

Reid, further developed by Stewart, and more explicitly expounded by Hamilton.

How does Dr. McCosh's doctrine differ from it? If we do not misunderstand his position, it is that "in one primitive concrete act"—such is his language^(*)—we know things in their reality: we know them at once in their integrity. If by knowledge Dr. McCosh meant both immediate and mediate knowledge as contemporaneously experienced, we would have nothing to object to his position, as it would have to be identified with that of the Scottish School. But this cannot be his meaning. It is that we immediately know by perception things as wholes—in their integrity. We know in one concrete act of immediate knowledge both substances and qualities. We know immediately the *substances as qualified*. This holds both in regard to matter and mind. We immediately know "a stone" as a certain material substance so and so qualified; and we immediately know self as thinking, feeling, willing, and passing moral judgments. Perception gives us the former, self-consciousness the latter. Touching this theory, we remark:

First, It is indeed a protest against the Catholic doctrine of the Scottish School: it involves a departure from its whole genius and spirit, and we cannot resist the conclusion that it is out of harmony with Dr. McCosh's teaching with reference to the knowledge which springs from faith in contradistinction to perception and thought.

Secondly, So far as it differs from the position of the Scottish School, it is in the main indefensible. If we have by perception an immediate knowledge of things, as substances, they are presented to us in the same way as are qualities. We would consequently be able to describe the former, just as we are able to describe the latter. This it is impossible to do, and the conclusion is necessitated that we do not in that manner know things considered as substances. We immediately know a stone as an aggregate of phenomenal qualities, but we do not immediately know the subtle material substance which is manifested by these qualities. If we do, we can tell how it looks and feels. In like manner, we must distinguish between our immediate knowledge, by consciousness, of the phenomena of the soul, and our knowledge of the soul itself as an immaterial substance. If we had immediate knowledge of it, as a substance presented to us, we could describe it as we describe its phenomenal manifestations. Who ever did this? If Dr. McCosh will do it, he will convince us of the truth of his doctrine. A direct consciousness of self, such as Dr. Mansel and Dr. McCosh affirm, could only be maintained by denying consciousness to be equivalent to immediate knowledge of presented objects. If that be denied, the question is degraded into one of words. We are conscious of the substance neither of matter, nor of our souls, nor of God. We are conscious of their phenomenal manifestations, and through them—that is, relatively—know them by immediate inferences enforced by fundamental laws

(*) Scottish Philosophy, p. 289.

of belief: immediate inferences so swiftly derived from the data conscious as to seem identical with those data themselves.

Thirdly, Dr. McCosh incorrectly charges Hamilton with considering phenomena as mere appearances. He as much holds them to be realities as does Dugald Stewart. What is the objection to calling qualities phenomena? Are they not the circumstances through which the substances appear as well as those by which they are modified?

Fourthly, We utterly dissent from Dr. McCosh's judgment that Hamilton's doctrine of relativity logically conduced to the Agnosticism of Spencer, and "ended in nihilism or at least in nescience." This is a serious indictment, and if correct a fatal one. To our mind, it has no foundation. What was Hamilton's real doctrine? He virtually represented knowledge as generic, having under it two species—immediate knowledge and mediate knowledge. Immediate is that which we have when an object is now and here present to us. We gaze upon it as an act of genuine intuition. Mediate is acquired either by mediate or immediate inference. The conclusion from a syllogistic argument is a specimen of the former, the judgment that as we immediately know phenomenal qualities there is a substance which they manifest, is an instance of the latter. When also we are conscious in an act of reminiscence of a mental image, re-presenting a past event, we immediately know the vicarious image, but mediately know the event. We immediately know the finite manifestations of God's existence, and through them, by an immediate inference, necessitated by a fundamental law of belief, mediately know God in an act of faith. Now, although Hamilton usually applied the term *knowledge* to that which is immediate, he did not absolutely restrict it. He admitted mediate knowledge—and as that is the sort of knowledge by which alone we can apprehend the infinite, God, the substance of matter and of the soul, he was logically bound to admit that our grandest knowledges are mediate. In fine, Hamilton's belief in God, in substance and in immortality was his mediate knowledge of those realities. They could not be immediately known, but *they must be known by faith* in consequence of the operation of fundamental laws empirically developed. To say then that his principles logically led to the unknowableness of God, of substance, of immortality, is either to confess ignorance of them, or abusively to employ them. The Atheistic Materialists who go by the name of Agnostics, aware that Hamilton denied, and justly denied, the possibility of apprehending God, as infinite, in an act of *immediate* knowledge, perverted his doctrine to mean that we cannot know him at all. But their doctrine was not born of Hamilton. It had another father, and claimed respectability by falsely pretending to be his child. This is not strange as coming from them, but we wonder when we hear an advocate of the Scottish philosophy sanctioning the groundless pretention. Hamilton no more denies the knowledge of

God by faith, than does Dr. McCosh affirm the knowledge of Him by perception.

There is, however, one respect in which it strikes us that Dr. McCosh has passed a just stricture upon Hamilton's position, if that position has been rightly construed. The latter says that to the object of sense-perception—that is, the external thing perceived, elements are respectively contributed by the distant object, by the intervening medium, by the organ of sense, and by the mind perceiving. The perceived object is modified by the mind itself. If this means that the object is compounded jointly of material and mental elements, we cannot see how Hamilton can be saved from the criticism that he compromises the great principle of his school, of an immediate, presentative knowledge of external objects, and that he imperils his own doctrine of Natural Realism, that in the same act we are conscious of the duality of self and the external world, of an antithesis, as to existence, of mind and matter.

We must arrest this notice before we would desire. Dr. McCosh's critical reviews of philosophical systems are learned and acute; his discussion of the doctrine of Causation is very able and has our hearty concurrence. To the Aristotelic causes, the material, the efficient, the formal and the final, which he has finely expounded, he might with propriety have added the instrumental of the Schoolmen. With his rejection of Hamilton's account of the genesis of the Causal Judgment we cordially agree. We regret his gingerly handling of Evolution. There is no reason why that hypothesis should be entitled to philosophic consideration, while there lie across its path Harvey's great and undisproved law: *Omne vivum ex ovo*, and the law of Hybridism which, if not removed, Huxley has confessed will shatter the Darwinian doctrine. It is the Transmutability of Species, not generative propagation *intra speciem*, that is the essence of Evolution, and until science has established that fact, philosophic concession to its claims is as unwise as it is premature.

J. L. G.

ALEXANDER'S PROBLEMS OF PHILOSOPHY.

SOME PROBLEMS OF PHILOSOPHY. *By Archibald Alexander, Professor Philosophy in Columbia College.* New York: Charles Scribners' Sons: 1886.

This is a small volume of only 170 pages, but it condenses into a brief compass the results of extensive philosophical learning. Professor Alexander displays a profound insight into the problems which for ages have tasked the speculative intellect. It seems to have been his purpose to state them rather than to solve them, to array in their most formidable shape the doubts which attend them, so as to stimulate the effort to encounter and settle them. But he does in some instances allow himself to indulge in positive argumentation and the defence of

dogmatic conclusions. This mixed character of the work, partly sceptical (in the philosophical sense) and partly dogmatic warrants a few critical observations.

One can hardly avoid the impression that the Professor is not merely stating doubts abstracted from personal experience, but having a concrete influence upon his own speculations. And this supposition is legitimated by the significant utterance: "Self-consciousness cannot be aided in its observation by any instruments, and it is extremely liable to make mistakes, because its testimony cannot be *directly* corroborated." No wonder doubts exist, if consciousness itself is doubted. This raises the mighty question of the fundamental certitude of knowledge as grounded, in the last analysis, upon the trustworthiness of consciousness. It might fairly be presumed that, unless our constitution was the product of a malign intelligence, and was intended to be an organ of deceit, we should have been endowed with some power designed to be a true witness to facts. Such a power is consciousness. The antecedent presumption is confirmed by universal experience. But sin exists as a revolutionary force deranging our original constitution. May not consciousness have been rendered untrustworthy by this influence? We cannot suppose it. For, in the first place, the consciousness of our original constitution must be regarded as an essential element of that constitution. If not, it never could have known itself. It would have been non-existent to itself, which is absurd. But no essential elements of man's nature have been ruined by his fall into sin. They lay deep down beneath the storm which wrecked his separable qualities. In the second place, the God who made our nature and subjected us to his moral government by the conditions of our being, would have left himself without witness within us, had he permitted the veracity of consciousness to be destroyed or even impaired by sin. Apart from a supernatural and external revelation, it is the only testimony to the existence of the intellectual, æsthetical and moral standards in our nature which represent God and uphold his authority—the laws of truth in the intelligence, of duty in the conscience, and of worship in the affections. To have suffered that testimony to be obscured would have been to have permitted himself to be deprived of moral government and the vindication of his moral perfections. Worse than that, man could have had no certain proof of the divine existence itself. This world would have been a meaningless waif in the universe. In the third place, if the testimony of consciousness be doubtful, the quest for fundamental certainty, which is as irrepressible, as it is natural, would, *cæ necessitate*, require an appeal to another and a deeper consciousness; and so, as has often been urged, a regression of consciousnesses to infinity would exist, which is absurd. In the fourth place, as a great philosopher has said and our author himself acknowledges, if we doubt consciousness, we would be obliged to doubt that we doubt, since consciousness is the only informant as to the fact of the doubt. Why, then, raise

doubts as to philosophical problems at all? The problems, the doubts and ourselves would all, as to knowledge, be zero. In the fifth place, the practical consequences of refusing reliance upon the veracity of consciousness furnish a complete reduction to absurdity. If we cannot trust consciousness, we can trust nothing. The processes of human law, the relations of life, the business of men would all be impossible. Society would be disintegrated and universal anarchy prevail. The result would be nescience in the intellectual sphere, and nihilism in the real.

No, consciousness does not need to be "directly corroborated." It is ~~an~~ ^{an} *antip*ostipistic. It is its own corroboration, and the fundamental corroboration of everything else. Otherwise our nature would be a radical lie. Consciousness, in a normal condition of our faculties, never lies. It no more deceives, as the intellectual eye, than does the bodily eye. The difficulty is not in the spontaneous testimony of consciousness, but in the inferences derived from it, and the reflective construction of its data. The intellect may take error for truth, but the consciousness correctly affirms the fact of the mistake. The conscience may approve crime as duty, but the consciousness tells the truth about the dreadful substitution. It gives the facts as they are, just as we may be conscious of the truth that a witness lies. Further, it gives the standards of truth and duty. It informs men of them, and then informs them of their misapplication of those standards to the cases of experience. In short, it is the mirror in which every fact within us, and every fact without us which is in relation to our perception, is faithfully reflected. It thus grounds the fidelity of memory, and makes possible a judicial review of our conduct. We must stand by the trustworthiness of consciousness, or the bottom is knocked out of everything. Religion and morality, philosophy and science, law and government would otherwise become unmeaning terms.

The author maintains the true and important position, that there is ground which is common between theology and philosophy. The distinction is obvious between natural religion—the religion originally communicated to man as an unfallen being, and supernatural religion—the religion communicated to man as fallen. It is in the first of these spheres that theology and philosophy meet. Without the Bible, the theology of natural religion and philosophy would have been coincident. But the Bible takes up, clarifies and republishes the elements of natural religion, and besides creatively originates the redemptive contents of supernatural. When, then, theology and philosophy confront each other upon the common territory of natural truth, it ought to be considered a maxim that the latter should bow to the supremacy of the former; and that for two reasons. First, the right reason and conscience which man originally possessed have been clouded and impaired by sin. They err, consequently, in their judgments, and if there be a new and authoritative revelation from God, their aberrations ought to

be corrected by its standard. That such a revelation has been furnished is incontestably proved by Miracles. Secondly, the later revelation must take precedence of the former, upon the principle that the last decision of a supreme authority must regulate all preceding ones.

Now we hold that most of the ontological problems—that is, problems transcending the empirical data of consciousness—which have perplexed philosophy, and which Professor Alexander so ably emphasizes, have been definitely settled by the Bible. It leaves no doubt as to the question of Being. It reveals to faith an individual, spiritual, free, personal Being who is the *fons et origo* of all things. It settles the profound question of the Infinite. It reveals to faith an infinite Being—infinite in his intelligence, will and moral perfections. It takes for granted an aptitude in man's nature for the reception of such a revelation—a faith which, going beyond the negative concepts of thought, positively affirms the Infinite, not as the vague abstraction of the Absolutists, but as a personal, active, creative being, not identical with the universe, but originating, comprehending, sustaining, governing and overpassing it. It settles the question of the duality of spirit and matter, and therefore leaves no room for doubt whether Monism or Dualism be true. It settles the question of the finiteness of the world, by affirming its beginning, and so denies the old Greek doctrine of its eternity, a doctrine to which, after the lapse of ages, modern speculators, with all the lights of the boasted inductive philosophy, are drifting. What progress! They come back at last to Anaxagoras, Plato and Aristotle. Meanwhile the Bible has for millenniums been definitely denying that doctrine. It settles the vexed question of Cause. It explicitly affirms God to be the first cause of all things, and that man, in a derived and secondary sense, is a real and responsible cause of his own acts. And here in its testimony to the responsibility of man in connection with a moral law, a Judge and eternal sanctions, is to be found the secret of men's rejection of the Bible, which, as a solvent of their merely intellectual difficulties, they would gladly welcome.

Philosophy, then, has no right to say that such problems, however baffling they may be to the unaided intelligence of man, are insoluble problems. They are settled by the highest authority. She ought not still, like the ancient heathen thinkers, to "reel to and fro and stagger like a drunken man," for she is face to face on the same ground with an authoritative, divine revelation, which if listened to would resolve her doubts and settle her difficulties. She might still be at liberty to speculate as to the *How*, but the *That* has been divinely given. Devoutest gratitude is due to God for the unerring testimony of consciousness in its sphere, and for the unerring testimony of the Bible in that transcendent sphere into which consciousness cannot penetrate! We are not blind orphans crying for light, but are led by the hand of a Father to all necessary truth. To those who reject that proffered hand, it will at last be said, "Behold, ye despisers, and wonder and perish."

J. L. G.

NATURAL LAW IN THE SPIRITUAL WORLD.

NATURAL LAW IN THE SPIRITUAL WORLD, *By Henry Drummond, F. R. S. E., F. G. S.* New York: James Pott & Co., 12 Astor Place, 1886.

Also, a popular, low-priced edition, New York: John B. Alden, Publisher, 1887.

The present idolatry is the worship of *Natural Law*. Its priests cold-bloodedly expound its inexorableness in glittering sentences, and enforce the reception of its religion by gilded sophisms. All beings, acts, events and relations are bound upon its altar and sacrificed to its un pitying nature. There is no escape from its relentless pursuit, no rescue from its iron hand. No prayers are ever heard, no relief is ever afforded. Its wheels crush unmercifully, and they whirl everywhere. When troubles come—when sorrows sweep over the soul like drowning seas, and helpless hands are seen above the angry waters, and strangling cries are heard across the plunging waves—these ministers of Natural Law stand serenely on the shore, and preach across the roaring surge the gospel of the inevitable, the religion of the inexorable. And when these same sorrow-waves dash over their hearts and darken all their vision, a part of the Carmel-scene is re-enacted as these Baal priests call frantically upon their God for some pitying recognition, the extension of some helping hand. The Gospel of Natural Law is a miserable failure, a mere religion of bleak despair. In its system there is no place for the miracle, for a supernatural interference in order to salvation. Whatever happens, happens according to unfeeling, unbending Natural Law. It is as cheerless as despair, as black as night. It is the Gospel of unkindness, thoroughly unfriendly to a guilty and suffering race. It lets in the facts of sin and misery, but excludes grace and its scheme of redemption.

Prof. Drummond, whose book we are to review, although a professor in the Free Church College at Glasgow, a sworn Presbyterian and Calvinist, is a disciple of this school, an expounder and friend of this icy system. His admirers and sympathisers will repel the charge; but if they will follow us patiently to the end of this critique, they will at least admit that this is no *unfounded* slander. Prof. Drummond doubtless would himself deny that he falls under this accusation. But we have nothing to do with his consciousness. We have no means of knowing his heart. We are dealing with his book. If his book, fairly interpreted, puts him in this category, then he must accept the companionship, or repudiate his publication.

Upon the first appearance of this volume it received unstinted praise from many sources. Some notices placed it by the side of the Analogy of Bishop Butler, and declared it the equal of that masterly and immortal apologetic. A more reckless comparison was never made, a more erroneous conclusion was never reached. Prof. Drummond, as we shall presently see, expressly discarded the idea of *analogy* and contended

for the veritable *identity* of natural and spiritual laws. We believe the book is rapidly and justly depreciating in public opinion. We write to help it in its downward course.

The central doctrine of an author is the critical position of his book. It would be exceedingly unfair to judge his work by incidental utterances, though these may be important enough to receive special attention. It would also be unfair to make the argument by which he seeks to maintain his view the principal ground for reaching a judgment as to the merits of his performance, though the method of his reasoning might be striking. No volume is every syllable erroneous, and only One is every syllable true. In all human compositions something can be found to be approved, and also something to be disapproved. To reach a judgment, therefore, upon the question whether a book shall be praised or condemned, it is obviously a just method to try the doctrine which threads the volume, the doctrine for which it was written, the doctrine which all illustrations are designed to make clear, which all reasonings are designed to make firm. If this central and all-pervading doctrine can be successfully assailed, there is no occasion for examining the work in detail. If, on the other hand, that central idea, around which all illustrations, facts and arguments are grouped, can be successfully defended, the citadel of the author will at least stand, though very out-post fall into the hands of his assailants. This is a canon of criticism which is grounded in simple fairness.

We propose to pursue this method with the volume under review. Consequently the first task which this rule imposes, is to discover the author's key-position, state it, and then try its strength and soundness. This method relieves us of the necessity of articulating those subordinate statements which we may regard as true, and also of detailing those which may impress us as false. Many utterances of Prof. Drummond in this volume we heartily accord with, and regard as charmingly expressed. But that which mainly concerns us in this notice is that radical principle which undermines our theology, and in the interest of which he has written.

The book is avowedly iconoclastic. The conscious and declared aim of its author is to obliterate the old and valuable distinction between the Natural and the Supernatural. The attempt is bold, dashing and brilliant, nevertheless a failure. The author is a devout worshipper at the shrine of Natural Law. He endeavors to widen its sphere until every thing in heaven and earth, in philosophy and theology, in nature and grace is brought under its relentless sway. He knows nothing that is not its subject—no place where it does not reign. His book is a grand retreat from before the enemy—a brilliant surrender to the materialism of the day.

To support this charge we put in evidence, first of all, the title of the book—“*Natural Law in the Spiritual World.*” If the constitutional principles and legal forms of the United States were enforced

upon Great Britain, could any sane man deny that the British government would cease to be a monarchy after receiving these republican forms and rules? If the carpenter apply the laws of the circle in cutting a piece of plank, must it not of necessity be circular in shape, and not square? In like manner, after Prof. Drummond has discovered that the laws of the Natural world are the laws of the Spiritual world also, can any doubt that, to his mind at least, the two spheres are the same in kind? If Natural law reigns in the Spiritual world, then the Spiritual must be Natural.

Prof. Drummond does not shrink from this conclusion. In his Introduction, on the 6th page, he states his question so plainly that no one can misunderstand him, or imagine that he does not understand himself.

"The Natural laws then are great lines running not only through the world, but, as we now know, through the universe, reducing it like parallels of latitude to intelligent order. * * * * * Now the inquiry we propose to ourselves resolves itself into the simple question, Do these lines stop with what we call the natural sphere? Is it not possible that they may lead further? Is it probable that the Hand which ruled them gave up the work where most of all they were required? Did that Hand divide the world into two, a cosmos and a chaos, the higher being the chaos? With Nature as the symbol of all harmony and beauty that is known to man, must we still talk of the super-natural, not as a convenient word, but as a different order of world, where the Reign of Mystery supersedes the Reign of Law?"

Thus does Prof. Drummond state his question. He affirms that, unless Natural laws are run up into the Spiritual world, then the Spiritual world is a chaos, while the Natural world is a cosmos. He strangely ignores the fact that Spiritual laws in the Spiritual world would reduce it to order and beauty. The reader will notice that he expresses a desire to see the word *Supernatural* banished from the English vocabulary, except as a convenient term by which one phase of the Natural may be referred to. He wants its old theological and philosophical signification withdrawn from it. But he is apprehensive that he might be misunderstood; somebody may think he does not know, or has lost sight of, the distinction between *analogy* and *identity*, between *likeness* and *sameness*. So on the 11th page he writes:

"The position we have been led to take up is not that the Spiritual Laws are analogous to the Natural Laws, but that *they are the same laws*. It is not a question of analogy, but of *identity*. The Natural Laws are not the shadows or images of the Spiritual in the same sense as autumn is emblematical of decay, or the falling leaf of death. * * * * * The Laws of the invisible are the same Laws, projections of the natural, not supernatural."

The passage is quoted as it stands. Nothing in the context modifies it. He means what he says, that there is no distinction between the Natural and the Supernatural. On the 14th page he frets with im-

patience that current theological literature should still blindly cling to the old exploded distinction :

"In the recent literature of this whole region there nowhere seems any advance upon the position of 'Nature *and* the Supernatural.' All are agreed in speaking of Nature *and* the Supernatural. Nature *in* the Supernatural, so far as Laws are concerned, is still an unknown truth."

The proof is abundant. We are not mistaken. He does mean to reduce the Supernatural to the Natural. On the 6th page of his Preface he says:

"Is there not reason to believe that many of the laws of the Spiritual world, hitherto regarded as occupying an entirely separate province, are simply the Laws of the Natural world? Can we identify the Natural Laws or any one of them in the Spiritual sphere? That vague lines everywhere run through the Spiritual world is already beginning to be recognized. Is it possible to link them with those great lines running through the visible universe which we call Natural Laws, or are they fundamentally distinct? In a word, is the Supernatural natural or unnatural?"

"Is the Supernatural natural or unnatural?" Of course our author does not believe it to be "unnatural." It is the oratorical affirmative of the proposition that the Supernatural is natural. On page 17, he tells us how it filled him with delight when this truth first burst upon him. He "ran up the Natural Law as far it would go," and "at the top," "the appropriate doctrine burst into view in a single moment."

On page 22 of his Preface, he lets his readers into a secret—he tells them how Science and Religion can form a compact. Just let Religion surrender everything to Science, and there can be peace between the two. "What is required, therefore, to draw Science and Religion together again—for they began the centuries hand in hand—is the disclosure of the naturalness of the Supernatural."

Science itself has never had the impudence to propose a union upon such a basis. It was left for a professor of the Church to propose the ignominious surrender! It is he who would hand over our Theology to Science! It reminds one of Benedict Arnold of unenviable Revolutionary notoriety.

"For the sake of the general reader who may desire at once to pass to the practical application," Prof. Drummond analyses his Introduction, that he may give such a reader a condensed view of the principles which permeate his book. There he reveals his motive. His avowed aim is to erase the old line between the Natural and the Supernatural. In listing the points under the "Law of Continuity," he says:

"5. The existence of Laws in the Spiritual world other than Natural Laws (1) improbable, (2) unnecessary, (3) unknown.

6. The Spiritual not the projection upward of the Natural; but the Natural the projection downwards of the Spiritual."

In defending these propositions, Prof. Drummond employs the in-

ductive method of reasoning, and from *eleven* individual laws, which, in his opinion, are the same in both the Spiritual and Natural worlds, reaches, by a grand generalization, the conclusion that the existence of laws in the Spiritual world different from the Natural laws is "(1) improbable, (2) unnecessary, (3) unknown." The inductive method of argumentation is certainly legitimate, but our author employs it with a degree of recklessness that cannot be commended. He must be a man of great self-assurance and dogmatism thus to announce, without the slightest twinge of modesty, without the faintest emotion of diffidence, the sweeping conclusion that the reign of Natural law is universal from so few instances as the basis of his judgment. A grand world-wide and heaven-embracing generalization, dogmatically announced, from eleven cases! This induction would have been startlingly large in its conclusion if every instance had been unimpeachably to the point; but when it is remembered that it is by no means certain that a single one of these specified Natural laws exists in the Spiritual world, it amounts to reprehensible rashness thus to deduce so radical a conclusion from so few instances, and they themselves doubtful cases. The top of the argument is too big for the bottom.

1. Prof. Drummond first examines the subject of "*Biogenesis*," and announces that the laws of physical and spiritual life are identical. Upon this investigation he finds the Scriptural words—"He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life"—equal to the Latin maxim, *Omne vivum ex vivo*. If we should grant this equivalence, then no information concerning the nature of life in general, nor of spiritual life in particular, is gained. The silly theory of spontaneous generation would be exploded, and all that would be proved is that all life, whether natural or spiritual, must have a living origin. This is all that the establishment of what is attempted in the first chapter would yield. The identity of nothing is proved.

2. Prof. Drummond next searches into the subject of *Degeneration* for an instance in which the Natural and Spiritual are one and the same as to their laws. The Spiritual law expressed in the words—"How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation"—is said to be identical with the modern scientific doctrine of *Reversion to Type*. If the cultivated and refined rose be neglected by the horticulturist long enough, it will revert to the wild brier, from which, by human attention, it was developed. But if a sinner neglect the Gospel provision for his salvation, he does not return to a state of *guilt* and condemnation, but remains where he is. That state which preceded his present was the holy life in Paradise: surely by the *neglect of salvation* no sinner will revert *thither*. If the Christian neglect the means of grace, of course his piety will decline, but will he degenerate to the sinner he was before conversion? No Calvinist can teach such degeneration, such spiritual reversion, without breaking with his creed. But what is the type of the Christian, but the immaculate Son of God? He is the pattern to

which grace will eventually conform the saint. By neglect of the Gospel will the child of God revert to this type? If not, then the law of degeneration as it reigns in the Natural world is not identical with the law of Spiritual declension in the realm of grace, but only in some aspects analogous to that principle.

3. The third instance is discovered in the laws of *Growth*. "*Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow,*" for when you have discovered *how they grow*, you have also discovered *how the soul grows* in spirituality. But the lilies "toil not, neither do they spin;" without anxiety and care their seed awakes to life, without effort their flower blooms into loveliness, without weaving their leaves are woven, without toiling their tissues are spun—passively in the loom of nature they are woven into more than a Solomon-like glory. It is not so, however, with the sinner as he rises from the state of death and expands in Spiritual life. Heavy conviction burdens the soul before its conversion; effort, painful, continued, and conscious, must be made in order to rise in the Spiritual scale. No soul ever grew into beauty and usefulness by sitting quietly upon the moist, rich banks of this world. Men are not plants. There are only some points of likeness between the way they grow in spirituality and the way flowers grow into beauty and fragrance.

4. Prof. Drummond heads his fourth chapter *Death*, and reasons to show that the Spiritual truth set forth in the words of Paul—"To be carnally minded is death"—is but one special determination of that scientific law written in the words—*A falling out of correspondence with environment*. The great mistake here, as also in his fifth and sixth chapters on *Mortification* and *Eternal Life*, is an utterly false definition of life and death. Life, he calls "correspondence with environment," and death "a failure of correspondence with environment." According to this definition life and death are nothing more than relative terms. Is life nothing but a *relation*? Is death nothing but another *relation*? Is there in the sprouting and growth of the acorn nothing but the influence of circumstances, nothing but the surroundings of environment? The idea is ridiculous. Life is a *real energy*, a something which has entity and continuity. The seed has a germ, and the environment is the occasion upon which it develops or dies, and to identify the life and the environment, is to identify the cause and the occasion. Much more is this true of animal life, and it is truer still of mental and spiritual life. Life is a real power at work within and through the environment. It is perfectly conceivable that the life may be extinguished while the environment remains the same. It may be perfectly true that God's ordinary method of bringing about death is by destroying the correspondence with the environment, but this by no means proves that life and death are mere *relations*. Prof. Drummond's idea is, that Spiritual life is nothing but Natural life with an altered environment, with which, however, it is still in correspondence, and that Spiritual death is nothing but Natural

death with a changed environment, but out of correspondence with it all the same. The idea is nonsensical. Spiritual life is one kind of life different from Natural life, and working within and through its own environment. There may be some beautiful analogies between the two, but to say that they are both *mere relations* to different environments is the sheerest stuff.

But our limits will not allow us to go any further into these details. We have accomplished our purpose. We have been making the point that so radical a generalization as Prof. Drummond makes when he declares that the Supernatural is Natural, ought to be an induction from a multitude of the clearest instances, before it can be announced with positiveness and inculcated with dogmatism. He has relied upon *eleven* instances. We have examined six of them, and find them *doubtful*, if not certainly erroneous. We repeat our charge of rashness. Instead of publishing such a book in his youth, he ought to have kept it in *soak* to the close of life, when, perhaps, it would never have been printed at all.

Now let us close this critique by listing those distinctions which Prof. Drummond seeks to batter down. Some of them he avows; all of them are legitimate and necessary deductions.

I. He assails the old distinction between *Theology* and *Natural Science*. He quietly assumes the truth of evolution. It runs all through the volume. You feel it in every page. You read it in the very phraseology. You see it in his quotations. His companionship is with that school. It is the scarlet thread on which he strings all his shining beads. He no more stops to prove evolution than he stops to discuss the divinity of the Bible. As the Bible is the unquestioned source of the Spiritual laws, so Natural Science is the unquestioned source of the Natural laws; and if the laws and principles of one are identical with those of the other, why should not Natural Science and Theology—the systematic arrangements of identical laws—themselves be identical? Hence it was easy for him to propose that union of the two on the basis that Theology surrender to Natural Science. If the constitutions of Great Britain and the United States furnish the same principles and laws, why could not the two, without any straining, be called the *same* constitution? If Natural Science and Theology are conversant about the same laws, why should the two not be identified, so that the Science of Nature would become the Science of Religion?

II. Prof. Drummond moves his heavy batteries against that ancient and useful distinction, without which neither philosophy nor theology can get on, the *Natural* and the *Supernatural*. Seeing how strongly this distinction is entrenched in the mind and literature of the church, he impatiently wishes the word *Supernatural* could be banished from the language; and yet he fails to see how he could get on without it, and so resiles a little, and desires it to remain, not as expressing some substantial idea, but merely as a "convenient term." But if the Natu-

ral and Supernatural are identical, why this partiality for the Natural? Why not wish that the word *Natural* could be stricken from the dictionary? Why run up the Natural laws into the Spiritual world? Why not run down the Supernatural laws into the Natural world? Instead of making all Natural, why not make all Supernatural? There must be some reason for this partiality.

III. He seeks to obliterate the distinction between the *Natural* and the *Miraculous*. Does he not teach us that Natural law reigns everywhere—in earth, in heaven, in nature, in grace? But the Miracle is an infraction of Natural law—a something which happens not in accordance with the course of Nature, but contrary to it. The very essence of the Miracle is contranatural, and its evidential value in the system of grace cannot be too highly estimated. All evidences, whether external, internal or experimental, may be grouped into unity upon the Miracle. But if, under this unbending and universal Reign of Law of which Prof. Drummond and his school write, there is no place for the Miracle, then there is no place for revelation, which is a Miracle, no place for the Scheme of Grace which is essentially Miraculous. Destroy this distinction, and not only is it impossible to prove a Supernatural Revelation and a Supernatural Religion, but these things cannot exist. A Miracle in accordance with Natural law is no Miracle at all. We want such an interference with the course of Nature as will prove to us that there is a God above Nature, able and willing to pardon through the Atonement.

IV. Prof. Drummond wrote his book to destroy the distinction between the *Natural* and the *Spiritual*. If this were not his design, then he did not understand himself; hence the title of his volume. And when he has accomplished his end, what becomes of us? If under this kingdom there is no hope of pardon for guilty sinners, how can there be any hope under the kingdom of Grace, seeing the two are identical in their laws? If there is hope under the laws of Nature, where is there any necessity for a Spiritual kingdom? Is there any difference between our state by Nature and our state by Grace? If not, what becomes of the Bible doctrine of Regeneration? If there is, what becomes of the theory that Grace and Nature deal alike with sinners? If there is in the kingdom of Grace a provision for pardoning the guilty, then that provision is also in the kingdom of Nature, or it is not. If it is not in the realm of Nature, then the two kingdoms are not identical. If it is, then why may not the natural man discover it, and by it work out his own salvation independently of grace? "If by grace, then it is 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." Paul recognizes a distinction between "the law of the spirit of life" and "the law of sin and death." In his inspired judgment they are not identical.

We do not like the companions of Prof. Drummond. The promi-

nence of a whole page and italics are given to excerpts from the writings of Herbert Spencer, Leslie Stephen, Frederick Harrison, Emerson, Carlyle, Rousseau, and such like. He speaks "half in the speech of Ashdod," and with difficulty "in the Jews' language." We remember he has lately sided with Huxley against Gladstone.

R. A. WEBB.

BRIGG'S MESSIANIC PROPHECY.

MESSIANIC PROPHECY. The prediction of the Fulfillment of Redemption through the Messiah; a critical study of the Messianic passages of the Old Testament in the order of their development. *By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D., Davenport Professor of Hebrew and the cognate languages in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1886.

This book is a vindication of American Scholarship. It is our first great contribution to the science of Biblical Theology. No longer can it be said that the scholars of our country have done no original work in this department. The fugitive articles in newspapers and the sporadic studies in reviews are at last succeeded by a volume of permanent value. It is the only book in the English language that discusses Messianic Prophecy from the true point of view, and is moreover the most thorough and adequate treatment of the subject in any language. The author needs no introduction to the theological public. His stimulating book on *Biblical Study* and his scarcely less fresh and forceful work on *American Presbyterianism*, to say nothing of his fearless—or, as some are pleased to call it, his presumptuous and savage—attack upon the Revised Version, have made his name a familiar one of late, not to say formidable. His ability and scholarship, his courage and enthusiasm, are conceded by all. The uneasiness he has caused is not due to distrust of any of these qualities but rather of his temper and prudence, together with his anomalous critical attitude. The devout tone of the volume before us is re-assuring, as is also the candor and courtesy with which he considers competing views before discarding them. The style is always brisk and clear, at times hard and metallic, fitting his thought more like a coat-of-mail than a soft and flowing garment, and, though his conviction that "the truth will take care of itself," and that "it cannot be resisted by the blind inertia of conservatism or overcome by the mad rush of radicalism," seems to have had a grateful effect upon his style, it still lacks somewhat of grace, mellowness, and repose. Especially in the treatment of this transcendent theme there is need of glow rather than glitter, and sweetness as well as light.

We believe Dr. Briggs to be an earnest, conscientious and reverent student of God's Word, and we have no sympathy with the attempt to deprive him of a fair hearing, by classifying him with the destructive critics of Germany and Holland, but at the same time we differ with

him very widely in some of his principles and many of his conclusions. The bulk of the readers of this notice, while admitting that the historico-critical method of treatment is the true one, will no doubt dissent at almost every stage of Dr. Briggs's application of the method.

This volume is one of a projected series of three, which, according to a comprehensive plan, are designed to cover the whole subject; the first treating of the Messianic Prophecy of the Old Testament, the second to expound the Messianic idea of the New Testament, and the third to trace the history of the Messianic ideal in the Christian Church. The present volume, which, of course is mainly critical and exegetical, opens with a manly and luminous Preface, followed by two chapters of more or less unsatisfactory definition and philosophical discussion. Prophecy is broadly defined as religious instruction; Hebrew prophecy and some heathen prophecy are both genuine and have common features, e. g., the dream, the vision and the enlightened spiritual discernment are the three phases of both; nevertheless the extraordinary divine influences which used the psychological and physical conditions of human nature to determine the origin of Hebrew prophecy, and its organic development towards the accomplishment of a divine plan of redemption, give to that prophecy its distinguishing features; the distinction between prediction and prophecy is emphasized and elaborated; Messianic prophecy is the prediction of the completion of redemption through the Messiah—the author does not confine himself to the prophecies concerning a personal Messiah. To the foregoing statements there will be less objection than to much that follows, especially his too free application of the principles of lower criticism, higher criticism, and his peculiar theory of Hebrew poetry.

Dr. Briggs makes occasional use of the Revised Version, but in most cases gives his own translation of the passages discussed, and in so doing he also does what he berated the Revisers for not doing, that is, he radically reconstructs the text in numerous places, the LXX of course being his chief authority against the Massoretes. There is too much of this, and his own work disproves his contentions against the Revisers, and shows that they were right in declining to undertake the task of textual criticism in detail, as a preliminary to a popular revision. At the same time many of his emendations must commend themselves to the most careful judgment, and his arguments for the changes are always strait forward, strong, thorough, and scholar-like. Let any one turn, for instance, to his foot-note on "Shiloh," though in this very case we dissent from his conclusion.

But the objections to his work in lower criticism will be as nothing to the protest against his use of higher criticism. It is well known that, while Dr. Briggs holds a conservative position in theology, he is far in advance of most American scholars in his critical views. As Messianic prophecy is an advancing organism, it is necessary in the outset to arrange the prophecies in the order of their origin, and, as this involves

a judgment on the great questions of Old Testament criticism, we have another opportunity of observing his exact attitude. He accepts the analysis of the Pentateuch into four distinct documents, contending that "it is simply impossible that they should have come from the same original author," but he rejects with equal emphasis the radical and irreverent conclusions of the Wellhausen school. Further, he holds that just as tradition ascribed the Pentateuchal group of writings to Moses, so the Psalter, the Wisdom literature, and the anonymous exilic prophecies clustered around the other three greatest names of Hebrew literary history, and in his analysis of the last group he ascribes to the great unknown, not only Is. XL-LXVI, but also XIII-XIV and XXXIV-XXXV. He assigns Zech. IX-XI to the age of Hezekiah and Zech. XII-XIV to a post-exilic author other than Zechariah.

Our author applies his theory of Hebrew poetry with great confidence, and, in many cases, to such serious effect, that we think he owes it to his readers to explain it more fully than he has ever yet done, especially in view of the fact that his theory, so far as it is known, like those of many of his confident predecessors in discovery, has failed to command general approval.

The foot-notes are exceedingly rich, and of themselves make this an indispensable book to the critical student of the Scriptures. In fine, while it is open to very serious objection, as indicated above, it will do as much perhaps as any other book in the language to stimulate the right kind of Old Testament study.

W. W. MOORE.

THE LAND AND THE BOOK.

THE LAND AND THE BOOK; or Biblical Illustrations drawn from the Manners and Customs, the Scenes and Scenery of the Holy Land. By William M. Thomson, D. D., Forty-five years a Missionary in Syria and Palestine. Volume I. *Southern Palestine and Jerusalem*. (140 Illustrations and Maps.) Volume II. *Central Palestine and Phœnicia*. (130 Illustrations and Maps.) Volume III. *Lebanon and Beyond Jordan*. (147 Illustrations and Maps.) New York: Harper and Brothers.

In these sumptuous volumes the venerable author has given us the form of his great work in Palestine, which he doubtless wishes to be final. And it is a form worthy even of such a book as his. The oriental magnificence of the binding, the elegance of the letter-press, and the abundance and beauty of the illustrations furnish a setting that should satisfy the most fastidious bibliophile. Indeed, the olive-green ground of the cover, figured with crimson and gold, the cream-tinted pages, the large, clear type, and the profusion and splendor of the engravings give it somewhat the air of an *édition de luxe*. These features of course increase the cost, which would be a misfortune in the case of an indispensable work like this, unless the same pictorial and textual

contents could be bought in less gorgeous binding for less money. Happily this is true of *The Land and the Book*. The same greatly enlarged and embellished edition is advertised by the publishers for \$9.00, a price that suits people "of poverty and parts" much better than \$18.00, the catalogue price of the richly bound copy under review. We are told in the Preface that these costly illustrations are entirely new, prepared specially for this work under the author's superintendence, and in the main they bear out his claim that they are accurate and reliable in detail. But it is absurd to call the cut on p. 135, of the second volume, a picture of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the statement of the title is contradicted by the text, which correctly describes this celebrated manuscript as a "roll." Harper's Monthly may be excused for representing the ancient Jews as reading from books in modern binding, but such an anachronism is unpardonable in a work whose illustrations are "prepared from photographs taken by the author." Again, the picture of the Sheikh's ride upon the human pavement represents all the men composing "this living corduroy causeway" as lying with their heads in the same direction, although the text is particular to state that the first lay with head to the south, the second with feet to the south, and so on. These, however, are the only inaccuracies we have observed, and in a work which numbers its illustrations by hundreds this is a most creditable showing. Moreover, but one typographical error has caught our attention. This is remarkable. Over two thousand pages, thickly sprinkled with foreign words and unfamiliar names, and only one misprint! In short, the execution is well-nigh perfect in every particular, and it remains to notice but one more point under this head. Good maps of Palestine have been rare. These are full, exact, and distinct.

Whatever may be her shortcomings in other departments of Biblical learning, America has made a number of the most notable contributions to Sacred Geography and Antiquities. Dr. Robinson's *Biblical Researches*, which laid the foundation for all scientific exploration in the East, Lieut. Lynch's *Expedition to the Dead Sea and Jordan*, H. J. van Lennep's *Bible Lands*, Barclay's *City of the Great King*, Merrill's *East of the Jordan*, Trumbull's *Kadesh-Barnea*—all these are the results of American scholarship and enterprise, to say nothing of the more popular works of Schaff, Bartlett and Field. But the greatest of them all is *The Land and The Book*. Dr. Thomson combined in himself more qualifications for writing the classic work on Palestine than any other man of our times. Forty-five years a missionary in Syria, thoroughly acquainted with the topography of the country, perfectly familiar with the language and manners of the people, a careful observer, well trained in physical science, an accomplished theologian, of evangelical and sympathetic spirit, with the literature of his subject at his fingers' ends, recalling promptly every effective bit of descriptive poetry or devout meditation, his mind saturated with Scripture—it is no wonder

he should have written the book that displays most effectively the Palestinian drapery of revelation and places us in the very atmosphere of the Bible. His book is the golden mean. While it has neither the technical exactness of Robinson's "fundamental and monumental" work, the witchery of Dean Stanley's style, it combines more successfully than was ever done before the substantial qualities demanded by scholars, and the attractive presentation demanded by the bulk of Bible readers. It would be little exaggeration to say that there is no safer guide for the critical student, and no pleasanter companion for the popular reader. For ministers and other Bible teachers the book is simply a mine of wealth, as a glance at the index of subjects or the number of Scripture passages illustrated will indicate. The style is easy, frequently *neglige*, always genial, with an occasional glow of mild humor, the chief infelicity being the fictitious and mechanical dialogue, which suggests that of a child's reading book or a newspaper interview, though of course it is more dignified than either. His interlocutor is too shadowy. A dialogue without personality is necessarily rather confusing. It not only breaks the flow to no purpose, but it is sometimes hard to know whether the remarks are made by the author or by the indistinct *compagnon de voyage*, and, as the author is an authority and his companion is represented as a novice, this uncertainty becomes uncomfortable.

The volumes are unequal in point of interest. The first and second are "good all the way through." There is not a dull page in them. What could be more interesting or luminous, *e. g.* than the remarks on the wild artichoke of the Shephelah? If the Victorian Revisers had remembered the graphic description here given of the helpless plaything of the winds, surely they would not have retained "whirling dust" as a translation of *galgal* in Ps. 83: 13 and Ps. 17: 13, answering in parallelism as it does to "stubble." By the way, Dr. Thomson seems to have made no use of their work, as he might well have done in many cases. For instance, the Revisers say that Boaz put the barley into Ruth's "mantle" while he retains the misleading word "veil;" and worse yet, although we have hoped that no scholarly book would ever again mention that mysterious "fifth rib," under which Abner smote Asahel, and Joab smote Abner and Amassa, except to ridicule the rendering, here it is unchallenged. He also neglects two fine opportunities to reject the superstitious interpolation in John 5: 4 about the angel that troubled the water. Nor can it be argued in his defense that it is not his province to handle matters of translation and textual criticism, for he actually does deal with both, as when he substitutes "hot springs" for "mules" in Gen. 36: 24, or discusses the interchange of "Bethabara" and "Bethany," of "Gergesa" and "Gadara," or comments upon the misplaced account (Josh. 8) of the convocation of all Israel at Shechem, or explains that the impossible number of Beth-Shemites who were smitten for looking into the ark, is due to an error in transcription, so that instead of fifty thousand, we should read sev-

enty. He excels, too, in relieving difficulties by arranging explanatory facts, such as the overflowing of the Jordan at harvest, the seeming contradiction between Josh. 15 : 63 and Judges 1 : 8 about the capture of Jerusalem, the apparently excessive estimates of the population of Palestine, the non-recognition of David by Saul at the time of his duel with Goliah, &c. We think he is disposed to insist too much upon the apologetic force of many facts. While nothing could be truer, or finer, than his discussion of the natural basis of the teachings of Christ, or his proof that He was not the product, but the antithesis, of his age, at other times he seems to be the victim of that apologetic disease which we have inherited from the last century, and which has made many an Uzzah in our day. The chief value of such "corroborative" facts is not to vindicate but to expound the Bible. This is the era of critical study, not only for the polemic, but also for the minister. We do not mean that Dr. Thomson has lost sight of the interpretation in his zeal for apologetics; for, as we said before, there is no better aid to the mastery of the historical and geographical frame-work of revelation than *The Land and The Book*. It abounds also in felicitous illustrations of spiritual truth which are not allowed to degenerate into illegitimate allegories, such as the meditations from the two views from Olivet, Ezekiel's vision of the holy waters, the Jordan as an emblem of life, and leprosy as a type of sin. The description of leprosy is almost as powerful as that of Gen. Wallace in *Ben-Hur* and, for the exegete, far more instructive. His conjecture that this fearful malady was caused by self-propagating animalculæ is especially interesting in the light of Pasteur's recent experiments in bacterial disease.

Our author shows some disposition to press the argument from Oriental conservatism too far, and occasionally infers with unwarranted confidence, that because a certain custom now exists, it has always existed in the same form. This is notoriously precarious in matters of taste and culture. For instance, we must dissent from his estimate of harmony among the ancient Jews. It may be merely sentimental, but we cannot bring ourselves to believe that the music which exorcised the lunacy of Saul, and thrilled the devout heart of Israel, was like the semi-Voodooism of the modern Ashkenazim. Moreover, it is explicitly admitted in a later volume that "it is impossible to obtain an accurate knowledge of Biblical music." But the author offsets any seeming slur upon David's music, by his vindication of the character of his first command, and if any member of the Parliamentary party wittily dubbed "the Adullamites" by Mr. John Bright, had known the facts given here concerning David's band of distressed and discontented debtors, he could have turned the tables completely on the distinguished Commoner.

Dr. Thomson is in general very cautious. Hence, it is, perhaps, that he has not discarded decisively enough the exploded tradition that the Cities of the Plain were at the Southern end of the Dead Sea.

Hence, too, he does not commit himself in regard to the site of Kadesh-Barnea, though that question is now settled. There is more reason for hesitating between Tabor and Hermon, as the scene of the Transfiguration. And yet, notwithstanding his caution, and while declining to be drawn into the notorious controversies about the topography of Jerusalem, "from which *libera nos domine!*" he mentions among points that are certain, some, *e. g.* the valley of the Son of Hinnom, that are confidently disputed by the great archaeologist, A. H. Sayce, on the ground of the statements and implications of the Siloam Inscription. Of course the two *cubs de sac* in the subterranean aqueduct from the Fountain of the Virgin in the Pool of Siloam are no longer mysteries, and yet Dr. Thomson, though professing to give the latest information, quotes without comment Captain Warren's conjecture that they are choked up passages. After this it is all the more pleasant and surprising to find that he has given fresh and full information about the Empire of the Hittites.

The third volume is not so valuable as the others, for the obvious reason that it has less to do with the home and times of the Bible. The most interesting chapters are those on Damascus and Beirut, not only because they are the most prosperous cities of Syria, but because one of them is the ancient capital and perennial metropolis of the country, and the other, being the seat of the Syrian Protestant College and of the proposed School of Archaeology, is the true base of operations for all Americans who wish to make personal study of the Land of the Book. We cannot help wishing that this volume had given a much fuller account of the Moabite Stone, instead of so many uninteresting details about Roman ruins.

There ought to have been given in the outset a brief description of the four parallel longitudinal divisions of the country, and, afterwards, fuller proof that Palestine was "preconfigured to its history."

These exceptions, however, are, after all, but as spots upon the sun; and we agree with Mr. Spurgeon in applying to this unique work the words of our Saviour concerning a sword—he that hath not a copy, let him sell his garment and buy one.

W. W. MOORE.

VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

POPULAR LECTURES ON THEOLOGICAL THEMES, *By the Rev. Archibald Alexander Hodge, D. D., LL.D.*, late Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1887.

The themes discussed are, God—His Nature and Relations to the Universe; the Scripture Doctrine of Divine Providence; Miracles; the

Holy Scriptures—the Canon and Inspiration; Prayer and the Prayer Cure; the Trinity of Persons in the Godhead; Predestination; the Original State of Man; God's Covenants with Man—the Church; the Person of Christ; the Offices of Christ; the Kingly Office of Christ; the Kingdom of Christ; the Law of the Kingdom; Sanctification and the Good Works—Higher Life; the Sacraments—Baptism; the Lord's Supper; the State of Man after Death and the Resurrection; Final Rewards and Punishments.

The familiarity of the Theological public with the author's general views, as given in his *Outlines of Theology, the Atonement, Commentary on the Confession of Faith*, and in his lectures to the large classes which he trained, and which feel the impress of his masterly mind, renders a review of his volume unnecessary. It is simply a presentation in popular form of the salient features of the reformed faith, with an application of them, from time to time, to some of the questions which engage the minds of the masses, as the objection to prayer, the faith-cure, the higher life, second probation, etc. The lectures were first prepared for a class of ladies, living at Princeton, and were afterwards delivered, by request, in Philadelphia, to large audiences of both men and women. Their warm reception and the great demand for their repetition elsewhere indicated their value as a popular setting forth of the subjects treated. The volume is finely adapted to meet the wants of that large class of Christians who, while earnestly desiring to know the reason for their faith and to be able to convince the gainsayer, have no time for the technicalities of theology.

OLD FAITHS IN NEW LIGHT. *By Newman Smyth.*—Revised Edition. pp. 391. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1887.

THE FREEDOM OF FAITH. *By Theodore T. Munger*, author of "On the Threshold."—Fifteenth Edition. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1887.

PROGRESSIVE ORTHODOXY, a contribution to the Christian Interpretation of Christian Doctrines, *By the Editors of "The Andover Review,"* Professors in Andover Theological Seminary.—Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1887.

THE CONTINUITY OF CHRISTIAN THOUGHT, a Study of Modern Theology in the Light of its History, *By the Rev. A. V. G. Allen*, Professor in the Episcopal Theological School.—Cambridge: pp. 438. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

For an extended review, see pages 32 to 51. The books are marked in appearance, binding and typographical character by the excellence for which the Scribner's Sons and The Riverside Press are so deservedly noted, and in their contents are the most fascinating as well as strongest representatives of what is popularly called "The New Theology."

TREATISE UPON THE LIFE, WALK AND TRIUMPH OF FAITH. *By the Rev. W. Romaine, A. M.* Robert Carter & Brothers: New York.

This is a re-print of a well-known and valuable work. Its author was a popular divine and preacher of the Church of England during a great part of the last century. The book, as its name imports, is a collection of treatises upon Faith, exhibiting its nature and its regulative influence upon the life of the Christian. It is thoroughly Calvinistic in doctrine and evangelical in spirit. It is especially instructive and consolatory to those who struggle with doubts and fears, and their name is legion. The Messrs Carter have performed a good office in issuing this Christian Classic in a new and attractive form.

BAPTISM MODE-STUDIES. *By Herbert H Dawes, D. D.,* Staunton, Va., 24 mo. pp. 109. Richmond: Whittet & Shepperson, 15 cents.

This modest little book is written in so direct and simple a style, and is so crowded with cogent reasoning and exposition that it deserves a wide circulation. It is a discussion of the mode of baptism, and deals with the subject from every Biblical standpoint. Its conciseness, without sacrificing thoroughness, adapts it to general use by pastors, for setting at rest the question so often sprung in the minds of the people by the assiduous efforts of the immersion propagandists amongst us.

THE SPIRITS IN PRISON, AND OTHER STUDIES ON THE LIFE AFTER DEATH. *By E. H. Plumprce, D. D.,* Dean of Wells. New and Revised Edition. Fifth Thousand. New York: Thomas Whittaker. 1887.

We have to reserve a notice of this elaborate defense of the doctrine of Universal Restoration until our next number; merely making now the remark, that the author entirely misapprehends and misquotes Calvin's position in regard to the clause in the Apostle's Creed: "He descended into hell." The Reformer never taught that Christ after death descended into the place of torment, or that the passion of the cross was "followed by the endurance, for a few brief hours, of the torments of the lost." He held that Christ's last sufferings on earth were the pains of hell which he endured. See the passage cited by Dr. Plumprce, Institutes, B. ii, C, vvi.

THE TWO BOOKS OF NATURE AND REVELATION COLLATED. *By Geo. D. Armstrong, D. D., LL. D.,* Pastor First Presbyterian Church, Norfolk, Va., and formerly Professor in Washington and Lee University, Lexington. 12mo pp. 213. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1886.

A succinct treatise, suitable for popular use where scientific doubts prevail, and yet exhaustive enough in same particular to satisfy the demands of the day. The author does not claim to give a full discussion of the matters considered, but only to present them in popular form and language, an attempt justified by the methods of others, as Huxley, Clodd, Robertson Smith, who certainly did not believe that all scientific

questions could be intelligently decided by scientists alone. Dr. Armstrong deals forcibly and convincingly with the objections brought against Revelation, in the chapter on the Age of Man on Earth, Evolution, the Mosaic Cosmogony, the Pentateuch, Providence and Prayer. He shows the irrelevancy or inaccuracy of the facts upon which the skeptical theories or hypotheses are based, and by frequent and careful quotations from the writings of the leaders of the Evolution school manifests both fairness in dealing with his opponents and shrewdness in using their admissions. Altogether it is a book to be generally circulated.

COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW. *By John A. Broadus, D. D., LL. D.* Svo., pp. 610. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. \$2.25.

Nothing that Dr. Broadus puts forth is poor. This work, however, will, we think, be found to surpass all his previous publications. He proves himself to be a master of textual criticism, and his great learning and strong common sense have happily combined throughout to give a commentary which will at once take rank with the foremost. It is cast in such a mold, too, as to be useful to the unlearned as well as most accurately trained. It does not pretend to be anything but a denominational publication, but that will not hurt it, and indeed the other divisions of the Church will owe a debt of gratitude to the body which he so ably represents for giving them such a man and such a work. A full, critical notice is deserved and will be shortly given this valuable commentary.

WORD STUDIES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. *By Marvin R. Vincent, D. D.* Vol. 1. The Synoptic Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, Epistles of Peter, James and Jude. Roy. Svo., pp. 846. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons. 1887; \$4.00.

It is Dr. Vincent's effort, most happily accomplished, to occupy ground midway between an exegetical commentary and the lexicon, and to trace for ordinary English readers the force and richness which lie hidden in the original words. For such a task both accurate scholarship and extensive learning are necessary, and withal a sympathetic grasp of the needs and capacities of the untrained yet inquiring mind. These conditions are met in the author, of whom Dr. Crosby says, "as a Greek scholar, a clear thinker, a logical reasoner, Dr. Vincent is just the man to interest and edify the Church." The work is for the unlearned especially, but no student will fail to profit by its exposition of many words and phases in the New Testament. It is beautifully printed on board, as it deserves, and will obtain and hold a permanent place in Biblical literature.

THE PARABLES OF OUR SAVIOUR EXPOUNDED AND ILLUSTRATED. *By* Wm. M. Taylor, D.D. LL.D., Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City. Svo. pp. 445. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1886.

Having delivered the discourse which constitutes this volume before his congregation, it can be seen that Dr. Taylor's main object is homiletical. Hence the reader will find little of the critical apparatus in this book. This was evidently used, and well used, but was then hidden, and only the results given. The work, therefore, cannot be compared with Archbishop Trench's Notes on the Miracles, or Prof. Bruce's Parabolic Teachings of Christ, and other similar productions, though the author avails himself of all these. Like all Dr. Taylor's expositions, it is intensely practical, written in attractive, incisive style, and is full of suggestions to the reader and preacher. Dr. Taylor has a happy faculty of showing the results rather than the methods of study.

HOURS WITH THE BIBLE; OR, THE SCRIPTURES IN THE HEIGHT OF MODERN DISCOVERY AND KNOWLEDGE. *By* Cunningham Geikie, D. D., with Illustrations. 6 Volumes, small 8 vo. New York: John B. Alden, Publisher. 1886-1887. Price \$2.40.

That publisher deserves a vote of thanks, in the form of a liberal patronage by the public, who will issue a good book, in good style, and at a moderate price. Mr. Alden, who has been working for some time along this line, has doubtless heard from a multitude of precincts in the book-buyers' district, and found out that he is popular as a publisher, and that his popularity is profitable. In presenting this work of Dr. Geikie, he has fulfilled all these requirements and is fairly entitled to the sort of commendation he wants. No one will rise from the perusal of "Hours With The Bible" without confessing, with some degree of impulsiveness, that they have been pleasant and profitable "hours." The volumes consist of one hundred and sixteen Bible studies conducted "in the light of modern discovery and knowledge." They extend from Creation to Malachi. They exhibit Dr. Geikie, as did his philosophical "Life and Words of Christ," as an author of wide and varied information, conservative and prudent in his views, and evangelical in spirit.

A DAY IN CAPERNAUM. *By* Dr. Franz Delitzsch, Professor in the University of Leipzig. Translated from the Third German Edition, by Rev. George H. Schodde, Ph. D. 12mo. pp. 166. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1887.

The rare gifts and learning of Delitzsch never produced a sweeter, more touching work than this. It is a simple weaving together, in a life-like way, of many different events in the Saviour's life which took place in or near Capernaum, and associating with them in a most natural manner the ordinary surroundings and duties of home life in that day and land. In this way the author succeeds in giving a large

amount of information concerning the habits and customs of that age; without the readers being conscious of it, for all the while the one who figures in the scenes is the object from which the eye can scarcely be turned.

THE BIBLE WORK: THE OLD TESTAMENT.—Vol. 1. Gen., Chap. I, to Exod., Chap. XII. From the Creation to the Exodus. The Revised text arranged in sections; with comments selected from the choicest, most illuminating and helpful thought of the Christian centuries, taken from four hundred scholarly writers. *Prepared by J. Glentworth Butler, D. D.*—347 pages. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1887.

The compiler displays such skill and discrimination in the choice and arrangement of the selections which compose this work, and secures for them such remarkable continuity, and that the reader will regard him as being as worthy of praise as if the whole book were original. It is a vast storehouse, arranged in most orderly manner, of valuable testimony. The introduction is of about ninety pages, and treats of the Bible under such topics as these: Its Structure and Elements; Writers and Contents; Unity of Teaching and Theme; Divine—Human; Fitness to Man's Needs; Revelation; Interpretation; Preservation, &c. These subjects are presented in the same manner as the following commentary, as viewed and discussed by the soundest and ablest thinkers. The whole work is of value to the Bible student, not only as an intensely interesting, useful and comprehensive commentary, but also as a collating of the testimony of the best men of the world to the claims of the Pentateuch. Among the authors cited are Drs. James W. Alexander, Stuart Robinson, M. D. Hoge, Dabney, Armstrong, B. M. Palmer, and Thornwell. The citations from Stuart Robinson are from printed but unpublished Lectures on the Old Testament, sent for use in this work.

EXPOSITION OF PSALM CXIX, AS ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE CHARACTER AND EXERCISES OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE. *By the Rev. Charles Bridges, M. A.* From the seventeenth London Edition. Svo., pp. 296. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. \$1.75.

An old work, but none the less worthy of reprint. It is an exposition, but at the same time a thoroughly devotional one and suited to the Christian upon his knees as well as in the study. The writer's own words best expose his purpose. "He has desired that every page should be lighted up with the beam of the Sun of Righteousness. He has endeavored to illustrate true religion as the work of the Divine Spirit, grounded on the knowledge of Christ, advancing in communion with Him, and completed in the enjoyment of Him, and of the Father by Him." He has also aimed to elevate the standard of Christian privilege, as flowing immediately from Him, by giving such a Scriptural statement of the doctrine of assurance as may quicken the slothful to greater dil-

igence in their holy profession, and at the same time encourage the weak and fearful to a clearer apprehension of their present salvation."

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE—DISCOURSES UPON HOLY SCRIPTURES, *by Joseph Parker, D. D.*, minister of the City Temple, Holborn Viaduct, London. Vol. V. Joshua—Judges, 8vo, pp. 360. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1887.

Dr. Parker proposes to himself the tremendous task of preparing twenty-five volumes, covering the entire Bible. He is a man of prodigious energy and fertile mind and shrinks from no work, in which he thinks he can further the cause of religion. The present work is his alone, and hence all who admire his methods and views, may be sure that "the jewels are from his own caskets." His vigorous, incisive style makes all his productions readable. The permanent value and character of the present work cannot be judged until it is complete.

SERMONS AND ADDRESSES. *By John A. Broadus, DD., LL.D.*, Professor in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. Second Edition. Fourth Thousand. Baltimore: H. M. Wharton & Co. 1887.

The author of these able and eloquent discourses is acknowledged to be one of the first preachers of this age. They are evangelical and unctuous; and others besides members of the denomination of which he is an ornament will find them interesting and instructive.

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF LIVING DIVINES AND CHRISTIAN WORKERS OF ALL DENOMINATIONS IN EUROPE AND AMERICA. A supplement to the Schaff-Herzog Encycl.—of Religious Knowledge. *Edited by Rev. Philip Schaff, D. D., L. L. D., and Rev. Samuel Macauley Jackson, M. A.*; 271 pages. New York: Funk & Wagnalls; 1887.

A catalogue of contemporary divines, with brief biographical sketches and a list of their works. The Herzog Encyclopedia excluding living authors. This supplement will be found a valuable addition, and should be in the libraries of all who possess the original work. It is hoped that later editions will supply many serious omissions observed in the present volume.

EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA, NEW BERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, AND NEW BERN. *By Rev. L. C. Vass, D. D.* Richmond, Va.: Whittet & Shepperson. 1886. \$1.65.

A beautiful octavo, well printed and illustrated, and written in most agreeable style. In addition to the culture necessary to the thorough execution of his work, and the advantage of twenty years' residence and pastorate in the community and church whose career he traces, the writer evidently had much of the spirit of his ancestor who was one of the earliest ordained ministers to visit this section and give it the Ordinances of the Church. The work nowhere impresses the reader as a task performed, but as a privilege enthusiastically undertaken and happily

accomplished. The book consists practically of three parts: An account of the settlement and early religious character of Eastern North Carolina, a history of the founding of New Bern and of the people establishing it, and a history of Presbyterianism in New Bern. It is a valuable contribution to local historical record and will be appreciated not only by those who live near at hand, but by their descendants and friends in many other regions, and by all who find pleasure in studying the development of Church life in particular localities, where the influence of the truth can be traced as it were along individual lines.

JAMES HANNINGTON, D. D., F. L. S., F. R. G. S., FIRST BISHOP OF EASTERN EQUATORIAL AFRICA, A HISTORY OF HIS LIFE AND WORK, 1847-1885. *By F. C. Dawson, M. A., Oxon.* New York: Anson, D. F. Randolph & Co. 1887. \$2.00.

Hannington was not a great missionary, in the ordinary sense of the word. It is evident that he had no time to make himself proficient in the native languages. He preached but little to the people. He does not appear to have won any converts for Christ. In the highest elements, therefore, of the missionary career, he cannot be said to have achieved success. But he was a hero of the true Christian type. At the call of God, he gave up a delightful home in England, among a people deeply attached to him. He parted from his wife and four little children that he might go to Africa, and meet dangers that were hardly less than those of the battlefield. He endured hardships and sufferings such as fall to the lot of few men. He went forward when most men would have retreated, and he laid down his life at the last in trying to open a new highway for the Gospel to some of the darkest places of the dark continent. He has left behind him an influence not unlike that of Livingstone. He was a missionary explorer, who has invested the country which he traversed and on which he died, with the memory of a pure, consecrated, heroic life.

He went to Africa to reinforce the mission-station of the Church Missionary Society in Uganda, a district lying on the northwestern shore of Lake Victoria Nyanza, close by the mystic source of the Nile. His first attempt was to reach his destination by the usual route from Zanzibar, which passes, for the most part, through a pestilential region, to the southern shore of the lake, from which point boats are taken to Uganda. On this journey Hannington almost lost his life by disease, and after reaching the lake, was compelled to turn back in what seemed to be a dying condition; and it was not till he sought the bracing climate of his native land that he recovered.

The second time, with the full knowledge gained by experience of the dangers he was to meet, he bade farewell to those he loved, and went to the region of the shadow of death. After some interesting experience in the field, it occurred to him that he might reach Uganda by another route, which would lead directly to the northern shore of the lake, and might thus open a way free from the ghastly malarial

fever, which, on the lower road, had reduced the strength of the strongest man, and neutralized his bravest efforts. In the hope of accomplishing this, he organized a caravan, and moved forward to the Masai country, which lay between him and the source of the Nile. The Masai are a race of truculent African warriors, and it was among them Hannington apprehended his chief danger. He and his men did, indeed, make a narrow escape, as they passed among the fierce savages, who were eager to plunder the caravan. Nothing but the cool intrepidity and patient tact of Hannington saved him and his men. When he had passed this tribe, he thought his danger ended. He expected that in Uganda he would meet a hospitable reception from the people, whose kindness Stanley had proclaimed to the world, and who had welcomed missionaries to their shores. He knew not that he was marching into the lion's den. Mwanga, the dissolute young tyrant of Uganda, had come to hate the Christians, and fear all foreigners. Haunted by a vague fear of invasion by white men, he had recently heard the definite report that Germany had demanded of Seyyiel Barghash the port of Bogamoyo, and threatened to take it if he would not sell. In the approach of Hannington to the northern shore of Nyanza by the upper road, he saw an attempt of the white man to get into his domains, as he expressed it, by the back door. His fears were not lessened when the English missionaries near his court informed him that the foreigner who was approaching was an important personage. He determined that his kingdom should not be entered in this way. Messengers were sent to intercept Hannington. The noble Englishman was seized, cruelly dragged through the forest, imprisoned in a hut reeking with filth and vermin, and then led out to death. "In that supreme moment," says the biographer, "we have the happiness of knowing that the Bishop faced his destiny like a Christian and a man. As the soldiers, selected to murder him, closed around, he made one last use of that commanding mein which never failed to secure for him the respect of the worst savage. Drawing himself up, he looked around, and as they momentarily hesitated, with poised weapons, he spoke a few words, which graved themselves upon their memories, and which they afterwards repeated just as they were heard. He bade them tell the king that he was about to die for the Buganda, and that he had purchased the road to Buganda with his life. Then, as they still hesitated, he pointed to his own gun, which one of them discharged, and the great and noble spirit leapt forth from its broken house of clay, and entered, with exceeding joy, into the presence of the King."

In the little pocket diary which Hannington carried, were found such entries as the following: "Oh, that we might possess fair Kavi-rondo for Christ." "Feeling I was being dragged away to be murdered at a distance, I sang, 'Safe in the arms of Jesus,' and then laughed at the very agony of my situation." "Fearfully shaken—scarce power to hold up small Bible. Shall I live through it? My God, I am thine."

"Some loud yells and war cries arising outside the prison fence. I expected to be murdered, and simply turned over and said, 'Let the Lord do as He sees fit.'" "Eighth days' prison. I can hear no news, but was held up by Psalm xxx., which came with great power. A hyena howled near me last night, smelling a sick man, but I hope it is not to have me yet." This is the last entry in the diary. The ink may still have been wet when his guards led him forth to die.

THE CRISIS OF MISSIONS, OR THE VOICE OUT OF THE CLOUD. *By Arthur T. Pierson, D. D.*, author of the "Gospel Flooding the World," etc. New York. Robert Carter & Bros. 1886.

The very book for the Pastor. With its valuable suggestions and information, the Monthly Concert will become a pleasure. Few busy men have the time to study the elaborate treatises, and examine the voluminous histories of heathen lands. The author has done this for them, and the only difficulty in using the material he gives will be the constant tendency to adopt his strikingly vivid descriptions; for after reading them, one can scarcely think of the subjects he treats except in his words and ideas. The book is a presentation of the facts of Missions, as well as the underlying principles. These words of the author are both indicative of his delightful style but also of the object of his book: "The logic of events adds its mighty demonstration, that the pillar of God still moves before His people. * * Facts are the fingers of God. To know the facts of modern missions is the necessary condition of intelligent interest. * * * A fire may be fanned with wind, but it must be fed with fuel; and facts are the fuel of this sacred flame, to be gathered, then kindled, by God's Spirit, and then scattered as burning brands, to be as live coals elsewhere."

THE DRAGON, IMAGE AND DEMON; OR, THE THREE RELIGIONS OF CHINA, CONFUCIANISM, BUDDHISM AND TAOISM, giving an account of the Mythology, Idolatry, and Demonolatry of the Chinese. *By Hampton C. DuBose*, fourteen years a Missionary at Soochow. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1887. \$2.00.

This beautiful, handsomely illustrated book should be in every house, especially in the church which Mr. DuBose represents in the foreign-field. Like his stirring lectures and addresses, of which it is an enlargement under further study, it will be an inspiration to all who are interested in Missionary enterprises, and will give such information concerning the religious condition of that Empire which embraces nearly one-fourth of the world's inhabitants as can rarely be had in such condensed and attractive form.

The Author is no dreamer, but a worker. He lives and toils in the presence of what he describes. His knowledge of the subjects he treats is not derived from encyclopedias, but "drawn from native wells." His estimate of the practical workings and effects of the false religions he tells of, comes from personal contact with them, and resistance of

their influence over the minds and hearts of the millions of Chinese. The object of the writer, well sustained to the end of the book, is to present such a view of China as will give a practical impetus to the work of Missions there. He touchingly says in the preface: "I write in a plain style, so that boys may understand, as well as men. When six years old my father gave me a little red picture book about Rev. R. Moffatt, in Africa. It took full possession of my soul, and in the 'log parsonage' I resolved to go to the heathen. I trust that this book will follow every Christian boy who reads it, like a policeman!"

The title conveys so much that little need be said of the contents of the book. It is an account of the three systems of religion which prevail in China. To the student, the first chapter, concerning the relation of the three religions, will be most interesting. The remarkable manner in which they exist, side by side, are practically supported by the State, exalt, in many cases, the same idols, nay, are adhered to by the same individuals, and are woven into each other in the practical worship of the people, while as systems they remain entirely distinct, is admirably explained in these words: "Confucianism is based on morality, Buddhism on idolatry, and Taoism on superstition. The first is man-worship, the second image-worship, and the third spirit-worship. From another point of view the orthodox faith is characterized by an absence of worship, the Indian faith by the worship of the seen, and the native faith by the fear of the unseen. Confucianism deals with the dead past, Buddhism with the changing future, while Taoism is occupied with the evils of the present." The relation of the three religions is also explained from the stand-point of philosophy and of economics in an equally practical way.

SIAM, OR THE HEART OF FARTHER INDIA, *By Mary Lovina Cort*, a resident of Siam.—New York: Anson D. F. Randolph. \$1.75.

Another Missionary's book, and containing a great store of interesting facts concerning the land it describes. A woman's eye sees much, in the details of foreign life and in the customs of a strange people which would escape the notice of a man. In this account of Siam, it was a keener-sighted eye than usual, however, and at the same time a finer power of accurate and vivid description than one usually follows. The interest of Southern Presbyterians will be awakened by reading in these pages an account of the work of Dr. Cheek of North Carolina, a medical missionary in the same kingdom, and not far away, in the Loos country, is the scene of the self-denying toil of our own McGilvary.

BIBLE WARNINGS. *Sermons to Children. By the Rev. Richard Newton, D. D.* 384 pp. New York: Robert Carter & Bros.; 1886.

The recent death of Dr. Newton, the prince of preachers to children, will add a peculiar interest to this volume of fifteen sermons, all of them Warnings from the Bible. They are characterized by the same

fervour, aptness, beauty of illustration and evangelical tone which are found in the author's entire series to children.

THE FAMILY, an Historical and Social Study. *By Charles Franklin Thwing and Carrie F. Butler Thwing.* Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1887. Small 8vo., pp. 213.

The book contains twelve chapters and an appendix. These trace the pre-historic family, the family among Greeks, Romans and Jews, the family in the first Christian centuries, the family in the Middle Ages, the family and the Church, Catholic and Protestant, the family as an institution divine and human, the family as a basis of social order, modern divorce laws, etc. The authors deal with the corruptions springing from celibacy, polygamy, communism, and easy divorce with an unsparing hand and give an array of facts and illustrations drawn from history, which it would be well to study. The growing looseness with which the marriage tie is held, the alarming increase of divorces, especially in New England, and the decadence of scriptural views concerning the family imperatively demand just such treatises as this. It is a wholesome book, a breath of pure, fresh, sweet air in an atmosphere that has become sadly polluted.

HEALTH MANUALS FOR TEACHERS. Five Vols. Sleep and Sleeplessness. The Secret of a Clear Head. How to Make the Best of Life. The Secret of a Good Memory. Common Mind Troubles. *By J. Mortimer Cranville.* 18mo; about 100 p. each. Boston: Interstate Publishing Co.

One or two of these little volumes have had a wide circulation and called for the preparation of the others. They are eminently practical and at the same time attractive treatises upon the subjects considered. The growing interest in hygiene, and especially as observed in our schools, has never received a better practical impulse than they are adapted to impart.

LIFE AMONG THE GERMANS, *By Emma Louise Parry.*—Boston: D. Lothrop & Co. \$1 50.

This is scarcely a book for notice in a theological review, but it is so simple and beautiful an account of the home-life of the Germans and is so pure and healthful in tone that it deserves special commendation. It is a book that will interest any one who will read it. The author made herself for a time one of the people. She dwelt among them, lived in their families and spoke their language, entered into their ways of living, and by so doing learned to understand their spirit and traits of character to an extent that could have been done in no other way.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE PULPIT COMMENTARY. *Edited by Rev. Canon H. D. M. Spence, M. A., and the Rev. Joseph H. Exell.* Eighth English Edition. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co.; London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. Per vol. \$2.00.
- THE MYSTERY OF GOD. A Consideration of Some Intellectual Hinderances to Faith. *By T. Vincent Tymms.* Second Edition. Small 8vo. pp. 358. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1887. \$2.50.
- HAM-MISHKAN, THE WONDERFUL TENT. An account of the structure, signification, and spiritual lessons of the Mosaic Tabernacle, erected in the wilderness of Sinai. *By Rev. D. A. Randall, D. D.* 12mo. pp. 465. Cincinnati: Robert Clark & Co. 1886. \$2.00.
- HAIFA, OR LIFE IN MODERN PALESTINE. *By Lawrence Oliphant, author of "The Land of Gilead," etc.* Edited, with introduction, by Chas. A. Dana. Small 8vo. pp. 369. New York: Harper & Bros. 1887.
- FATHER ALDUR. A Water Story. *By Agnes Giberne.* pp. 376. Beautifully Illustrated. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1887.
- THE BIBLE IN SPAIN, or, The Journeys, Adventures and Imprisonments of an Englishman in an Attempt to Circulate the Scriptures on the Peninsula. *By George Barrow.* Thirteenth Edition. 8vo. pp. 232, and bound with the same, and by the same author: *The Zineali*, an account of the Gypsies of Spain. pp. 148. Both books \$1.75. New York: Robert Carter & Bros.
- EVOLUTION AND CHRISTIANITY, or, An Answer to the Development of Infidelity of Modern Times. *By Benj. F. Tappan, D. D., LL.D., formerly President of Genesee College, etc.* pp. 512. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1885. \$1.50.
- EVOLUTION AND RELIGION. *By Henry Ward Beecher.* Part I. pp. 145. New York: Fords, Howard & Hulbert. 50 cents. Ditto Part II. pp. 440. \$1.00.
- THE NEW PSYCHIC STUDIES, in their Relation to Christian Thought. *By Franklin Johnson, D. D.* pp. 91. Funk & Wagnalls. 1887.
- NEARER TO JESUS. Memorials of Robert Walter Fergus. *By his mother.* With a prefatory notice by Rev. J. Oswald Dykes. From the 5th thousand of the Glasgow edition. 18mo. pp. 248. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 75 cents.
- BEDSIDE POETRY. A Parent's Assistant in Moral Discipline. *Compiled by Wendell P. Garrison.* Boston: D. Lothrop Co. 75 cents.
- THE OBELISK VOICES; or, The Inner Facings of the Washington Monument, with their Lessons. *By Henry B. Carrington, U. S. A.* pp. 47. Paper. Lee & Shepard. 1887. 50 cents.
- JUANITA. A Romance of Real Life in Cuba Fifty Years Ago. *By Mary Mann.* pp. 436. Boston: D. Lothrop Co. 1887.

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 2.—OCTOBER, 1887.

I. SPURIOUS RELIGIOUS EXCITEMENTS.

It is believed all thoughtful Christians are alive to the fact that religious excitements, which consist of temporary movements of the emotions devoid of any saving operation of the Truth on the reason and conscience, are equally frequent and mischievous in America. This judgment not seldom expresses itself in very queer and inaccurate forms. Thus: good brethren write to the religious journals grateful accounts of a work of grace in their charges, and tell the Editor that "they are happy to say, the work has been purely rational and quiet, and attended by not the slightest excitement." They forget that the efficacious (not possibly, tempestuous) movement of the feelings is just as essential a part of a true religious experience, as the illumination of the intellect by divine truth; for indeed, there is no such thing as the implantation of practical principle, or the right decisions of the will, without feeling. In estimating a work of divine grace as genuine, we should rather ask ourselves whether the right feelings are excited; and excited by divine cause. If so, we need not fear the most intense excitement. This misconception is parallel to the one uttered by public speakers, when they assure hearers that, designing to show them the respect due to rational beings, and to use the honesty suitable to true patriots, "they shall make no appeal to their feelings, but address themselves only to their understandings." This is virtually impossi-

ble. On all practical subjects, truth is only influential as it stimulates some practical feeling. There is no logical appeal of the rhetorical nature which does not include and appeal to feeling. Does the orator proclaim, for instance, that waving all appeals to passion, he will only address his hearer's intellects to prove what is for their interest, or "for their honor," or "for the good of their country?" What is he really doing except appealing to the emotions of desire for wealth, or love of applause, or patriotism?

In the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, 1884, I presented a discussion on the psychology of the feelings. I wish to recall a few of the fundamental positions there established. The function of *feeling* is as essential to the human spirit, and as ever present as the function of cognition. The two are ever combined, as the heat-rays and the light-rays are intermingled in the sunbeams. But the consciousness intuitively recognizes the difference of the two functions, so that it is superfluous to define them. "Feeling is the temperature of thought." The same kind of feeling may differ in degree of intensity, as the heat-ray in the brilliant winter sunbeam differs from that in the fiery glare of the "dog days;" but the thermometer shows there is still caloric in the most wintry sunbeam, and even in the block of crystal ice. So a human spirit is never devoid of some degree of that feeling which the truth then engaging the intelligence tends to excite. No object is or can be inducement to volition unless it be apprehended by the soul as being both in the category of the true and of the good. But, that function of soul by which the object is taken as a good, is desire, an act of feeling. Whence it follows, that an element of feeling is as essential to every rational volition as an act of cognition. The truly different sorts of feelings were distinguished and classified. But this all important division of them was seen to be into the passions, and the active feelings; between those impressions upon the sensibility of the soul, caused from without, and in receiving which the soul is itself passive, and its spontaneity has no self-determining power (as pain, panic, sympathy) on the one hand, and on the other hand those subjective feelings which, while occasioned from without, are self-deter-

mined by the spontaneity from within and in which the soul is essentially active, (as desire, benevolence, ambition, etc.)

It may be asked here: Does the writer intend to rest the authority of his distinction between genuine and spurious religious experiences on a human psychology? By no means. The Scriptures are the only sure source of this discrimination. Its declarations, such as that sanctification is only by revealed truth, its anthropology, its doctrine of redemption, and its examples of saving conversions, give the faithful student full guidance as to the conduct of gospel work, and the separation of the stony-ground hearers from the true. But it is claimed that the psychology outlined above is the psychology of the Bible. It is that theory of man's powers everywhere assumed and postulated in Scripture. It gives that theory of human action on which all the instances, the narratives, and the precepts of Scripture ground themselves. Hence these mental laws and facts are of use, not as the mistress, but as the hand-maid of Scripture, to explain and illustrate those cautions which the Bible gives us.

One inference is simple and clear. The excitement of mere sensibilities, however strong or frequent, can offer no evidence whatever of a sanctified state. The soul is passive in them; their efficient cause is objective. An instinctive susceptibility in the soul provides the only condition requisite for their rise when the outward cause is applied. Hence the excitement of these sensibilities is no more evidence of change or rectification in the free agency, than the shivering of the winter wayfarer's limbs when wet by the storms. Now the doctrine of Scripture is that man's spontaneity is, in his natural state, wholly disinclined and made opposite (yet freely) to godliness, so that he has no ability of will for any spiritual act pertaining to salvation. But it is promised that, in regeneration, God's people shall be willing in the day of his power. He so enlightens their minds in the knowledge of Christ, and renews their wills, that they are both persuaded and enabled to embrace Jesus Christ. The very spontaneity is revolutionized. Now the stimulation of merely passive sensibilities, in which the will has no causal part, can never be evidence of that saving change. No evidence of it

appears, until the subjective desires and the will exhibit their change to the new direction. That fear, that selfish joy, that hope, that sympathy are excited, proves nothing. But when the soul freely exercises a "hungering and thirsting after righteousness," hatred of sin, desire of God's favour, love of his truth, zeal for his honor: this evinces the sanctifying revolution.

Shall we conclude then that the excitement of the passive sensibilities by the pastor is wholly useless? This class of feelings presents the occasion (not the causes) for the rise of the subjective and spontaneous emotions. This is all. It is this connection which so often misleads the mental analyst into a confusion of the two classes of feelings. The efficient cause may be restrained from acting by the absence of the necessary occasion: this is true. But it is equally true, that the occasion, in the absence of the efficient cause, is powerless to leaving any effect. If the pastor aims to move the sensibilities merely for the purpose of gaining the attention of the soul to saving truth, and presents that truth faithfully the moment his impression is made, he does well. If he makes these sensibilities an end, instead of a means, he is mischievously abusing his people's souls.

People are ever prone to think that they are feeling religiously because they have feelings round about religion. Their sensibilities have been aroused in connection with death and eternity, for instance; so, as these are religious topics, they suppose they are growing quite religious. The simplest way to clear away these perilous illusions is, to ask: What emotions, connected with religious topics as their occasions, are natural to the carnal man? These may be said to be, first, the emotions of taste, or the mental-æsthetic; second, the involuntary moral emotion of self-blame, or remorse; third, the natural self-interested emotions of fear and hope, and desire of future security and enjoyment; and fourth, the emotion of instinctive sympathy. The following conclusions concerning these feelings need only to be stated, in order to be admitted.

The æsthetic feeling may be as naturally stimulated by the features of sublimity and beauty of God's natural attributes, and of the gospel-story, as by a cataract, an ocean, a starlit sky, or a

Shakespearean hero. Now it is most obvious that the movements of taste, in these latter cases, carry no moral imperative whatever. They have no more power to reform the will than strains of music, or odors of flowers. Yet how many souls are deluded into supposing that they love God, duty, and gospel-truth, because these æsthetic sensibilities are stimulated in connection with such topics!

When the ethical reason pronounces its judgment of wrongfulness upon any action or principle, this may be attended by the feeling of moral reprehension. If it is one's own action which must be condemned, the feeling takes on the more pungent form of remorse. But this feeling is no function of the soul's spontaneity. Its rise is purely involuntary; its natural effect is to be the penal retribution, and not the restrainer of sin.

How completely this feeling is disconnected with the correct regulation or reformation of the will, appears from this: that the transgressor's will is usually striving with all his might, not to feel the remorse, or to forget it, while conscience makes him feel it in spite of himself. A Judas felt it most keenly while he rushed to self-destruction. It is the most prevalent emotion of hell, which gives us the crowning proof that it has no power to purify the heart. But many transgressors are persuaded that they exercise repentance because they feel remorse for conscious sins. Man's native selfishness is all-sufficient to make him desire the pleasurable, or natural good, and fear and shun the painful, or natural evils. Those desires and aversions with the fears and hopes which expectation suggests, and the corresponding terrors and joys of anticipation, may be stimulated by any natural good or evil, more or less remote, the conception of which occupies the mental attention distinctly. Just as the thoughtless child dreads the lash that is expected in the next moment, and the more thoughtful person dreads the lash of next week or next month; just so naturally a carnal man, who is intellectually convinced of his immortality and identity, may dread the pains or rejoice in the fancied pleasures of another life. He may fear death, not only with the unreasoning instinct of the brute, but also with the rational dread (rational, though purely selfish) of its penal

consequences. Selfishness, with awakened attention and mental conviction, suffices fully for all this. In all these feelings there is nothing one whit more characteristic of a new heart, or more controlling of the evil will, than in the wicked sensualist's dread of the colic which may follow his excess, or the determined outlaw's fear of the sheriff. Yet how many deluded souls fancy that, because they feel these selfish fears or joys in connection with death and judgment, they are becoming strongly religious. And unfortunately they are encouraged by multitudes of preachers of the gospel to make this fatal mistake. Turretin has distinguished the truth here by a single pair of phrases, as by a beam of sunlight. He says: Whereas the stony-ground believer embraces Christ solely *pro bono jucundo*; the gospel offers him mainly *pro bono honesto*. True faith desires and embraces Christ chiefly as a Saviour from sin and pollution. The false believer embraces him only as a Saviour from suffering and punishment. Holy Scripture is always careful to represent Christ in the former light. His "name is Jesus because he saves his people from their sins." He gives himself to redeem us from all iniquity, and to purify us unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works. But preachers so prevalently paint the gospel as God's method of delivering sinners from penal pains and bestowing the enjoyment of a sensuous paradise, and the guilty selfishness of hearers is so exclusively exercised about selfish deliverance, that we apprehend most men are permitted to conceive of the gospel remedy solely as a *bonum jucundum*: a provision for simply procuring their selfish advantage. It is true that if asked: Is not the gospel to make you good also? many of them might reply with a listless "Yes." They have a vague apprehension that their grasping the *bonum jucundum* is somehow conditioned on their becoming better; and they suppose they are willing to accept this uninteresting formality for the sake of the enjoyment that follows it; just as the epicure tolerates the tedious grace for the sake of the dainties which are to come after at the feast. But were one to tell this gourmand, that the grace was the real chief-end of the feast, and the eating a subordinate incident thereto, he would be ex-

ceedingly amazed and incredulous. Such would also be the feeling of many subjects of modern revivals, if the Bible conception of redemption were forced on their minds. Hence, one great reform in our preaching must be, to return to the scriptural presentation of the gospel in this particular. A grand reform is needed here. This grovelling, utilitarian conception of redemption must be banished. Men must be taught that the blessing is only for them "who hunger and thirst after righteousness," not for those who selfishly desire to grasp enjoyment only and to shun pain. They must be made to see clearly that such a concern does not in the least differentiate them from reprobate souls in hell, or hardened felons on earth: not even from the thievish fox caught in a trap.

The fourth and the most deceptive natural feeling* of the carnal man is instinctive sympathy. It will be necessary to state the nature and conditions of this feeling. First: it belongs to the passive sensibilities, not to the spontaneous appetencies. It is purely instinctive, appearing as powerfully in animals as in men. Witness the excitement of a flock of birds over the cries of a single comrade, and the "stampede" of a herd of oxen. Next: it is even in man an unintelligent feeling in this sense: that if the emotion of another be merely seen and heard, sympathy is propagated, although the sympathizer understands nothing of the cause of the feeling he witnesses. We come upon a child, who is an utter stranger, weeping: we share the sympathetic saddening before he has had time to tell us what causes his tears. We enter a room where our friends are drowned in laughter. Before we have asked the question, "Friends, what is the jest?" we find ourselves smiling. We see two strangers afar off exchanging blows; we feel the excitement stimulating us to run thither, while ignorant of the quarrel. Sympathy is in its rise unintelligent and instinctive. The only condition requisite for it, is the beholding of the feeling in a fellow. Third: this law of feeling extends to all the emotions natural to man. We so often connect the word with the emotion of grief, that we overlook its applicability to other feelings, and we forget even its etymology: *παθος*, in Greek philosophy,

did not mean grief only, but every exercise of feeling; so *συμπαθεῖν* is to share by spiritual contagion any *παθος* we witness in our fellows. We sympathize with merriment, joy, fear, anger, hope, benevolence, moral approbation, courage, panic, just as truly as with grief. Fourth: the nature of the emotion witnessed determines, without any volition of our own, the nature of the feeling injected into us. Sympathy with joy is a lesser joy. The glow is that of the secondary rainbow reflecting, but usually in a weaker degree, precisely the tints of the primary arch.

The reader is now prepared to admit these conclusions: that sympathy may infect men with a phase of religious emotion, as of any other; that the sympathetic emotions, though thus related as to their source, have no spiritual character whatever in themselves—for they are involuntary, they are unintelligent, they are passive effects on an instinctive sensibility, giving no expression to the will, and not regulating it nor regulated by it. The animal feels these sympathies as really as the man.

The reader should notice that these propositions are asserted only of the simple sensibility, the immediate reflex of strong feeling witnessed. It is not denied that the capacity of sympathy is a social trait implanted by a wise Creator for practical purposes. It is the instrumental occasion of many useful results. Thus, upon the excitement of sympathy with grief follow the appetency to succour the sufferer, and the benevolent volition. The first is the occasion, not the cause, of the second. On our natural sympathy with the actions we witness, follows our impulse to imitate. But imitation is the great lever of education. So sympathy has been called the sacred "orator's right arm." Let us understand precisely what it could and cannot do in gaining lodgment for divine truth in the sinner's soul. This truth and this alone is the instrument of sanctification. To Presbyterians the demonstration of this is superfluous. It is impossible for the truth to work sanctification except as it is intelligently received into the mind. Light must reach the heart through the understanding, for the soul only feels healthily according as it sees. To the inattentive mind the truth being unheard, is as though it were not. Hence it is of prime importance to awaken the list-

less attention. Whatever innocently does this is therefore a useful preliminary instrument for applying the truth. This, sympathy aids to effect. The emotion of the orator arouses the slumbering attention of the sinner, and temporarily wins his ear for the sacred Word. Another influence of awakened sympathy may also be conceded. By one application of the law of association, the warmth of a feeling existing in the mind is communicated temporarily to any object co-existing with it in the mind; though that object be in itself indifferent to that soul. The stone dropped into the heated furnace is not combustible, is no source of caloric; but by contact it imbibes some of the heat which flames there, and remains hot for a little time after it is drawn out. So the mind warmed with emotion, either original or sympathetic, is a furnace which gives some of its warmth to truth or concepts co-existing in it, otherwise cold and indifferent to it. But the warmth is merely temporary.

The whole use, then, of the sympathetic excitement is to catch the attention and warm it. But it is the truth thus lodged in the attention that must do the whole work of sanctification. Here is the all important discrimination. Attention, sympathetic warmth, are merely a preparation for casting in the seed of the Word. The preacher who satisfies himself with exciting the sympathies, and neglects to throw in at once the vital truth, is like the husbandman who digs and rakes the soil, and then idly expects the crop, though he has put in no living seed. The only result is a more rampant growth of weeds. How often do we see this mistake committed? The preacher either displays, in his own person, a high-wrought religious emotion, or stirs the natural sensibilities by painting in exciting and pictorial words and gestures, some natural feeling connected by its occasion with a religious topic, as a touching death or other bereavement; or he stimulates the selfish fears by painting the agonies of a lost soul, or the selfish desires and hopes by a sensuous description of the pleasures of heaven. Then, if sympathetic feeling is awakened, or the carnal passions of hope, fear and desire are moved, he acts as though his work were done. He permits and encourages the hearers to flatter themselves that they are religious, because they

are feeling something round about religion. I repeat : if this stimulation of carnal and sympathetic feeling is not at once and wisely used, and used solely as a secondary means of fixing a warmed attention on didactic truth, which is the sole instrument of conversion and sanctification, then the preacher has mischievously abused the souls of his hearers. The first and most obvious mischief is the encouragement of a fatal deception and self-flattery. Unrenewed men are tacitly invited to regard themselves as either born again, or at least in a most encouraging progress towards that blessing ; while in fact they have not felt a single feeling or principle which may not be the mere natural product of a dead heart. This delusion has slain its "tens of thousands."

The reader will remember the masterly exposition by Bishop Butler of the laws of habit as affecting the sensibilities and active powers. Its truth is too fully admitted to need argument. By this law of habit, the sensibilities are inevitably dulled by repeated impressions. By the same law, the appetencies and will are strengthened by voluntary exercise. Thus, if impressions on the sensibilities are followed by their legitimate exertion of the active powers, the soul as a whole, while it grows calmer and less excitable, grows stronger and more energetic in its activities, and is confirmed in the paths of right action. But if the sensibilities are stimulated by objects which make no call, and offer no scope for right action, as by fictitious and unreal pictures of human passion, the soul is uselessly hackneyed and worn, and thus depraved. Here we find one of the fundamental objections to habitual novel reading. The excitement of the sympathies by warmly colored, but unreal, portraiture of passions, where there cannot possibly be any corresponding right action by the reader inasmuch as the agents and sufferers are imaginary, depraves the sensibilities without any retrieval of the soul's state in the corresponding cultivation of the active powers. The longer such reading is continued, the more does the young person become at once sentimental and unfeeling. The result is a selfish and morbid craving for excitement, coupled with a callous selfishness, dead to the claims of real charity and duty.

The same objection lies against theatrical exhibitions, and for the same reason. Now this species of spurious religious excitement is obnoxious to the same charge. In its practical results it is fictitious. The merely sensational preacher is no more than a novelist or a comedian, with this circumstance, that he connects topics, popularly deemed religious, with his fictitious arts. He abuses and hackneys the souls of his hearers in the same general way, rendering them at once sentimental and hard, selfishly fond of excitement, but callous to conscience and duty.

Once more ; spiritual pride is as natural to man as breathing, or as sin. Its only corrective is sanctifying grace. Let the suggestion be once lodged in a heart not really humbled and cleansed by grace, that the man is reconciled to God, has " become good," is a favorite of God and heir of glory—that soul cannot fail to be swept away by the gales of spiritual pride. Let observation teach us here. Was there ever a deceived votary of a false religion, of Islam, of Buddhism, of Brahmanism, of Popery, who was not in reality puffed up by spiritual pride? It can not be otherwise with a deceived votary of a Protestant creed. The circumstance that there is divine truth in this creed (which has no vital influence on his heart) is no safeguard. The only preventive of spiritual pride is the contrition which accompanies saving repentance. Here, also, is the explanation of the fact, that the hearty votaries of those professedly Christian creeds, which have more of Pelagianism than of gospel in them are most bigoted and most hopelessly inaccessible to truth. Their adamant shield is spiritual pride, fostered by a spurious hope, and unchastened by sovereign grace. Of all such self-deceivers our Saviour has decided, that " the publicans and harlots enter into the kingdom before them."

These plain facts and principles condemn nearly every feature of the modern new measure "revival." The preaching and other religious instructors are shaped with a main view to excite *ions* the carnal emotions, and the instinctive sympathies, while no due care is taken to present saving, didactic truth to the understanding thus temporarily stimulated. As soon as some persons, professed Christians, or awakened "mourners," are infected with any

lively passion, let it be however carnal and fleeting, a spectacular display is made of it, with confident laudations of it as unquestionably precious and saving, with the design of exciting the remainder of the crowd with the sympathetic contagion. Every adjunct of fiery declamation, animated singing, groans, tears, exclamations, noisy prayers, is added so as to shake the nerves and add the tumult of a hysterical animal excitement to the sympathetic wave. Every youth or impressible girl who is seen to tremble, or grow pale, or shed tears, is assured that he or she is under the workings of the Holy Spirit, and is driven by threats of vexing that awful and essential Agent of salvation to join the spectacular show, and add himself to the exciting pantomime. Meanwhile, most probably their minds are blank of every intelligent or conscientious view of the truth; they had been tittering or whispering a little while before, during the pretended didactic part of the exercises; they could give no intelligent account now of their own sudden excitement, and, in fact, it is no more akin to any spiritual, rational, or sanctifying cause, than the quiver of the nostrils of a horse at the sound of the bugle and the fox-hounds. But they join the mourners, and the manipulation proceeds. Of course, the sympathetic wave, called religious, reaches them more and more. As I have shown, it is the very nature of sympathy to assume the character of the emotion with which we sympathize. Thus this purely natural and instinctive sensibility takes on the form of *religious feeling*, because it is sympathy with religious feeling in others. The subject calls it by religious names—awakening, conviction, repentance—while in reality it is only related to them as a man's shadow is to the living man. Meantime, the preachers talk to them as though the feelings were certainly genuine and spiritual. With this sympathetic current there may mingle sundry deep original feelings about the soul, to which, we have seen, the dead, carnal heart is fully competent by itself. These are fear, remorse, shame, desire of applause, craving for future (selfish) welfare, spiritual pride. Here we have the elements of every spurious grace. The "sorrow of the world that worketh death" is mistaken for saving repentance. By a natural law of the feelings, relaxation must

follow high tension—the calm must succeed the storm. This quiet is confounded with “peace in believing.” The selfish prospect of security produces great elation. This is supposed to be spiritual joy. When the soul is removed from the *stimuli* of the revival appliances, it of course sinks into the most painful vacuity, on which supervene restlessness and doubt. So, most naturally, it craves to renew the illusions, and has, for a time, a certain longing for, and pleasure in the scenes, the measures, and the agents of its pleasing intoxication. These are mistaken for love for God’s house, worship and people. Then the befooled soul goes on until it is betrayed into an erroneous profession of religion, and a dead church membership. He is now in the position in which the great enemy of souls would most desire to have him, and where his salvation is more difficult and improbable than anywhere else.

The most fearful part of these transactions is the unscriptural rashness of the professed guides of souls. They not only permit and encourage these perilous confusions of thought, but pass judgment on the exercises of their supposed converts with a haste and confidence which angels would shudder to indulge. Here, for instance, is a hurried, ignorant, young person, no real pains having been taken to instruct his understanding in the nature of sin and redemption, or to test his apprehension of gospel truths. In his tempestuous excitement of fear and sympathy, he is told that he is unquestionably under the influence of God’s Spirit. When he has been coaxed, or flattered, or wearied into some random declaration that he thinks he loves his Saviour, joyful proclamation is made that here is another soul born to God, and the brethren are called on to rejoice over him. But no time has been allowed this supposed convert for self-examination; no care to discriminate between spiritual and carnal affections, or for the subsidence of the froth of animal and sympathetic excitements; no delay is allowed to see the fruits of holy living, the only test which Christ allows as sufficient for other than the omniscient judgment. Thus, over-zealous and heedless men, ignorant of the first principles of psychology, and unconscious of the ruinous effects they may be producing, sport

with the very heart-strings of the spiritual life, and that in the most critical moments. It were a less criminal madness for a surgeon's raw apprentice to try experiments with his master's keen bistoury on the patient's jugular vein.

These abuses are the less excusable in any minister, because the Scriptures which he holds in his hands tell him plainly enough, without the lights of philosophy, the wrongness of all these practices. No inspired Apostle ever dared to pass a verdict upon the genuineness of a case of religious excitement with the rashness seen on these occasions. Christ has forewarned us that converts can only be known correctly by their fruits. Paul has sternly enjoined every workman upon the visible church, whose foundation is Christ, to "take heed how he buildeth thereupon." He has told us that the materials placed by us upon this structure may be genuine converts, as permanent as gold, silver, and costly stones; or worthless and pretended converts, comparable to "wood, hay and stubble;" that our work is to be all tried by the fire of God's judgments, in which our perishable additions will be burned up; and if we are ourselves saved, it will be as though we were saved by fire. The terrible results of self-deception and the deceitfulness of the heart are dwelt upon, and men are urged to self-examination.

The ulterior evils of these rash measures are immense. A standard and type of religious experience are propagated by them in America, as utterly unscriptural and false as those prevalent in Popish lands. So long as the subjects are susceptible of the sympathetic passion, they are taught to consider themselves in a high and certain state of grace. All just and scriptural marks of a gracious state are overlooked and even despised. Is their conduct immoral, their temper bitter and unchristian, their minds utterly dark as to distinctive gospel truths? This makes no difference; they are still excited and "happified" in meetings; they sing and shout, and sway to and fro with religious feelings. Thus these worthless, sympathetic passions are trusted in as the sure signatures of the Spirit's work.

Of the man who passes through this process of false conversion, our Saviour's declaration is eminently true: "The last

state of that man is worse than the first." The cases are not few which backslide early, and are again "converted," until the process has been repeated several times. These men are usually found most utterly hardened and profane, and hopelessly impervious to divine truth. Their souls are utterly seared by spurious fires of feeling. The state of those who remain undeceived, and in the communion of the Church, is almost as hopeless. "Having a name to live, they are dead." Their misconception as to their own state is armour of proof against warning.

The results of these "revivals" are usually announced at once, with overweening confidence, as works of God's Spirit. A minister reports to his church paper, that he has just shared in a glorious work at a given place, in which the Holy Ghost was present with power, and "forty souls were born into the kingdom." Now, the man of common sense will remember how confidently this same revivalist made similar reports last year, the year before, and perhaps many years previously. He was each time equally confident that it was the Spirit's work. But this man must know that in each previous case, time has already given stubborn refutation to his verdict upon the work. Four-fifths of those who, he was certain, were converted by God, have already gone back to the world, and declare that they were never converted at all. The means he has just used in his last revival are precisely the same used in his previous ones. The false fruits wore at first just the aspect which his last converts now wear. Is it not altogether probable that they are really of the same unstable character? But this minister declares positively that these are God's works. Now the cool, critical world looks on and observes these hard facts. It asks: What sort of people are these special guardians and expounders of Christianity? Are they romantic fools, who cannot be taught by clear experience? or are they conscious and intentional liars? The world is quite charitable, and probably adopts the former solution. And this solution, that the representatives of Christianity are men hopelessly and childishly overweening in their delusions, carries this corollary for the most of worldly men who adopt it: That Christianity itself is an unhealthy fanaticism, since it makes its

chosen teachers such fanatics unteachable by solid facts. Thus, the Christian ministry, who ought to be a class venerable in the eyes of men, are made contemptible. Civility restrains the expression of this estimate, but it none the less degrades the ministry in the eyes of intelligent men of the world, as a class who are excused from the charge of conscious imposture only on the theory of their being incurably silly and fanatical.

In the denominations which most practice the so-called revival-measures, abundance of facts obtrude themselves which are conclusive enough to open the eyes of the blind and the ears of the deaf. Instances may be found, where annual additions have been reported, such that if the sums were taken, and only subjected to a fair deduction for deaths and removals, these churches should number hundreds, or even a thousand members, and should be in a splendid state of prosperity. But the same church-reports still set these churches down as containing fifty or seventy members. Others which have been boasting these magnificent processes are moribund; and some have been "revived" to death.

But the men who work this machinery, notwithstanding the fatal condemnation of the facts, are not blind! What are the causes of their perseverance in methods so worthless? One cause is, doubtless, an honest, but ignorant zeal. In the bustle and heat of this zeal, they overlook the unpleasant facts and still go on, "supposing that they verily do God service." Another subtle and far-reaching cause is an erroneous, synergistic theology. The man who believes in the efficient co-operation of the sinner's will with the divine will, in the initial quickening of his soul, will, of course, seek to stimulate that human will to the saving acts, by all the same expedients by which men seek to educe in their ~~fol~~ follows carnal acts of will. Why not? Why should not the evangelist practice to evoke that act of will from the man on which he believes the saving action of the Almighty pivots, by the same kind of arts the recruiting sergeant practices—the martial song, the thrilling fife and palpitating drum, the spectacular display of previous recruits in their shining new uniforms—until the young yeoman has "committed" himself by

taking the "queen's shilling?" That volition settles it that the queen is to make him her soldier. It must be the youth's decision, but, when once made for a moment, it decides his state. Thus a synergistic theology fosters these "revival-measures," as they, in turn, incline towards a synergistic creed. Doubtless, many ministers are unconsciously swayed by the natural love of excitement. This is the same instinct which leads school-boys and clowns to run to witness a dog-fight, Spaniards to the cock-fight and the bull-fight, sporting men to the pugilist's ring, and theatre-goers to the comedy. This natural instinct prompts many an evangelist, without his being distinctly aware of it, to prefer the stirring scenes of the spurious revival to the sober, quiet, laborious work of religious teaching. But it is obvious that this motive is as unworthy as it is natural.

Another motive which prompts men to persevere in these demonstrably futile methods is the desire to count large and immediate results. To this they are spurred by inconsiderate, but honest zeal, and by the partisan rivalries of their denominations. These unworthy motives they sanctify to themselves, and thus conceal from their own consciences the real complexion of them. No word is needed to show how unwise and unsuitable they are to the Christian minister. Here should be pointed out the intrinsic weakness of the current system, of employing travelling revivalists in settled churches. No matter how orthodox the man may be, the very nature of his task lays a certain urgency and stress upon him, to show, somehow, immediate results before the close of his meeting. If he does not, the very ground of his vocation as a "revivalist" is gone. He has been sent for to do this one thing, to gratify the hopes, zeal and pride of the good people by, at least, a show of immediate fruits. If he fails in this, he will not be sent for. This is too strong a temptation for any mere mortal to endure without yielding. But the prime fact which decides all true results of gospel means is, that the Holy Ghost alone is the Agent of effectual calling; and *He is sovereign*. His new-creating breath "bloweth where it listeth." His command to the sower of the Word may be expressed in Solomon's words: "In the morning sow thy seed;

and in the evening hold not thy hand; for *thou* knowest not which shall prosper, whether this or that." The best minister on earth may be appointed by God's secret purpose to the sad mission given to Isaiah, to Jeremiah, and even to their Lord during his earthly course, "to stretch forth their hands all the day long to a disobedient and gainsaying people." Hence, this evangelist has put himself under an almost fatal temptation to resort to some illicit expedients which will produce, in appearance, immediate results. How few, even of the orthodox, escape that temptation!

An old and shrewd practitioner of these human means of religious excitements, was once asked by a man of the world, "if it were possible he could be blind to the futility of most of the pretended conversions?" The answer was: "Of course not; we are not fools." "Why then," said the man, "do you employ these measures?" The preacher answered: "Because a few are truly converted, and make stable, useful Christians; and the rest, when they find out the shallowness of their experiences, are simply where they were before." The worldly-wise preacher's statement involved two capital errors. It assumed that the "revival measures" were the effective instruments of the conversion of the genuine few; and that without these expedients they would have remained out of Christ. This is utterly false. The solid conversion of these souls took place not by cause of, but in spite of, the human expedients. The work was the result of sober Christian example, and previous didactic teaching in gospel truths, and had there been no "revival measures" these souls would have come out for Christ, perhaps a little later, but more intelligently and decisively. The mistake as to the second class, "the stony ground believers," is far more tragical. *They are not left where they were before*; "the last state of these men is worse than the first." I will not repeat the explanation of the depraving influences sure to be exerted upon the heart; but I will add one still more disastrous result. These deceptive processes usually *end in making the subjects infidels*. Some who keep their names on the communion rolls are secret infidels; nearly all who withdraw their names are open infidels, unless they are too

unthinking and ignorant to reflect and draw inferences. First, every young person who has a spark of self-respect is mortified at being thrust into a false position, especially on so high and solemn a subject. Pride is wounded. He feels that he has been imposed on, and resents it. This wounded pride, unwilling to take the blame on itself, directs its anger against the agents of the mortifying cheat. But to despise the representatives of Christianity is practically very near to despising Christianity. The most earnest and clear-minded of these temporary converts has now what appears to him, with a terrible plausibility, the experimental argument to prove that evangelical religion is a deception. He says he knows he was honest and sincere in the novel exercises to which he was subjected (and in a sense he says truly). The religious teachers themselves assured him, in the name of God, that they were genuine works of grace. Did they not formally publish in the religious journals that it was the Holy Spirit's work? If these appointed teachers do not know, who can? Yet now this backslider says himself, "I have the stubborn proof of a long and sad experience, a prayerless and godless life, that there never was any real spiritual change in me." Who can be more earnest than he was? It is then, the logical conclusion, that all supposed cases of regeneration are deceptive. "Many," he says, "have had the honesty like myself to come out of the church candidly, shoulder the mortification of their mistake, and avow the truth." Those who remain "professors" are to be accounted for in two ways. The larger part know in their hearts just as well as we do, that their exercises were always a cheat, but they prefer to *live a lie*, rather than make the humiliating avowal, and for these we feel only contempt. The minority remain honestly self-deceived by reason of impressible and enthusiastic temperaments. For these, if they are social and moral, and do not cant, we can feel most kindly, and respect their amiable delusion. It would be unkind to distrust it. This reasoning having led them to discredit entirely the work of the Holy Ghost, leads next to the denial of his personality. The backslider sinks to the ranks of a gross Socinian, or becomes a Deist or an Agnostic. Let the history of our virtual

infidels be examined and their early religious life traced: here will be found the source and cause of their error. "Their name is Legion." He who inquires of the openly ungodly adults of our land, will be astounded to find how large a majority of them were once in the Church. They conceal, as well as they can, what they regard as the "disgraceful episode" in their history. Their attitude is that of silent, but cold and impregnable skepticism, based, as they think, on the argument of actual experience. In fact, spurious revivals we honestly regard as the chief bane of our Protestantism. We believe that they are the chief cause, under the prime source, original sin, which has deteriorated the average standard of holy living, principles, and morality, and the Church discipline of our religion, until it has nearly lost its practical power over the public conscience. Striking the average of the whole nominal membership of the Protestant churches, the outside world does not credit us for any higher standard than we are in the habit of ascribing to the Synagogue, and to American Popery. How far is the world wrong in its estimate? That Denomination which shall sternly use its ecclesiastical authority, under Christ's law, to inhibit these human methods, and to compel its teachers back to the scriptural and only real means, will earn the credit of being the defender of an endangered Gospel.

One corollary from this discussion is: How perilous is it to entrust the care of souls² to an ignorant zeal! None but an educated ministry can be expected, humanly speaking, to resist the seductions of the "revival measures," or to guard themselves from the plausible blunders we have analyzed above. And the Church which entrusts the care of souls to lay-evangelists, self-appointed and irresponsible to the ecclesiastical government appointed by Christ, betrays its charge and duty.

No man is fit for the care of souls, except he is deeply imbued with scriptural piety and grace. He must have a faith firm as a rock, and humble as strong, with profound submission to the divine will, which will calm him amidst all delays and all discouragements that God will bless his own word in his own chosen time. He must have that self-abnegation, which will make him willing

to bear the evil repute of an unfruitful ministry, if the Lord so ordains, and unblanchingly refuse to resort to any unauthorized means to escape this cross. He must have the moral courage to withstand that demand of ill-considered zeal in his brethren, parallel to the *ardor purus civium juvenium* in politics. He must have the unflagging diligence and love for souls which will make him persevere in preaching the gospel publicly, and from house to house, under the delay of fruit. Nothing can give these except large measures of grace and prayer.

R. L. DABNEY.

II. DENOMINATIONAL COLLEGES.

The history of our country is marked, in its beginning, by the peril of new things. The structure of the government, in its thoroughly representative character, in its wide extension of suffrage and in its voluntary union of sovereign States, was a startling departure from long established precedent. Wise statesmen regarded the experiment more than doubtful. Even after an existence of three-quarters of a century, Macaulay, when asked his opinion of this American Republic, replied, "Let the 20th century answer that question." One of the specially novel features, pre-eminent in our governmental organization, was, "A free Church in a free State." Here the line was broadly drawn. The long, dark record of bloody persecutions, with which the world was so familiar at that time, suggested to the soberest minds of the new republic this radical modification of the relation of these co-ordinate institutions. Entire, perpetual separation was the clear and definite conclusion reached. The words of the First Amendment to the Constitution are as follows: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." A well-informed, careful writer observes that, "to-day every State, old and new, has a similar provision in its organic law."

Ante-dating the formation of the Constitution, there were active movements towards the founding of institutions of learning. These movements were especially marked in Virginia and the New England States. "Up to the American Revolution," says Dr. Magoun, in the *New Englander*, "eleven colleges had been founded: Harvard, William and Mary, Yale, Princeton, Pennsylvania University, Washington and Lee, Columbia, Brown, Dartmouth, Rutgers, and Hampden Sidney." It is interesting to inquire into the origin, control and support of these early institutions, as indicating the convictions of our forefathers on this subject of higher education.

In a valuable Circular recently issued by the National Bureau of Education,* it is claimed that two, at least, of these eleven colleges were State institutions. The writer says of William and Mary: "It, like Harvard, was a State institution." But the very circular in which this statement is made contains conclusive evidence, as it seems to us, drawn from ancient historical records that the institution owed its origin not so much to a State law as to the Church of the mother country, as separate from the State. Indeed, so close and dependent was the relation between the Church of England and William and Mary, that President Gilman, of Johns Hopkins, distinctly affirms: "William and Mary was emphatically a child of the Church of England." This statement finds strong corroboration in the terms of the charter, which declare the object of its foundation as follows: "That the Church of Virginia may be furnished with a Seminary of Ministers of the Gospel, and that the youth may be piously educated, and that the Christian faith may be propagated among the Western Indians, to the glory of Almighty God." There is, too, the further fact that a considerable part of the funds contributed to the establishment of the institution was from private individuals. Do not these facts, viewed in their united strength, show that William and Mary was not an exception among the earlier institutions of the country; that it was not the creation of the State by special enactment?

* History of William and Mary College.

In reference to Harvard, the declaration of President Eliot ought to be accepted as decisive. He says, "Harvard was never a State institution in the sense in which the University of Michigan is a State institution, or in any proper sense. The Legislature has never had any direct control whatever over Harvard." In the claim set up, that the control of these colonial colleges was predominantly churchly, it should not be forgotten that there was at that time a thorough union of Church and State. Church membership was, in Massachusetts, a condition of citizenship. "Suffrage and office-holding," says Dr. Magoun, "were restricted not only to church members, but to Congregational church members." Hence a grant by the General Court of Massachusetts was really the gift of the Church. It is evident, from facts like these, that the very first efforts in this country in favor of colleges originated with the churches. Every one of the other nine ante-revolutionary institutions, with the nominal though not real exception of Yale, was confessedly the result of private benefaction. They were church institutions: Princeton being under the control of the Presbyterians; Rutgers, of the Dutch Reformed; Columbia, very largely of the Episcopalians; Brown University, of the Baptists; and Dartmouth, of the Congregationalists, as also Yale.

It might be well just here to emphasize the statement that Denominational Colleges are not necessarily sectarian, as they are sometimes reproachfully called. They were established and endowed not for the propagation of some distinctive, denominational tenet, not in the interest of Calvinism or Arminianism; of immersion or affusion; of Episcopacy or Presbyterianism or Congregationalism. However deep, earnest and sacred may have been the convictions of their founders on questions like these, yet no system of doctrine or church polity found a place in the curriculum. The high, broad and generous purpose was to furnish the most thorough culture under distinctly Christian influences—where science and religion are indissolubly married, with that divine sanction, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." Outside of Roman Catholic schools there is no more teaching of sectarian doctrine in Denominational Col-

leges, than in those under the control of the State. They recognize the just distinction that ecclesiastical education is one thing and Christian education is another. We risk nothing in the statement that a pupil might pass through the entire course at a denominational college without identifying the distinctive religious beliefs of the instructors from their work in the class-room. If it be asked, "why then is the control lodged in the hands of a single denomination, rather than a joint management of a number of denominations?" we answer, in the words of Dr. Porter, of Yale, "In the present divided condition of Christendom, there seems no solution of the problem, except the one which has been accepted in this country, viz., that the College should be in the hands of some single religious denomination in order to secure unity and effect to its religious character and influence, and that it should be preserved from sectarian bias and illiberality, by its responsibility to the community which it would influence and by the enlightened and catholic supremacy of the culture to which it is devoted." The entire history of Denominational Colleges supports this view. They are not a system of sect-propagandism.

The eleven colonial institutions to which we have referred may be regarded in their main features as the germ and type of all the denominational institutions of this country. They agree in one specific object named in all their charters, viz., to furnish the Church with a learned and pious ministry: their control and management are much the same, with boards of Trustees, appointed by some Church court: their means of support are also the same—by endowments secured through voluntary contributions. In these simple, fundamental characteristics we have the distinct outline of every denominational college in the land.

For a considerable period after the close of the Revolutionary war, the educational interests of the country shared in the general exhaustion and prostration of that great struggle. But that high appreciation of liberal culture which has ever distinguished the Scotch-Irish very soon asserted itself in the organization of such institutions as Jefferson, Dickinson, and Union of Schenectady. A little later the movement broadened and

deepened until all the older States were planning for similar institutions.

The comprehensive zeal of the churches in this matter is seen in the fact that, of the 370 colleges and universities in this country, nearly eighty per cent. are under distinctively religious control. And while the endowments of most of them are meagre enough, they yet represent such devotion to the interests of education, such cheerful self-sacrifice, such conspicuous labor and toil as are found only among a people deeply religious and of high intelligence. Who that has any acquaintance with the history of these colleges and their struggles; who that has looked into the faces of their hard-worked and poorly-paid teachers, but renders unstinted homage and praise? I know it is said that there is a needless and damaging multiplication of these colleges—needless, because they are multiplied beyond the wants of the country; and damaging, because, in the sharp competition for students, the standard of scholarship is lowered and the regular degrees are cheapened. But while this is admitted and lamented, and while the subject demands some concerted action on the part of educators, yet this zeal, however unwise, shall not abate one jot our high appreciation of the large and self-denying liberality of those who established these institutions. With the strongest convictions, and under the highest impulses, they gave time and labor and money to the noblest purposes. Grant that there has been, perhaps, a degree of misdirected effort, and something of wasted resources, yet, certainly, not more in this department than in any other line of human endeavor involving such large interests and such extended co-operation.

We have thus made it plain as a prominent historical feature of our Denominational Colleges, that they are all the outgrowth of the conviction that higher education is a function of the Church; that it is not only its legitimate prerogative, but its imperative obligation. And are there not impressive indications that this conviction, so far from weakening, is growing stronger? As the population of this country becomes, every year, more heterogeneous, as the peculiar and distinctive feature of our con-

stitution—the complete separation of Church and State—is held to with such tenacity, is there not just occasion for the apprehension that, apart from religious institutions, our educational system will become secularized? Dr. Dabney said, about ten years ago, “If the State is the educator, then, in America at least, education must be secularized totally, because in theory our State is the institute for realizing secular justice.” “It has absolutely severed itself from all religions equally, * * * and has forbidden the imposition of any burden for a religious pretext.” “All State officials derive their authority from State laws, hence all their functions are as truly State actions as those of the Sheriff in hanging or of the Judge in sentencing a murderer.” That this is not the view of a visionary or an alarmist is seen in an article in a recent issue of the *Forum*, by a professor in the leading university of the South.* In that article this proposition is earnestly advocated: “In all State schools, high and low, created and supported in whole or in part by general taxation, all religious exercises, whether of instruction or devotion, maintained as a part of the established school system, ought to be prohibited by law.” In that proposition we have the early and complete confirmation of the statement of Dr. Dabney. Our forefathers, with prophetic sagacity, anticipated this issue, an issue that is pressing itself for a settlement in the matter of the “Bible in the Public Schools.” They provided against it in the organization of Denominational Colleges.

What has been the work of these Colleges? What have they done for the country? In what way and to what extent have they made us what we are as a people, strong and prosperous at home, and respected abroad as no other nation on the globe?

We answer, 1st. They have been a wonderful stimulus to education. They have turned the attention of the people to this great subject, by constant and earnest appeal. The early settler, struggling with all the hardships and adversities of felling forests, fighting savages and building a home, was not allowed to forget that the great forces which rule the world are

* Dr. Noah K. Davis, of the University of Virginia.

the moral and the intellectual. He was taught that the church and the school-house are the only safe guardians of our liberties, and that the responsibilities of American citizenship are inseparably associated with virtue and intelligence. The college agent, generally a minister of the Gospel, in private converse around the fireside and in public address, pressed the practical truth that the best inheritance for our children is not in broad acres and large wealth, but in a trained and disciplined intellect, quickened and roused to effort by integrity of heart and high purpose. As the hardy pioneer thought on these things, the fire would burn within him, and the resolution was taken that one of the boys must go to college. Such influences were felt in the most obscure localities, and religion and learning have drawn some of their most distinguished ornaments from the humble homes of a hardy peasantry. Not only is it true that these institutions have been the most active and successful promoters of liberal culture, but it is also true,

2nd. That they have furnished such facilities for securing an education as made it the privilege of the poor. Thousands have received the advantage of a liberal training in these denominational institutions who, without them, must have remained in comparative ignorance. Located, generally, in communities where the cost of living is low, with but few temptations to dissipation and extravagance, with all necessary expenses reduced to a minimum, these colleges have been public benefactors. It is the union of these two influences, the one furnishing the stimulus and the other the opportunity, that has given us so large a proportion of students in our thickly-settled districts. For instance, Germany is commonly reckoned the high example and model of educational progress, and yet while Germany has one student for each 2,134 of population, in the New England States there is one student for each 1,028 of population, or about twice as many. Even in these Southern States, awfully scourged as they have been, poor as they are to-day, and sparsely populated as they are, there is (approximately) about one student for each 4,500 of population. Can there be a question that this proportion is due mainly to the presence and influence of the Denomi-

national Colleges? Standing as the faithful handmaids of religion, they have been the preponderating force in our educational life. By the co-operation of the religious press, by the widely diffused efforts of active canvassers, with every minister as a recruiting officer, they reach with their benedictions the dwellers in the vales, by the brooks, and upon the mountain side, and they have infused high and noble ambitions into their fresh young life. In every nook and corner of these United States, in every walk and profession of life, there are numerous and honorable witnesses to their stimulating influence.

3rd. But these Colleges have impressed themselves on the religious as well as the intellectual life of this country. They have infused a healthy conservatism into the thought and investigation of the age. There has been a manifest and alarming tendency in the last quarter of a century towards scepticism in Science and liberalism in Theology. A thoughtful and competent observer summarizes the situation thus: "Science, physical science, has become as speculative and as prolific of metaphysical theories as the most insane metaphysician could wish." "It is somewhat surprising that the leaders of thought in the higher departments seem ready to submit to these domineering pretensions, so that theology proper, in many cases, has caught the infection of a materialistic philosophy, and speaks 'half in the speech of Ashdod.'" "A rationalistic scepticism steals within the very inclosures of the conscience, and makes use of the pulpit for the purpose of seducing men into disbelief of everything that is peculiar to the gospel system."*

It has been persistently asserted that scientific theories stand in no relation to religious beliefs—that these lie in separate and independent spheres, and that, therefore, there should be the largest toleration of scientific opinion. Cerebralism, which is outright materialism, is claimed as the latest fruit of biology—and must it claim toleration? All supernaturalism is accounted an unscientific, if not antiquated conceit. It must be rigidly excluded in dealing with the phenomena of nature. Thus it has come to pass that in the hot zeal to be non-religious, there is

* Dr. Stuart Robinson.

a real danger in some of our higher institutions of learning of becoming anti-religious and anti-christian. The idea has received some favor even in religious quarters that a liberal culture is somewhat narrowed and hampered by decided religious influences, and hence the extreme position, that all the truths of Christianity must be regarded as open questions, by a devotee of learning. But is it not true that this very solicitude to be non-committal is to dishonor the most sacred and indisputable verities? Must our youth be taught that the educated reason holds in abeyance the deepest questions of truth—that it can pronounce with confidence on the age of the world, on matters social, political and scientific, but that it must adjourn to some indefinite future the high themes of the spiritual kingdom? Is not the attitude of professed indifference in such a supreme and vital interest the attitude of hostility? Must every other branch of knowledge be welcomed in our colleges, while a knowledge of Him who declares that He is THE TRUTH is “ostracised?”

Now, is it too much to claim for the Denominational Colleges of this country that they stand steadfastly in the breach against the tendency to a secularized education? They are a conspicuous and abiding protest against the severance of science and religion. If Waterloo was won in the Halls of Eton, we believe the victory over a spirit of reckless speculation is to be won in our Christian Colleges. Without apology or qualification they declare with emphasis that “to do its best work a college must be instinct with the light and life of Christianity.” “Other things being equal, such institutions will exert the best, the highest and the most permanent influence on those whom they instruct, and through them on society and the world.”*

Is it not true that they are needed now more than ever? The times in which we live are times of deep agitation—not so much on questions political as on questions social and religious. He is blind indeed who does not see something of those tendencies to which we have alluded. There is an insolent rejection of

* President Knox, of Lafayette College.

Christian dogma on the ground that it bars the progress of science and human enlightenment.

Every Christian patriot feels that such influences are to be uncompromisingly resisted. This can only be successful in the united strength of an earnest faith and high scholarship. It is, we believe, the glorious prerogative and the inspiring destiny of the Christian Colleges of America to maintain the sentiment of that great scientist who declared that "in discovering the law of creation he was but thinking the thoughts of God after Him." We cherish the pride of the American citizen. "Our Country," many-sided as are the problems which it suggests, is in the van of human progress. On its standard "are blazoned the hopes of the world, and in its bosom beats the heart of humanity." These are no exaggerations of rhetoric. To finish the work given her to do, so wide and far-reaching in its consequences, she must hold fast a morality whose principles are rooted and grounded in the infallible revelations of divine truth. She must preserve, with a scrupulous fidelity, all those Christian features of this government which have been incorporated into its life by our God-fearing forefathers. No mean or insignificant auxiliaries in this stupendous task are those institutions of learning, founded in faith and prayer, and upon whose portals are graven the words, "*Pro Christo et ejus cruce.*" They are a salutary and enduring reminder of the fact that the highest inspiration of the scholar as well as the surest hope of the patriot is found not in the Academy or the Porch, not in the Athenian Acropolis or the Roman Forum, but in that humble Cross outside the gates of Jerusalem.

4th. In estimating the work of the Denominational Colleges, prominence must be given to their contributions to an educated, learned ministry. The able President of the Rochester University says that the ministry is the one profession in this country which exacts a definite grade of scholarship as a qualification for its sacred functions. These Denominational Colleges furnish the most distinct and pronounced declaration of the high estimate placed by their founders upon learning and scholarship as qualifications for the ministry. An influential, a prevailing reason for their creation was, without an exception, that the Church

might be furnished with able ministers of the New Testament. With a frank confession of all the deficiencies of their work in this line, it is yet true, as claimed by Dr. Porter, of Yale, that the ministry of these United States constitute its literary class. They have received their training mainly at the Denominational Colleges. The Church has never depended upon secular institutions for the supply of her ministers. Her experience has taught her that she cannot do it. In proof of this I beg leave to refer to the following unpublished statistics, which have been kindly furnished me by Rev. Dr. Bunting, of Clarksville, Tennessee: The University of Alabama, up to 1879, graduated 659, and, so far as known, only 30 were clergymen. The University of Georgia, at Athens, in 80 years, has sent out 2,003 graduates, only 137 of whom entered the ministry. Of all the graduates of the University of Michigan, in 36 years, from 1844 to 1879, only 157 were ministers. Cornell's graduates number 814. She can put her finger positively on 19 only who have become ministers. These are a few of the facts on the one side. What are they with reference to the Denominational Colleges? Sewanee, the Episcopal University of the South, has sent 11 of her 80 graduates into the ministry, while 53 of her students are now candidates. Emory College, Ga., of her 791 graduates has sent 156 into the ministry of the Methodist Church, also a large number who did not graduate. Mercer University, of Georgia, has sent out 591, and 101 of them are ministers. Of the 54 graduates which Roanoke, Va., has sent out in the past five years, 24 have studied theology. Princeton, New Jersey, has graduated 5,921, and 1,147 entered the ministry. The alumni of Washington and Jefferson, Pa., number 3,274, and 1,458 entered the ministry. These figures prove the statement made by Dr. Dabney that, "each Church must look chiefly for the rearing of its candidates to its own College." "Whether we can explain it or not," he adds, "the stubborn facts prove this." Any just appreciation, therefore, of the service which these institutions have rendered the cause of religion and learning must signalize the vast contributions of the ministry to the departments of letters, criticism,

scientific research and sound theology. All these departments have felt their quickening influence.

There are gratifying indications of the increasing usefulness of these Colleges. More and more as our national perils increase do the hearts of the people turn to these nurseries of learning and piety. Insisting as they do upon a Christian scholarship, may their Christianity be as pure and elevated as when it came from the lips of the Divine Teacher, and may their culture, in its extent and thoroughness, fairly represent that spirit of earnestness, fidelity and devotion to truth which Christianity enjoins—a spirit which is never content with low standards and narrow aims.

W. M. GRIER.

III. THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS.

PART II.

The design of our calling, as Gentiles, is, that we may be *tributary* to the ultimate Restoration and Reinstatement of the Chosen People: not only indirectly tributary, by God's using us to provoke His own people to jealousy by them that were no people, but directly tributary, by labouring for their conversion, which shall secure for us the highest privileges and richest blessings that can be obtained on earth.

An interregnum of twenty-five centuries, during which Israel, the Church of God, has been kept in an abnormal condition, is now drawing to a close. The Theocracy, while it flourished, was the foremost of the kingdoms of the world. Hence, no other monarchy could be recognized as universal or supreme, until Israel had been formally rejected and visibly cast off from their national eminence, for their transgressions. As soon as the chosen people had filled up their iniquity, the predestined supremacy of the world-power began. The first year of Judah's captivity was also the first year of Nebuchadnezzar's predominance, and the prophetick date of the Babylonian Monarchy. From this time, the independence of Israel departed for over 2,000 years. The whole period into which Israel entered at the commencement of the Captivity—which has not yet terminated, but which is now in process of termination—the period of the dominion of the world-powers, from the downfall of the Theocracy till its final restoration, was the period which was to be revealed by the light of prophecy. The Coming of Christ introduced no material change into this period of the World's Dominion; for under it, it behoved Him to suffer and die, and be raised from the dead, and ascend to Heaven, and sit down on the right hand of the Majesty on High: "Whom the heaven must receive until the time of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began." And by the mouth of His holy Prophets did God set forth the two-fold Coming of the Messiah: first, as a suffering and dying

Messiah ; second, as a triumphant and reigning Messiah ; and the first in order to the second—a vital point, at which many Jews refuse to look. Christ had to instruct His own disciples on this point, again, after His resurrection :—“*Ought not* Messiah to have suffered these things, and to enter into His Glory?”

The 53d chapter of Isaiah, exhibiting, as it does, both a suffering and a reigning Christ, has long been a stumbling-block to the Jews. Refusing to admit its plain application to the Messiah, varieties of interpretations have been devised, to get rid of the difficulty. But the difficulty will not thus be got rid of. The most popular exposition is that which makes the Jewish Nation the subject of the prophecy, and many go so far as to affirm that no personal Messiah is to be expected, but Israel itself is God’s Messiah to the nations. Insuperable objections exist to this interpretation, such as these : The character described in the prophecy does not agree with the character of Israel. The Person spoken of, was to bear the sins of others. The transgressions of others, not His own, are the cause of His afflictions : “He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed.” Now, this is not true of Israel. The Jews suffer not because of the sins of others, but because of their own. Neither is it true that other nations are healed, in any sense, by the afflictions which the Jews have suffered. Both Jews and Gentiles are sinners, and those who are themselves sinners, and are suffering the punishment of their sins, cannot be an atonement for the sin of others. Another characteristic of the Person described in this chapter is equally inapplicable to the Jewish Nation. It is this,—a patient endurance of injuries, a non-resistance of evil : “He was oppressed, and He was afflicted, yet He opened not His mouth ; He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so He openeth not His mouth.” Now, the meekness and gentleness of lambs do not characterize the Jews. True, their provocations were great, exceedingly great. But that is not the question. The question is, Did the Jews bear oppression like lambs?

Did they suffer evil without resisting it? History answers in the negative. The history of the Jewish Captivity for the first seven centuries after Christ is a history of insurrections, fierce and violent, against the nations.

It is only in the controversial commentaries of Rashi, Kimchi, Aben Ezra, Abarbanel and others, that a strained and unnatural exposition is given of this chapter. In their non-controversial books, this prophecy is applied to the Messiah. The Book of Zohar, an authority of great weight among all Rabbinical Jews, has these words: "The Messiah exclaims, May all the diseases, all the griefs, all the punishments of the Israelites come! And they all come upon Him. But unless He took them away from Israel, transferred them to Himself, there would be no man who could bear the chastisement of the Israelites, on account of the heaviness of the punishments pronounced in (the) (our) law; and this is what is written: He hath borne our griefs, He was wounded for our sins." Such is the testimony of this book to the Messiah. It testifies also to the doctrine of the Trinity.

Again. Every year at the feast of the Passover, the 52d and 53d chapters of Isaiah are attributed to Messiah in all the synagogues of the world, in the following prayer: "Accelerate our redemption, my Beloved! Hasten that the shadows may flee away. Let Him be *exalted* and *extolled* and *high*, that is now despised. Let Him *deal prudently*, and reprove, and *sprinkle many nations*." Every Jew who is in the habit of saying his prayers knows that these words are understood of the Messiah. Is it honest, in prayer to a heart-searching God, to apply this passage to the Messiah, and, in controversy with men, to deny this application?

But not the Prophets only, but the entire Jewish Economy preached Christ to Israel. All their institutions preached Christ to them. All their ceremonies preached Christ to them.

"Israel in ancient days,
Not only had a view
Of Sinai in a blaze,
But learned the Gospel, too:
The types and figures were a glass,
In which they saw the Saviour's face.

“ The paschal sacrifice,
 And blood-besprinkled door,
 Seen with enlightened eyes,
 And once applied with power,
 Would teach the need of other blood,
 To reconcile an angry God.

“ The lamb, the dove, set forth
 His perfect innocence,
 Whose blood of matchless worth
 Should be the soul’s defence ;
 For He who can for sins atone,
 Must have no failings of His own.

“ The scape-goat on his head
 The people’s trespass bore,
 And to the desert led,
 Was to be seen no more :
 In him our Surety seemed to say,
 ‘ Behold ! I bear your sins away !’

“ Dipped in his fellow’s blood,
 The living bird went free ;
 The type, well understood,
 Expressed the sinner’s plea ;
 Described a guilty soul enlarged,
 And by a Saviour’s death discharged.

“ Jesus ! I love to trace
 Throughout the sacred page,
 The footsteps of Thy Grace,
 The same in every age.
 O ! grant that I may faithful be
 To clearer light vouchsafed to me.”

—COWPER.

When the question is between the Rabbis and the Prophets, the commentaries of men and the Word of God, we do not hesitate a moment to choose. “ Let God be true, and every man a liar.” The Talmud may boast of its superiority to the Old Testament, as well as to the New ; and the Rabbis have a saying : “ The Bible is water, but the Talmud is wine ;” but the contact between the two cannot fail to be as efficacious as that of the Ark of God with the Image of Dagon.

The statements in the famous Essay on the Talmud, in the *London Quarterly*, by Emanuel Deutsch, were taken for granted

by many readers, as they had been taken for granted by the author himself from writers who preceded him, but its superficial character was readily discerned by true scholars, who exposed its blunders, and chastised its author for his pretensions. This blunderer, led by preceding blunderers, affirmed that the Lord's Prayer was borrowed from Jewish Liturgies, whereas the contrary is the fact. After the days of Christ, certain of its petitions were incorporated with Rabbinical Liturgies. But previous to Christ, none of them contained these petitions. *Let him who affirms it, prove it, if he can.* Certain of these petitions are found in the O. T. Prophets, and our Lord frequently quoted, and made use of those writings which were inspired by His Spirit, and which all testified of Christ. Particularly, the writings of David and Daniel teem with the praises of Christ's Kingdom, Power and Glory, and predict the transcendent blessedness which shall characterize the Restoration of the Kingdom to Israel.

Christ has not, as yet, restored the Kingdom to Israel. His Kingdom has not, as yet, fulfilled its destiny and become the Kingdom of the World. But it is to be. The Prophet Daniel declares: "In the days of those kings, (or kingdoms,) shall the God of Heaven set up, (or, as it is properly, *raise up again,*) a kingdom which shall never be destroyed." The same great truth was declared by the Apostle James, in the General Assembly at Jerusalem: "Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for His Name; and to this agree the words of the Prophets, as it is written, After this will I return, and *will build again* the tabernacle of David which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will *set it up*, that the *residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom My Name is called*, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things." Thy kingdom come.

"Glorious things of Thee are spoken,
Zion, city of our God!"

The greatest blessing that God has promised to His Church is yet future, viz: the restoration to her bosom of the wanderers of Israel. This is declared again and again, by both Prophet and Apostle. The remarkable vision granted to the Prophet Ezekiel,

of the valley of dry bones, symbolickal of the present condition of the Jewish people, which would seem to forbid the possibility of their restoration, occurs in the midst of a prophecy, which, nevertheless, assures us of it, (Ezekiel 37) a prophecy, which nothing that has already occurred, such as their return from Babylon, has satisfied, and which nothing can satisfy, but their final restoration to their own Church and their final possession of their own land. They are to be taken out of their graves, recovered from among all nations, and brought into their own land; and it is only in their own land that the two divided kingdoms of Judah and Israel shall become one. Their present scattered and unconverted state is fitly represented by a number of dry bones. No longer a body, but separated, bone from its bone,—their civil and ecclesiastickal policy broken up,—never has there been the least approach towards the reconstruction of any government of their own. They have never been anything else than the skeleton of a nation, and a skeleton whose bones have been detached, and spread confessedly throughout the whole world. “No more do they possess that life and spirit which distinguished their holy ancestors, but are as dry as bones which have been long dead,—not only devoid of everything like true religion, like other sinners, but singularly averse from it; not only dry, but very dry. They retain something indeed of the semblance of religion, but it is that which a skull retains of the human countenance,”—many of them not Jews, but Infidels, caring as little for Moses as they do for Christ.

A distinguished missionary to the Jews, himself a born Jew, the Rev. Mr. Wolkenberg, says: “What *practical* test shall we adopt for proving the moral condition of the Jewish people? Certainly not the absence or presence among them of such crimes as require boldness, daring, and open defiance of law for their commission. This unwarrantable criterion has been repeatedly urged by the Jewish press all over the world, and tacitly admitted by the unreflecting Christian publick. And what has been the corollary drawn from it? Nothing less than the moral superiority of Judaism to Christianity, and that in the face of the legalization by the former of polygamy, divorce, and a host of other evils,

both social and moral, for whose partial suppression in some parts of Europe the Jews are indebted to Christian legislation and its enforcement by Christian authorities. The incompatibility of reckless violation of law with a state of political servitude and grinding oppression endured for centuries, has been prudently ignored by Jews, and thoughtlessly overlooked by Christians. The best test for Jewish morality is not the *number* of Jewish convictions, but the *nature* of the offences of which they are convicted, and the *social position* of the convicts. These offences are almost invariably dictated by insatiable avarice, and characterized by such a shrewd evasion of the law that it is but seldom that the arm of justice can reach them. The recent trial for libel against the *World* newspaper, in which the prosecutors were non-suited, is far more reliable as an indication of the low ebb of Jewish morality, than are the high-flown phrases and confident assertions of the Jewish press. It was instituted by, and it implicated a considerable number of, men of the highest reputation in the Synagogue, some of whom aspired to fill the office of the Lord Mayor of London. And one of them, in a letter to the *Jewish Chronicle*, plainly insinuated that his moral standard was not by any means lower than that of the United Council of the Synagogue, from which he had been expelled in consequence of his inconvenient notoriety. 'The disqualification of the Jews,' says a correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, 'is part of a measure for the better administration of railways in Russia. . . The Jews have been much employed as inspectors of goods depots, and some of them have, as such, proved themselves untrustworthy. They are disqualified, not for their belief, but for their morals—not *qua* Jews, but because, as a class, they are what travellers in Eastern Europe know them to be.' More than one-sixth of the Jews in Russia live by means of the liquor trade, as they themselves admit.

The legitimate inference deducible from these and many other facts, which might be easily adduced, is simply this: whereas the moral delinquencies of the Protestant nations are more striking, but limited to comparatively small and neglected sections of the population, who repudiate every religious profession ;

those of the Jews are less apparent, but almost co-extensive with the whole people, and more or less due to the baneful influence exerted by their creed. The honourable exceptions, which, it must be admitted, are not inconsiderable, especially in this country, (England,) are mainly the effect of the social and commercial contact between the better class of Jews and Christians.

It is scarcely necessary to dwell upon the spiritual condition of the Jews. The combination of a low moral standard with spirituality of mind is a monstrous conception, and does not deserve a moment's consideration. It has been reserved for superstition to unite deliberate neglect of the Decalogue with deep religious devotion. Two ways are open to the educated Jew. He must either embrace Christianity as offering the most perfect solution of all his difficulties; or, he must declare open war against Moses and the Prophets, and denounce them as impostors. But pride of intellect, the fatal example of faithless Christian professors, and his own inherited prejudices conspire to prevent his adopting the former course. And, on the other hand, his long cherished national aspirations—based originally upon a rooted belief in the Divine origin of the Hebrew Scriptures, and interwoven with every fibre of his being—could not at first be absolutely renounced, without doing extreme violence to his inner consciousness. Even now, when this difficulty is being rapidly removed, any outspoken adoption of a purely deistic creed in opposition to all Revelation, would at once exclude him from the pale of the Synagogue, which, to accommodate that very class of Jews, is content with a mere *profession* of Judaism on the part of its members, and that not even verbal, but only tacit. And why should he place himself in a painful position of extreme social isolation, when the condition of avoiding it is so easy—the sacrifice of truth, which, ‘for the sake of the ways of peace,’ has always been sanctioned by Judaism? (‘For the sake of the ways of peace,’ God Himself is represented, in the Talmud, as having told an untruth. Tract Yebamoth, fol. 65, col. 2; Baba—metzia, fol. 87, col. 1.)

To this peculiarity, therefore, in his social position, the logical inconsistency of Judaism, and the ease with which the Syna-

gogue, whether Orthodox or Reform, adapts itself to the exigencies of the age, are due that religious insincerity and want of straightforwardness which, more than any other vice, mark the character of the Jew, whenever and wherever he is brought into contact with the effects of Christian enlightenment, and not under the direct influence of the Gospel itself. It is that religious constraint which corrupts his heart, deadens his moral sensibilities, and blunts his spiritual perceptions.

Such being the intellectual aspect of the educated, it may easily be inferred what must be the moral and spiritual condition of the uneducated Jew. The traditional standard of morality, low in itself, but reduced still lower by external circumstances of an unusual kind, is now fixed by the logical and practical inconsistency of 'enlightened' Judaism; and what was formerly the partial result of supervenient impulse has now become the necessary sequence of an untenable system.

Few among the intellectual, and none among the illiterate Jews may be able to perceive clearly the demoralizing effects of their creed, but its influence is none the less baneful for their deficiency or want of perception. It is seldom that the patient has a distinct apprehension of the disease which undermines his constitution, but so far from being impeded, its ravages are rather aggravated by his ignorance of the nature and extent of its operation. Besides, unless unalloyed Scripture truth is substituted in its place, the mere renunciation of superstitious belief will leave wholly unaffected the moral and spiritual evils engendered by it. The mind may be intellectually enlightened, and the heart remain utterly unimproved."

So far the testimony of this eminent scholar, who speaks of what comes under his own observation.

The present attitude of the Jews in Europe towards Christianity is not that of mere rejection, but that of active opposition. And this must be taken into consideration, if we would have a correct understanding of the Anti-Jewish agitation, which threatens to be more wide-spread in Europe than it is already. An impartial examination of the causes of this agitation will reveal the fact that some of these are eminently creditable to the

Jews, and that others are not. It very rarely happens, in the strifes and controversies of this world, that the fault is altogether on one side. The *rationale* is this: That in spite of the hatred and prejudice of ages, which is by no means extinct, within less than a century from the beginning of their emancipation, the Jews are everywhere showing a tendency to outstrip their Gentile fellow-citizens in the race of life, and so become a dominating class. A feeling of jealousy and envy, on account of this, is, without doubt, one chief reason of the Anti-Jewish feeling in Europe, and one which, probably, underlies many other reasons that are put forward. A German writer puts the whole case, thus: "The question has, in our day, arisen, not, as on former occasions, whether the Jews shall have *equal* rights with all others, but, whether they shall be allowed to have and exercise *more* power and influence than others." Again: "The rapid rise of the Jewish Nation to leadership is the Great Problem of the future for East Germany."

And because Jews prove themselves to be smarter than all other peoples, must they be made to suffer for it? It would be more honourable to emulate them than to seek to crush them. Do not talent and energy, everywhere, command respect? Are brains at a discount only in the case of the Jew? In order to keep the Jew down, must a premium be put upon Gentile incapacity and indolence?

One ground of dissatisfaction is the extraordinary tendency of *capital* in Europe, more and more, to concentrate in Jewish hands. The well-known position which has long been held by the Rothschilds is not an exceptional one. In Germany and Austria, the Jews almost monopolize the business of banking. They have become, more than ever before, the money-lenders of Europe, and are becoming, to a startling extent, owners of the soil in Central and Eastern Europe. It was said, in a debate in the German Reichstag, that the lands in Upper Silesia and Posen have, largely, passed by mortgage foreclosures out of the hands of the German population into those of the Jews, and that "the Christian population, stripped and impoverished, were almost incapable of raising themselves again." In Hungary, the Jews

have already obtained possession of so many of the old estates as to make a change in the Hungarian Constitution a necessity.

Another ground of dissatisfaction is the eminent position occupied by the Jews in the matter of *education*. The doors of the Schools and Universities of Europe being thrown open to Jews, they have entered eagerly into the intellectual contest with Christians, and a much larger percentage of their number is already found among the educated and educating classes. In every land, men of Jewish blood are found, holding positions of the highest prominence and influence, as scholars and educators of the people, to an extent out of all proportion to their number. A remarkable example is afforded even in Islam. In Cairo, Egypt, is the largest Theological College in the world. It has 300 Professors and 10,000 Students. Those students come from all parts of the Mohammedan world, from West Africa to China. They take their course of study, and go forth devoted missionaries of Islam, into the depths of Africa and wilds of Central Asia. It is not easy to over-estimate the influence of this great Arabick University, perhaps the most effective religious Propaganda in the world. But at the head of this ancient institution of learning, stands one of the Jewish race! A Jewish pervert to Islam, by name Abbasi, holds authority over all those three hundred Professors and ten thousand Students, and, so, occupies the highest position of theological instruction in the Mohammedan world.

If we turn to Europe, we find a remarkable proportion of men, in the foremost rank as scholars and as educators, to be men, of Jewish blood. On the side of Christian scholarship, Jewish names of renown are found, compared with whom, the Company of Bible Revisionists are but pigmies. In Germany, where they are not two per cent. of the population, the Jews hold seventy Professors' chairs in the Universities. In all the higher institutions of learning, the proportion of Jews is one in ten. So that in a few years more, every tenth educated man in Germany will be a Jew!

Another ground of dissatisfaction is the extensive controul of the European press by Jews. In London, the paper having the

largest circulation is owned by a Jew. In Spain, where there are not four thousand Jews, a Jew leads the radical party, and a Jew edits the most influential paper. In Italy, the press is greatly indebted for its vigour and brilliancy to Jewish pens. With the memories of the Mortara outrage, and the merciless cruelties of the Inquisition fresh in their minds, the Jews in Italy, as elsewhere, are the most unsparing enemies of Papal pretensions, and by their influence thus exerted through the press, powerfully contributed to that change in Italy which culminated in the final overthrow of the temporal power of the Pope. And herein, they have done admirable service, both to God and man. Out of twenty-three Liberal papers of Berlin, there are only two which are not in the hands of the Jews. In Lower Austria, of three hundred and seventy Authors, two hundred and twenty-five are Jews.

Another ground of dissatisfaction is the prominent position of the Jews in the *politicks* of Europe. This fact attracts attention everywhere. In Italy, the Jews number scarcely 40,000, but they hold eight seats in the Chamber of Deputies, including the Vice-Presidency. In England, where there is only one Jew in eight hundred of the population, they held, recently, nine out of the six hundred and fifty-eight seats in the House of Commons, while, as every one knows, one of their race was at the same time Prime Minister. So, also, it was a Jew, the late Sir Geo. Jessel, the Master of the Rolls, and pronounced the ablest lawyer in equity that has sat in that court in the present generation, and the most distinguished graduate, in his day, of the University of London. In France, lately, no less than twenty-one Jews were decorated with the order of the Legion of Honour. It is alleged, that it is not simply the politickal success of the Jews that has awakened so much angry feeling, as the conviction that their ascendancy in politicks is a danger to the State. Those who bring this charge against them affirm, that, as a rule, the Jews of Europe belong to the radical, and often to the revolutionary, party, and therefore they form a disintegrating element in the State, and they point to the fact, that the Radical leaders, Castelar, Lasker, Schultze, Delitzsch, Oppenheim and

Bamberger, and the Socialist leaders, Laselle, Marx, Bebel and Leibknecht, are all Jews; and that of the sixty-two recent convictions in the Nihilist trials in Russia, no less than nineteen of the convicted were Jews, *i. e.*, nearly one-third of the whole.

But the most potent element of dissatisfaction, which is felt by many of the most earnest religious men, is the belief, that in view of the pronounced hostility of the Jews to all evangelickal Christianity, the undue preponderance of their influence cannot but be most pernicious in its effect on the Christian life of any people. It is the conviction, that the Jewish Question is "above all, a religious question," that has excited such wide-spread interest in it, and has given it such a deep hold on popular feeling. It is extensively believed that it is the Jews, who, since their emancipation, have been among the most prominent agents in unsettling the publick faith in Christianity, and the loyalty of the people to the existing order of society, and continuing the present condition of insecurity on the European continent. To appreciate the case fully, we must remember that the modern Jews are divided into two schools, the Orthodox, and the Liberal or Reformed. The former substantially agree with Christians in their belief in the infallible authority of the Old Testament Scriptures, and are still looking for the Messiah to come and fulfil unto them the promises made unto the Fathers. The Reformed, on the other hand, are avowed Rationalists, of various grades; and their views as to the Divine authority of the Old Testament, however they may differ among themselves, seem to agree, in general, with those of Rationalists in the Christian Church. These expect no Messiah, but maintain that Israel itself is the Messiah, appointed of God to be the Saviour of the world. Their position is set forth in these words of Rabbi Wise, of Cincinnati: "We do not wish to return to Palestine, nor do we pray for the coming of Messiah. An American Israelite who trusts in God, and believes in the Divine truth of the Bible, needs no King to govern, no Messiah to redeem, and no miracles to demonstrate the truth of religion." These words involve a contradiction. No one who "believes in the Divine truth of the Bible" could possibly embrace so monstrous a creed, but would

reject it with horror. The man who could utter such words is no Jew, but an Infidel, and deserves to be excommunicated from Israel.

Numerically, the Orthodox are much stronger than the Reformed. But the Reformed are much the stronger in wealth and general education, and it is they that controul the press of Germany and Austria. Both Orthodox and Reformed are hostile to Christianity, but the latter are much the more bitter and aggressive of the two, giving their whole strength to the extension of that rationalistick movement against Evangelickal Religion, which the Jew Spinoza, 200 years ago, in a manner began, and which, with untiring zeal, they are so prosecuting "until Germany and Austria are threatened with de-christianization by their means." A distinguished Professor in a German University says: "The root of this whole Antichristian movement in the German Empire is with the Jews. They have come to controul almost the entire secular press, and are using all the power of that press to diffuse unbelief in Christianity among the masses of the people."

These are momentous facts. Matters are now reversed. The sin of so-called Christians in persecuting the Jews, and carrying on a fearful crusade against them, is now the sin of Jews, inaugurating a fresh crusade against Christianity, and crying out: "Crucify it! Crucify it!"

The present hopeless condition of the Jews is fitly expressed by the question addressed to the Prophet: "Can these bones live?" Judging by sense alone, the answer must have been: They cannot. There is no people so hardened against conviction; none who have lived among Christians so much in vain; none who are so unwilling to be reasoned with; none whose conversion is so improbable. Even they themselves seem to have no hopes but what are of a worldly nature. And now, if at any time there had come to us a voice from heaven, demanding whether such dry bones could live, our only response would be: "O, Lord God, Thou knowest!" The bones are scattered: who shall collect them? They are dry: who shall animate them? But yet Ministers of the Gospel are commanded to prophesy re-

specting these dry bones : to declare in unqualified language that the Jews shall again be brought back to their fold, the Church of God, and to their land, when "the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled."

But an objector will say : Does not the New Testament declare that the Jews are blinded ? Is it not written (2 Cor. 3:14) : "But their minds were blinded ; for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament ; which vail is done away in Christ. But even to this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart. Nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away ?" Is not both the blindness here plainly asserted and the period of its continuance fixed ?

The objector mistakes the sense of the passage. The Apostle is not speaking of a blindness inflicted upon the Jews because of their rejection of Christ, but of a blindness which began in the days of Moses. Neither is he speaking of a blindness which renders faith in Christ impossible, but which prevented the Jews from the time of Moses until Paul's time, and, we may add, until our own time, from understanding the nature of the Mosaick Dispensation. Note the context : "Seeing, then, that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech : and not as Moses, who put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished (*i. e.*, the Mosaick Dispensation) : but their minds were blinded ; for until this day *remaineth*, (not, which now is inflicted because of the rejection of Christ, but which began in the days of Moses, and from that time until this day, *remaineth*) the *same* vail untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament, which vail is done away in Christ." This vail is so far from preventing faith in Christ, that we know that it remained on thousands, not excepting the Apostles themselves, after their conversion to Christ, and after the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, until at last it was removed by a special vision vouchsafed to Peter : yea, and it will, as the Apostle tells us, remain on the Jews until after their conversion : "Nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away." Mark his words. He does not say that

this vail shall be taken away, in order to render their turning to the Lord possible, but that they shall turn to the Lord first, and then the vail shall be taken away.

This passage, then, rightly interpreted, does not warrant the assertion that the present condition of the Jews is beyond recovery. Abundant Scriptures, as we have seen, proclaim the certain restoration of Israel. And what has already occurred is sufficient to confirm our faith in the fulfilment of the Divine prediction, and to admonish us not to argue from a difficulty to an impossibility. *The British Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Jews* states, that during the last fifty years, the number of converts who give every evidence of sincerity that man can give, is counted, not by hundreds, but by thousands. Since the beginning of this century, 100,000 have been converted, and the rate of increase now is over 1,000 a year. In England, and on the continent, there are 30,000 converted Jews, of whom 400 are Ministers of the Gospel. There are, at this time, over one thousand children in Sunday-schools in Palestine, the majority of whom are in Jerusalem. This should encourage us respecting the full accomplishment of the sure word of prophecy. Let not Christians exclude them from their prayers, their sympathies, their affection, and their labors.

“God hath not cast away His people” Israel. Let us not cast them away. The Abrahamic covenant that made them a nation is still in force, and provides for their continued existence, and their ultimate restoration to all their glory, and all their privileges. It made them what they were, and it will again make them even greater than what they once were. Its hold is upon them, never to be removed! God hath not cast away His people Israel. They are not cast away *totally* nor *finally*. Not *totally*, for a chosen remnant has always existed, and does to this day. Not *finally*, for in the latter days the *whole nation*, and not a remnant, simply, as many suppose, *shall be restored*. “And so *all Israel* shall be saved,” says the Apostle. And this will be when “the fulness of the Gentiles shall have come in,” *i. e.*, not the general conversion of the world to Christ, as some take it, for in

this work restored Israel is to be the chief agent ;* but, until the Gentiles have had their *full* time of the visible Church all to themselves, while the Jews are out, which the Jews had once all to themselves, until the Gentiles were brought in. To represent the restoration of the Jews as subsequent to, and consequent upon, the conversion of the nations, is contrary to the argument of the Holy Ghost : “ If the fall of the Jews be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles ; how much more their fulness ? ” “ If the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead ? ” Who can estimate “ the riches of the world, ” occasioned by the fall of the Jews—the triumphs of the Gospel in many lands, the number of converts, the illustrious army of martyrs, the innumerable blessings to society, the splendid monuments of Christian civilization, and culture and genius ! And yet all this is not to be mentioned in connection with the universal and wonderful effects which are to follow the restoration of Israel. If the diminishing of the Jews has enriched the world, what shall their fulness do ? Through their fall, multitudes of individuals have been brought to Christ ; but, by their recovery, *multitudes of nations* shall be brought to Christ. *The conversion of the whole world to Christ, the coronation of the King of Zion as the King of Nations, can be effected only by the Jew.*

As God had but one Church under the Old Testament, and this one Church, was, as to its polity, Presbyterian, and as the various Churches that do now exist are scriptural and fruitful only in the proportion in which they partake of the root and fatness of this one grand Old Testament Presbyterian Olive Tree ;

* The Apostle Paul, quoting from the 59th of Isaiah, says : “ All Israel shall be saved, as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.” He here informs us, that the Prophet predicts the National Conversion of Israel. But mark the words which follow his quotation : “ Arise, shine ; for thy light is come, and the Glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. For, behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people ; but the Lord shall arise upon thee, and His Glory shall be seen upon thee ; and the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising.”

so, when Israel re-enters the Church of God, its own Church, that Church shall be again, in every respect, one, the denominational differences that now mar its unity and impede its progress ceasing; and this united Presbyterian Church of the New Testament shall enter upon a new career of unexampled splendour, power and success.

Tributary to this result, in its own sphere, will be the restoration of civil polity to its normal relation to Him who is Head of all principality and power, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, Jesus Christ, who is Head over all things to the Church. The governments of earth are unsettled, as they have always been unsettled, and can never find rest until they rest in Christ, their lawful Head. The entire political creation groaneth and travaileth in pain until now, subjected to vanity and sighing for deliverance, that deliverance which is to be found only under Messial's gentle reign—the reign of righteousness and reign of peace. And it will come, when, with the restoration of Israel, the Theocracy shall also be restored, not limited to one nation as before, but a universal Christian Theocracy, wherein the State and the Church, in all lands, are both subject to Christ, the Head of all power, but yet are kept without interference or collision, each to its own appropriate orbit, to transcend which, and encroach upon that of the other, would be to rebel against the authority of their common Head.* Under this universal Theocracy, the nations, for the first time, render unto Jesus, Prince of the Kings of the earth, that allegiance and honour which are His due, and receive from Him, in return, those smiles of His Providence and influences of His Spirit which secure stability, prosperity and renown. The enthronement of the Theocratic principle in the governments of the earth will accompany the restoration of the Theocratic Nation, and this will take place when “the fulness of the Gentiles shall have come in.”

* Under the Jewish Theocracy, Church and State were not united, nor confounded—a common, but gross error. The Church was not the Nation, nor the Nation the Church. Each had its distinct rulers, courts, laws, subjects, revenues, penalties and duration. The Jewish Church survived the Jewish State 135 years.

The winding up of the Gentile period of exclusive possession of the Church will, in all probability, be marked by revolutions and wars throughout the nations, as the winding up of the Jewish period of exclusive possession of the Church was marked by violence and war. A universal instinct is now leading the nations to prepare for wars, as they never were prepared before. And the state of society, both in Europe and America, presents features so revolting, as to startle every thoughtful mind—the statesman and the philosopher, as well as the minister and the layman. The *decay of Faith*—the decrying and scouting at the supernatural; the contempt of the Sabbath; the trampling upon the relations of husband and wife, parent and child, master and slave, ruler and subject; the impatience of the restraints of law; the degrading materialism and besotted sensualism of the age; the ever growing apostacy in the Churches; the conspiracy of the nations against the Lord and against His Anointed, and their malignant hostility to the sacred truths and institutions of the Gospel; the blotting out, in some places, the *very name of God*; Spiritualism, or the worship of devils; the wonderful activity everywhere exhibited by the Roman Antichrist; fierce, remorseless Atheism rearing its horrid front, and, hand in hand with lawlessness, making fearful strides towards the throne of society: these are fearful signs of an impending universal catastrophe. The spirit that is now abroad—agitating, agitating, agitating—is the spirit of Infidelity, that has struck down one domestic relation, and aims to strike down all government, all society, all the barriers which man has erected to guard against the corruption of his fellow-man, and to run the ploughshare of ruin over all the dearest interests of humanity, for this world and the next. The troubles which disturb society find not their origin in politics, but, back of this, in a corrupt theology, in a false religion. It takes a long time for either religious truth or religious error to mature and bear fruit. The stream which comes down to us finds its source far away and high up among the mountains. Religious heresies will always, if unchecked, originate social and civil heresies. The corrupt creed which scouts at the Bible doctrine of the representative character of Adam and of Christ,

originated in politicks, that mischievous individualism which would disintegrate society, destroy its cohesive principles, and afford no solid foundation for the fabrick of government to rest upon. It is simply a contest between the Mediator and Satan for headship over society. The question is, whether Law and Order and Liberty shall maintain the ascendancy, or whether Anarchy shall wave its horrid sceptre over the broken altars and the prostrate institutions and the blighted interests of every people, and crazy devils riot over every murdered government and every ruined land! This is the Devil's Millennium, and the frantick Jubilee of Hell!!

All around the horizon there are forebodings of a coming storm which may wrap the whole world in darkness. It is idle to urge that all these dangers have always more or less existed. It is the universal feeling of Christendom that such a combination and marshalling of all the forces of evil against the kingdom of God never before existed. The partial revivals in the Church that here and there occur, even if all these were genuine, bear but little proportion to the mighty and wide-spread revivals that now mark the kingdom of darkness. The season of temptation that will try all them that dwell upon the earth has come. And the true Church of God will be no loser, but a gainer by it. She comes out of the furnace purer than before.

The glorifying the sovereignty of His Grace is the ultimate end of God in all His works. Nature is nothing without Grace. Providence is nothing without Grace. Grace itself is nothing, if left to itself; it must always be kept depending upon God. No man, no nation can glory before the Lord. No dispensation can glory before the Lord. Patriarchal, Jewish, Gentile, all have been tried, and though serving important ends, all have failed in holding the world for Christ, and establishing the universal kingdom of God. Through the unbelief of the Jews, mercy came to the Gentiles. And so God will conclude the Gentiles in unbelief, that He may have mercy upon all, both Jews and Gentiles. Man's extremity is God's opportunity. No flesh can glory in His presence. *The setting of the Gentile sun which we are now witnessing, will be succeeded sooner or later,*

after a dark and awful night, by the rising of the Millennial Sun, which will fill the whole earth with the glory of the Lord. And to this glorious consummation the Jew will pre-eminently contribute. "In consequence of the unbelief of the Jews, the development of the Church assumed a different form from what it might have done; and thus the ideal of the New Testament Church was not realized then, but deferred till the time when Israel shall be brought back again to the Lord." And the restoration of Israel will prove to be the restoration to the Church of her true position, of her proper power, and of the normal operation of it. It is a great mistake to suppose that the normal state of the Church was found in the days of the Apostles,—when one half, and the better half, of the Church was then out of it.

Romanism—Satan's Theocracy—and Mohammedanism are not only, in themselves, the two greatest curses under which this earth is now groaning, but they constitute the two greatest hindrances to the greatest blessing which this distracted world is yet to receive at the hands of God, viz: the reconstruction of the Jewish Nation, their restoration to the Church and to their own land. The enmity of these two false systems of religion to the Jew is unappeasable. With respect to Romanism, hear the testimony of a Jewish Doctor, Dr. Philippson, the editor of an influential journal in Germany: "*The Church of Rome has made it an integral part of its very essence and endeavours, to persecute the Jews, in word and deed, in the most hateful manner, and to plant in the hearts of the nations the bitterest enmity, hatred and contempt against the Jews.* We need not turn to the pages of history. It is well-known that Popery, as soon as it had obtained temporal power, deprived the Jews of all civil rights, placed them *below* the lowest classes of society, and through all the middle ages continually stirred up princes and people to the most bloody excesses against the Jews, and at length, in more modern times, established the Inquisition, in order to destroy the Jews, whom it had forced to give up Judaism. During the last twenty years this spirit manifests itself again. As soon as Ultramontanism began to gather strength, it turned its sharpest sting against the

Jews. The entire Ultramontane press made it their business every day to calumniate the Jews in the most shameless manner, and to advocate their destruction. They did what they could, that burning torches might everywhere be cast into the houses of the Jews, and that their lives and property should be destroyed by infuriated mobs. It has been asked with astonishment, What have the Jews done to excite such unheard of conduct? Since the time when the Governments of Germany, Austria and Italy have opposed the pretensions of the Romish Hierarchy, and notwithstanding that we might have expected that the leaders of Popery would have too much to do to contend with their opponents, to busy themselves with the harmless Jews, things have become much worse."

Similar is the attitude of Mohammedanism to the Jews. Innumerable instances of cruelty still mark the course of that persecuting power. But recently, it burnt to death a Jew in Persia, because of his religion. But its downfall is approaching. The settlement of the great "Eastern Question" cannot be delayed much longer. And that will result in setting Jerusalem free. Moslem rule will be utterly overthrown, and the Jew will no longer be a slave in his own land.

When the fulness of the Gentiles shall have come, then a whole nation of seven millions or more will be restored *to their own Church*; for, remember, it is the Jewish Church into which we have been taken. The middle wall of partition was taken down, not to let Jews into the Gentile Church, but to let Gentiles into the Jewish Church. The New Dispensation, as well as the Old, had its foundations laid by Jewish Apostles and Prophets, and among the ancient people of God. Jewish Missionaries planted the cross throughout the Roman Empire. The New Testament Church was in all its offices represented by members of the House of Israel. The multitudes of them that believed through the preaching of the Apostles were mainly Jews. Jews gave to the world not only the Law of God, but also the Gospel of Christ. The Christian Church was established long before any number of Gentiles were converted to the faith; was constituted of Jews exclusively for fifteen years after the Ascension;

and during the first century consisted principally of Jews, the Gentiles forming almost everywhere the minority. "Salvation is of the Jews." Judaism and Christianity are not two religions. The latter is as entirely Jewish as the former. The Author of Christianity was a Jew. But one *Perfect Man* has walked on this earth,—and He, *a Jew!* the Man Christ Jesus! The first Preachers of Christianity were all Jews. The Apostle Paul was a Jew.* The first Christians were all Jews. In discussing the truth of these systems, we are not opposing a Gentile religion to a Jewish religion, but comparing one Jewish Creed with another Jewish Creed; one "fulfilling," or *filling out* the other. We are disciples of the Jews, converts to Jewish doctrines, partakers of the Jewish hope and of all Jewish privileges, and advocates of that truth which Jews have taught us. Protestantism owes everything to Jews. The Jew did much for the Reformation, by his use of the newly-invented printing art to spread the Hebrew Scriptures. One of the most eminent precursors of the Reformation was a Christian Jew, an Englishman by birth, and educated in the University of Oxford, the famous *Nicolas DeLyra*, who wrote a Commentary on the Old and New Testament. Deeply

* The Talmud narrates the following interesting incident: Gamaliel, the President of the Sanhedrim, and the head of the more lenient school of Hillel, being looked upon by the more violent as a traitor, and goaded on, probably, by the vituperations of the fierce Shammaites, thought it high time to vindicate himself from the imputation of heresy, to which his defence of the Apostles exposed him. While engaged in drawing up the "Eighteen Blessings," which, to this day, form the principal part of the Jewish Liturgy, he exclaimed: "Is there no one capable of formulating a prayer of imprecation against the Christians?" whereupon, Saul the Little (afterwards Paul) sprang to his feet, and with the approbation of the Council, proposed the adoption of the following form: "Let the Christians, doomed to perdition, and the hereticks, have no hope; and let all evil doers perish in a moment; and may they all be speedily cut off. Hasten to root out, break down, cast to the ground, and subdue the presumptuous sinners in our own day, quickly. Blessed art Thou, O God, that breakest down the enemies and subduest the presumptuous."

The same man, who anathematizes Christians here, afterwards, as the Apostle Paul says: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema, Maranatha."

versed in the ancient tongues, and well read in all the works of the learned Rabbis, he selected their best opinions, and expounded the Scriptures in a manner far above the age, being better acquainted with the principles of interpretation than any of his predecessors. The great Wickliffe profited much by DeLyra's writings, and used them frequently when translating the Bible. So deeply indebted was Luther to these Commentaries, which contained numerous animadversions on the abuses of the Romish Church, that many have doubted whether the Reformation would have taken place when it did, had not DeLyra lived and written. The Polyglot of Complutum was the work of Hebrew converts. The Bible of Ferrara (about 1540,) was only one of the productions of the Hebrew press in Italy. The Reformation did nothing for the Jews in return. Luther, at first kindly disposed, became a relentless foe, and advised the strongest methods of dealing with them. Calvin, owing to his views on the fulfilment of prophecy, was coldly indifferent. The Reformed Churches followed their leaders in this neglect or hostility, and the Reformation itself suffered; its progress was checked by the Thirty Years' War, its growth stayed by the failure of its early heat, and the loss of its first love.

Such was the opposition of the old Christians, that they destroyed most valuable Hebrew Manuscripts of the Old Testament—things of great importance in the revised translation of the Old Testament Scriptures. So violent and wicked was their opposition, that Jews were forbidden, in the name of Christendom, to enter a Christian Church! And what could the effect be of all this folly and wickedness—of this neglect, coldness and opposition, which, in some places, still exist? A most disastrous one upon Christendom itself! The world is now facing a remarkable and fearful example of God's law of retributive justice. The prime movers, the head and front of the Communistick and Atheistick movement that now threatens the social upheaval of the Eastern continent, are Jews. They are Jews whom the Church would not make Christians, and the enemy of the Church has made them Atheists. Disraeli himself, in his life of Lord George Bentinck, adverts to this fact. Infidelity is

slaying its thousands in Israel. In France, copies of Voltaire are almost as common among the Jews as the Pentateuch or the Books of the Prophets. They are, as we have seen, largely the conductors of the press abroad, and are poisoning the publick mind with pestilential social and religious heresies, seeking to abolish the Sabbath and everything that is sacred. They are the leaders of unbelief and of the most godless materialism, many of them avowed and boastful Atheists. What a retribution on Christendom for spiritual neglect of the Jew! This comes of letting him alone, and making no effort for his conversion. Their eyes having been put out, they are, like Samson, pulling down the present Gentile Dispensation. To neglect and despise *them*, is to neglect and despise our own mercies, because "Salvation is of the Jews," always and forever; for it is "*the blessing of Abraham* that has come upon Gentiles," and will come upon them in all its fulness, when the entire nation of Israel shall be restored to the Church.

Restoration to their Church will be followed by restoration to their Land. People and Land are bound together in indissoluble ties. As defection and dispersion were connected, so reconciliation and restoration will also be connected. The great Abrahamic covenant secures both the People for the Lord, and the Land for the People, "for everlasting possession." Numerous predictions declare this, as we have seen. The dispersed among the nations are to be restored to their Church, and then re-established in Palestine. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, The Lord liveth which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt, but, The Lord liveth which brought up and which led the seed of the House of Israel out of the north country, and from all countries whither I had driven them, and *they shall dwell in their own land.*"

We remark, in passing, that there will be no revival of temple-worship, with its sacrifices and ceremonies, in restored Palestine, for these are forever done away with in Christ. Ezekiel's Temple does not refer to Palestine future, as many suppose, but to Palestine past, the return from Babylon. The chapters in Ezekiel which treat of it are not prophetick, but pre-

ceptive, directive, and contain commands, which, like all other commands, may be disobeyed, through sloth, unbelief and wickedness of men. But we cannot enter upon the full elucidation of that subject here.

It is true that very many Jews are already in Palestine, and it may be, as some think, that all will be there, ere they get "the new heart" promised to them. But, in that event, they will be there only as sojourners. Their covenant-right to Palestine takes effect, and their covenant-possession of it begins, only upon their reconciliation to God and restoration to their Church. Their conversion will be effected by a glorious outpouring of overwhelming light from the Sun of Righteousness, dispelling forever satanic mist and compelling them to see, in the rejected Christ, their own Messiah. But prophecy intimates that fearful trials will precede this, and be necessary to effect this. Even now, God is "stirring up their nest," and will, doubtless, continue to do so, unsettling them, in the countries where they would fain abide, and continually unsettling them, until he settles them in Palestine. And *there* will the last great battle be fought—the Battle of Armageddon—that will result in their everlasting deliverance from all their foes. In Ezekiel, 38th and 39th chapters, after making known the purpose of God to bring Judah and Israel together out of all lands, and unite them as one kingdom in their own land, it is intimated that the envy of Russia will be excited by beholding the ease and prosperity, in their own land, of a people, two and a half millions of whom were once her own subjects, and her insatiable lust of dominion will impel her to go against Israel, like a cloud covering the land. "Son of man, set thy face against Gog, the land of Magog, the Prince of Rosh, Mesheck and Tubal,"—*i. e.*, the Prince of Russia, Muscovy and Tobolsk,—“and prophesy against him.” (*Rosh* is both a proper and a common name, the latter signifying *head, prince, chief*. Our translation unhappily renders it by a tautology, “chief Prince,” treating it as a common name, instead of a proper, designating *Russia*.) “Say unto Gog: Thus saith the Lord God, in that day when my people of Israel dwelleth safely, shalt thou not know it? And thou shalt come from out

of thy place in the north parts, thou and many people with thee, all of them riding upon horses, a great company and a mighty army. And thou shalt come up against my people Israel, as a cloud to cover the land. It shall be in the latter days, and I will bring thee against my land, that the heathen may know Me, when I shall be sanctified in thee, O Gog, before their eyes. And I will call for a sword against thee, throughout all my mountains, saith the Lord God. And I will plead against thee with pestilence and with blood. I will turn thee back, and leave but the sixth part of thee, and will cause thee to come up from the north parts, and will bring thee upon the mountains of Israel. Thou shalt fall upon the mountains of Israel, thou and all thy bands. I will give thee unto the ravenous birds of every sort, and to the beasts of the field to be devoured. Thou shalt fall upon the open field, for I have spoken it, saith the Lord God."

The fearful straits to which Israel is reduced, before deliverance comes, produce the desired effect. They will then look upon Him whom they have pierced—with astonishment will they look upon their crucified Saviour—and then shall they mourn with a bitter mourning, as one mourneth at the death of the first-born. The mourning will be universal and particular. "The whole land shall mourn." "The family of the House of David apart, and their wives apart," or the representatives of the royal line shall mourn. "The family of the House of Levi apart, and their wives apart," or the representatives of the sacerdotal line shall mourn. Then "all the families that remain, every family apart, and their wives apart." Such a mourning as will then take place, the world has never seen. Such a mourning will move, excite, and shake the world! And then what wondrous effects will ensue throughout the earth! Already the languages of earth are at their command. And the resources of earth are coming more and more under their controul. And the discipline to which they have been subjected has produced a capacity for endurance, and a tenacity of purpose, which, with other qualities when sanctified, fit them to be the most valuable missionaries in all the world. And then, if not before, will the universal observance of the unpealed law of the Tithe, still

honoured by them, be restored in the Church of God; the effect of which will be to speedily cause the Millennial Dispensation to culminate in power, honour and majesty.

The "Eastern Question" is looming up more and more prominently before the nations of Europe, and the eyes of Christendom are turning more and more towards Palestine.

"England is ever watching with the utmost anxiety, the occupation of Constantinople by Russia, because Constantinople commands the high road by sea to Suez, just as Kars and Erzeroum command the high road by land, which Russia now controuls. England's communication with India is dependent on that narrow isthmus of Suez, and, in consequence of the absence of the Jews from Palestine, the approach to that Isthmus from the north is altogether uncovered. The highway from the north is open to any enemy, and what England and France require for the protection of Suez, is a strong people in the very district which God gave to Abraham, the district reaching from the sea to the river. The return of the Jews to Palestine is just what is required to allay the anxieties of Western Europe. If they were to return with all their great talents and enterprise and throw all their wonderful energy into the revival of that magnificently fertile territory, they would supply exactly what Europe requires, a protective power on the northern side, for the Alexandrian Railway and the Suez canal."

Palestine's capital will more than regain her ancient influence and grandeur. As it was at the first, when "the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance; when He separated the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the people *according to the number of the children of Israel,*" so will it be seen at the last. The future metropolis of the world will not be Rome, or Paris, or London, but *Jerusalem*. From Jerusalem will go forth influences that will govern the whole earth. She will give law to the world.

Then shall the crown of earth's power and grandeur and glory be placed upon Israel's brow! Then shall her songs of victory be chanted in sublimer strains than Moses or Isaiah knew! And then, the exultant shout of a people, redeemed, regenerated and

disenthralled, shall thunder through the land: "In the name of our God we will set up our banners!"

"Behold! the Mountain of the Lord,
In latter days shall rise
Above the mountains and the hills,
And draw the wond'ring eyes.

"To this the joyful nations round,
All tribes and tongues shall flow,
Up to the Hill of God they say,
And to His Courts we'll go.

"*The beams that shine on Zion's Hill,
Shall lighten every land,
The King who reigns in Zion's towers,
Shall all the world command.*"

As it was at the beginning of the New Dispensation, so, doubtless, will it be seen again:—The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the world convened at Jerusalem. The Presbyterian Church is, above all others, a debtor to Jerusalem. Let her carry back to her that Gospel which sounded forth from her throughout the world. "The fact that Palestine is the stronghold of Rabbinism, appears to be a sufficient reason why Christians should direct their most vigorous efforts to send the light of the Gospel among the Jews of this land." "Jerusalem is the heart of the nation, and everything done there, or in the Holy Land, will tell upon the whole Jewish world. When conversions take place, although they wish to keep them quiet, still the intelligence is soon communicated and known, and spoken of everywhere." "Those who come to Palestine are the *elite* of the devotional and strictly religious Jews of other countries." "The climate of Jerusalem is decidedly healthy." [*Mission of Inquiry to the Jews.*]

We have reason to remember the Jew at a Throne of Grace, and yet how few prayers are put up in his behalf. The same incredulity that was manifested by Jews at the beginning of the New Testament Dispensation, touching the introduction of Gentiles into their Church, is now exhibited by Gentiles, in even greater degree, touching the restoration of the Jews to their own Church! The accomplishment of the latter is considered a far greater and more difficult work than was that of the former;—

which is contrary to the argument of the Holy Ghost: "If thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted, *contrary to nature*, into a good olive tree, how MUCH MORE shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree?" The blindness that has, in part, happened to Israel will not last always. Through their unbelief a dispensation of mercy came to the Gentiles, not to the extent of national conversions, but an *electick dispensation*: "to take out of them a people for His name," as the Apostle James declared in the Jerusalem General Assembly (Acts, 15:14): an extraordinary dispensation termed by the Apostle Paul "a mystery"—"the mystery hid (*i. e.* partially, not totally hid, as the predictions of the Prophets shew) from ages and generations, but now made manifest to the saints, that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs (with the Jews), and of the same body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the Gospel,"—a parenthesis, as it were, in the settled economy of ages, during which the *first fruits*, only, of the Gentiles are gathered into the Church of God; for the reaping of the harvest of nations will be the glorious work of Israel, under the Universal Dispensation inaugurated by their Restoration. The greatest blessing that can be given to earth, is the Restoration of Israel to the bosom of the Church. No other event is to be compared to it for the magnitude and grandeur of its consequences. It will place the Church of Christ on an elevation before the eyes of the nations never yet attained. Her conquests, thenceforward, will be rapid, universal, complete. The Gospel-car will be borne with resistless energy through the earth, and the Banner of the Cross float in triumph round the globe! Mark the words of the inspired Apostle: "If the *fall* of the Jews be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their *fulness*! If the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but *life from the dead*?" "*Life from the dead!*"—which it could not be, if, as some suppose, society and the Church shall be in a continually ascending scale, culminating at last in Millennial purity and splendour. No! there must, first, be a condition of *death*—spiritual death, eccle-

siastickal death, social death, civil death, politickal death—before that grandest of all events takes place, the Restoration of Israel, which shall be to the world, *Life from the dead!* “Behold! the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people; but the Lord shall rise upon thee, and His Glory shall be seen upon thee, and the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and Kings to the brightness of thy rising.” So wonderful will its effects be, that the Apostle compares them to the changes that shall be witnessed at the Resurrection Day!

Oh, then! let us fervently supplicate the God of Israel to hasten that auspicious era, and let us look forward in the confidence of faith and the assurance of hope, to that happy time, when Jew and Gentile shall together rejoice in the blessings of one common, free, transcendent, blood-bought Salvation, and with united hands place the Crown upon the Saviour's Brow, and with united tongues hail Him, LORD OF ALL!

“Hail Glorious Day! expected long,
When Jew and Greek *one prayer* shall pour,
With eager feet *one Temple* throng,
With grateful praise *one God* adore!”—*Amen!*

“Come forth out of Thy royal chambers, O Prince of all the Kings of the earth! Put on the invisible robes of Thy Imperial Majesty! Take up that unlimited Sceptre, which Thy Almighty Father hath bequeathed Thee; for now the voice of Thy Bride calleth Thee, and all creatures sigh to be renewed!”

“Come then, and added to Thy many Crowns,
Receive yet *one*, the Crown of all the Earth,
Thou who alone art worthy! It was Thine,
By ancient Covenant, ere nature's birth;
And Thou hast made it Thine by purchase since,
And overpaid its value with Thy blood.

“One song employs all nations, and all cry:
‘Worthy the Lamb, for He was slain for us!’
The dwellers in the vales and on the rocks
Shout to each other, and the mountain-tops
From distant mountains catch the flying joy,
Till Nation after Nation taught the strain,
Earth rolls the rapturous HOSANNA round!”

—*Amen and Amen.*•

A. W. MILLER.

IV. NINETEENTH CENTURY EVANGELISM.

A recent writer, referring to the century now nearing its last decade, says: "As distinguished from every other age since the Apostolic, it may be called the *Sæculum Evangelicum*. This is its most noted characteristic. This is its highest and most enduring glory. By this it will doubtless be rendered memorable in the annals of the future." With this writer we must certainly agree, in so far as to admit that one of the most prominent characteristics of the century has been the revival throughout the great body of the Church of the Spirit of Missions. At no period since the days of the Apostles has the Church seemed so fully to accredit its divine commission, and recognize its solemn responsibility to preach the Gospel to every creature. Looking at the work of evangelization in its relations to the heathen world, this is unquestionably true. Never before have there been such organized, concerted, and persevering efforts to carry the Gospel into the "regions beyond." The history of Foreign Missions may almost be said to begin with the present century. Previous to this, noble and self-denying efforts had been made by the Danish Churches, the Moravian Brethren, and others, to plant and maintain missions on heathen soil; but these efforts had been for the most part spasmodic, and had proven to a great extent abortive for want of thorough organization and hearty co-operation. It was near the close of the 18th century that the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts" was organized; and in its organization the first real advance was made towards a systematic and united effort for the conversion of the world to Christ. It was just a century ago that William Carey in England, and Charles Grant in India, startled the Church with their views as to its responsibility for the souls of the heathen. It is a grand work that has been done since that time. Missionary vessels have found their way into the ports of every heathen nation. Mission stations have been planted on every pagan shore. Barbarous tongues have been mastered, and reduced for the first time to written form. The word of God has been translated into nearly every language spoken by man. Churches,

school-houses, printing presses have been multiplied. Grammars, reading books, tracts, newspapers, etc., have been printed and circulated by the thousands and tens of thousands, in languages of which not a single written character was in use when the missionaries came. To-day there are not less than six thousand missionaries, and twenty-five thousand native helpers employed in preaching in these various languages the unsearchable riches of Christ. There are nearly, if not fully, a million communicants in the native churches established on these foreign shores. A larger number of candidates are applying to the various Committees and Boards of Missions than can possibly be equipped and sent forth into the field. It is impossible to estimate what ingatherings the twelve years of the century that are yet to come will witness. Up to within a very recent period, the work has been one not only of great difficulty and hardship, but one requiring the exercise of great patience and faith. To use an illustration for which we are indebted to one of our missionaries now in the field, the work of Foreign Missions has been like the building of a great breakwater on some rough and stormy coast. For months, and even years, vessel after vessel brings its cargo of stone and empties it into what Homer calls the "all devouring sea." After thousands of ship loads have thus been thrown in, the sea still rolls with its rough waves over the spot, and it seems as if all the labor and time have been lavished in vain. But at length the faint line of stone begins to appear with the white caps playing upon it, and soon there is the massive wall, behind which the vessels ride at peaceful mooring, however the storms may rage without. The greater part of this century of Missions has been spent in labor of which no immediate results could be perceived. The Church of God, in the expenditure of money, and the sacrifice of valuable lives, seemed to be pouring her treasure into the sea. Many were the incredulous ones, many the scoffers; but the day of ridicule and misconception has gone by. The outlines of the great breakwater are beginning to appear. The fruits of missionary toil are beginning to abound. Converts are numbered by thousands where, a few years ago, they could only be counted by scores.

The harvest period is at hand. No wonder so many young men are pressing in. Other men have labored and they are going to enter into their labors. With the present facilities of travel to foreign lands; with the speed of communication with home by mail and telegraph; with the provisions for the comfort of the newly arrived missionary; the congenial society of fellow-laborers; and the appliances, ready to hand, for speedy mastery of the language and entrance upon work, the life of a foreign missionary is very different from what it was fifty years ago, and we may hope that constantly increasing numbers will enter the field, and hitherto unparalleled results be attained before the end of the next decade shall bring the century to a close.

When we turn from the Foreign to the Home Field, we find even more remarkable evidence of the presence and power of the spirit of evangelism. The great question, "how to reach the masses," has assumed a magnitude and importance it has never possessed before. Hitherto it has been thought sufficient that churches should be erected, ordinances duly administered, a stated ministry employed, and the masses invited to come and sit down to the Gospel feast. But of late the Church has been impressed with the idea that if the masses will not come to the Gospel, the Gospel must be carried to them. Theatres, public halls, and other places of popular resort have been procured, in the hope that those who were wont to frequent them would enter their doors, to hear the Gospel, more readily than those of a regular church edifice. Stands have been erected in public gardens and upon the corners of the streets. Missions have been opened in the closest possible contiguity to the purlieus of vice and crime. Consecrated laymen in bands or, after the Apostolic method, two by two, have gone into highway and byway, into garret and cellar. Noble Christian women in Flower Missions, and Prison Missions, and Midnight Missions, have sought to win back the erring ones and lift up the fallen. It is the age of the colporteur and the evangelist, penetrating into the remotest recesses of our mountains, and carrying the word far out over the plains of our great western frontier. It is the era of the Mission Sunday School, of the tract-distributor, of the Bible-

woman, of the Young Men's Christian Association, of every agency that sanctified ingenuity can devise, or consecrated energy carry into effect, to bring the power of the Gospel to bear upon the non-church-going masses of the people. It is pre-eminently the age of lay-effort and lay-service. We do not claim for the ministry greater zeal, efficiency, or self-sacrifice than in previous eras; but we do claim that the laity of the Church are more thoroughly aroused, more active, more aggressive than ever before since the days when being scattered abroad by persecution they went everywhere preaching the word. We claim that their organization for work is more thorough, and their equipment more complete, that woman's agency, always so potent in the Church for good, is more fully consecrated, and more serviceably employed than ever before, and that at no previous period in her history has the Church seemed so fully to enter into the spirit of her divine Lord, who left the ninety and nine in the wilderness that he might go after the one that was lost. In the Synod of Kentucky, of which the writer is a member, an evangelistic work of most remarkable character, and one that illustrates fully the spirit of the age, has been for several years progressing. It originated in the earnest faith and consecrated zeal of two of the laymen of the Synod. It has been maintained chiefly through the prayers and offerings of the laity of the Church. It has given a new era to Presbyterianism in the State. Within five years, more than \$60,000 have been raised for evangelization within the bounds of the Synod. The Evangelists have penetrated into the heart of the mountains, established churches and erected edifices of worship in counties where the voice of a Presbyterian minister had never been heard. The Church has been increased nearly a hundred-fold, and the good work goes forward with no apparent limit to the blessings which it is to confer. Other Synods, incited by the example, and encouraged by the success of this one, are taking steps looking to the same character of aggressive work, and with this thorough organization for evangelistic work in every Synod, giving wise direction to the zeal of earnest Christian hearts, there is no estimating the great results that with God's blessing will ensue.

The reader, who has followed thus far, may be ready to say : " Well, surely you will agree with the writer from whom you quote, and be ready to say that the evangelism of the nineteenth century is ' its highest and most enduring glory.' " If the century had terminated twenty years ago, there would have been no difficulty in according to the evangelism of the day all the honor which is implied in the language under consideration. But he must be blind indeed who does not see that, within the last few years, evils have arisen and abuses crept in, which, if they are not checked, will bring the very names of evangelist and evangelism into contempt.

With profound regret for the necessity of such discussion, but under an equally profound conviction of its importance at the present time, let us look at some of those incipient evils that threaten not only to impair most seriously the efficiency of our evangelistic work, but to undermine the confidence of all sober-thinking people in the work itself.

I. The first of these perils to which attention will be called, is that arising from *fanaticism*. It will no doubt be true to the end of the world that every good cause must suffer from the zeal of ignorant and misguided fanatics. When all other arts and devices fail, and when the great enemy of all godliness finds it impossible to check by ridicule or opposition any great movement in the interests of Christ's Kingdom, his last and favorite recourse is to undertake to run it; and when once the great movement has under his leadership been derailed, the greater the momentum with which it has been running the wider will be its departure from the true track, and the more inevitable and disastrous the wreck and ruin that will result.

Now, in this matter of evangelism there are so many elements of fanaticism creeping in, that the whole movement seems in danger of slipping from the grasp of the Church of God and being " led captive by Satan at his will. " We can only allude in a very brief manner, in a paper like this, to a few of these elements. In the first place, then, no one can be blind to the fact that the evangelistic movement in this country is being conducted largely under the conduct and control of leaders who, in so far as the

Church through all its methods of discipline is concerned, are utterly irresponsible. It does not fall within the purview of this article to discuss the relations of Mr. Moody and other great evangelistic leaders to the Young Men's Christian Association, or the relations of that great agency to the Church of God. In view of the incalculable good that has been done by the Association, and the wonderful blessing of God upon the labors of these noble and consecrated men, it is profoundly to be deplored that to so great an extent they have allowed the supremacy of the one witness-bearing Church of Christ, and their own due subjection to it in the Lord, to lie in the back-ground, and have thus unintentionally given abettance to the evil of which we now complain. Leaving these honored men out of view, we are confronted in all our cities, and in many of our interior towns, with a class of evangelists, who offer no credentials, who sustain as evangelists no ecclesiastical relations, who seek no ordination, and acknowledge no Church authority; but who wander through the land at their own sweet will, the self-constituted and self-sufficient guides of the people in that most momentous of all matters,—the salvation of the soul. It is both pitiable and painful to follow these men with their crude theories and one-sided statements of Christian doctrine. Some of them are good men, pious cranks, honest and earnest, having a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. Some of them are ecclesiastical tramps, restless spirits, fond of change, unable to succeed in any settled charge or steady work, and so beating from city to city, staying in one place only long enough to wear off the edge of novelty; and receiving through the liberality of those whom their novel methods have attracted and temporarily beguiled, sufficient remuneration for their services to pay their way to the next point where they are to "open a mission." Some of them are mere pulpit mountebanks, seeking ecclesiastical notoriety, and ready to stand on their heads or do anything else that will attract a crowd. One of this latter class appeared in Louisville, Ky., a few winters ago, and being refused access to the churches because he had no credentials, made arrangements with the proprietor of a theatre in which a nightly "variety

show" was held, by which he secured the use of the building for religious services on Sunday afternoons. There he entertained the crowds that came to hear him, with denunciations of the churches and the clergy, whilst he patted the proprietor of the theatre on the shoulder, called him "Brother," and invoked God's blessing upon him; and when his services closed, the audience, as they passed out of the building, found the box-office open for their accommodation, and the obliging ticket agent of the "brother" for whose prosperity the evangelist had just prayed, waiting to sell them tickets to his Sunday night variety performance. When all this is being done under the name of evangelism, and under the cloak of religion, how long will it require to bring the very name of evangelist into contempt?

But the relation of these evangelists to the Church is unfortunately not only that of irresponsibility, but usually of indifference, and too often of open antagonism. Instances without number could be given in illustration of this assertion. One of the latest, and at the same time one of the most astonishing, examples is found in the recent attitude of Rev. Sam. Jones, at present the "bright, particular star" in this constellation of popular evangelists. When Mr. Jones began his wonderful career, the keen blade of his satire and wit was turned against vice. Few men could equal him in his power to hold up the popular vices and follies of the day upon the point of his scalpel, and exhibit them in all their deformity and meanness. It was this power that first attracted the crowds to him. By its exercise he might have continued to hold them, and his preaching have been as useful in its results as it is novel in its methods. But unfortunately, he discovered that another thing also is popular with the "non-church-going masses," and that is witticism at the expense of the regular ministry of the Gospel. And now nothing delights him more than in drawling tones to imitate, to the intense amusement of his hearers, the sermons and even the prayers of good men not gifted with the same powers of oratory with himself, and to detract from the hard-earned esteem in which faithful and self-denying pastors are held, by contrasting the comparatively small amount of good which, in his judgment, they and their churches

are accomplishing, with the wonderful results in certain missions, in which the high-pressure methods, now so much in vogue, are employed. The attitude of modern lay evangelism towards the churches; the dissatisfaction which both by direct and indirect influence it tends to awaken and foster towards the regular services of the sanctuary, and the orderly relations of the pastorate; the lukewarmness with which these evangelists recommend church membership to their converts, if indeed they recommend it at all—these things, together with the well-known fact that so few of those who make confession in the evangelistic meetings ever really identify themselves in any true sense with any branch of the visible Church of Christ, may well make even the most earnest advocates of this form of evangelism pause, and ask how far under the zeal of those who have the lead of it, it is drifting away, not only from the control, but even from the sympathy and co-operation of the Church; and whether it is not time to call a halt for all those who are not willing to see the Church of God as a divine institute thrust out of the way, and its place usurped by a self-constituted and self-directed evangelism.

Another direction in which this tendency to fanaticism in connection with evangelization is running, is seen in the perversion of woman's true relation to the Church, and the thrusting of her forward into offices and relations for which she is unfitted by nature, and for which providence never designed her. It is one of the most unhappy features of the present time that the advocates of the unscriptural and unsexing theory of "woman's rights" have seized upon the popular sympathy with the two greatest moral movements of the day, hoping to make of this popular sympathy a leverage with which to lift themselves into power. There is, first, the temperance movement, which looks to the closing of saloons and drinking houses and the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. Inasmuch as woman is the principal sufferer by intemperance, and there is no man, deserving the name of a man, who would not be ready to give her all lawful and proper relief from the evils of that iniquitous traffic which embrutes her husband, and reduces her children to beggary and rags, the advocates of woman-suffrage, with

a strategy worthy of the highest generalship, step forward and say: "The saloons must go: we are all agreed upon that. But you men are unable, as experience shows, to accomplish with your unaided strength this so desirable result. Now, give woman the right of suffrage; put the ballot into her hands, and the saloon will go. And just because it will go with woman-suffrage and will not go without it, we demand in the name of humanity and of heaven that this right be conferred upon us." And just because of this demand, and to the extent of it, the prohibition movement is being shorn of its strength, and sober-minded men are saying, "if the temperance cause can only prevail at the cost of the unsexing of woman, and her subjection to all the debasing influences of the voting precinct and the ballot-box, then, in the name of common sense, and in the interest of true womanhood, let the temperance cause go."

What is true in reference to the temperance movement is equally true in reference to the evangelistic. We are unhappily placed in a position in which our ardor in this great cause is continually subjected to damper, by reason of the unfortunate thrusting of woman, in connection with it, into relations and offices which are inconsistent with the whole spirit of Scriptural teaching, and, in many cases, in the face of express prohibitions given in the word of God. Look, for instance, at the Foreign Mission work. Here you find, in certain sections of our country, what are called "Women's Foreign Mission Boards." They are composed exclusively of women, and appear to have exclusive control, not only of the raising, but of the appropriation and disbursement of funds. They accept, equip, and send out missionaries of their own sex. They support, continue, or withdraw them. They have their public "Annual Meetings," in which, in presence of promiscuous audiences, women preside, make elaborate reports, deliver set addresses, and go through all the forms and business of public parliamentary assemblies. Leaving out of view altogether the question of the propriety of woman's occupying such conspicuous positions, and rendering such oratorical performances, it remains to be considered that here to a very large extent, not only without any Scriptural

precedent or authority, but in immediate antagonism to the whole spirit of Scriptural teaching, woman is charged with the entire responsibility of one great department of the aggressive work of the Church.

In the Home Mission field, this projection of woman into a sphere for which she was not intended and is not fitted, is still more remarkable, and deserves to be still more seriously considered. One of the features of the day is the "woman-evangelist." An attractive young lady, or perhaps a young and handsome widow, or as in one notable instance that readily occurs to us, a divorced woman, living apart from her husband, is regularly engaged to take charge of the services at an evangelistic station and "run the mission." Night after night, in the presence of great audiences, principally of men, she occupies the position and performs the functions of a regular minister of the word. The beauty of her person and the music of her voice are essential elements in the attraction of the crowd. When, at the close of the sermon, Bible-reading, address, or whatever it may be called, she comes down from the pulpit, passes along the aisle, takes some hardened sinner by the hand, and leads him up to the "altar" for prayer, it would, no doubt, be as difficult for him, as it would be impossible for any one else, so far to analyze his feelings as to determine how much of the influence that draws him to the place of prayer is the power of the Holy Spirit leading him to salvation, and how much is the mesmeric influence of the gentle, sympathetic woman which, alas, will vanish as soon as her presence is withdrawn, and which, being mistaken for a higher impulse from above, will leave him baffled and bewildered, in a more hopeless slavery to vice than when the mesmeric influence was first exerted upon him. What a pity it is that, when God has opened to woman a sphere of labor in the Church so suited to all her instincts of womanly modesty and reserve, so full of all beneficent result, and so free from all the danger to which we have alluded above, she should, on the tide of this enthusiasm in connection with evangelistic work, be borne far out beyond those safe bounds which God, in His

holy word, has fixed, and within which alone she can expect His blessing upon her!

II. But it is time that we should pass to the consideration of a second of these perils to which the evangelism of our day is exposed—that from *sentimentalism*. It is perhaps in accordance with philosophic law, that as the tendency of unbelief is in our time grossly materialistic, so, by a natural law of reaction, the trend of Christian thought and feeling should be strongly in the the direction of sentimentalism. Certain it is, however it may be accounted for, that there is a strong tendency in all religious matters to substitute a maudlin sentimentality for a vigorous and healthful maintenance of Christian principles. You have only to compare the preaching of most of our popular evangelists at the present day with that of Paul, who “reasoned of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come,” who was glad that he had made the Corinthians sorry with a sorrow that was after a godly sort, to have the first illustration of what I mean. George O. Barnes, the “Mountain Evangelist,” who has stirred the hearts of the people of Kentucky as perhaps no other man ever did, takes as the keynote of all his preaching, “God is love.” He sedulously excludes all thought of God as an offended Sovereign, or an avenging Judge. He carefully eliminates from the divine character all elements of wrath. He sedulously excludes from the divine agency everything in this world that produces sorrow or pain. Sickness, adversity, war, pestilence, famine, death, these are the work of the devil. God has no agency in them. They are not in accordance with, but contrary to the divine will. Only have faith enough to overcome the devil and you will escape them all. Mr. Beecher’s popularity arose in large measure from his denunciation or caricature of the “hard old dogmas of Calvinism,” and his preaching a gospel which appealed to the sentimentalism of the day—that sentimentalism which eschews capital punishment, which shrinks from the doctrine of the future punishment of the wicked, which rejects the doctrines of election, reprobation, substitution and vicarious atonement, and which pleads for moral suasion, universal redemption, final restoration, and what it is pleased to call

the "universal fatherhood of God." Mr. Moody, who does not of course come in the same category with either of the men whom we have mentioned, and who may be taken as the representative of the better class of evangelistic preachers, dwells in his preaching almost exclusively upon what is denominated "the sunny side of God's character." And it is unquestionably true that in the great mass of evangelistic preaching of the day, those doctrines of grace, which, in their due symmetry and proportion, made the spiritual pabulum of our fathers, and developed those robust virtues and stalwart characters for which they were conspicuous, have now been allowed to fall largely into the background. Men under this sentimental style of preaching are losing their relish for the strong meat of the word of God, and we are in danger of nourishing a class of spiritual babes, who, being fed only on the milk of the word, will never attain to any true and vigorous manhood.

The same characteristics appear in the hymns now popularly in use in connection with these evangelistic services. If it would not bear the appearance of subjecting to ridicule things of a sacred character, we would like to present our readers with some specimens of the so-called hymns which we have gathered together from various popular collections. As examples of the most vapid and puerile sentiment, expressed in most wretched doggerel, they almost surpass our comprehension as hymns intended for religious worship. But, leaving these out of view, and confining ourselves to the collection of "Gospel Hymns Consolidated," now in such general use, and which must be admitted to be the very best of its class, you find this same sentimental, rhapsodic element largely predominating. Instead of hymns of faith and hope, hymns of inspiration and courage for life's conflicts and duties, you have such rhapsodies as "I am sweeping thro' the gate," "I brush the dews on Jordan's banks," etc., with such refrains as "Pull for the Shore," "O, come, angel band, come and around me stand," "Oh, to be over yonder, in that land of wonder," etc., etc. Can there be any clearer evidence of the want of vigorous and healthful tone in the type of piety developed in these great evangelistic meetings, than is found in

the substitution of such hymns as these for those grand, soul-inspiring ones of our older collections, such as "Rock of Ages," "Am I a soldier of the Cross," etc.? I confess to a good deal of sympathy with the writer who has recently said that if the Church would sing less of the "Sweet bye-and-bye," and more of the "Sweet now-and-now," things would go a great deal better.

Another conspicuous evidence of the trend towards a maudlin sentimentalism, is found in the impatience of the times with all doctrinal differences and all denominational distinctions; in the tendency to confound denominationalism with sectarianism, and a firm adherence to creeds and doctrinal symbols with bigotry and intolerance; and in the corresponding disposition to exalt as the one goal towards which all effort is to be directed, the breaking down of denominational barriers, and the merging of all christendom into one organic and visible whole. Now, certainly every Christian heart must rejoice in everything that tends to narrow the lines of separation between the different branches of the one visible Church of Christ, and to bring about more of that real unity, which consists in the intelligent acceptance of the same body of truth as Scriptural, and of the same order and polity as of divine authority and obligation. The result of such oneness of belief is an organic unity that is real and not nominal, a unity of faith and life, not of name and form. But that the tendency now is rather towards uniformity—the mere shadow of unity, where the substance is not—must, we think, be painfully evident to all. What can a denominational union be worth, that gathers within its broad folds creeds as utterly at variance as the Calvinistic and the Arminian, and Church polities as far severed as the Congregational and the Episcopal? "How can two walk together except they be agreed?" How much better that each denomination shall preserve its own organic unity, and, if need be, independence, and that the efforts of all Christian hearts be bent towards the exclusion of all bigotry and sectarianism and the cultivation towards one another of the "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." In this view, the course of many of our most prominent, and in other respects most judicious,

evangelists, in sedulously concealing from the public their own denominational views and connections, is as misguided as it is injurious. Their motive, as their apologists tell us, is to prevent the weight of their own personal influence being given to the denomination with which they are known to be personally connected; but the overbalancing evil in giving their apparent sanction to the non-denominational tendencies of the day should lead them to withdraw from so anomalous a position, and be recognized always and everywhere as soldiers duly enlisted in some great division of the army of Christ.

This same tendency towards a union founded upon mere sentiment and not upon intelligent conviction is, we have reason to fear, a largely preponderant element in the present movement, North and South, towards the consolidation of the two great Presbyterian bodies of this country. Into the question of the expediency of organic union it would not be timely or proper for us here to enter, especially in view of the present attitude of the two Assemblies; but it is certainly to be hoped that, if this union shall be effected, it will not be upon a mere sentimental wave of philanthropic feeling—but as the expression of an intelligent conviction of real unity between the two Churches upon points in which we have been supposed to differ; so that the union may be the expression not of a tumid and vapid sentiment, but of an honest, genuine, manly, Christian love. Such love always founds itself upon principle. We can entertain it only for one whom we believe to act upon principle. We forfeit all right to it, when we hold principles to be of so little moment that they may be sacrificed in the interests of a mere fusion that is expressive of no common convictions, and is possessed of no real strength.

III. The third and last of these perils to which we will allude is that which comes from *mammonism*. It seems as if everything that is sacred and good is in danger of being trampled down at the present time in the eager rush after money. If you will look closely into the great social evils that threaten us, nihilism, communism, socialism, and all these, you will find the explanation of them in that one word, *mammonism*. These are some of

the "divers and hurtful lusts" into which "they that will be rich" are said to fall, and which "drown men in perdition." Look at the "labor problem of the day," as it is called, and what is the secret of it? There never was a time when capital was at once so safe of investment and so remunerative as now, and when, therefore, there was so little occasion for "grinding the faces of the poor," and so much reason for large and generous dealing on the part of the employer towards the employed. On the other hand, there never was a time when a laboring man received higher wages, or could support himself and his family in more comfort upon the proceeds of his work. What is the reason then of this strife? It is the unhallowed craving for more than the allotments of providence have given as the honest wages of labor on the one hand, and as the righteous income of capital on the other. This it is that lies at the basis of all the stock speculation, and commercial gambling of the day. Men are running wild after riches. And as all other interests of the Church of Christ are imperilled, so, in particular, is this one, the evangelization of the world. If missionaries are sent abroad, if evangelists are maintained at home, it must be through the consecration of the substance of Christian people. We have now hundreds of young men in this country applying to be sent abroad as missionaries, and the Church is without money to send them. The Lord's people have millions for railroads, grain-elevators, savings-banks, bucket-shops, but only tens or hundreds at most for this great work of evangelization. Our Secretaries of Home Missions and Evangelistic Labor dole out the comparatively small sums that come into their hands, whilst hundreds of fields, without laborers and white to the harvest, invite and even plead, but they have not the means to send men in. Our Secretary should have one hundred thousand dollars a year for evangelization alone, and even then he would not be able to answer to the full extent the meritorious appeals that come to him for the ministry of the word.

Our readers may be ready to ask, what remedy is proposed for these incipient evils, what safeguards against the perils to which attention has been called? It would extend too much the

length of this paper to enter upon this branch of the subject in detail. Suffice it to say that the measures we would propose are aggressive, rather than repressive. We must not abandon or decri a good thing because it is abused. Let the Church of God, through her regularly organized agencies, throw herself with all her energy into this work of evangelization. Let her undertake to reach the "non-church-going masses." Let her set apart to the work both ordained ministers and consecrated laymen, who will act under her authority and be obedient to her voice. Let these men avail themselves of all that is good in the methods of the popular evangelists of the day, and eschew all that is evil. If the hymns and tunes long in use in our Church do not adapt themselves to the requirements of these special services, let suitable ones be selected or prepared. Let the money be poured into the Lord's treasury, with which to educate and train men for this branch of work. Let such agency be given to consecrated Christian women under the supervision of Church Sessions that they shall not feel that the door of Christian service is closed against them, and so be tempted to enter upon positions and assume functions for which God has not designed them. Let our Committee have the means with which to enlarge the sphere of its operations, and give better support to the men who are now engaged in evangelistic work. Let every Synod set on foot and maintain some such system of evangelistic labor as that now carried on in the Synod of Kentucky. Let every Presbytery look well to the supply of all the waste places within its borders. Let every pastor, within the bounds of his own congregation, and to the very utmost of his ability, "do the work of an evangelist, and make full proof of his ministry." Let us set a higher value upon, and come into closer sympathy with, every effort made by any branch of the true evangelical Church of Christ, through its organized agencies, to do this work. Let us endeavor not to put down, but to crowd out, the self-constituted and irresponsible evangelism to which we have referred. Let the Church of God, in her various branches, occupy the ground so fully that there shall be no room for these outside agencies. Then, with the presence and power of the Divine

Spirit resting upon us, we shall be able to retrieve the character of the evangelism of our day, to free it from the opprobrium under which, to a considerable extent, it rests in the public mind, and make it indeed what, as we have seen, it is claimed to be, the "highest and most enduring glory" of the nineteenth century.

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

V. ORGANIC UNION.

To arrest the progress of the dangerous sentiment in favor of organic union with the Northern Church, and to prevent the division of our own, it is only necessary for our people to be made to comprehend the real issues involved in the case. Whatever advantage might be gained along the border line between the two branches of the Presbyterian Church, or in interior localities where they come face to face in the same community, by an organic fusion of the two bodies, this advantage must be foregone if there are reasons sufficient to justify and demand the continued independence of the Southern Church. Without such reasons, that Church can show no cause for its existence at all; but if it can justify its right to live as a branch of the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus, every reason for its existence is a reason for its existence independent of every other branch of the Kingdom. This is the real issue involved in this question of organic union. If we go into it, our autonomy is lost; we are merged absolutely in a body so overwhelmingly superior in number, that we shall be constitutionally subjected absolutely to their control. They will have the settlement of questions vital to our interests not only in the ecclesiastical, but in the social sphere altogether in their hands. Our relations to the negro race, the control of all our property, the right to determine all questions of ecclesiastical usage and policy, the propriety of a rotary eldership, the examination of ministers, the relations of women to the *public* work of the Church, the question of a mixed Church of whites and blacks—

all such questions will be determined for us by the overwhelming majorities of a Northern body. We have these questions now, so far as our own ecclesiastical life is concerned, in our own hands. Some of them are vital to our social existence. Some of them involve principles which we have long held with cordial unanimity as matters of conscience before God. Some of them are so vital to our covenanted creed that we shall be compelled to abandon it if we merge ourselves in a Church standing on the present basis of the Church of the North. What higher grounds of necessity, reason, conscience and the Word of God, any favorer of organic union could demand to assure him of the absolute necessity for the continued existence of the independence of the Southern Church, it would be hard to conjecture. To develop the reasons for this in their full extent, we feel assured, will break down this dangerous movement and preserve us from any serious division in any parts of our bounds.

But before we proceed to do this, we desire to set aside some of the purely gratuitous and unfounded assumptions which are made touching the decisive opposition which is felt towards this policy of fusion. It is alleged that political hostility to Northern men is at the bottom of this opposition to ecclesiastical union. This we pointedly repudiate and deny. If this were true, why are we not equally hostile in feeling towards other Churches of the North? Not one feeling of opposition exists in any Southern heart towards the Episcopal or Congregational or Methodist or Baptist Churches in the Northern States. Our feelings towards them are those of cordial good-will. We feel towards them just as we feel towards those same denominations in our own section. Why is this, if political feeling animates the resistance to organic union with Northern Presbyterians? The members of those Churches are presumably as much opposed to our view of political matters, past and present, as are the members of the Presbyterian Church of the North. Yet political differences do not qualify our kindly feeling towards them, while those differences are held to account for our opposition to organic union with Northern Presbyterians. Why is this difference made in our feelings towards the various Churches of the North?

It is simply due to the fact that all of them except the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America are content to let us alone, to work out the hard problems thrown upon us by the universal uprooting of our social state, without their interference. On the contrary, that one member of the family of Presbyterian Churches at the North, no nearer to us than the rest, seems to feel commissioned to attempt the formation of such relations as will take from us and give to it the absolute control over our whole ecclesiastical existence, including questions so vital to our success as a Church and our very existence as a race, that it would be absolute lunacy to put them out of our own control, and to leave our protection to the determination of a Northern body. If the Presbyterian Church of the North would assume and keep the same position towards us that other Northern Churches maintain, it would be as cordially recognized as those other Churches are. If there were questions in which Northern Presbyterians had an interest a thousand-fold more important than our interest in them, and had in their own hands the power to protect themselves in them, they would regard as an absolute impertinence, a proposition from us to have that power transferred into our hands. It would be nothing but justice to credit us with a similar measure of common-sense without charging us with political prejudice, or self-righteousness, or the Pharisaic assumption of superiority to their fellowship, in refusing to yield our autonomy and with it all our security into their hands. In asserting our convictions of truth, we are only faithful to our convictions, and it is an outrage upon all reason and right to charge us on this account with assumptions of a consequence which makes us construe Northern Presbyterians as unfit for our fellowship. We hold all Christians worthy of our communion; we reverence all who serve our Lord in all fundamental articles of obedience. But we do not hold ourselves bound to an organic union with many branches of the Kingdom, just because we cannot make ourselves responsible for the errors which we do honestly think they have mingled with their testimony to the truth. In spite of all imputations of political prejudice, and unworthy assumptions of superior excellence, this is

the reason why we cannot unite with the Northern Presbyterian Church. That Church is positively alleged to be absolutely one with us. Such an assertion could only be made under incompetent conceptions of the actual truth. This we shall proceed to show in a manner which will define a necessity for the continued existence and independence of the Southern Presbyterian Church which no one can deny as to fact, and no true Presbyterian can gainsay as to importance to the integrity of the Presbyterian faith. These great reasons are four-fold in number, and exclusively religious and ecclesiastical in their nature. Not a shadow of political thought is to be found in any one of them. Organic union with the Northern Church is prohibited to us, and the existence and independence of the Southern Church is absolutely required,

First, by a radical difference in *creed principle*;

Second, by differences in doctrinal views of Christian truth;

Third, by a difference in view of a moral question on which there is an explicit decision by the Holy Spirit in Holy Scripture;

Fourth, by wide differences on a variety of important questions of ecclesiastical administration, policy and usage.

To the proof of these points we now ask the impartial and discriminating attention of every member of the Southern Church. We will introduce this proof by a brief history of the New and Old School parties from the division in 1837 up to their reunion in 1869. Let the fact be fully noted and weighed, that the Church we are now invited to enter is not the Church from which we separated in 1861. With that Church we were in full harmony in *creed principles*—in *doctrine*—in our *testimonies on great moral questions*—and, for the most part, in *our views of ecclesiastical policies and usages*. But after negotiations extending through several years, this Church, from which we had separated on the single issue of the Spiritual character of the Church, merged itself with another Church from which we had been separated on many grave and important doctrinal and moral questions. The result of this amalgamation was the emergence of another Church, perhaps differing from both of its constituents, and certainly presenting us with a question of inexpressible importance when we are invited to become part and parcel of it. Certainly if the Church from which we separated had remained

as it was before our departure, there would have been comparatively little difficulty in our reuniting with them. It is equally certain that if the New School Church had remained separate, no proposition for our uniting with them would have been entertained for a moment. But their fusion in 1869 raises the serious question, what is now the character of the body which emerged from the fusing process which has taken place between a Church with which our difference, formerly, was confined to a single point, and a Church with which our former differences were not only many in number, but radical in essence? The *tertium quid* may be different from both of its constituents. But, possibly, the effect may have been to carry the Church from which we differed the least, still farther away than the single issue of the Spiritual character of the Church. Possibly the effect may have been to qualify the errors of the New School to a certain extent, and yet to leave enough of its grave departures from the creed of our Church to admit of no room for our union with them. Possibly the effect may have been to give a new and treaty-guarded standing to all, or the most, of the errors driven from the Church in 1837. Who can answer this grave question? Yet it must be answered, or organic union will involve to us a fearful breach in our covenant as a Church. We are now under a solemn covenant with each other to teach the old Calvinistic doctrines, of the Federal Headship of Adam, Imputation, Original Sin, Total Depravity, the Election of Grace, Regeneration by the Spirit, and Vicarious Atonement. Each of these doctrines was repudiated in the bosom of the New School of Presbyterian theology in 1837—not by all New School men, but by many. The errors opposed to these doctrines had so full and extensive a standing among the New School party that they were the distinguishing features of the New School doctrine. This was the deliberate judgment of such men as Charles Hodge, Archibald Alexander, George Baxter, Ashbel Green, Robert Breckinridge, William Plumer, and of the whole of that grave body of able and godly men who met in Convention on the 11th of May, 1837, one week previous to the meeting of the celebrated Assembly of that year. Let any

one read the Memorial presented by that body, or prepared for presentment, to the Assembly, if he wishes to gain an idea of what New School theology really was in the beginning. *Has it changed?* If not, then organic union involves our absolute apostacy from our covenanted creed. We have solemnly pledged faith to each other in our Southern Presbyterian Church, to deny these errors and to maintain faithfully the truths which oppose them. Can we now consent to admit these errors under our covenant and bind ourselves to respect forever the chartered freedom and franchise of these dangerous travesties of the truth of Christ, now standing guarded by treaty in the Church of the Northern Presbyterians? We trow not; this Southern Church is, we trust, yet sound and faithful enough to turn with horror from the bare suggestion. But to the *history* of this scheme of error misnamed Presbyterian. We go no farther back than the period of the disruption of the Church in 1837. For several years the Church had been rent with controversy about the errors in doctrine, in Church order and in discipline, which had found their way into the Church chiefly through the agency of the Plan of Union with the Congregationalists of New England, adopted in 1804. That serious departures from the doctrines of the Presbyterian creed had become widespread in the Church, can admit of no reasonable doubt. Prolonged conflicts preceded the disruption. For years the ablest men on both sides had been engaged in open conflict. The mischief had increased to such an extent that the Church was nearly equally divided. In 1836, the errors of Mr. Barnes which had implicated his Presbytery in Philadelphia and the Synod of Pennsylvania in a severe struggle for many months, were actually sustained by the General Assembly on his appeal. From this period the friends of the old and genuine faith of Presbyterians saw that the time for decisive measures had come, if the creed of the Westminster Standards was to be maintained. The open design of revolutionizing the Presbyterian Church had been exultingly proclaimed by Lyman Beecher, when Barnes was sustained, and Wilson, of Cincinnati, withdrew his appeal to the Assembly of 1836. The next year the issue was brought to a settlement. A Convention,

composed of firm friends of the Presbyterian system, met in Philadelphia on the 11th of May, one week previous to the meeting of the Assembly. That body drew up a Memorial setting forth the causes of the trouble which was desolating the Church. The paper under the heads of "Errors in Doctrine," "Errors in Church Order," and "Errors in Discipline," disclosed a condition of things in the Church absolutely appalling. This paper was presented to the Assembly and designed to define and regulate its action. But the course of events in the Assembly was modified by the issues raised during its sessions; its powerful and effective remedies were applied without the guidance of the Memorial, and that paper was finally adopted after the measures of relief had been passed, and was given to the Church as an explanation of the grounds on which the course of the Assembly had been taken. That paper then has become historical, not only on the authority of the Convention which prepared it, but of the great Court of the Church which adopted it. Surely, allegations of fact touching errors in doctrine which come down to us certified and assured by such men as George A. Baxter, Robert Breckinridge, Charles Hodge, Archibald Alexander, and the whole O. S. party in the Assembly of '37, are fully entitled to our credit. They were men not to be deceived by the subtle investment of these errors in the form of orthodox phraseology, nor misled as to their gravity and importance. The following extract from the Memorial adopted by the Assembly will disclose to the Church the real nature of the *doctrines* of the so-called New School of Presbyterian theology. No one at all acquainted with the real doctrines of the Presbyterian Church can fail to see that these errors, in the language of the Convention of May 11th, 1837, "strike at the foundation of the system of the gospel of grace." They contain a strange mixture of Arminian and Pelagian errors, enveloped as we shall see in the established forms of orthodox expression. This will appear in the answer to the allegations of the Memorial, by the New School men.

"ERRORS IN DOCTRINE."*

1st. That God would have been glad to prevent the existence of

* See Foote's Sketches of Virginia. Second Series, pp. 514-515.

sin in our world but was not able, without destroying the moral agency of man, or from aught that appears in the Bible to the contrary, sin is incidental to any wise moral system.

2d. That election to eternal life is founded on a foresight of faith and obedience.

3d. That we have no more to do with the first sin of Adam than with the sin of any other parent.

4th. That infants come into the world as free from moral defilement as was Adam when he was created.

5th. That infants sustain the same relation to the moral government of God, as brute animals, and their sufferings and death are to be accounted for on the same principles as those of brutes, and not by any means to be considered as penal.

6th. That there is no other original sin than the fact that all the posterity of Adam, though by nature innocent, or possessed of no moral character, will always begin to sin when they begin to exercise moral agency; or that original sin does not include a sinful bias of the human mind, and a just exposure to penal suffering; and that there is no evidence in Scripture that infants, in order to salvation, do need redemption by the blood of Christ and regeneration of the Holy Ghost.

7th. That the doctrine of imputation, whether of Adam's sin or of Christ's righteousness, has no foundation in the word of God, and is both unjust and absurd.

8th. That the sufferings and death of Christ were not truly vicarious and penal, but symbolical, governmental, and instructive only.

9th. That the impenitent sinner is by nature, and independently of renewing influence or almighty energy of the Holy Spirit, in full possession of all the ability necessary to a full compliance with all the commands of God.

10th. That Christ never intercedes for any but those who are actually united to Him by faith; or that Christ does not intercede for the elect until after their regeneration.

11th. That saving faith is the mere belief of the word of God, and not a grace of the Holy Spirit.

12th. That regeneration is the act of the sinner himself, and that it consists in a change of his governing purpose, which he himself must produce, and which is the result, not of any direct influence of the Holy Spirit on the heart, but chiefly of a persuasive exhibition of the truth, analogous to the influence which one man exerts over the mind of another; or that regeneration is not an instantaneous act, but a progressive work.

13th. That God has done all he can for the salvation of all men, and that man himself must do the rest.

14th. That God cannot exert such influence on the minds of men, as shall make it certain that they will choose and act in a certain manner without impairing their moral agency.

15th. That the righteousness of Christ is not the sole ground of the sinner's acceptance with God; and that in no sense does the righteousness of Christ become ours.

16th. That the reason why some differ from others in regard to their reception of the Gospel is, that they make themselves to differ.

To this allegation of error, the following reply was made :

We protest, finally, because in view of all the circumstances of the case, we feel that while we were prevented from uniting in the final vote with the majority in their testimony against error, for the reasons above stated, we owe it to ourselves, to our brethren, to the Church and to the world, to declare and protest that it is not because we do directly or indirectly hold or countenance the errors stated. We are willing to bear our testimony in full against them, and now do so, when, without misapprehension and liability to have our vote misconstrued, we avow our real sentiments, and contrast them with the errors condemned, styling them, as we believe, the true doctrine, in opposition to the erroneous doctrine condemned, as follows, viz :

First Error. "That God would have prevented the existence of sin in our world, but was not able without destroying the moral agency of man; or that, for aught that appears in the Bible to the contrary, sin is incidental to any wise moral system."

True Doctrine. God permitted the introduction of sin, not because he was unable to prevent it, consistently with the moral freedom of his creatures, but for wise and benevolent reasons, which he has not revealed.

Second Error. "That election to eternal life is founded on a foresight of faith and obedience."

True Doctrine. Election to eternal life is not founded on a foresight of faith and obedience, but is a sovereign act of God's mercy, whereby, according to the counsel of his own will he hath chosen some to salvation; "yet, so as thereby neither is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established;" nor does this gracious purpose ever take effect independently of faith and a holy life.

Third Error. "That we have no more to do with the first sin of Adam, than with the sins of any other parent."

True Doctrine. By a divine constitution, Adam was so the head and representative of the race that, as a consequence of his transgression, all mankind became morally corrupt and liable to death, temporal and eternal.

Fourth Error. "That infants come into the world as free from moral defilement as was Adam when he was created."

True Doctrine. Adam was created in the image of God, endowed with knowledge, righteousness and true holiness. Infants come into

the world, not only destitute of these, but with a nature inclined to evil and only evil.

Fifth Error. "That infants sustain the same relation to the moral government of God, in this world, as brute animals, and that their sufferings and death are to be accounted for on the same principles as those of brutes, and not by any means to be considered as penal."

True Doctrine. Brute animals sustain no such relation to the moral government of God as does the human family. Infants are a part of the human family; and their sufferings and death are to be accounted for on the ground of their being involved in the general moral ruin of the race induced by the apostacy.

Sixth Error. "That there is no other original sin than the fact that all the posterity of Adam, though by nature innocent, will always begin to sin when they begin to exercise moral agency; that original sin does not include a sinful bias of the human mind, and a just exposure to penal suffering; and that there is no evidence in Scripture that infants, in order to salvation, do need redemption by the blood of Christ and regeneration by the Holy Ghost."

True Doctrine. Original sin is a natural bias to evil, resulting from the first apostacy, leading invariably and certainly to actual transgression. And all infants, as well as adults, in order to be saved, need redemption by the blood of Christ, and regeneration by the Holy Ghost.

Seventh Error. "That the doctrine of imputation, whether of the guilt of Adam's sin, or of the righteousness of Christ, has no foundation in the word of God, and is both unjust and absurd."

True Doctrine. The sin of Adam is not imputed to his posterity in the sense of a literal transfer of personal qualities, acts and demerit; but by reason of the sin of Adam, in his peculiar relation, the race are treated as if they had sinned. Nor is the righteousness of Christ imputed to his people in the sense of a literal transfer of personal qualities, acts and merit; but by reason of his righteousness in his peculiar relation, they are treated as if they were righteous.

Eighth error. "That the sufferings and death of Christ were not truly vicarious and penal, but symbolical, governmental and instructive only."

True Doctrine. The sufferings and death of Christ were not symbolical, governmental, and instructive only, but were truly vicarious, *i. e.*, a substitute for the punishment due to transgressors. And while Christ did not suffer the literal penalty of the law, involving remorse of conscience, and the pains of hell, he did offer a sacrifice which infinite wisdom saw to be a full equivalent. And by virtue of this atonement, overtures of mercy are sincerely made to the race, and salvation secured to all who believe.

Ninth error. "That the impenitent sinner is by nature, and independently of the renewing influence or almighty energy of the Holy

Spirit, in full possession of all the ability necessary to a full compliance with all the commands of God."

True Doctrine. While sinners have all the faculties necessary to a perfect moral agency and a just accountability, such is their love of sin and opposition to God and his law, that independently of the renewing influence and almighty energy of the Holy Spirit they never will comply with the commands of God.

Tenth Error. "That Christ does not intercede for the elect until after their regeneration."

True Doctrine. The intercession of Christ for the elect is previous as well as subsequent to their regeneration, as appears from the following Scripture, viz: "I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me, for they are thine. Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word."

Eleventh Error. "That saving faith is not an effect of the operations of the Holy Spirit, but a mere rational belief of the truth, or assent to the word of God."

True Doctrine. Saving faith is an intelligent and cordial assent to the testimony of God concerning his Son, implying reliance on Christ alone for pardon and eternal life, and in all cases it is an effect of the special operation of the Holy Spirit.

Twelfth Error. "That regeneration is the act of the sinner himself, and that it consists in a change of his governing purpose which he himself must produce, and which is the result not of any direct influence of the Holy Spirit on the heart, but chiefly of a persuasive exhibition of the truth, analogous to the influence which one man exerts over the mind of another, or that regeneration is not an instantaneous act, but a progressive work."

True Doctrine. Regeneration is a radical change of heart, produced by the special operations of the Holy Spirit, "determining the sinner to that which is good," and is in all cases instantaneous.

Thirteenth Error. "That God has done all that he can do for the salvation of all men, and that man himself must do the rest."

True Doctrine. While repentance for sin and faith in Christ are indispensable to salvation, all who are saved are indebted from first to last to the grace and Spirit of God. And the reason that God does not save all is not that he wants the *power* to do it, but that in his wisdom he does not see fit to exert that power further than he actually does.

Fourteenth Error. "That God cannot exert such influence on the minds of men as shall make it certain that they will choose and act in a particular manner without impairing their moral agency."

True Doctrine. While the liberty of the will is not impaired, nor the established connection between means and end broken by any action of God on the mind, he can influence it according to his pleasure, and does effectually determine it to good in all cases of true conversion.

Fifteenth Error. "That the righteousness of Christ is not the sole ground of the sinner's acceptance with God, and that in no sense does the righteousness of Christ become ours."

True Doctrine. All believers are justified, not on the ground of personal merit, but solely on the ground of the obedience and death, or in other words, the righteousness of Christ. And while that righteousness does not become theirs in the sense of a literal transfer of personal qualities and merit, yet from respect to it, God can and does treat them as if they were righteous.

Sixteenth Error. "That the reason why some differ from others in regard to their reception of the Gospel, is that they make themselves to differ."

True Doctrine. While all such as reject the Gospel of Christ do it not by coercion, but freely, and all who embrace it, do it not by coercion, but freely, the reason why some differ from others, is because God has made them to differ. (Moore's Digest, pp. 227-230).

In these two papers adopted and recorded in 1837, we have the whole case so far as the doctrinal issues were concerned, as between the Old and New School parties in the Church. From the very beginning there was an allegation of error on the one side and a denial on the other. The denial is couched, in forms of orthodox expression adroitly adapted to avoid the acknowledgement of the orthodox conception, and yet appear at the same time not to impeach or depart from it. Orthodox terms are used; orthodox logic is employed; and so effectually are these expedients employed, that the ordinary reader is left at a loss to know wherein the parties differ, and to ascribe the strong assertions of serious error to the artificial modes of thinking in the professional theologian, with which the common mind cannot sympathize, or perhaps, to the virulence of theological antipathies and prejudice. Such a class of minds is apt to fall into a snare. They are not aware that such is the universal mode under which serious errors spring up under an established and authoritative creed. Arius pursued this method when he introduced the Arian heresy. Arminius pursued it, when under a Calvinistic symbol, and in a Calvinistic Church, he introduced the Arminian theory. Both used and continued to the last to use orthodox expressions, the regular and established technicalities of the orthodox creed. An ordinary reader or hearer

would have been puzzled to understand where the difficulty lay. Yet under a form of sound words, Arius denied the divinity of Christ, and Arminius, the doctrines of grace. It is absolutely certain that the able and accomplished men who made open and uncompromising war on New School theology, the Baxters, Hodges, Alexanders, Greens and Breckinridges, and all the Old School party who followed their lead, asserted that the dangerous errors cited in the Memorial of the Convention of May 11th, 1837, were couched in the orthodox phrase employed by the New School. The only alternatives are these: either the Old School utterly misapprehended and misrepresented the views of the New School in 1837, or else these errors were hidden under orthodox form of expression, adroitly contrived to make the impression of adhesion to orthodox views, while carrying a sense really divergent from them. Take one or two examples. The Federal Headship of Adam was denied by Barnes, according to the Old School view of his teaching. In the New School vindication of him,* it is denied that Mr. Barnes "denies, much less sneers at," the doctrine; but it is asserted that, "though he employs not these terms, he does, in other language, teach the same truths which are taught by this phraseology." In the assertion of the "True Doctrine," as opposed to the "Third Error,"† it is stated in carefully guarded phrase that, "by a divine constitution, Adam was so the head and representative of the race, that as a consequence of his transgression, all mankind became corrupt and liable to death temporal and eternal." "Adam was so the head and representative of the race." But *how* was he so constituted? There are two theories touching the *method* of this constitution, and the difference in the view of *this method* constitutes the difference between the doctrine of Calvinistic theology and the doctrine of Arminianism and other divergent creeds. The Calvinistic view makes Adam the Federal Head and *legal* representative of his descendants, and in consequence of his sin, the consequences fell upon them *as a sentence of law*. The Arminian view denies the legal representative character, makes Adam merely the natural head of his posterity,

*Moore's Digest, p. 227. †Moore's Digest, p. 229.

their representative purely as the result of a social organization or natural relation, and the consequences of his fall come upon them merely as the effect of the law of heredity—as the mere natural consequence of an unalterable law of nature. Now, in view of these divergent theories, it is perfectly obvious that it is altogether futile to say that “Adam was so the head and representative of the race,” in order to vindicate a claim to Calvinistic orthodoxy. Calvinistic theology explains and asserts the method of Adam’s headship as *Federal* and *legal* representation. To refuse to use these terms as Barnes does, and as the explication of “True Doctrine” does, creates an irresistible conviction that they do not hold the Federal Headship of Adam in the Calvinistic sense. Why should they refuse the terms if they hold the idea? These terms have long been settled as technicalities fairly expressing the conception; why should they be repudiated if the conception is really held? It is altogether misleading to employ a phrase which may be used by an Arminian, or by any theorist denying the Calvinistic view, as in itself a reliable proof of adhesion to Calvinistic conceptions.

Take another sample, for it is impossible for us to go through the whole of the sixteen contrasted statements. To the allegation of the “Eighth Error,” “that the sufferings and death of Christ were not truly vicarious and penal, but symbolical, governmental and instructive only,” it is replied in the assertion of the “True Doctrine,” that “the sufferings and death of Christ were not symbolical, governmental and instructive only, but were truly vicarious, *i. e.*, a substitute for the punishment due to transgressors.” We do not copy the whole of this assertion of the “True Doctrine,” because it is enough for our purpose to quote the statement on the one only point on which we have space to comment. We are informed that the vicarious nature of our Lord’s intervention consists not in his becoming a substitute for sinners, but in the adoption of a “substitute for the punishment due to transgressors.” This is a clear variation from the Calvinistic theology, which teaches that God laid upon Christ the iniquity of us all, and that “by his obedience and death he did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to God’s justice in

behalf of them that are justified.”* This teaches a substitution for *persons*—not *penalties*. It is obvious also that if a substitute for the *punishment* due to sinners was found, then the actual claims of the law were set aside, and Christ did not redeem us from the real curse by being made a curse for us. The curse is set aside; a *substitute* is found for it. There is no satisfaction made to the broken law; for its claims are set aside, and a substitute found for them. Atonement is not a satisfaction of justice, but a compliance with a substitute for it. Is it possible to conceive a more dangerous travesty of Gospel grace? Is it possible to conceive of a phrase, apparently orthodox, carrying a sense so completely divergent from the Calvinistic creed—so utterly empty of all power to give peace to a soul really awake to the sense of sin and the awful, intrinsic and unalterable justice of the *penal* claims of the law?

We have no space to pursue the analysis of these subtle assertions of the “True Doctrine.” *Ex uno disce omnes*. Let the Southern Presbyterian Church understand *what she is invited to do*, by the project of organic union. She would not tolerate these errors now in her own bosom. She is not now responsible for their treaty-guarded standing in the Northern Church. She is under a solemn covenant to teach the doctrines of her creed, and to resist the errors opposed to them. Organic union will take her into a body where these errors have a standing, and apparently a treaty-bound and chartered freedom to propagate at will. We must come on the same terms on which the re-union took place in 1869. We must assume responsibility for these errors. We must pledge ourselves not to resist them. In other words, organic union means the *repudiation of our creed and principles of adhesion to our Standards*—the breach of our covenant, as a Church, to teach the doctrines of genuine Calvinism—the acceptance of responsibility for errors which we do not hold—the abandonment of our right and solemn duty to resist and repudiate these errors. Are any of us ready for this? We do not believe it of one in our whole connection.

But to anticipate here a cavil which will be made to the

* Larger Catechism, Question 71.

above impeachment of the soundness of the Northern Church—the New School for making these erroneous constructions of the Westminster Standards—the Old School for allowing them to be made under their responsibility: it will be said we impeach *the integrity* of both sections of the Northern Church. We distinctly repudiate all reflection upon their *integrity*; we only impeach the *correctness* of their interpretation of the Standards, and their view of what is required by a genuine Presbyterian theory of adhesion to the Standards. We do not impeach the integrity of the original New School innovators, much less of the present generation of New School theologians. We only impeach the correctness of their interpretation of the Standards, and *assert their divergence in doctrinal view from ourselves*. How symbols so clearly and definitely Calvinistic could be construed to yield results so completely divergent from Calvinistic principles, we do not pretend to explain. The vagaries of the human understanding are infinite and inexplicable. We impeach the integrity of no Christian man, and especially of no great branch of the Christian Church, while we are bound to recognize their errors. This is all we do in recognizing the errors of the Northern Presbyterian Church. Let no advocate of organic union try to make capital of our impeachment of these errors, as synonymous with an imputation upon their integrity. We disclaim it in advance. Nor do we impute these errors to all New School men, either of the era of 1837 or of the present day: we only assert that the statements of doctrine formulated in the protests and answers of the party in 1837 are not just expositions of Calvinistic doctrine. We only assert that many of their leading men, such as Barnes and Beman, were undeniably unsound. We do not deny that many New School men—then and now—notably the Southern New School party, were sound men. It may be that the authors of “the Auburn Declaration” may have been sound men: we do not assert that as fact, for we have never seen the Declaration, and do not know the men who adopted it. The New School party in 1837 was, emphatically, not a uniform or consolidated body, so far as doctrine was concerned. Knowing this, it seems altogether logically possible for

a whole convention of the sound men among them to have met and honestly protested against the imputation to them of the errors of their party. This could have been done by the Southern New School; it may have been done by some among the Northern New School. But *the fatal fact* remains that the errors charged by the Old School did have a currency *wide enough to constitute the characteristic features of the New School theology*, and were covertly contained in the public formulations of doctrine in the Protests and Answers of the party in the Church Courts, and in the writings of their leading men. They are, therefore, *as a party*, answerable for these errors, in spite of the presence of sound men, to a greater or less degree, in their ranks. We do no injustice, then, in dealing with these views as *distinctively New School Theology*.

Now what has been the history and what is *now the present status of these new views?* Two Churches distinct in form, and openly antagonistic, sprang out of the long and vehement conflicts resulting in the exciting acts of the Assembly of 1837. For twelve years they stood apart in uncompromising opposition. In 1849, the first move towards friendly relations was made in the New School Assembly. The Old School made no response and the matter was dropped. In 1850 the Old School Assembly made a general declaration of its desire for the union of all sound Presbyterians. To this the New School made no response. In 1862 the N. S. Assembly expressed its willingness to unite "with all persons who can stand on the Basis of the Standards, and who agree on the moral questions of the day, in the matter, especially, of *loyalty* to the Government and in the views of slavery set forth, prior to the division in 1818." In 1862 the O. S. Assembly initiated the project proposed by the New School in 1849 for exchange of delegates. In 1863 this was accepted by the N. S. Assembly and the system of intercourse by delegates adopted. In 1866 the proposal of reunion into one organic body was made by the O. S. Assembly and a Reunion Committee was appointed, consisting of nine ministers and six elders. In the same year a similar committee was appointed by the N. S. Assembly. These committees met in joint session in New

York in February, 1867, and continued sitting for five days. They adjourned to meet in May and continued in session seven days. They united in a paper proposing terms of reunion in a series of eleven propositions directly bearing on the issue, and three more on the incidental requisites to a general understanding of them. In 1867 the report of the Joint Committee was favorably received by the O. S. Assembly, and recommitted to the Joint Committee for further co-operation and progress. In 1867 similar action was taken on the report of the Joint Committee, and the Committee continued to prosecute the work in hand. The Joint Committee assembled in Philadelphia in March, 1868, and continued in session four days, and finally adjourned after adopting an explanatory paper and Terms of Reunion somewhat changed from the Terms as originally adopted. The First of these articles is the chief matter of interest to us in the issue now before us. It is in the following words :

1. "The reunion shall be effected on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common Standards; the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments shall be acknowledged to be the inspired Word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the Confession of Faith shall continue to be sincerely received and adopted, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures; it being understood, that this Confession is received in its proper historical (that is the Calvinistic or Reformed) sense; it is also understood, that *various methods* of viewing, stating, explaining, and illustrating the doctrines of the Confession which do not impair the integrity of the Reformed or Calvinistic system, are to be freely allowed in the united Church, *as they have hitherto been allowed in the separate Churches*; and the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States shall be approved as containing the principles and rules of our polity."

We reserve comment and proceed with the history. In 1868, these amended Terms of Reunion were approved by the O. S. Assembly and sent down to the Presbyteries for their action, by a vote of yeas 188, nays 70, excused 1. In the same year, in the N. S. Assembly, these Terms of Reunion were unanimously adopted, after some amendment, and sent down to the Presbyteries, four persons being excused from voting. In the O. S.

Assembly, Dr. Monfort moved, and the motion was adopted, that while approving the Terms of Reunion it preferred dropping all explanatory or restrictive expressions in the First Term, which we have just quoted, and *uniting on a mere adhesion to the Standards*. This motion was submitted at once to the New School Assembly; it was received with profound satisfaction, but declined, as coming too late in their sessions to make any change desirable. Consequently, the Terms of Reunion went down for the formal vote of the Presbyteries. In the meantime, a powerful protest, signed by 57 of the Old School Assembly, among whom are the names of Edward P. Humphrey, Robert J. Breckinridge, L. J. Halsey, Charles Hodge, Archibald Alexander Hodge and John C. Backus, was entered against the Terms of Union. That paper reads like a duplicate of the "Errors in Doctrine," in the Memorial of the Convention of May 11th, 1837, with some strong items of objection additional. The answer is along the same line of denial adopted by the New School from the beginning. These papers are of high importance, because they show that up to 1869 the same errors of New School Presbyterians were recognized *up to the very date of the reunion*. In 1869, at the regular May meetings of the Assemblies, the reports of the action of the Presbyteries were received. In the Old School Church, out of one hundred and forty-three Presbyteries, *one hundred and five opposed the Basis of Reunion*, most of them expressing "a desire for reunion, on terms that will not override the Confession of Faith with any special stipulations." In the New School Assembly, the Terms of Reunion were reported as accepted by a vote of Presbyteries well-nigh unanimous, one hundred out of one hundred and thirteen Presbyteries direct in favor, *four* against them. This division, the Old School Church against, the New School in favor of the Terms of Reunion, broke down the work of the Joint Committee entirely. The whole movement was in peril. The New School appeared to be more willing to give guarantees than the Old School to require them. In this critical state of the case, both Assemblies met in New York in May, 1869. On the first day of the Old School Assembly, Dr. Musgrave led the way to an entirely

new deal. The work of the Joint Committee was thrown aside ; the Terms of Union proposed by them were rejected ; a committee was appointed to draft a Basis merely on the Standards, which was at once adopted, in these words of the *Second* article :

2. "The reunion shall be effected on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common Standards; the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments shall be acknowledged to be the inspired Word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the Confession of Faith shall continue to be sincerely received and adopted as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures; and the Government and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States shall be approved as containing the principles and rules of our polity."^{*}

These words were framed into a question to be answered categorically by the Presbyteries, which were to forward answers by November 1st, 1869. It was then provided that both Assemblies should adjourn, when their business was finished, to meet in Pittsburg on the second Wednesday of November, 1869, to receive the response of the Presbyteries and take action accordingly. If the Presbyteries accepted the new Basis, measures should be taken for the meeting of the General Assembly of the reunited Church, in May, 1870. Concurrent declarations of the two Assemblies were drawn up, covering the ground occupied by the bulk of the rejected Terms of Reunion, and a day of prayer recommended. This report of the New Committee on the Basis was adopted by the O. S. Assembly, yeas 285, nays 9 ; by the N. S. Assembly unanimously. This Basis was then sent down to the Presbyteries with peremptory orders to report before the 1st day of November to the Stated Clerk of the Assembly ; both Courts taking this action. On the 10th of November, 1869, at 11 o'clock, a. m., both Assemblies met in Pittsburg, the Old School in the 1st Church, the New School in the 3d Church. The Stated Clerk of the Old School Assembly announced that out of one hundred and forty-four Presbyteries, one hundred and twenty-six had answered in the affirmative, three in the negative. In the New School Assembly, answers were received from all its one hundred and thirteen Presbyteries, all

^{*} Moore's Digest, p. 91.

in the affirmative. In three Presbyteries a single negative vote was given. Thus the Reunion was accomplished. Each Assembly adjourned on Friday, after calling a General Assembly of the reunited Church for May, 1870. They then met according to a fixed programme in a Joint Convention for solemn worship, communed together in the afternoon of the day, and after resolving to raise a Memorial Fund of \$5,000,000 to set forward their joint work with suitable *clat*, dispersed to their homes, their work, whether for good or evil, accomplished.

From this historical sketch of the Reunion proceedings, many striking lessons may be learned. We limit our comments to the few matters which concern us in the issue of organic union with this reunited Church, now forced upon our attention.

1. It is certain that the grave errors of New School theology in 1837 were still extant when this reunion took place in 1869, in the judgment of such men as Charles and A. A. Hodge, Robert Breckinridge, Edward P. Humphrey, John C. Backus and Henry J. Van Dyke, this last as we learn from a different source from the Minutes of the Assembly.

2. It is certain that Terms binding to a construction of the Standards in their proper, historical, that is, the Calvinistic or Reformed sense, and allowing "various methods of viewing, stating, explaining and illustrating the doctrines of the Confession which do not impair the integrity of the Reformed or Calvinistic system in the United Church, as they had been hitherto allowed in the separate Churches," were laid down by the Joint Committee in their "Terms of Reunion." These terms were *not satisfactory*, simply because they allowed each man to judge for himself whether his views did or did not impair the integrity of the Calvinistic system, and secondly, because the New School had always insisted that the distinctive New School views were in accord with the Calvinistic system. Under these terms, the New School ideas could be freely taught as before. Moreover, this was also fully assured by the agreement that various methods of *viewing*, stating and explaining doctrine current before the union in either separate Church, should remain current in the united Church. This specification gave an ample

and chartered franchise to every New School error. The limitation of not impairing the Calvinistic system was inept and powerless to check the free charter of error given in the continued liberty of various methods, as we have just seen. When Monfort's amendment to the *first* article of the Terms was suggested, several New School Presbyteries assented on condition that "all reasonable liberty in interpretation be not relinquished."* But strange to say, while the New School were willing to come under *some* terms of positive covenant apparently constricting the interpretation of the Standards, the Old School rejected the Basis of Terms elaborated by the Joint Committee. The New School accepted them. But the whole case was brought into imminent peril of total failure by the refusal of one hundred and five Old School Presbyteries to endorse the Terms proposed.

3. It is certain that the Basis finally offered by the Old School and eagerly accepted by the New, has given no assurance whatever on the common construction of the Standards. New School constructions are still chartered *without even the gossamer restrictions of the Joint Committee's Terms*, those Terms being thrown aside by both parties. It is absolutely clear from the history of the case, not only that the errors of New School theology in 1837, are, in the judgment of the signers of the Protest of Drs. E. P. Humphrey, Charles Hodge and others of equal trustworthiness in discerning error, still extant in the New School constructions of the Standards, *but that they have gained a franchise and chartered freedom of life and motion in the reunited Church of the North*. Now what is all this to us? The proposition of organic union invites us to share in that Basis and assume responsibility for these errors and the mistaken policy which has given them a treaty-standing in the Presbyterian Church of the North. If we do, what will be the consequences? Let us look before we leap.

1. It is perfectly clear that we differ from the Church we are invited to enter on the *fundamental condition of doctrinal fidelity*—the *creed principle* of a *single* construction of the Standards. A creed is a definition of doctrine and a covenant to

* Moore's Digest, p. 89.

maintain it. To allow of double and divergent constructions of a creed, is to *destroy it*. Under the principle of double construction it ceases to be a definition of doctrine, because it allows the doctrinal statement to be construed in two or more different ways. It ceases to be a covenant to maintain it, because there is no longer any settled truth to be maintained. If the Baptist creed upon immersion were allowed to be construed first as demanding immersion, and then as demanding something else, the Baptist creed on the ordinance of baptism would be destroyed. Moreover, the single construction of a creed is demanded by the fact that *the truth it defines is single*; and to allow it to be construed in two different ways is to *betray the truth itself*. To allow divergent constructions of the creed is to turn a witnessing Church with a clear, united and definite testimony into a *Broad Church* allowing varying and contradictory doctrines to be taught in it. It is to violate our covenant as a Church. It is to weaken our influence as a teaching institute. It is to break down the barriers that fence out error. It is to make ourselves responsible for errors which we do not hold. It is to betray our high duty to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, and thus to sacrifice our most important interests. The principle of a single construction of the creed has always been a distinguishing peculiarity of the Presbyterian branch of the Kingdom of Christ. Can we in good conscience toward God now abandon it? This is the first grave sacrifice which organic union will demand at our hands—the *abandonment of our creed principle* of a single construction and a united testimony of our creed itself. Can we consent to destroy the noble creed of our Fathers by allowing it to be construed in different ways?

2. It is also clear that important doctrinal differences exist between us and the Church we are invited to enter, certainly with such an important element in it that we cannot enter into this fusion without a grave compromise of our own fidelity to the truth. We are under covenant to teach certain truths yielded by certain constructions of our Standards adopted from the Word of God. We are under covenant to resist all errors opposing these views. The New School constructions of the Standards

were resisted by our fathers fifty years ago, as yielding the errors which antagonized their views and ours. The Protest of Humphrey, Breckinridge, and the two great theologians of Princeton Seminary, Charles and A. A. Hodge, and more than fifty others, in 1869 recognized these errors as still extant among the New School Presbyterians. At all events, it is certain, that, even admitting the entire body of the New School to have receded from the theology of Barnes and Beman, and become genuinely orthodox, *still it is a chartered right of any man in the future* to teach, without the possibility of arrest, in all the various methods of viewing, stating and explaining the Standards, which did once obtain among the New School Presbyterians. If they are bound to teach nothing to impair the historical, Calvinistic, or Reformed sense, they are left still to construe their teachings, as they have always done, as *not impairing* the historical Calvinism of the creed. It is certain they secured "a liberty of interpretation." Although these explicit items in the "Terms of Reunion" of the Joint Committee were formally superseded by the basis of the Standards, merely, yet they remain as authoritative expositions of what was meant by adherence to the basis of the Standards. The denial, now, of the New School claim to still apply the "various methods" to the construction of the Standards, is utterly impossible. The Southern Church and the United Synod came together on the basis of the Standards, but only after elaborate conferences had clearly shown a hearty agreement in construction. The Northern New and Old School came together on the basis of the Standards, after elaborate conferences, which settled terms of allowed variation in construction. Neither can retire from the obligations thus assumed, though not entering formally into the final covenant. The conclusion is resistless that the doctrinal differences which drove our heroic fathers into war in 1837, have re-entered the united Church of the North, and now stand guarded by treaty stipulations which secure the chartered freedom of the errors in question forever, within that body. The Southern Church would not now tolerate in her pulpits, in the deliverances of her Church Courts, or in the literature published under her responsibility, any of these errors. She is not

now at all responsible for them among our Northern brethren. To their own Master they stand or fall. We would never have opened our mouths to impeach their soundness unless it were forced upon us by some necessity not of our seeking. But when the proposal of an organic union with them is made, which will make us responsible, we are bound to investigate their status in relation to the doctrines allowed to be taught under their authority, and if they differ in doctrinal views from ourselves, fidelity to the truth as we solemnly receive it from the Word of God absolutely forbids our fusion with them *at the expense of our doctrinal covenant*. The independence of the Southern Presbyterian Church is absolutely demanded by our fidelity to the doctrines we profess and have solemnly covenanted to maintain.

3. Organic union with the Northern Church is also prohibited by a positive command of the Holy Ghost, until that Church can unite with us in the testimony which we are commanded in 1 Tim. 6: 1-5, to bear on the relation of masters and servants. There is a deep and radical difference between us and at least the New School element of the Northern Church, on *the moral nature* of the relation of slavery. Up to the separation from the O. S. Church in 1861, that body was united in its testimony adopted in 1845 on this vexed and exciting topic. Differing in their estimate of the civil value of the peculiar institution, Northern and Southern Old School Presbyterians were united in their view of the *moral element* involved in it as determined by the Word of God. They were at one in construing the command of the Holy Spirit in the Epistle to Timothy:

“Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort. If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.”

The Old School accepted the same view of this command with ourselves up to the period of the separation in 1861. Whether they would be willing to renew that testimony of 1845, is, to say the least of it, exceedingly doubtful. It is absolutely certain the New School element would not do it. They have always stood upon the deliverance of 1818, and accepted the more extreme views on the moral nature of the relation of slavery. They drove out the United Synod, composed of their Southern members, on that very account, and to-day they are an unit in their testimony. The divergence of large masses of intelligent and Christian people on a point of morals, and the radical nature of their differences in interpreting the teachings of the Scriptures upon it, constitute one of the most remarkable problems of human thought. The difference in the *moral intuition* is mysterious, but may be partly accounted for by both parties looking at different faces of the shield, one seeing the golden, the other the silver side. The difference in the interpretation of Scripture springs from the same faulty narrowness of view, the one party confining attention to one part of the teaching, the other looking to another part of it, and accepting both parts as logically consistent. In one part of its deliverances on the subject, the Word of God pronounces servitude to be *a curse*. God himself denounced it as such upon Ham, and by his own judicial act subjected him to his brethren. It was an intended curse upon Ham, because it was the punishment of his sin. It was designed as a blessing to his brethren because it was the reward of their filial reverence. The relation created by the act was right because God appointed it. The same conception is enforced by many other definite proofs. He rewarded Abraham by giving him gold and silver, and camels and asses and men-servants and maid-servants. Of these servants, it is expressly said: "Some were born in his house and some bought with his money." Job is expressly noted as the master of slaves. In the only civil constitution ever given directly by God, a form of domestic slavery was introduced. Nay, in the very letter of the Ten Commandments, the relation is recognized in two distinct precepts, in the very words traced by the finger of God on the Tables of

Stone. The whole legislation and teaching of the New Testament is to the very same purpose. The Church was founded by the Apostles in slave-holding countries, yet they did not assail this relation as intrinsically sinful. They gave rules for its regulation, defined the mutual duties of masters and servants, and by irresistible implication sanctioned the relation itself. In the passage quoted from Timothy, they not only sanctioned the relation, but positively commanded that the instructions they had given and enforced by the honor of God himself, should be exhorted and taught. Now here are the two phases of Scripture teaching: one, *servitude, a curse*—the other *slavery, a lawful relation*. The great mass of modern Christians, departing from the views held by the Church for centuries, fix their attention exclusively on the one decision of servitude as a curse. The Church of Christ, under all its forms in the fifteen Southern States of the American Union, following the old views of the Christian Church, have accepted *both decisions* of the Word of God: servitude, a curse, and the relation of master and servant a lawful relation. These Southern Churches can see no inconsistency in the two instructions. The Bible, like the common-sense of all mankind, discriminates *between the condition of servitude and the relations it creates*. The condition of servitude in the poverty it implies—in the menial offices it involves—is a condition of lapsed humanity—an incident of the fall, and a part of the curse which follows it. But *the relations* it creates are right, whether those relations be the relation of a hireling or a slave—of hired or heritable service. Many similar incidents of the lapsed condition of the human race are patent in human society. Sickness and death are a part of the curse; but the relations they create—the relation of doctor and nurse—are absolutely right. War is a part of the curse; but the relations created by it—the relation of the soldier and the diplomat—are right. Civil government itself is an incident of the fall, an institute designed to restrain the evil impulses of a fallen race; yet all the relations of civil government are right. All servitude is a part of the curse; but to confound servitude with the relations it creates, is a blunder of modern philosophy, but not of the Scriptures. The testimony

of the Southern Church is now what it has always been. The reasons for their unalterable adhesion to this testimony are two fold: *first*, moral questions are unalterable; and *second*, the teachings of the Scriptures are to-day what they were a thousand years ago—what they will be a thousand years to come. They are as *authoritative* now as they have always been, and as they always will be. Their *utility* is as unchangeable as their *authority*. All Scripture is *profitable* as well as eternally obligatory. If the question is asked, why raise this issue now, the answer is ready. The command “These things teach and exhort” is still in force, and the Church is bound to obey it. But more than this, the principles underlying the teachings of the Scriptures, on the rightful subordination of men in the relations of society, are necessary to the preservation of domestic peace, property, and the rights of every class. The modern constructions put upon it have turned the grand maxim of civil freedom into the most dangerous and foolish rule that ever entered the brain of an enthusiast. Identical in form, the precept of Sydney, Locke and Jefferson, has been turned by the unchastened constructions of modern socialists into the ruinous maxim of the Communist and the Socialist. True in one remote and abstract sense, and as such valuable, it is false in twenty senses intensely practical, and as such is infinitely mischievous. The time is fast approaching when all Christendom will appreciate the *utility* of the Scripture teachings, which the Southern Christians are reproached for upholding. In this testimony on the relations of servitude, we are standing, first and foremost, in maintenance of the Word of God, and secondly, for the rights of property, for domestic peace, for social order, and for the rights of all classes of mankind as defined in their actual status in all human society. We cannot go back from this testimony. We must obey the unrepealed command, “These things teach and exhort. If the Northern Presbyterian Church will not unite in this testimony, organic union or co-operative union are impossible, unless we mean to rebel outright against the orders of the Holy Ghost. If they refuse to unite in this testimony, we must obey the command, “From such withdraw thyself.”

4. Organic union is likewise prohibited to us by the *number and gravity* of the points of *ecclesiastical usage and administration* on which the two Churches differ. A single point separated us at first from the Old School section of the Northern Church; a number of points separated us from the New School; and the Reunited Church has developed a similar phase of multiplied divisions of sentiment and practice. We will state these without discussion, except so far as may be necessary to explain. We differ,

(1). On the *construction* of the *spiritual character* of the Church. The formal re-acknowledgement of the authoritative paragraphs of the Confession of Faith by the Northern Synod of Missouri, lately approved in the Omaha Assembly, is absolutely without force, for the simple reason that those paragraphs are construed by them as fully consistent with the power to decide all sorts of political questions. The Omaha Assembly itself, on the very heels of its acknowledgement of the purely spiritual character of the Church, threw out an appeal from an act of the Synod of Pennsylvania recommending an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The paragraphs were in the Confession when the notorious Spring Resolutions were passed; yet they were not and never have been construed as prohibiting these Resolutions. What is the use or the sound sense of claiming identity of principle on the spiritual character of the Church, when the *construction* of the principle is supposed, on one side, to warrant an unlimited interference with things secular, because the moral distinction can inhere in them; and on the other side, the principle is construed to limit such interference within brief bounds. The Northern principle—the Church has a right to interfere wherever the moral distinction is found—absolutely destroys all restraint upon interference with secular matters. It is identical with the Popish principle, the infallible right to decide all questions of doctrine and morals. It is altogether possible the Southern Church has not made a consistent application of her principle, and may have been guilty of more than one trespass beyond her spiritual limits. But the difference between her and her sister at the North is radical.

Whenever the Southern Church is convicted of such a trespass, *her principle* gives the right to call her to *account*, and imposes the obligation upon her to retrace her steps. But her Northern sister Church so construes her commission that no trespass can be arrested, no repentance can be demanded; because her construction of her principle has broken down, to all practical intents and purposes, all distinction between things secular and ecclesiastical. This view of the late action of the Omaha Assembly is confirmed by the view taken of it by the press of the Northern Church. The New York *Evangelist*, by one of its correspondents, says plainly: "The Northern Church cannot accept the Southern interpretation of the spiritual character of the Church." In simple truth, the paper of the Missouri Synod approved by the Omaha Assembly has not closed the division in the view of the real sphere of the Church by so much as a hair's breadth.

(2). We differ on our theories of the real sphere of the Church in relation to an indefinite number of things besides political matters. The principle of the Northern Presbyterians, the right to intervene wherever the distinction of right and wrong inheres necessarily, gives an unlimited charter to ecclesiastical action. The Church becomes an authorized agent to take the lead in every benevolent or humanitarian enterprise. She may as lawfully interfere with secular education, as with religious instruction. She may lead in legislative assaults upon the opium traffic, or recommend changes in favor of temperance, in State Constitutions, as readily as teach "the moral evils" of opium and whisky. All charitable enterprises, Masonic, Pythian, or Odd Fellow she has a right to patronize. The Church is a *Broad Church* in all things in which moral distinctions or religious obligation, can enter. The Southern view of the Kingdom of Christ limits its lawful functions to the spiritual work of propagating the Gospel, and allows the Church to meddle with secular things only so far as they are truly *incidental* and strictly ancillary to her own work. She may not fully understand all the applications of her maxim, and may sometimes overgo and sometimes fail to go as far as her principle will warrant. But the general notion is effective be-

tween a Church with functions practically unlimited, and a Church seeking, as her duty, to give safe bounds to her official action.

(3). We differ on the idea of the true nature of the Ruling Elder's office. In the North, the Rotary Eldership is popular and allowed. This empties the office of its grave and sacred character as a Presbyter of the Church, and makes it a mere office of convenience and temporary investiture. The very nature of the Church is implicated in this view of one of its fundamental elements. The Southern view makes the Ruling Elder a Presbyter called of God to as permanent an office as the ministry of the Gospel. In function of rule, they are construed as the same office. This difference of view is a serious one.

(4). We differ from Northern Presbyterians in our views of Romish baptism and, consequently, in our views of the great Roman apostacy. The Old School once agreed in our view; the New School differed; and the view of the United Church gives one more proof of the supremacy of the New School views in that body.

(5). There is also a difference between our views and practice and an allowed custom of considerable, we know not how great extent, in the use of boiled grape-juice in the stead of wine in the sacrament of the Supper. To us no practice could appear more seriously objectionable, or more worthy of peremptory prohibition by the courts of the Church.

(6). There is a difference between us also touching the relation of women to the *public* work of the Church. The inestimable work of Christian females, instead of being conducted in the private methods consonant to the retired sphere in which the New Testament defines the general scope of female energies, is formulated into a grand, distinct department, publicly recognized as exclusively womans. While discouragement has been thrown upon the formal assumption of the ministerial office by Christian females, their public appearance as reformers and workers is regarded with favor, and construed as no censurable departure from the true sphere of woman. The tendencies of such a policy are far from being approved by the conservative feeling of Southern Christians.

(7) A different rule prevails also in reference to the right of the Presbyteries to preserve themselves and the Churches under their care from the instruction of unsound men, by the *examination of ministers*. In the Southern Church, the rule is mandatory. In the Old School Church of the North, the same regulation prevailed. In the New School, its propriety was always disputed. In the Reunited Church, the rule is reduced to a mere privilege, unregulated by any positive prescriptions touching its use, and distinctly abolished *as law*.* Organic union, laying open our Presbyteries and churches to the approach of New School men from the North, would disable the securities of sound doctrine. No Presbytery would risk the trouble of an appeal to the General Assembly by rejecting any man whose franchise was guarded by the well understood terms on which the Reunion of the New and Old School took place. Organic union would bring us serious hazards of corruption in our public testimony, or of difficulty in protecting our churches from error.

8. There is also a serious theoretic and a still more formidable practical difference between *the modes* of conducting the enterprises of the Church. Our method is to do it by *Committees*; their method is to do it by *Boards*. This distinction is reduced to entire insignificance by some, and is only recognized in the incorporated character of Boards and the incapacity of incorporation attributed to Committees. For years before the war, such thinkers as Breckinridge, Thornwell, and Stuart Robinson were profoundly convinced of the value of that distinction, and labored with intense solicitude to incorporate it into the actual organization of the Church. Would such men have laid such stress on a distinction so immaterial—reduced to a mere difference of size—and an unfounded allegation of incompetence to be incorporated? A Committee can be incorporated, as witness our Committee of Publication. It is still a Committee. The distinction between Boards and Committees lies in another direction. A Board is a conception born of the organic weakness of the Congregational system; it is a body apart from the organization which creates it, designed to do the work assigned

* Moore's Digest, p. 80.

to that organization. In Congregationalism, such a body is necessary, springing from the essential weakness of the system. In a Presbyterian system, a Board is the product, not of organic weakness, but of a mistaken transfer to a body outside of the Church or engrafted upon it of the work assigned to the Church itself. Under a Committee, the Church does her own work with her own organic hand. The distinction is both plain and important. It was brought out by Robert Breckinridge in the very beginning of the reorganization of the Church after the disruption in 1838.* That seed-thought grew until it created the Committee of Church Extension in the unbroken Old School Church in 1855, and moulded the whole form of the Southern Church as it now exists. Great men do not misguide themselves or others by an unfounded distinction.

(9). Lastly, there is a difference between us and the Northern Presbyterians, on a matter of principle, involving a matter of practical importance so absolutely imperious as to be in itself, alone, an absolute bar to organic union, if no other objection lay to the project. This is the question of *a mixed Church of whites and blacks*. The Northern Church is fixed in the purpose to recognize the negro as an organic unit in the Church, and not to give form to an independent African Presbyterian Church. The Southern Church is determined on an independent African Church, in accordance with the preferences of the blacks themselves, and with their own deep convictions of the unqualified necessities of their social state, and, in the long run, of the purity of their blood. In the North this question is of no practical importance. The negro, at the North, is a factor in society absolutely insignificant, and carries no menace to the social conditions, the Church property, the moral advancement, or the race purity of the Northern people. In the South it is different. The negro is with us, by the million; and, relatively to the numbers of the whites, his thronging multitudes are all the more menacing. In other words, he is not only absolutely, but relatively, dangerous. Association in the Church, in her pulpits, in her courts, and in her congregational assemblies walk hand in hand with social rela-

* Critic, Vol. 1, p. 399.

tions, and these with all the horrors of ultimate amalgamation. The distinctions of race are drawn by the hand of God: He always acts upon sufficient reasons in all that He does: however unknown to us, they are guaranteed to us by His infinite perfection. The attempt to obliterate distinctions established by infinite wisdom is infinite folly. All measures tending to that result are, by that very fact, marked as resistance to a divine ordination, and an infinite peril to man. The law of love, so far from impeaching the policy of preserving our race purity untainted, absolutely demands it. Amalgamation between races stamped with the radical distinctions of the five great families of the human race, will result in the deterioration of the best qualities of both; and the law of nature requiring the maintenance of the distinction will re-establish it by the ultimate victory of the baser blood. The white race of the South, brought into close relations with the negro, owe no higher duty, through the long centuries to come, than to preserve the purity of their blood.

But it is supposed the unity of the Church of Christ demands the organic union with the negro race, because we are to call no man common or unclean. The National distinctions of Churches imply no violation of that precept. Denominational divisions in the kingdom do not imply it, where the communion of the saints, in sacrament and worship, is allowed. Organizations in sections of society differing in the social scale, in culture, in tastes, in social habits, are no violation of the precept. Why should organizations based upon race distinctions, and important to guard the great race distinctions created by Almighty God for the best interests of His creatures, be construed as violations of the precept? Neither does the *unity of the Church* require an organic fusion of races. In what does that unity consist? The principle of unity in the kingdom of Christ is exactly the same with the principle of unity in any other kingdom. *It is subjection to the crown.* To condition the unity of the kingdom on a single official or a class of officials under the crown is an absolute solecism. The Roman Church conditions, unity on the Pope and the Episcopal Church conditions it on the order of bishops. This is about as reasonable as it would be to condition the unity of the

German Empire on the Chancellor of the realm, or the unity of the British Empire on the clerks in the war-office. The unity of the kingdom of Christ is exclusively *in the crown of Christ*, and not in any mode or principle of organizing His subjects into a regular organic body. The unity of the kingdom is not at all inconsistent with its division into distinct branches. If this principle is denied, the Church is destroyed; it has long ago committed an act of *felo-de-se*; for these divisions have always existed, and have been occasions of infinite advantage. If this principle is true, then the unity of the kingdom is not broken by the separate organic arrangements of the kingdom, and any separate organization is not a question of law determined by unity, *but a question of expediency*. The formation, then, of an independent African Presbyterian Church will not violate the unity of the kingdom: it is demanded by the highest considerations of wisdom and absolute duty in these Southern States of the American Union. No Southern Christian ought to allow his conscience to be disturbed, for one moment, by the thought that he is violating the unity of the kingdom of Christ by demanding an independent ecclesiastical organization for the negro race. One of the most fatal objections to our organic union with Northern Churches, is that it will bring us into organic union with that very race. It will moreover put the decision of all questions arising along the course of years out of our relations to the negro, into the hands of a body of Northern men. This alone is decisive of the question. We cannot afford to do it, nor will we do it, if God please. We have these questions under our own control as long as the independence and autonomy of the Southern Church is preserved. That lost by organic union, our fate hangs suspended on the will of Northern men. They ought no more to desire than we ought to grant that favor. It would be madness pure and simple.

In conclusion, what ought our Church to do? In the first place, by deliberate study, master the considerations which demand the independence of the Southern church. They are not political; they are not the fruits of passion and prejudice; they are considerations of fidelity to our creed, to the truth of God, and to

the highest concerns of our social life and race purity. Settled in this view, we shall be able to stand in the future in a fearless attitude before all Christendom and in full confidence in God, our King. In the second place, let us hang resolutely together. Why should any Southern church abandon the Assembly of our faithful witnessing body, bearing steady testimony to the doctrine and moral teachings of the Word of God, to enter a broad Church like that of the North, destroying the noble Westminster creed of our fathers by their divergent constructions, and refusing to obey the voice of the Holy Ghost in His teachings on the relations of subordination and servitude among men? What will you gain by refusing to obey the command, "From such withdraw thyself?" In the third place, let us maintain our independence, if possible, without forfeiting the good-will of our Northern brethren. We differ from them in our interpretations of the Standards of the Church, and the teachings of the Scriptures on grave issues of doctrine and morals. But we respect them as a noble branch of the Kingdom of our Lord. We bid them God-speed in their grand endeavors to save the souls of lost men. Nay more, we welcome their presence and work for our own dear Southern countrymen. They proclaimed their mission among us, once, in the terms of war. We are ready to welcome them in terms of peace. The more souls of our dear countrymen they can bring to Jesus, and draw through legitimate conquests of faith and prayer into their churches, the more we shall rejoice. Nay, if any of our suffering churches can find relief among them which we, in our poverty, cannot give, we shall sorrowfully acquiesce in their loss to us. All we ask is fair play, no illegitimate interference with our churches or our work. Give us a noble competition in generous rivalry; give us real friendship under professed fraternity; and the blue banner will float high in the Southern heavens over two branches of the Kingdom doing their work in the unity of the Spirit and the bonds of peace. Let each answer to his own Lord.

C. R. VAUGHAN.

VI. NOTES.

THE MCGLYNN AFFAIR.

It may well be doubted whether, during the present century, anything has occurred so well calculated to enlighten the people of America in regard to Romanism, as what is popularly known as "The McGlynn Affair."

Before proceeding to discuss the grounds upon which the above statement is made, let us enter into a more or less elaborate definition of terms. Romanism, as a general term, may be defined as that system of "deceivableness of unrighteousness" which comes "after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders," the system which realizes the proud boast that "Rome never changes," for the system will remain in its essential features unchanged, until it is destroyed by the brightness of our Lord's coming. But it lies more properly within the scope of this article to consider Romanism, in a more restricted sense, as that politico-ecclesiastical system which, having its seat on the Tiber, essays to dominate in the interest of the Romish Church the policies of all the governments of the earth. Under this phase, the ruling purpose is always the same and the aim inflexibly steady; yet in all the details of its working, it is of all things most vacillating and capricious. The mode of its working is authoritatively revealed in instructions very recently sent by the Pope to Cardinal Rampolla—instructions which, very much to the annoyance of the Pontiff, found their way into the *Moniteur*. In this letter, the Pope announces that he has taken upon himself the mission "to reconcile the people and the governments of civilized States." He then in turn considers in their relation to the Roman Church the present state of political affairs in Italy, France, Austria, Spain and Germany—devoting special space to an expression of his pleasure in contemplating the success of his plans in the last-named country, and not omitting to reiterate his claim to territorial sovereignty "as an indispensable condition of settlement in the affairs of Italy." In reflecting upon the audacity displayed in thus dealing with the nations of the earth, one, after the manner of John in the vision of the scarlet woman,

finds himself wondering with "great admiration." This Italian subject, who owns not a foot of land, save by the grace of the King of Italy, essays to deal with kings and kingdoms as things his own. Nor is the wonder lessened, but the rather immensely increased, when we look to apostolic teaching or apostolic example for the warrant of this vaunted successor of the Apostles, in thus dealing with the affairs of secular governments.

This digression, we trust, will not be considered unpardonable when we come to consider the incidental results and the consequences of the McGlynn affair, to which subject we now advert.

Edward McGlynn was, until very recently, a priest in charge of the Roman Catholic parish of St. Stephens, in New York City. His administration of the affairs of his charge is admitted to have been distinguished in a remarkable degree by practical sympathy for the distressed or suffering, and by acts of most disinterested kindness and of charitable self-sacrifice for the poor. Along with this, Dr. McGlynn was for quite a time in the habit of exercising a degree of independence of thought and action, which has not infrequently brought him into opposition, more or less direct, with the policy of his Church. Thus, in 1883, he incurred the displeasure of the Romish Propaganda for views on Irish affairs and the interest he took, as was charged, in inciting Irish revolution, by making speeches in favor of the Irish Land League. It should be explained that the Roman authorities were at this time entirely on the British side of the Irish question. Cardinal McCloskey, possibly fearing to proceed to extremities, declined to suspend Dr. McGlynn, although fully authorized to do so. More recently, Dr. McGlynn has opposed the policy of his Church in the matter of parochial schools. In this he exhibited a fearless independence which must have exasperated his superiors in the highest degree. The act, however, which has been the means of drawing down upon him the utmost penalties of the canon law, is the maintaining and proclaiming in public addresses that all lands should belong to the State, and that the State should reclaim all lands by excessive taxation upon those who now hold the soil.

Dr. McGlynn was directed to cease to proclaim his peculiar views on the matter of land tenure, and failing to do so, was ordered, through Archbishop Corrigan, (Cardinal McCloskey having died,) "to condemn in writing the doctrines to which he has given utterance in public meetings, or which have been

attributed to him in the press," and to proceed to Rome. Claiming the right, as an American citizen, to hold such views as he chose upon what he regarded as economic questions, he refused to retract his opinions, and knowing that to appear at Rome without having complied with this condition precedent, would be merely to court the utmost vengeance that could be inflicted, he disobeyed the summons, and incurred the penalty of excommunication for his contumacy.

Thus we have presented in outline at least the McGlynn affair. The principal actors claim at least a passing notice. Of Dr. McGlynn we have spoken. Archbishop Corrigan, judged by his part in the transactions we have noted, seems to have been a prelate worthy of the times of the torch and the fagot, the rack and the dungeon. Stern, relentless and unswerving, in the fifteenth century he would have been such an one as Torquemada; in the 17th, under somewhat changed conditions, he would have successfully competed for honors with the infamous Laud. As opposite in disposition and in character as can well be conceived, is Cardinal Gibbons. Possessed of more than usual ability, excelling in the graces of manner and speech, and withal not less earnest and purposeful in his regard for the interests of the Romish Church than Corrigan, he proceeds in its service with an adroitness that is matchless and a tact that is consummate.

Corrigan, utterly oblivious to the genius of American institutions, and in utter disregard of the opinions of the American people, could see no obstacle to the utter destruction of McGlynn. Not so the wily Gibbons. He knew full well the popularity of the refractory prelate, and knew full well the temper and the spirit of his following; above all, he knew, as few could know, the importance to Romish interests that McGlynn should not pose before the American public as a martyr to his indulgence in freedom of political opinion. So the Cardinal went to Rome, ostensibly in furtherance of other matters; but the subsequent proceedings against the priest bear unmistakably the impress of the master mind of the Cardinal.

It behooves us now to consider, more fully, the effect of this episode in Romish history. However lightly many may be disposed to regard the conduct of Dr. McGlynn, in its bearings on the prospects of the hierarchy in this country, it seems plain that the authorities of that hierarchy regarded it as worthy of their

most serious thought, and most careful management. In his efforts to control the governments of the earth to the advantage of the Roman Catholic Church, it might be supposed that one sitting in the temple of God and setting himself forth as God, would have some markedly distinct principles of morality and right to be unswervingly maintained through all the mutations of time and circumstance. But, in all her dealings, the Romish Church places the end to be gained as paramount to the means to be employed. With her, principle is always to be regarded as accidental, and policy essential. In every case demanding practical application, the determination of the line of action to be followed is made to depend upon the accidents of the existing situation. Thus, in Ireland, procrastination was the policy adopted. Both the Irish Romanists and the British were kept, for months, in expectancy of Papal expression of sympathy for Irish Home Rule, or of its unqualified condemnation. But the wise old Pontiff reserved his action until at once the Irish could be appeased, and the British not angered. In Prussia, Bismarck, under the pressure of political necessity, contracts with the Pope for the granting of certain concessions, in return for which Leo issues from the Vatican, direct, those lordly mandates which transfer, like so many chattel slaves, the so-called freemen from the one political party to the other. But, in America, neither the policy of procrastination would serve the purpose of the Pontiff, nor the policy of autocratic dealing with the adherents of the Romish Church. Cardinal McClosky had, indeed, put off from time to time, the evil day, but the Cardinal was no more. Corrigan had blundered into the false step which precipitated the crisis, and now there was naught left but the dealing, as best might be done, with the situation in its actuality.

What was the situation? At the time the McGlynn affair was approaching its crisis, it became necessary for the Roman Pontiff to take cognizance of the connection of adherents of the Church with the Knights of Labor—a secret political society—and as a secret society amenable to the ban of Roman Catholic canon law. At the sacrifice of consistency—a sacrifice never counting for a great deal with the hierarchy—this violation might easily have been overlooked, but that Archbishop Taschereau, of Montreal, in proceeding to extremity, raised the issue and forced it to a determination. Just how far the views and principles of Dr. Mc-

Glynn are co-ordinated with those of the Knights of Labor, cannot certainly be known. While the utmost cordiality of feeling exists, neither party acknowledges unity of aim or purpose. It is enough to know, however, that the affair of Dr. McGlynn and the issue anent the Knights of Labor, coming together, formed, from a Romish point of view, a serious complication. Both political parties in this country labor to secure the Roman Catholic vote, the one party that of the Irish, the other that of the German. In playing these parties against each other, Rome finds its readiest way to realize political aims, but the game is one that requires to be played with masterly skill. The parties as such are neutral, or if not neutral are doing the bidding of Rome; the press find their interest in silence or subserviency; the people sleep. Obviously, it is for the advantage of the Romish Church to have these things just so, but Corrigan's misstep has aroused the people, and, with a flash as from a magic lantern, the history of Romanism—Romanism past as well as present—is pictured upon the canvas. What now is to be done? In the days of Innocent or Gregory the answer would be easy; the torch and the fagot would quickly down the first uprisings and all would be as if it had not been. Not so now can this matter be disposed of. The gaze of the people must be averted; again they must be lulled to their slumbers. Harsh measures against McGlynn are not to be thought of; the softly-gloved hand of apparent friendship must be extended, and he must be made to seem his own destroyer.

The proof of these reflections is found throughout the details of this whole affair. The writ of excommunication, and the circumstances attending its issuance, are well deserving of study. The absence of all ceremony, indeed we may say the modesty of the whole affair, evidently preconcerted, is noteworthy. The excommunication was not even pronounced in church, but was sent by mail to Dr. McGlynn and published in the newspapers. In it we recognize no "thunderings of the Vatican," but a bare announcement, almost apologetic in its tone. Along with all this, care is taken to inform the public that the minor excommunication, which gave to the major excommunication its terrors, is no longer recognized by canon law, and hence Dr. McGlynn's social status is not interfered with. How different this from the excommunication of Robert, King of France, by Gregory V, or Henry of Germany by Hildebrand, or the weakling John of England by Inno-

cent! In explanation, Cardinal Gibbons says: "In the earlier days of the Church, the major excommunication was very severe, and cut off the person excommunicated from all social intercourse, even with the members of his own family. The advance of social conditions has rendered the execution of such decrees impossible, and they have been greatly modified." At the risk of digression, we invite attention to this authoritative admission of the time-serving spirit of the Romish Church. There is no apology for the past, nor plea in extenuation; but everything is justified by "the advance of social conditions."

What of Dr. McGlynn? Apart from the personal influence that Dr. McGlynn is at present exerting, and for a while may continue to exert, he does not appear to be a very considerable factor. In justice to the hierarchy, we must admit its absolute right to prescribe the conditions upon which one may remain in its pale and discharge official or other functions. In regarding its dealings with Dr. McGlynn—barring of course its tacit claim to shut the gate of heaven against him—we do not find ourself wrought to any high degree of indignation. The only apology we can find for Dr. McGlynn's theory of land tenure is that its wickedness is surpassed by its absurdity. On the question of parochial schools, indeed, and the demand for absolute non-interference of the Church with the charitable institutions of the State, and *vice versa*, he is admirably sound. Here we bid him God-speed. Judged by his public utterances, the Doctor's views of many of the essential points that separate the Romish from the Protestant Churches are all that could be desired. Thus on the subject of excommunication he says:

"But then they say they have excommunicated me. No; no man can do that! There are only two beings in all the vast universe that can separate me from God. One is that infinite, wise, good-and merciful Being, our Heavenly Father. He could do it; but He never will until I consent, first, to separate myself from Him. Then there is only one other being in all the universe, and that is Edward McGlynn. He can separate me from Him. I am conscious that I am frail, that I am very weak; but I am intensely conscious that I am only desirous of doing, in all things, the will of God. I will trust in His infinite love, in His infinite power, in His infinite goodness to all men, all women and children."

Much more we would like to quote did space permit, but we forbear longer to tax the space of the publisher or the patience of the reader.

Dr. McGlynn still claims to be a Catholic. He is in no sense such a Reformer as Martin Luther, or Calvin, or Zwingli. We find ourselves attaching most importance to the whole matter in consideration of the effects consequent upon his excommunication. He has a very large and enthusiastic following, and the full sympathy, if not the active co-operation of not a few priests. Thus his denunciations of Romish tyranny and intolerance reach ears that would never hear them when uttered from Protestant pulpits. All that he says and does is published, and so reaches hundreds of thousands who would never read the same unveilings of Romish depravity in Protestant books. This publicity, this turning of the eyes of the American people to the fact that one no more than an Italian subject—albeit Pope of Rome—essays to inter-meddle in the political affairs of this country, it is this publicity, we repeat, that seems to us to give its prime value and importance to "the McGlynn affair."

JOHN McLAURIN.

THE HEBREW MOVEMENT; ITS PAST AND FUTURE.

An organized movement for the promotion of the study of Hebrew and other Semitic languages and literatures, which has been in process for a few years, has attracted considerable attention. It is proposed in this note briefly to tell the story of its origin, to outline its methods and the results thus far attained, and to indicate the promise of the future.

The effort had its rise in the discernment of a widely felt need for more thorough study of the Old Testament. There was a time when the Old Testament received from the Christian Church about as much consideration as the New. The effect of this was seen not only in the theology, but also in the legislation of the older States of the Union. Later, in the earlier period of Sunday-school instruction and of evangelistic work, the Old Testament fell into disuse. The New was studied almost exclusively in the Sunday-school, and the teachings of the gospels and epistles were the almost sole theme of the pulpit. Within the last

twenty-five years, the public mind has taken another turn. The introduction of the system of International Sunday-school lessons, which has sought to give courses of study from the Old Testament half the time, the Bible-readings of Moody, Whittle and others, in which a topic is taken and traced through the entire book, the more frequent practice of expository preaching in the pulpit generally, have awakened anew an interest in the more ancient portion of the Scriptures. It is also in harmony with the general tendency of modern thought towards a wider application of the inductive method of philosophy, that the undue influence of systems of Dogmatic Theology over the pulpit and its teachings should be abated; that the facts which lie at the foundation of Christianity should be fully searched out, investigated and weighed. This spirit gives history, its records and literature, their just measure of significance, and so it has come to be felt that Christ's Bible must be studied and understood as He understood it. Besides this, there is a motive in the movements of skepticism. The rationalism which, fifty years ago, attacked the New Testament on historical and literary grounds, under the lead of Strauss and Baur, has, of late, assailed in like manner the records of Israel. This has summoned the Christian scholarship of the world to the defence of these records. Just as this controversy began in America, the valley of the Euphrates was opened, and the libraries of Semitic nations, long extinct and buried from the eye and thought of man, were brought forth and began to confirm the validity of the ancient Scriptures. Under these circumstances, the clergy found themselves inadequately prepared to guide the public mind in its new interest, to read intelligently and profitably the discussions of scholars. The seminaries had given to Old Testament literature but little attention. Men had seldom gained Hebrew enough for practical purposes. Indeed, most ministers had obtained just enough Hebrew to make them regret that they had any, such a sense of waste, inadequateness and uselessness was attached to it. Besides, the erroneous notion had widely prevailed that Hebrew was a language very difficult to acquire, an error arising solely from unfavorable conditions for its study and vicious methods of teaching it. But the need was so widely felt, and the desire for a better knowledge so earnest that it seemed possible to dispel this mistaken opinion. Accordingly the plan, as since carried out in its main features, including Correspond-

ence Schools, Summer Schools and periodicals, was determined upon.

In December, 1880, a letter was sent out from Morgan Park, Illinois, suggesting concerted study of Hebrew, and offering to teach by correspondence. The response was immediate and hearty. On the 1st of February, 1881, the first Hebrew lesson, written with the electric pen, was distributed to a class of forty members. By the third week the class numbered seventy, and the pen was abandoned for the press. The number taking the lessons steadily increased. During the past four years, the membership of the Correspondence School has been between six and seven hundred, consisting of men not only from every State and Territory in the Union, but from every English speaking people, and from most of the important Mission fields in heathen lands. In the summer of 1881, a few months after the Correspondence School began, the first Summer School was held in Morgan Park, with twenty-five in attendance. During each summer, for five years, there have been held four or five Summer Schools in different sections of the country, the aggregate annual attendance being about two hundred and fifty. In all, about a thousand educated men have been pursuing Semitic studies in the Correspondence and Summer Schools each year.

Shortly after the Correspondence School opened, *The Hebrew Student* was started, partly as a bulletin with the Correspondence lessons, and partly to push the work more widely, calling attention to the opportunity offered, and urging men to embrace it.

In 1884, the American Institute of Hebrew was organized, nearly all the Semitic scholars and teachers of the United States entering heartily into it. Since that time the work has been done under their general review and with their cordial co-operation. *This is the strength of the movement.*

The union of such a large number of scholars commands the public confidence, has rapidly intensified and widened the general interest and given the work national significance. Students in this department are coming more and more to feel that they belong to a large and honorable guild who have charge of highly important interests.

The primary assumption of the Schools is that Hebrew can be *mastered*, and that with less difficulty than either of the ancient tongues which College students are accustomed to pursue. More

than that, it can be *completely mastered*, so as to be a facile instrument to the Bible student, by men engaged in the urgent duties of the ministry. Thorough and continuous work becomes speedily and largely remunerative.

The aim in the teaching has been therefore to realize a very high attainment. The method of instruction adopted has been mainly the inductive. This involves full acquaintance with facts, before the grammatical principle concerned is stated; and so, very little memorizing of the grammar is demanded. This study of principles in the concrete is aided by much transliteration, by literal translation at the first, by regular memorizing of words and abundant sight-reading. The avidity with which men, who have had the unfortunate experience of failing with former methods, have seized upon this mode of study, and the rapidity with which they have acquired the language, have been to them a constant source of surprise and delight.

The work has not been confined to Hebrew. In all the Summer Schools, for four years, other Semitic languages have been taught. The best scholars in the land in Assyrian, Arabic and Aramaic, have conducted classes in their respective departments, considerable in number and enthusiastic in spirit.

In the Summer Schools, courses of lectures have been given by eminent scholars on themes of vital interest to students of the Bible and other Semitic literature. Many of these lectures have subsequently appeared in reviews and treatises of high and permanent value.

The Publication Society of Hebrew has been a very important factor in the work. It was found very early that the field was altogether too large for *The Hebrew Student* to cover adequately. That the movement might find expression equal to its needs, the task was divided between two periodicals, the one, *Hebraica*, a quarterly for the interchange of views between scholars upon all Semitic themes, inevitably too erudite for popular use; the other, *The Old Testament Student*, equally scholarly in its character, but less recondite, and, as its title indicates, dealing mainly with things of immediate importance in the study of the Old Testament. Nothing more clearly shows the breadth and power of the Hebrew movement than the large and rapidly growing subscription list of these periodicals, on both sides of the sea.

At the beginning, it was found necessary to send out to pupils

a brief exhibit of the Elements of the language, the grammars being too full and cumbersome for learners. This book, at first printed for private circulation only, was improved and issued anew from time to time, until two years ago, in fairly satisfactory compass and completeness, the seventh edition was published and sent forth, with an accompanying Manual, to the public. It is now used not only in the Correspondence and Summer Schools, but also in sixty institutions in the United States. Under the auspices of the same society, other Semitic treatises were issued, such as Lyon's Assyrian Manual, Brown's Aramaic Manual and Lansing's Arabic Method. Since February 1, these books have been published by Messrs. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York.

In the promotion of the aim of its existence, the American Institute of Hebrew has given particular attention to the introduction of Hebrew into Colleges, mainly, that intending theological students might come to the Seminary with some preparation in that department. Last year two hundred and fifty letters were addressed by the Secretary, Prof. John P. Peters, Ph. D., of Philadelphia, to as many Colleges in the country, the replies to which were generally full of hope and promise. Whether as the result of this influence or not, chairs of the Semitic languages have been established within two years in Yale, Columbia and Princeton, and a large number of institutions have inaugurated elective courses in Hebrew.

This survey of facts affords data for forecasting somewhat the future. Surely there is ground for hope. The need is as great as ever and is more deeply realized. The demand upon the workers is constantly increasing. Inquiries are numerous and incessant. A dozen Summer Schools for next summer have been asked for and could be organized, if there were teachers to man them. They are wanted all over the country. Plainly, the movement has just begun; and yet it has gained a momentum which promises to put the Semitic literatures where they belong in the Universities, to redeem Semitic history from neglect and to bring its light to bear upon the pages of Scripture history, and thus make more clear than ever the revelation of Jehovah to men.

The organization of the American Institute of Hebrew was made for five years; of these, three have passed. Within the two that remain, the future policy must be determined. Shall it go out of existence? This means the discontinuance of Summer

Schools and of the Correspondence School. Shall it not rather be continued upon a broader basis, with larger plans? In view of what has been done, and of what possibly may yet be accomplished, is not the question, viz: What shall be the future of the American Institute of Hebrew? one worthy of the consideration of every man who is interested in the cause of scientific Biblical study?

Yale University.

W. R. HARPER.

THE PSEUDO-SCIENTIFIC VIEW OF MIRACLES.

In the May Number, 1887, of the *Homiletic Review*, appeared an interesting and suggestive article entitled "The Miraculous Element in the Egyptian Plagues," by Rev. A. J. Lyman, of Brooklyn, New York. This article has quite enough of vivid thought, and of eloquence of a certain kind, to make it acceptable to cultured readers. But this very fact makes it desirable that an earnest protest against its central teachings shall be at once entered, and that the real tendency of those teachings shall be plainly shown, lest we drag the anchors of our faith, and begin to drift toward a lee-shore, under a heavy and disastrous norther.

Rev. Mr. Lyman finds fault with the settled beliefs of the Church and of the soundest scientific Christian learning as to "miracles." He expresses his dissent from those beliefs in the following words: "This, then, is the real question. Can a God who works in the occasional outburst of miracle, be identified as the *same God as He who at the same instant and in the same place*, is also working according to the invariable power and sequence of natural law? This is the real question, and it rules out at once that antique (would we could say obsolete) definition of a miracle which seems formed expressly for easy manipulation by our scientific opponents, viz: that a miracle is an event contrary to, or in suspension of the laws of nature. That definition is about the worst boomerang that ever became mixed up with the true weapons of faith. It hurts nobody except the person who throws it. Because, if God be in nature in any strong and steady way, as we insist that He is, why, then, it is not *Nature* that is Suspended, contravened and set aside when a miracle occurs, according to this definition, but it is *God in Nature* that is

so contravened and set aside, and this is a very serious thing to say, for how can God set aside God? And the more honor we put upon God as actually living in His own world, immanent and operative, the sharper becomes the back-stroke of the boomerang, when we define a miracle as calling for a stoppage of that invariable and immanent energy." p. 375.

Having thus set aside the established belief of the Christian world as a dangerous and deceptive "boomerang" always ready, by its "back-stroke" to return and overthrow its inventors and employers, Rev. Mr. Lyman proceeds, with a smiling complacency, admirable in its way, to give us his view of nine out of ten of the "Egyptian plagues." For the purposes of this article it is entirely unnecessary to say anything of his exposition of the water turned into blood, the frogs, the lice, the flies, the murrain upon the cattle, the boils upon human bodies, the storm and hail, the locusts and the darkness over all Egypt, except in Goshen, where "the children of Israel had light in their dwellings." It is due to him to acknowledge that he has given us some ingenious thoughts, and not very familiar facts, which may do good and can do no harm unless they be perverted to the general purposes of his theory concerning miracles. But, it will be observed that the learned expounder of the "plagues" touched very lightly on the *tenth* plague—that fearful miracle of "the death of all the first-born" of the Egyptians. He evidently felt that that plague did not suit his theory and could not be reconciled with it. Therefore, he touched it only enough to push it out of view; but he could not push it out of existence, and it completely overturns his theory.

Science and Christianity are not hostile to each other. We mean, of course, *true* Science and *genuine* Christianity. "Science falsely so-called," the false science of which Paul wrote eighteen hundred years ago, which he designated then as *TES PSEUDONUMOU GNOSEOS* (1 Timothy vi. 20), and which has been in the world in all ages, may be, and very often is, hostile to Christianity. And, on the other hand, it is equally certain that there is a good deal of pseudo-Christianity in the world, to which true Science is always opposed. But true Science and Scriptural Christianity are never in conflict.

Our esteemed brother, Rev. Mr. Lyman, has evidently adopted the views of false science, as to what he calls "the laws of nature."

The teachings of true Science, on this subject, concur with the teachings of Holy Scripture when interpreted according to the analogy of faith.

These teachings all recognize God—the infinite, eternal and Almighty Spirit—as cause, power, force, in His universe. Matter of itself has no force, no power, no motion. God imparts motion to it; and all other forms of force are but modes of motion. Heat itself which, in the days of false science (and those days were not two hundred years ago) was considered to be a distinct, substantive element in the universe, is now known to be only a mode of motion.

Therefore, what we call the laws of nature are only the ordering and working of God in the universe of matter and spirit. This ordering and working must be, in general, uniform and persistent. If it were not so, this sublime course of Nature would not be the adequate expression of that infinite, calm, and all-seeing knowledge which devises its plans wisely, and suffers no caprice, no fickleness to interrupt its majestic career. And if the course of Nature were not uniform, the rational creatures of God would be rational in vain: neither angels nor men could have exercised the prudence and foresight which was a part of the high virtue that God bestowed on them. Men could not provide for a single day, for those dependent on them. They could not know that the sun will rise to-morrow; that food will nourish the body; that corn sown in the cultivated field will spring up and yield a harvest for bread.

The laws of Nature, therefore, are uniform and persistent in all ordinary cases. This is the fixed belief of genuine Science and of genuine Christianity. We call this uniform course of Nature the *law* which governs her, because it is a rule of action wisely and lovingly imposed on her by her Almighty Creator. The law of gravitation; the law of cohesion; the law of chemical affinity; the law of elemental proportions; the laws of optics, of reflection and refraction, and polarization, and all the laws of generation and growth and development which govern living organisms, and which, when violated, result in disease, and decomposition, and death—all these laws are nothing more nor less than the will of the Omnipotent and Omniscient Spirit, immanent in His created universe, and moulding and controlling its forms according to His own infinitely wise and benevolent attributes. And thus we

reach the question of miracles. If miracles have ever been wrought in this world, what are they, and for what purpose have they been wrought? The answer to this question is not difficult, either to real Science or real Christianity.

For, be it remembered, that true Science and true Religion both admit and insist on the *personality* of God. This is the final test of sound religious thought. The doctrine of the "unknowable Infinite," which, in some one or other of the Protean shapes which modern agnosticism has assumed, is widely diffused in the literature and the thinking of the present day, is really the basis of all the unsound views of miracles that are so persistently urged on us. Agnosticism does not believe in, nor acknowledge a *personal* God. The very utmost concession it will make is that there is immanent in the material entities of the universe, an unknown and unknowable something (whether spirit or matter, agnosticism does not know, and simply cries "ignoramus"), and that this unknown something makes, blindly, but necessarily and continuously, for righteousness and order, and for this purpose is able to impose on the universe *laws*: or, in other words, a course of action which has never been interrupted and never will be, but will go on forever in evolution and development.

Now, in opposition to agnosticism, true Science and Religion believe that God is a *Person* in the highest sense of that word—that He is a Being possessed of intelligence, wisdom, power and will, all infinite—that is, without limit in their application to any subject. That this is the teaching of Holy Scripture, no devout student can deny; and true Science has nothing to say against it; and has admitted it, in the persons of such men as Sir Isaac Newton, Professor Joseph Henry, Matthew F. Maury, Principal Dawson, and many other scientists who have found that true Science does not forbid a man to be a true Christian.

If, then, God be a Person, and if God be the author of the laws of Nature—in other words, the uniform course of Nature—none but the grossly ignorant will deny that God has the *power*, at some special time and place in His universe, to intervene personally, and to arrest or suspend, at that time and place, the law or course of things previously given by Himself. No power less than the power of God can do this, but God has *power* to do so, if He chooses to do so. That He will not choose thus to intervene, and arrest or suspend His own laws, for slight or insufficient

causes, or at frequent intervals of time, may be safely assumed and declared. But that He *can* thus intervene, none but an atheist or an agnostic will deny. And, when a crisis in His providential government of the universe occurs, which renders it fit and becoming and worthy of One infinite in wisdom, goodness and power that He shall thus intervene, we may be sure that He will do so.

Such a crisis would be presented when, in the wise and benevolent ordering of God, it became fit and proper to introduce new beings like angels or men, or a new species of living organism; or to sweep away an effete and hopeless generation in order to start the race of man on a new departure; or to authenticate a new revelation; or to introduce the Son of God to the world with appropriate majesty, even when He came in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin: all these would be crises calling for immediate personal intervention of God in the ordinary course of Nature, at such times and places as His infinite wisdom might elect.

Any such intervention would be a "miracle." It would be an act by which, *at that time and place*, the ordinarily uniform and persistent course of nature would be *arrested* and *suspended*. It would be an irresistible and unanswerable proof that God was there *in person*, or by His personal power; for, no power save His power, could suspend for one moment the course of Nature which He had previously imposed on her. And the very potency and conclusiveness of the proof that God was personally there to authenticate His revelation, or to meet and answer some other grand crisis in the history of this universe, would depend on the fact of there being an actual arrest and suspension, *at that time and place*, of the ordinarily uniform and persistent course of Nature. Nothing less than that would prove the actual presence and power of God, then and there specially exercised, to meet and answer the crisis or to authenticate the mission or revelation from Him.

Therefore, our learned brother, Mr. Lyman, doubtless without intending to do so, has given aid and comfort to Herbert Spencer and his school of agnostics and evolutionists. They will be highly pleased with his notion that, in what he calls "the occasional outburst of miracle," God is, *at the same time and place*, "working according to the invariable power and sequence of natural law." This same *hylozoism* was what Alexander Pope learned from

Bolingbroke, and attempted to foist upon the world in the "Essay on Man." Here is the cloven foot protruding :

" All nature is but art unknown to thee ;
 All chance direction which thou cans't not see ;
 All discord harmony not understood ;
 All partial evil, universal good.
 And spite of pride, in erring reason's spite,
 One truth is clear, whatever is, is right."

We know that this is false. Whatever is, is *not* right. Sin is *not* right. And it has required the personal intervention of the personal God to introduce the only remedy for sin. Agnosticism ignores it, and leaves the sinner without hope.

And when we come to test Rev. Mr. Lyman's theory by the *facts* as to the miracles narrated in Holy Scripture, then his theory is instantly exploded, and vanishes in smoke. Look at that *tenth* plague in Egypt. Assuredly it was a *suspension*, yes, a *contradiction* of all the uniform and persistent laws governing and controlling the phenomena of health and life and death, that *in one and the same night*, in the land of Egypt, the first born child in every Egyptian family should die, and not one child in any Hebrew family should die. It approaches impiety to claim that this was a "working according to the invariable power and sequence of natural law." It was a working in arrest of, and in suspension of, and contrary to "the invariable power and sequence of natural law." It was the act of the angel (the *power* sent immediately by God) who struck down in death the first born in every Egyptian family, and who, seeing the sprinkled blood on the lintels and posts of the doors of the Hebrew dwellings, passed by them and left these families in safety and peace.

Look at the miracle of the axe-head, which fell into deep water, narrated in 2 Kings vi : 5-7. The iron went to the bottom according to the law of gravitation which is uniform and persistent, not only in this world but throughout all the boundless universe of God. What caused that iron axe-head to rise from the bottom and float like a cork on the surface of the water? Manifestly, the immediate power of a personal God, who, then and there, wrought a miracle *contrary to* and *in suspension of* the law of gravity in its application specially to this axe-head. That was the whole extent of the miracle. But it was enough ; it proved that God was there. And it proved it, all the more conclusively, because the "invaria-

ble power and sequence of natural law " were left unchanged—unsuspended as to all other nature around the scene!

And if we take all the great miracles wrought by Christ, " God manifest in the flesh," and attempt to apply Rev. Mr. Lyman's theory to them, we shall speedily find that theory worse than impotent. His talk about the " boomerang " and the " easy manipulation " by which, as he seems to suppose, the fixed belief of our blessed religion as to the nature and purposes of miracles has been overthrown " by our scientific opponents," as he is pleased to call them, are specially unfortunate.

Miracles are facts, and therefore capable of being proved by testimony like any other facts. Hume's shallow argument has been, long since, exploded. The very best trained legal minds, like those of Starkie in England, and Greenleaf in America, have demonstrated that human testimony is capable of proving the existence of a miracle so completely that to doubt is far more irrational than to believe. And the miracles, on which our faith stands, are proved by testimony many thousand fold stronger than that which proves any other facts that have ever occurred in this world.

R. R. HOWISON.

REASONS FOR REUNION.

I gave in full, in my address before the General Assembly at St. Louis, the reasons that influence me to favor the reunion of the two great branches of our now divided Presbyterian Church. That address was taken down by short-hand reporters, and has been widely published in both the religious and the secular press. And some others have presented to the public condensed statements from the short-hand report of what seem to them to be the reasons by which I support the position which I have taken. Under these circumstances, it is not a matter of wonder that my views have been incorrectly reported in some points, and misunderstood in others. A stenographic report at best is but a photograph of the original address, the shadow of a substance. The representation of one's views made by others from such a report is but a pencil sketch of the photograph, a shade of the shadow of the original substance. In this way words have been put in my mouth which I never used and arguments have

been attributed to me of which I never dreamed. I am therefore grateful for the space accorded me in this journal to set forth, in my own language and over my own signature, a few of the reasons that lead me to desire the reunion of the two Presbyterian Assemblies of the United States, as soon as it can be effected on terms and conditions safe and honorable to both sides. I will state some of these reasons in the fewest possible words, and leave them to stand in their own strength or to fall of their own weakness.

1. The Church is the kingdom of Christ in this world, but not of it. It is a divine institution, and is one and the same throughout all dispensations, and in all generations. Under existing circumstances human weakness and imperfection render a plurality, and even diversity, of denominations unavoidable. But separate denominational organizations, so long as each holds the essential elements of Gospel truth in charity for, and in Christian recognition of, all others, do not destroy the unity of the whole Church. But there should be no more denominations than *there is a reason for*. Therefore each denomination must show a sufficient and justifiable reason for its separate and distinct existence. What are justifiable reasons for separate and distinct denominational organizations? Such a difference in articles of doctrines as cannot be reconciled in a common creed, or such a divergence in principles of polity as cannot be harmonized in a form of government, necessitates the formation of different denominations. The difference in doctrine or polity must be fundamental and irreconcilable in order to constitute a sufficient reason for denominational division and separation. On this ground alone can we justify the separation of the Church of Christ into distinct denominations as Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists and the like. But this ground does not justify the separation of those of like precious faith and similar polity into sub-denominations.

It is permissible, and generally advisable, and may even be necessary, for those of like faith and polity existing under different human governments, or in different provinces of the same government, to be separated into distinct organizations; and so there are, very properly, the Presbyterian Churches of Ireland, of Scotland, of Canada, of Australia, of the United States, and so on. They are not different denominations, but the same denomi-

nation in distinct organizations for convenience of work and worship. And further, a total difference of race or language may justify the separation of those of the same faith and order, even when living in the same geographical territory, into distinct organizations. It may be totally impracticable for Presbyterians of different races or languages, even when living side by side, to mingle and worship together in the same congregations, or to work together in the same Presbyteries and Synods.

Does any one of these considerations justify the now divided and separate existence of the two great branches of the Presbyterian Church in these United States? They are identical in faith and of like order and polity, and now exist under the same government. It is admitted that there have been and may yet be significant differences between them at certain points; but, is the divergence now between them of such a fundamental and irreconcilable nature as to constitute a real and distinctive denominational difference? Let it be admitted that the Northern Presbyterian Assembly in the famous "Spring Loyalty Resolutions," at Philadelphia in 1861, did err and transcend the Constitution to the fullest extent ever charged. Did that action in itself constitute a sufficient reason for the division of the Church? We will let the Southern Assembly answer this question. In the famous Address of the Southern Assembly to all the Churches throughout the earth, adopted at Augusta, Ga., 1861, which, among other things, sets forth "the causes of our separation from the Churches in the United States," it is emphatically declared, "We frankly admit that the mere unconstitutionality of the proceedings of the last Assembly (Old School at Philadelphia, 1861) *is not in itself considered a sufficient ground of separation.*" That Address then goes on to justify the separation on the ground that there were *two countries*, the United States and the Confederate States, and says, "That the division into National Churches, that is, Churches bounded by national lines, is, in the present condition of human nature, a benefit, seems to us too obvious for proof." And now that there are no longer two countries, we, who favor the reunion of the divided Church, plant our feet upon the principles announced by the Southern Assembly in the very act of separation, and say, since the cause, which at the time constituted the *sufficient reason* for the separation, has ceased to exist, the reunion should now follow.

2. The same Address, while frankly admitting that the uncon-

stitutionality of the "Spring Loyalty Resolutions" did not in itself considered constitute a sufficient ground of separation, goes on to say, "the two Confederacies hate each other more intensely now (December 1861) than they did in May, and if their citizens should come together upon the same floor, whatever might be the errand that brought them there, they could not be restrained from smiting each other with the fist of wickedness. For the sake of peace, therefore, for Christian charity, for the honor of the Church, and for the glory of God, we have been constrained, as much as in us lies, to remove all occasion of offence. We have quietly separated." But now, since the Southern Confederacy has ceased to exist for more than twenty years, and since the hatred and prejudices engendered by the war have passed away, and since the people of the North and the South are now more harmonious in all the political, commercial and social relations of life than at any time for the last fifty years, this second reason assigned for the separation has also ceased to exist. Its removal is one more reason why the reunion should now take place.

3. The question of slavery, which was assigned as one of the causes of the separation, is now a dead and departed issue. Whether or not slavery as it once existed in this country both at the North and at the South was a sinful institution, is a question about which this generation concerns itself but little, and about which the future generations will concern themselves less and less. At all events, there is not enough in the now dead question of slavery, either in a moral or political point of view, to constitute a sufficient denominational basis for the continued separation of the two great branches of our Church. We cannot now find in this question a sufficient reason to justify our continued denominational existence.

4. There was at the time of the separation far more difference between the Boards of the Northern Assembly and the Committees adopted by the Southern Assembly than there is now. Both their Boards and our Committees have been modified in some important features, and they are now almost identical in theory and practice. At all events, there is not now enough of difference between them to form a justifiable reason to continue the separate existence of the two Churches as distinct and independent denominations.

5. It may be said that we are justified in continuing the separation because the Northern Assembly has, subsequent to the Spring Resolutions, passed a series of actions of a like political nature. If the passage of the "Spring Resolutions" in itself considered was not a sufficient reason to justify the separation, can the repetition of the same offence in itself considered be a sufficient reason to continue the division after the other causes for it have ceased to exist?

In regard to the "Spring Resolutions" and all similar actions of the Northern Assembly I will express my own views in the words of Dr. John B. Adger, taken from his very able review of the Northern Assembly of 1861, as they are found in the Southern Presbyterian Review for July, 1861. I was then a pupil in the Theological Seminary at Columbia where he was then the Professor of Church Polity. I received from him the views of this great question which I have ever since entertained and defended. He says, "With regard to the question of the right and duty of the General Assembly, or of the Synod, or of the minister in his pulpit, to enjoin upon the people their duty to the Government, we have no doubt whatever. We think in nothing was the weakness of the Southern Commissioners (in the Northern Assembly at Philadelphia, 1861) more manifest than in their constant, but vain, effort to disprove this right and duty. None have been more hostile than we to 'political parsons,' or to *untimely* intermeddling with civil affairs by bodies of ministers. But there are, without doubt, *morals in politics, which sometimes demand a testimony*. There is duty to God in respect to country and to rulers, to ancestors and to posterity. The second table of the law must be preached as well as the first. And not only may a Church-court, as we conceive, testify to the citizens, individually and separately, respecting their civil duties, but that Court may sometime, be required to testify to the nation itself. The nation is a moral person. * * * It does seem to us if there ever was occasion when Church-teachers might legitimately have spoken, and were under obligations to speak, to the Church and to the Country, about duty and about sin, that occasion was when the last Assembly met (in Philadelphia, 1861). * * * It seems to us to be the absurdest possible notion of our Church Government that the Confession of Faith forbids the Church-court from speaking out for justice and right and peace, in such a case as this. It

was their duty to testify to whatever might seem to them right in the premises." In the same article, Dr. Adger goes on to say that he could not see how any gathering of ministers and Christian men at that time could neglect to speak out, loudly and distinctly, their views of the war; and adds, that "*the only misfortune of the Philadelphia Assembly in 1861 was, their views were on the wrong side;*" but, he also adds, "it is their own responsibility if they speak for the wrong side." While holding in the main to the views of Dr. Adger as above set forth, we are now of the opinion that the Northern Assembly in the "Spring Resolutions," and especially in some subsequent enactments along the same line, went too far, and that many of the actions of that Assembly in the exigencies of the trying times were extra-constitutional if not contra-constitutional. But since the excitement of the war has passed away, that Assembly has done all that it can do to retrace its steps and to put itself right on the doctrine, which we proudly call *our doctrine*, "of the purely spiritual and non-political nature and province of the Church." After the Northern Assembly at Omaha has, *by a rising and unanimous vote*, heartily approved and reaffirmed the PRINCIPLES of the Missouri-paper, and adopted the said paper as the declaration of "THEIR OWN PRINCIPLES of the non-political and purely spiritual nature of the Church," I cannot see how any one among us can possibly demand that our brethren of the Northern Assembly should do more.

6. The question of organic union is one of reunion. On the removal of the causes that led to the division, the two Assemblies should reunite. If all obstacles in the way of reunion are not yet removed, it seems to me to be the duty of both sides to inquire whether or not the remaining difficulties are of such a nature as to constitute a fundamental and denominational difference between the two Assemblies. If they are only two branches of the same denomination, then let each yield as much as possible to the other, and thus let them meet and reunite, and together go forward in the greatest economy of men and means to possess the whole land. But, if, indeed, there is enough of difference between the two Assemblies to constitute a sufficient reason for the existence of two denominations, then let each go forward to possess the whole land for itself, regardless of the presence of the other in any part of the field. If we cannot unite with the Northern

Assembly, we have no right to forbid, or even to object to its presence and occupation in our Southern States.

7. The divergence in the interpretation of our common Standards, which led to the unhappy division of our beloved Zion, had its origin in times of great political differences and prejudices, and, there are yet opinions and sentiments on both sides which help to hold us apart, that strike their tap-roots down into a political subsoil from which they draw their life and strength. I do not mean by this that the point of difference between us *is itself a political issue*, but, that it had its origin in close affinity with certain political issues of a departed day. What is the historical fact that lies back of the popular names, the "Northern Assembly" and the "Southern Assembly." These words have not a geographical but a political origin, and carry in the minds of the people at large a political significance. In the popular mind, the Northern Assembly is regarded as representing the Presbyterian Church that *prayed for the conservation of the Union*, and the Southern Assembly as representing the Presbyterian Church that *prayed for the success of Secession*. It may be said that all this is a misconception of the origin and causes of the separation; but if it is a misconception, it is one that has gotten itself deeply rooted in the minds of the people. The Southern Assembly is sectional in its boundaries, and many look upon it as sectional in its origin and sympathies. The churches of the Northern Assembly in the Southern States are regarded by many "as Yankee churches." Some Northern people who come South to live, cannot connect themselves with our churches, because they look upon our Assembly as a sectional Church, and they do not wish to connect themselves with churches of the Northern Assembly, because there is, they find, in the minds of many of our people a prejudice against them which carries an influence into the social relations of life. Not for the glory of the Southern Assembly nor for the glory of the Northern Assembly, but for the glory of God in the more rapid progress of Presbyterianism in the Southern States, and throughout the whole land, I desire to see all prejudices against the Presbyterian Church in both its branches removed from the popular mind. For this reason I most ardently pray that the unhappy division in our beloved Zion, which had its origin in the times of a dreadful war, may be speedily healed, and that our Church may

not carry, in the very names of its divided branches, the memories of a bitter fratricidal war forward into history.

8. It is said that the Southern Assembly must maintain its separate existence as a perpetual testimony against the betrayal of the crown of Christ to the throne of Cæsar. Let it be granted that there have been cause and a call for this testimony; and thereupon we have two questions to ask. Does the duty of bearing this testimony to-day constitute a sufficient reason for a separate and independent denomination? Will not the popular name of the Southern Presbyterian Church, and the fact that it came into existence as the Presbyterian Church of the Southern Confederacy, obscure in the public mind the very point against which its continued existence is meant to be a standing protest? As soon as the present controversy dies away, if it does not result in the reunion of the two Assemblies, the great mass of the people on both sides will begin again to lose sight of the real points at issue, at first slowly and gradually, but, as the years roll on, with an ever-increasing forgetfulness. This was beginning to be the situation when the present movement toward reunion revived the old issues. And further, has not the testimony of the Church on the main point of divergence already accomplished its purpose? Has it not brought the majorities in both Assemblies into agreement on the question of "the purely spiritual and non-political nature and province of the Church?" Our Assembly at St. Louis approved of the principles of the Missouri paper in approving of the Minutes of our Missouri Synod without a voice of dissent or a word of comment. The other Assembly at Omaha heartily approved and unanimously adopted the same paper as the declaration of its own principles. And let us bear in mind that that paper is not merely the quotation of the paragraphs of our common Standards which define the non-secular and purely spiritual nature of the Church, but is the explicit declaration of "that peculiar interpretation of our Standards which affirms and emphasizes the purely spiritual nature of Christ's kingdom, and forbids her legislating on political and civil matters." And one of our Synods, which has been in the very front of the great controversy from the beginning, has declared its judgment in advance that the said paper constitutes the all-sufficient basis for the reunion which was the avowed object designed to be accomplished by it. Shall we now sit in judgment on our brethren at Omaha, and say that they did not mean

what they said? They are intelligent men; they have said just what they meant to say; they are sincere brethren, they meant just what they said. Let that paper stand as the end of the controversy, and be made the basis of the reunion; and then it will stand as a perpetual monument to the doctrine for which the Southern Assembly has contended for the twenty-five years of its separate existence. To reunite on that basis would not be to surrender this testimony, but to accept, at this last act, the other Assembly as a joint witness in it. This ought to be satisfactory to those among us who have carried "the peculiar interpretation" to an extreme point to which some others among us cannot go. I, for one, believe that the Church has the right, and sometime finds itself under obligation, not to legislate, but to testify and to advise in matters of public morals, even when they may involve civil and political issues. The Church has the right to testify against the evils of Mormonism, Sabbath-breaking, intemperance, and the like, and to advise its members to *pray* and to *vote* for the success of all legitimate measures to suppress all such evils, even if it should involve the use of the strong arm of the law of the Commonwealth and of the Nation.

I have not presented, in the above lines, a restatement of all, nor of the most important, of the reasons given in my address on the floor of the Assembly, in favor of the reunion of the two Assemblies; but have given a statement in my own words of certain points in which I have been misunderstood. And even now I do not hope to escape all misinterpretation. I know how easy it is to find a meaning, in the most carefully written words, of which the writer himself did not dream. I remember the famous expression of Richelieu: "Qu'on me donne six lignes de la main du plus honnête homme, j'y trouverai de quoi le faire pendre." One of his secretaries wrote as a test: "One and one make two, and one and two make three." "*Heresy* against the holy sacrament of marriage, and *blasphemy* against the Holy Trinity," cried Richelieu, "for one man and one woman, in holy marriage, make *one flesh*, and one Father and the two persons, the Son and the Holy Ghost, make *one God*." With such possibilities in human language, who can escape being misunderstood at some point in a controversy in which some of the points of difference are of such a delicate nature, and are so finely drawn, that it requires a microscope to trace the lines of divergence? But here I leave the dis-

cussion, praying the great Head of the Church, who is the God of peace and reconciliation, so to guide us and our brethren of the other Assembly that neither we nor they may insist on anything that cannot be righteously conceded; and that neither they nor we may concede anything it were criminal to surrender, and so that the final result of this movement may be for His own highest glory, and the sweetest peace and largest prosperity of His kingdom on earth.

JOHN M. P. OTTS.

THE MORAL CHARACTER OF GEORGE ELIOT.

It has now been more than two years since the press of the Harpers gave to the reading public in this country "George Eliot's Life, Related in her Letters and Journals, Arranged and Edited by her Husband, J. W. Cross." The appearance of this book was greeted with that general interest which ever awaits the personal history of one over the discrepancies of whose life men have been hopelessly puzzled. More than one of the ablest reviewers of the age gave George Eliot's character as thus revealed a searching examination. Yet it seems to us that there are some phases of that character which have not been clearly exhibited. Certain floating straws, which showed the direction of the currents of her being long before they took their sharpest bend, have not been pointed out. And we are only now arriving at the proper focal distance from which to view both the book and its subject with a fairness which shall err neither by partiality nor by prejudice.

Mr. Cross has earned a praise almost unanimous for the manner in which he has discharged his part of this task. The method which he has adopted is almost original with himself, and presents, along with some difficulties, not a few manifest advantages. George Eliot, not he, is the great *Ego* of this book. There is something almost pathetic in the self-forgetfulness with which he labors to enhance her reputation. If he fails in this, it is not from any lack of devotion. He relates her Life as she herself tells it in her Letters and Journals, contributing himself nothing more than the cord on which his selections are most admirably strung.

In a letter written shortly after the appearance of a life of Charles Dickens, she said: "Something should be done by dispassionate criticism toward the reform of our national habits in the matter of literary biography. Is it not odious that as soon as a man is dead his desk is raked, and every insignificant memorandum which he never meant for the public is printed for the gossiping amusement of people too idle to read his books? I think this fashion is a disgrace to us all. It is something like the uncovering of the dead Byron's club-foot." It strikes us as strange that Mr. Cross did not catch the spirit of this admonition. If the materials which furnish out this book were selected by him, his judgment was not equal to his infatuation; if they were marked out for him by George Eliot herself, then her discretion was left to beg at the door of her vanity. We cannot believe that one thoughtful man or woman has risen from the perusal of these pages with other than a lowered estimate of her character. Amid the milder lights of her private history, our eyes become strong to perceive the blots upon her nature and conduct to which the glittering pages of her great novels had blinded us. Truly, as Sir Thomas Browne has said: "Fortune lays the plot of our adversities in the foundation of our felicities." Fortune was certainly laying the plot of retributive adversities when George Eliot sought felicity in a union through which the world was to be taught how ill she lived who wrote so well.

Mary Ann Evans was born at Arbury Farm, Warwickshire, England, November 22, 1819. Her father, many of whose leading traits are said to be found in Adam Bede and Caleb Garth, was agent on the estate of Mr. Francis Newdigate. Her mother is described as "a shrewd, practical person, with a considerable dash of the Mrs. Poyser vein in her." With Mary Ann, their youngest child, they moved to Griff on the same estate when she was only four months old, and here, in the seclusion of an English country home, without any sharper distraction than the passing of the daily coach, she spent the first twenty-one years of her life.

The history of her childhood impresses us only with the sense of its being utterly common-place. In no single respect was the child the mother to the woman. She was not precocious; she even learned to read with more than ordinary difficulty. "Her's was a large, slow-growing nature;" her only predominant characteristic a kind of jealous and sensitive pride.

At the age of five years, she was placed under the care of Miss Lathom at Attleboro. From this school she passed to that of Miss Wallington, at Nuneaton. When thirteen years old, she was entered as a pupil in the boarding-school conducted by the Misses Franklin in Coventry.

This last change was largely influential in giving shape to her early religious opinions. Her new teachers were daughters of a Baptist minister, and women of marked intellectual power. Her biographer says, Mary Ann, "with her chameleon-like nature, soon adopted their religious views with intense eagerness and conviction, although she never formally joined the Baptists or any other communion than the Church of England. She at once, however, took a foremost place in the school, and became a leader of prayer-meetings among the girls." Her religious opinions now took on the most extreme type. Her letters are filled with pious rhapsodies. To a friend she writes: "I do not deny that there may be many who can partake with a high degree of zest of all the lawful enjoyments the world can offer, and yet live in near communion with their God; but I confess that, in my short experience and narrow sphere of action, I have never been able to attain to this." And again, "I have highly enjoyed Hannah More's letters; the contemplation of so blessed a character as her's must be very salutary." "O that we could live only for eternity! that we could realize its nearness!"—in such exclamations as these her correspondence abounded. We cannot but believe that this shallow enthusiasm was significant of a moral nature singularly fickle, and marked her as a fit subject for the apostacy so soon to take place at Coventry.

In March, 1841, her father moved his household to the vicinity of Coventry. George Eliot's whole history was determined by the change. Up to this point of her life, there seems not to have been a suspicion in her mind as to the truth of her doctrinal opinions. But now she was thrown suddenly into intimate association with a small circle of cultivated people, more than qualified both to interest and to mislead. She was received with special kindness into the family of Mr. Bray. Mrs. Bray's brother, Charles Hennell, was a writer of some reputation, having in 1838 published "An Inquiry Concerning the Origin of Christianity," for the German translation of which Strauss contributed a preface. In this circle, the measure of Miss Evans was quickly and accurately

taken. They recognized her as a person whose moral qualities were as infirm as her intellectual nature was vigorous and robust. They marked her for their own. Against the effective influences of such associates and the spurious arguments of such disputants, her overpowered faith could marshal but a weak array. In this damp atmosphere, the flame of her enthusiasm which, amid the congenial environment of the Misses Franklin's school, had flared so brightly, soon expired. While we recognize the strain of such flattering notice to have been a severe one, we cannot but feel that she shifted her position and abjured her faith with a precipitancy and a facility which indicate not only the superficial nature of her former convictions, but a moral laxity, a spiritual faithlessness, which more than justify her expressed fear that she should be thought "a very weather-cock and a most pitiful truckler."

In 1852 she prepared and published an analysis of Mr. Hennell's book which seems to have been the principal instrument in giving shape to her new opinions. The reader may be curious to know what was the style of the argument against Christianity which Miss Evans found so convincing. The following is a fair sample: "The secret of the disappearance of the body of Jesus probably lay with Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, who were anxious to avoid implicating themselves with the fermentation of regretful enthusiasm to which a resort of the disciples to the grave might give rise." A firmly rooted faith would hardly be torn up by such proofs. But having settled in Coventry only in March, in November George Eliot writes, with the usual high-flown abstraction of unbelief: "For my part, I wish to be among the ranks of that glorious crusade that is seeking to set Truth's Holy Sepulchre free from a usurped domination." In less than one year, she was a declared convert from the doctrines of Christ to the doctrines of Strauss.

In 1844 she began, in 1846 she published, a translation of Strauss' *Leben Jesu*. This undertaking marks her entire committal to infidelity. Yet the work cost her many a pang. She is plainly not yet beyond the painful novitate of religious scepticism. Once she writes: "Glad am I that some one can enjoy Strauss! I should work much better if I had some proof-sheets coming in to assure me that my soul-stupefying labor is not in vain." Again she declares that she is Strauss-sick: it makes her ill dissecting the beautiful story of the Crucifixion, and only the Christ-

image, 'which with a curious inconsistency she kept over her desk,' makes her endure it! At the very time the translation is published, she writes: "I have been thinking of that most beautiful passage in Luke's gospel—the appearance of Jesus to the disciples at Emmaus. How universal is its significance! The soul that has hopelessly followed its Jesus—its impersonation of the highest and best—all in despondency; its thoughts all refuted, its dreams all dissipated. Then comes another Jesus—another, but the same—the same highest and best, only chastened—crucified, instead of triumphant—and the soul learns that this is the true way to conquest and glory." Jesus has been denied with an oath, but His glance still pierces the south of the unfaithful disciple. She has not yet learned to look on the sepulchre of her faith without tears; not yet learned to bid a final farewell to Christ without the exceeding bitter cry: "They have taken away my Lord."

And still she struggles desperately with these regrets for her lost and better past. She solemnly assures us that she is influenced in her own conduct at the present time by far higher considerations and by a nobler idea of duty than she ever was while she held the evangelical beliefs. She decides to write a book on "The Superiority of the Consolations of Philosophy to those of (so-called) Religion," a book which happily was never produced. Defiant now of all charges of inconsistency, she contradicts her former judgment by writing to a friend: "I am glad you detest Mrs. Hannah More's letters. I like neither her letters, nor her books, nor her character. She was that most disagreeable of all monsters, a blue-stocking—a monster that can only exist in a miserably false state of society, in which a woman with but a smattering of learning or philosophy is classed along with singing-mice and card-playing pigs."

While reading the earlier pages of this biography, we were impressed with the fear that the book was likely to do incalculable mischief; and we almost dreaded to see her statement of the grounds on which she had rejected Christianity. We imagined that if any pen could make the denials of scepticism coherent, it would be that vigorous pen which she handled. But we soon discovered that the language of infidelity was as much of a jargon with her as with the rest, and that she was, like all others of her class, a bundle of inconsistencies. As an example of her theorizing on this subject: "To say 'Jewish philosopher' seems

almost like saying a round square; yet those two words appear to me the truest description of Jesus." Again: "It seems to me that the soul of Christianity lies not at all in the facts of an individual life, but in the ideas of which that life was the meeting-point and the new starting point. We can never have a satisfactory basis for the history of the man Jesus, but that negation does not affect the Idea of the Christ either in its historical influence or its great symbolic meanings." If apprehension precedes faith, and this is the gospel according to Strauss, men have need to be thankful that eternal life does not depend on believing it.

But it is in a brief note upon *Jane Eyre* that she gives the first indubitable evidence that her moral beliefs have shifted and her moral character hopelessly degenerated. Says she: "I have read *Jane Eyre*. . . . All sacrifice is good, but one would like it to be in a somewhat nobler cause than that of a diabolical law which chains a man, body and soul, to a putrefying carcass." Every reader of Miss Bronte's book will understand the significancy of this comment. Mr. Rochester wished to wed *Jane Eyre* while his insane wife was confined in an upper room of his house. The "diabolical law" can be no other than that which forbade the bigamy; the deplored sacrifice can only be that involved in *Jane Eyre's* flight when the fact was discovered. Chronologically considered, this remark of George Eliot is doubly significant. It was made more than two years before she was introduced to Mr. Lewes—more than three years before she accepted from him the criminal offer which, from Mr. Rochester, *Jane Eyre* declined. When this union was consummated, the wife of Lewes, by a most singular coincidence, was in confinement on account of mental derangement. This passing comment of Miss Evans enables us to form an authoritative estimate of the relation which she afterwards formed. Many a man's character is better than his conduct at a given crisis. We should be able to offer for the conduct of George Eliot in the great mistake of her life a more unreserved apology, could we believe that to that mistake she had been led against her will, by a temptation with which her affections were in league. We might then be able to cherish some remains of confidence in moral purity and truth. But we are forced to the conviction that her conduct was the outcome of her beliefs; that as she thought in her heart, so was she; that in the wreck of her moral principles she had been ripening for her criminal course long before the

occasion was presented. Before the front of such a demonstration, apology dares not lift its head.

In 1851, she assumed the editorial management of the *Westminster Review*. This *Review* was then, as it is now, the pot under which the thorns of scepticism, materialism, and radicalism were kept constantly crackling. Her new duties threw her into intimate association with the leaders of the current infidelity, and necessitated her residence in London. In a letter written this year we find the entry: "I was introduced to Mr. Lewes the other day - - - sort of miniature Mirabeau in appearance." This man, as was stated above, was at this time living in separation from his wife, but had not been divorced from her. The next year George Eliot took the step which cut down every bridge by which she might have returned to her older and better life, by uniting herself to Mr. Lewes and living with him without the sanction of marriage.

Hitherto, it was not impossible that the "chameleon-like nature" might once again change, and the translator of Strauss and the editor of the *Westminster Review* become an older and better copy of the young religionist of former days. But this decision carried her forever far beyond the border-land, from which there was hope that she might yet return, into the dark interior of confirmed unbelief. Belief is by Descartes declared to be a function of the will. Her will was now irrevocably enlisted on the side of irreligion. Her infidelity hardened into granite. The converse of Pope's famous line is wholly true: He can't be right whose life is in the wrong. Her life was hopelessly wrong, her views could nevermore be righted. She had good reason now to reject the Christian's Bible for she had now defied the Christian's God. To retreat would have involved the confession of a sin for which a woman finds, in this world at least, no forgiveness. Much has been said, and said with truth, of the incalculable assistance which she derived from Mr. Lewes in her literary career; some have even asserted, and not without a show of probability, that without his countenance and aid, she could never have given us *Adam Bede* or *Romola*. Be this as it may, she certainly made to him a complete self-surrender. We search through her letters in vain for the least expression of a misgiving as to the propriety, the decency, or the morality of her conduct. The law that condemned her was still in her estimation "a

diabolical law." To Mrs. Bray, whose planting had borne an unexpected fruit and one displeasing, she writes the following justification of her course: "If there is any one action or relation of my life which is, and always has been, profoundly serious, it is my relation to Mr. Lewes. . . . We cannot set each other quite right in letters, but one thing I can tell you in a few words. Light and easily broken ties are what I neither desire theoretically nor could live for practically. Women who are satisfied with such ties, do *not* act as I have done. That any unworldly, unsuperstitious person who is sufficiently acquainted with the realities of life can pronounce my relation to Mr. Lewes immoral, I can only understand by remembering how subtle and complex are the influences that mould opinion." We have no desire to argue these propositions. We are content to confess ourselves, by this test, worldly and superstitious.

Her whole life, from this time, was utterly godless. We are not surprised to find her expressing herself as "much pleased" with a miserable actor who exclaimed: "Shakespeare ist mein Gott; ich habe keinen anderen Gott," and as "delighted" with another German whose thorough liberalism, social, political, and religious, sets the mind at ease in conversation and delivers it from the fear of running against some prejudice or coming suddenly on the sunk fence of some miserable limitation." Persons who live in glass houses shudder at the very sight of a stone. Of Mr. Lewes she writes with an artlessness which forces a smile, "He is not fond of reading the Bible himself," to which we are disposed to answer with the Parson to Scotty Briggs in "Roughing It," "Why should he be?" and then adds, "But he sees no harm in my reading it." Her diary furnishes a glimpse of her Sabbath-keeping in such entries as these: "Finished correcting Silas Marner;" "detained from writing by the necessity of gathering particulars about Lorenzo de Medici's death," etc.

We may interrupt for a moment this examination of George Eliot's moral history, to record one or two interesting facts in connection with the publication of her novels. It was in 1857, in the January number of the Blackwood's Magazine that *Amos Barton* appeared, the first of that series which in succession startled, amazed and enraptured the world. From that time until the date of the publication of *The Impressions of Theophrastus Such*, she rode on the very wings of literary success. Mr. Cross tells us

that the now famous *nom de plume* was selected by Miss Evans because "George was Mr. Lewes' Christian name, and Eliot was a good, mouth filling, easily-pronounced word." The most various conjectures as to the identity of the author of *Amos Barton* were hazarded when that book first appeared. A large party to whom Mr. Lewes read the story voted unanimously that it had been written by a clergyman and a Cambridge man. But the keen insight of Dickens penetrated the mask, and he remarked in a letter to "George Eliot, Esq." that he would have been strongly disposed, if he had been left to his own devices, to address him as a woman. To this he added that "if they, (*Scenes in Clerical Life*) originated with no woman, I believe that no man ever before had the art of making himself mentally so like a woman since the world began. Since the truth has been known, the judgment of her writings has been that no woman ever before had the art of making herself mentally so like a man since the world began.

Nothing in the record of her life impresses us more strongly than the terms on which she won her success. Her genius consisted primarily in an unsurpassed faculty for taking pains. She sought no royal road, she trusted to no indolent inspiration. To perfect the least detail, she thought it no hardship to master a dozen volumes. The reading which she undertook while preparing to write *Romola* and *The Spanish Gipsy* would have exceeded the the compass of many a mind and engrossed the leisure of many a life. This is one of the few noble and helpful lessons taught by her career.

When in 1878 she lost by death the presence and the comfort of the man whom she truly loved, and for whom she had made such sacrifices, she had an opportunity of testing "the superiority of the consolations of philosophy to those of (so-called) religion." The result was not satisfactory. She fell into a kind of stupor, from which on the New Year's Day 1879, she could only rouse herself to write, "Here I and sorrow sit." Shortly after she wrote to a friend: "The everlasting winter of my life has set in"—the concrete of Paul's terrific abstract, "Without hope and without God in the world."

Had her life ended here it would have been closed with at least a mournful dignity. But her "everlasting winter" was to vanish before the spring of a new alliance in marriage. We find it diffi-

cult to decide what were the motives which impelled her to this course. Perhaps it proceeded from loneliness; possibly it was a tardy concession to the power of the public opinion which she had so long defied. She was married, May 6, 1880, to John Walter Cross, at St. George's, Hanover Square.

It had been well if Mr. Cross had hurried over these last pages with a yet quicker pen, and abridged them by a yet more modest reticence. He pictures her at the age of sixty-one writing thus to announce her marriage to a friend: "I am going to do what not very long ago I should myself have pronounced impossible for me By the time you receive this letter I shall (so far as the future can be matter of assertion) have been married to Mr. J. W. Cross, who, you know, is a friend of years, a friend much loved and trusted by Mr. Lewes, and who, now that I am alone, sees his happiness in the dedication of his life to me." The unimpassioned egotism of these words can hardly be reckoned ideally beautiful for a bride, and a more sensitive lover than Mr. Cross might have wished to be chosen on grounds more personal to himself. But having dedicated his life to her, he accepts the station granted him and shines contentedly with reflected glory.

We have no doubt that the arrangement of this biography was to Mr. Cross a labor of love. But it was surely not a zeal according to wisdom that gave it to the world. We imagine that few have laid this book down without the regretful consciousness that their estimate of the author of *Janet's Repentance*, *Adam Bede*, and *Romola* has suffered a sad contraction during the reading of these Letters and Journal. For her intellectual greatness is herein shown to have been unaccompanied by that moral dignity and truth without which it is a gloomy mockery—her character, a mighty fact marred by the contrast of a mightier possibility. All that she had cannot console us for the want of that which she lacked. Her history, while marked by a literary success almost unexampled, is none the less heavy with sadness. It abounds in admonitions. It comments forever on the folly of walking in the counsel of the ungodly, standing in the way of sinners, and sitting in the seat of the scornful. The weak and inconsistent infidelity that had its root in spiritual tergiversation, that grew up into the denial of the obligation of moral law, that unfolded itself into the gloomy leafage and the bitter fruit of a life so godless and an old age so dreary, so hopeless, and so piti-

ful, can poison none. The more enthusiastically we admire her genius, the more inexorably must we condemn her character and her life. We can never think of her save as a colossal figure, marred and defaced by sin. A sad spectacle is before him who stands and contemplates the wreck of her nature on those rocks of doubt above which her own hand had set this beacon gleaming :

“ No great deed is done
By falterers who ask for certainty.
No good is certain, but the steadfast mind,
The undivided will to seek the good.”

JAMES HENDERSON SMITH.

VII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

PLUMPTRE'S "SPIRITS IN PRISON."

THE SPIRITS IN PRISON, AND OTHER STUDIES ON THE LIFE AFTER DEATH, *by E. H. Plumptre, D. D., Dean of Wells. New and Revised Edition, Fifth Thousand.* New York : Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House. 1887. 12 mo., pp. 440.

The doctrine of this book is that there will be another probation beyond the limits of this present life. The question which is discussed bids fair to emerge into fresh prominence. The *New York Independent* is quoted as having expressed the opinion that the religious press of this country is, with inconsiderable exceptions, outside of Andover, true to the old conservative doctrine of the evangelical churches. We are glad to learn this, but yet we fear that the tendency is a growing one to relinquish that doctrine. When such scholars as Farrar and Plumptre lend their influence to its overthrow, and their works meet with acceptance, at least with a demand, so wide, the apprehension we have expressed cannot be regarded as groundless. There is a call upon the evangelical school to re-affirm the arguments for their position, and to subject to a careful examination those which are now advanced on the opposite side.

The learned author of this work has broken with so much of Calvinism as is asserted in the Thirty-nine Articles of his Church. He treats as abhorrent the sovereign decrees of God, utterly rejects unconditional election, disparages "the forensic theory of atonement," confounds punishment with discipline, contends for the office of free will as the determining factor in the matter of personal salvation in this life, and for the continuance of that office in the case of the ungodly in the

world to come. In short, he is partly Arminian, partly Socinian and partly Universalist. One does not wonder, therefore, at finding him in revolt against the doctrine of the irrevocable issues of death and judgment. Judging from the tenor of his views, and from his undisguised admiration of Frederick Denison Maurice, we would assign him to the Moral Influence School—a school which endeavors to accomplish the amazing feat of reducing justice and mercy to the unity of one special divine attribute, of making the judgments upon Judas Iscariot, Herod, Ananias and Sapphira expressions of God's compassion, the execution of a criminal a token of paternal love, and heaven and hell in different degrees a like exponent of infinite benevolence to man. Such is the general character of the author's views, and should the Church of England, or any other Church, come to embrace them, it will be in palpable insurrection against the consent of the Church Universal.

It is true that Dr. Plumptre has exhibited great scholarship and learning in quoting Fathers and theologians and poets in support of what he calls "The Wider Hope"—a hope of the future restoration of those who died without faith in Christ. This very phrase, however, by which he imparts an air of fascination to that hypothesis, is in itself a confession that the creeds and symbols of all Christian Churches embody another and narrower doctrine. The presumption is vastly against him and those who think with him, which is derived from the consentient testimony of the Church, in its interpretation of the Word of God.

It is almost needless to observe that this profound question touching the everlasting destinies of men is one which in the main rests for its determination upon the teaching of the Scriptures. It has been truly said that proof-texts from the Bible must settle it. What saith the Lord? The ingenious attempt to make the term *Æonian* express a kind of life rather than an endless duration, or indicate an indefinite but not illimitable period, has often been made, but it has failed to convince the unsophisticated readers of the Bible. If it does not signify everlasting when applied to the destiny of the wicked, there is no proof from the Scriptures of the everlasting happiness of the righteous. The argument proves too much, and is therefore logically worthless. The disproof of an eternal hell might be very desirable, so far as our human sympathies are concerned, but it would be dearly won by the corresponding disproof of an eternal heaven.

We do not purpose in a brief notice like this to examine particularly Dr. Plumptre's scriptural argument, but we cannot refrain from remarking that while he has expended great, but, as we believe, fruitless ingenuity in attempting to show that some of the positive statements of the Scriptures support his theory, he has not examined other positive statements that certainly seem to deny it, and, more than all, that his argument is fatally damaged by his neglect to notice what John Foster said were stumbling-blocks to him—"the negatives" of the

Bible : such as, the worm that dieth not, the fire that is not quenched, the great gulf fixed which none could pass from Abraham's bosom to the place of torments, nor from the place of torments to Abraham's bosom, there remaining to those who sin wilfully after they had received the knowledge of the truth no more sacrifice for sin, and the like. Alas, these fearful negatives ! No wonder they are overlooked by the advocates of the Wider Hope, or treated, as the author treats them, as "seeming contradictions" to that hope.

The key-note of the book is struck in a sermon with which it begins, and which had been delivered at St. Paul's Cathedral, on the text, I Pet. iii. 19: "He went and preached to the spirits in prison." He takes this passage as teaching that Christ, in the interval between his death and his resurrection, went to Hades and preached the gospel of hope to those who had lived in ungodliness and died in unbelief. Without going into an elaborate discussion of the meaning of this difficult and much-controverted passage, we have to say that it is too intricate, too susceptible of divergent interpretations, to be employed as a proof-text in favor of the dogma maintained by the author. It is capable of a construction, it has received a construction, exactly the opposite of that contended for in this work. Judging from the whole context in which it stands—and we know of no surer canon by which an author's meaning is to be ascertained than the drift and strain of his argument—we have reached, aside from any connexion with this question of the future restoration of the wicked, a conclusion precisely contrary to that of Dr. Plumptre, and those who agree with him. The passage is too doubtful to be made a proof-text of a doctrine which the author himself acknowledges to be seemingly contradicted by other Scriptures, especially by the words of our Lord.

The great assumptions of the work, demanding but not receiving, clear proof from the Word of God, are that the sufferings of the lost are disciplinary, and that the free will of men in hell is capable of improving the discipline to the ends of faith and repentance. It behooved him to prove these affirmations from Scripture. This he has not done, and could not do. Failing that, he ought to have produced scriptural evidence in favor of the efficacious influence of the Holy Spirit upon the souls of the lost. This also he has entirely failed to do; indeed would deny, since he denies that such an influence is exerted upon men in this world. One thing is perfectly certain: It is that except sinners, either in this world or in the next, are born again, of water and of the Spirit, they cannot enter into the kingdom of God. The author's doctrine cannot be proved from the Bible, unless it can be shown from that sacred volume that men are regenerated in hell. When that is done, it will gratify our human inclinations to preach the Wider Hope, *but not before.*

We close by commending to our readers a now almost forgotten treatise against Chauncy the Universalist by the younger President

Edwards. It is marked by the remorseless and consuming logic which distinguished the polemical writings of his illustrious father. It destroys the assumption that suffering in the future state is disciplinary and remedial.

JOHN L. GIRARDEAU.

DOCTRINA DUODECIM APOSTOLORUM.

DOCTRINA DUODECIM APOSTOLORUM, CANONES APOSTOLORUM ECCLESIASTICI, AC RELIQUAE DOCTRINAE DE DUABUS VIIS EXPOSITIONES VETERES: Edidit adnotationibus et prolegomenis illustravit, versionem Latinam addidit *Franciscus Xaverius Funk*. Tübingae, in Libraria Henrici Laupp: 1887. Svo. pp. LXVII, 116.

Dr. Funk, of Tübingen, was one of the patristic scholars to whom the critical world looked for guidance, when the discovery of the *Teaching* was announced, nearly four years ago. His response was a sober and valuable paper in the Tübingen *Theologische Quartalschrift* for 1884 (pp. 381-393), followed since by reviews, from time to time, in the same journal, of the more important literature of the subject; and, early this year, by the publication of the Greek text of the *Teaching* with a Latin translation, in the new issue of his valuable edition of the Apostolical Fathers. The limitations of space required by the form of that publication, left many things unsaid or said in insufficient detail, which it seemed desirable to say. And hence, Dr. Funk has yielded to the solicitations of his friends, and prepared the present separate edition of the document itself and its kindred writings. It may be said at once that the book is worthy of the distinguished reputation of its learned author. The prolegomena are a model of sober judiciousness and concise statement. In the space of some sixty-seven pages, they give us an adequate review of all the really important critical questions, a survey of the literature and history of opinion, and an acute and telling criticism of opposing views. The text is furnished with a suggestive commentary—one of the most careful that has been published. And the whole is clearly and beautifully printed.

The views which Dr. Funk defends are without essential modification the same which he has already published in his journal. He asserts the integrity of the text of the *Teaching*, as transmitted to us in the Constantinople MS., and admits only the bare possibility that even I. 3-II. 1 is of later interpolation. He holds the *Teaching* to be older than, and the source of, the similar sections in Barnabas and Hermas; and assigns it to a probably Palestinian or Syrian origin of about the end of the first century. He believes the Latin Version (the MS. containing which he has himself recovered,) to be more likely early than late, and to depend on Barnabas. The *Ecclesiastical Canons*, he thinks, were probably Egyptian in origin and belong to the first part of the third century. The *Apostolical Constitutions*, he assigns to the middle of the third century, while the interpolator and continuer (to whom

the whole of the additions are probably due,) belongs to the opening of the fourth century.

In stating and controverting the views of others, Dr. Funk combines a fine courtesy with a crispness of utterance which delights while it refutes. There are several points in which he records his disagreement with the published opinions of the present reviewer,—as, for example, in the matters of the genuineness of I. 3—II. 1, the relation of the Latin Version of the *Teaching* to Barnabas, the use of the *Teaching* by the Pseudo-Phocylides, and the relations of the several documents which have used the *Teaching*, to one another. I am not convinced by his arguments, but I cannot complain of his treatment of mine, and only in a single instance are my views erroneously stated, (p. lxvi., note 3.) I have never contended that the Latin text was the source from which Barnabas drew, but only that the Latin represents a Greek text which was the source of both its translation and Barnabas' excerpting. This still seems to me true; while the denial of it appears to me a sad sin against the law of parsimony. I have nothing, however, to urge in its favor, beyond what I have briefly stated in the *Andover Review*, vi. 81-97; and Dr. Funk thinks this insufficient.

Dr. Funk's sobriety leads him into a little overdrawn conservatism at times; but it is a guaranty against wire-drawn theorizing. He could never fall into the trap of a "Jewish Original," for instance; and what he urges against those who have so fallen seems to me judicious and satisfying. On the whole, he has given us one of our most satisfactory editions of the *Teaching*, and his work is one which can be cordially recommended to students.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

ATONEMENT AND LAW.

ATONEMENT AND LAW; OR REDEMPTION IN HARMONY WITH LAW AS RECALLED IN NATURE, by *John M. Armour*. Second Edition. Philadelphia: H. B. Garner.

Mr. Armour wrote this book to show "that the Great Redemption was wrought out in perfect accordance with Law as revealed in Nature and Providence." "Redemption," he says, "has been almost universally regarded as the Great Exception." His object is to negative this venerable faith of the Church. He belongs, therefore, to that modern class of writers who cannot see anything in heaven or earth but *natural law*. If by law, he and his school meant that general plan of God upon which he has projected and conformed the universe, then, of course, he would be asserting a mere truism. But by law he means the principle of continuity in Nature—the rules which eternally perpetuate its inviolable order. Now, he affirms that the scheme of Redemption falls under these laws, and is in harmony with this order.

Our author's first confusion arises from a failure to keep clearly before his mind the distinction between Natural and Moral law. He

notes the distinction, but he does not perceive, apparently, its full force. Hence, he can write the explanatory clause on his title-page, "Redemption in harmony with law as revealed in nature." Then again he writes as if he intended to identify the two kinds of law: "This is true of Natural, as well as of Moral law; for they are not separated, they are not separable; they do not merely co-operate, nor is it the whole truth to say that they *become* one—they *are* one in awful onward movement in the universe."

Now natural laws, or the laws of nature, do not, *per se*, impose the slightest moral obligation upon rational creatures. We, as moral agents, are bound to respect them as far as they are known, not because they inherently bind the conscience, but by reason of that moral law which commands the exercise of prudence. It is, for example, the sixth commandment which grounds the sinfulness of violating the laws of health. Hence all Mr. Armour says about conforming the plan of salvation to *natural* law is off the point.

But besides this the two laws—natural and moral—are not one. They are and must be separable. It is ruin to amalgamate them. It is perfectly right to violate one natural law by the use of another for beneficial ends. It is perfectly right to countervail the influence of gravity by sailing in an iron ship, but it would be infamous to violate the law of honesty for charitable ends; and yet, if the two laws are the same in kind, they may, with equal impunity, be treated in the same way.

Again, if the suffering consequent upon a violation of natural law is of the nature of *punishment*, then it is wrong to seek to alleviate such suffering, on the broad principle that it is wrong to attempt the defeat of justice. The absurdities involved, all along the line, in this attempt to identify the rules of morality with mere cosmical arrangements are everywhere palpable.

Mr. Armour joins in the furious tirade of modern progressives against the Miracle. He says: "If the Christian world must at length abandon the long cherished belief that miracles involve the suspension of law, it will be because they will accept the higher faith that, law coming from infinite wisdom, there could be no need for its suspension." "The miracle of Redemption itself, was one which, in its very nature, honored law, in that it, in no respect, interfered with its onward movement." Our author was right when he called Redemption a *miracle*, but he spoilt it all when he described it as a miracle in harmony with law, for, to our view, the very essence of the miracle is that it is *contra-natural*. It is this, or nothing. It is ridiculous to assume that the miracle, while intersecting known natural laws, yet accords with some unknown and supersensible law, for the simple but sufficient reason that of the *unknown* nothing can be affirmed. Trench put an ugly weapon in the hand of the enemy when he signaled this idea.

A genuine miracle "no interference with the onward movement" of "absolute and inviolable law"! An innocent child is playing on the

pavement beneath the walls of the building in the process of erection. Thirty feet above the child, a huge block of granite breaks the gearing by which it is being elevated, and falls back in a line perpendicular to the unconscious child. It is falling by the law of gravitation. Suddenly it stops, suspended by some supernatural power in mid air. Now what has become of the law of gravitation during the moment the stone is balanced by the voice of God? Surely its "onward movement" has been interfered with. It has been checked. Now in accordance with what higher and supersensible law is the plenipotent command of God? Echo answers.

The law of death is, (whatever else may be said,) the law of *immobility*—no corpse can move itself. Now Lazarus is under this law—he has been under it for four days. Without the use of any second agents, by the mighty word of his power, Christ commands the immobile body to come forth from its grave, and it obeys. Now what has become of the law of death? No one can be under the law of death and the law of physical life at one and the same moment: no man can be dead and alive, in a corporeal sense, at one and the same time. Before Christ spake, Lazarus was under the law of death—he was dead. After he spake, he was under the law of life—he was alive. Has there been no interference with the "onward movement" of the law of death? Does it still continue to operate? Is it still in force in some higher and supersensible way? The idea is nonsensical.

The law which thunders terror in the sinner's ear is: "*The soul that sinneth it shall die.*" The "onward movement" of this law is towards the burning gates of despair, and if nothing interferes with its onward movement it will surely press the guilty soul through the fiery portals. But Mr. Armour says the Atonement of Christ lies across the track of doom, and halts this relentless law. The only intelligent meaning of which is, that the law was suspended, held in abeyance, by the Mediatorial Hand of Christ. Then why, in the name of reason, does he, does any man, object to saying that the law in the case was suspended?

Of course God did not arbitrarily and causelessly suspend the law which denounced death against the guilty. He does not absolutely pardon—that is, he does not forgive without reference to the rules and interests of his moral government. He had an adequate reason for suspending the law of spiritual death. That reason was the full and adequate atonement of Christ, which was a genuine satisfaction to his law in the case. Nevertheless the law, as it was in force against the believer, was suspended, or he could not be saved. To say that it was properly suspended, that it was suspended by being truly and completely satisfied, does not alter the fact.

The grace of God which bringeth salvation in the Scriptures stands over in contrast to *the law of God which bringeth condemnation*. Grace is not law, and law is not grace. Redemption, as a scheme, was originated in grace, but was wrought out, not by overslaughing and outraging

the principles of the moral law, but by meeting those principles and satisfying them in the strict rigour and severe exactitude of divine justice. Grace built the Temple of Redemption: Law stood off and admired its grand proportions and proportionate grandeur. Grace called Christ to the office of Mediator: Law became the rule of his obedience. Grace introduces the sinner, contrary to the laws of his spiritual nature, into the covenant of Redemption: Law at once becomes the rule of his life. Grace introduces the principle of substitution into the system: the principle is itself legal in its nature. *To Christ* the salvation of the elect is a matter of justice—of justice springing from those covenant-rules under which he interfered with the “onward movement” of the law of sin and death. *To the believer*, on the other hand, his salvation is a matter of free and unmerited grace. Redemption is not a law-product. The Atonement arrested the law which was bearing down upon the sinner with the burning curse. The curse was deposited on Christ, who graciously interposed himself, but the law was stopped “in its onward movement.” That law can never reach the believer from whom it was turned away by the work of Christ. Its power, in this direction, was forever broken. “We are saved by grace.”

R. A. WEBB.

BAPTISM MODE STUDIES.

BAPTISM MODE STUDIES, *by the Rev. Herbert H. Hawes, D. D., Staunton, Va.* Richmond: Whittet & Shepperson, 1887.

The lovers of sound doctrine and the friends of Dr. Hawes are equally indebted to the author for this little volume. It is a thorough-going and masterly treatise on the mode of Baptism, in good print, and yet it is comprised in a hundred small pages. It was just what was needed, and was called forth by a personal request from the Rev. Moses D. Hoge, of Richmond. There are three especially striking things about this book. One is, that nearly everything that is practically worth much in the larger volumes is to be found here boiled down. Another is its marked individuality—I might go so far as to say, its original presentation of the argument. The third thing is its brevity and popularity. True, there are points in the usual discussion that are not adverted to in these few pages. This was hardly possible in the limited compass the author has allowed himself, without injury to those parts of the argument where the well known Staunton pastor has put out his strength. Besides, it will be seen on mature reflexion that (in most cases at least) an exaggerated importance has been attached by the other writers to such points. Then, too, it will commonly appear that the given point in question, while not taken up professedly, has been to all intents and purposes disposed of in one or more of Dr. Hawes's keen, incisive sentences. The author of this book, if challenged would, himself be one of the first to acknowledge, that scarcely anything really

new can be said on the subject of the mode of Baptism. Yet our author has certainly made the old points shine in a new light.

Those who want a more *popular* treatise, are hardly in quest of one more perspicuous but of one more entertaining. There may be here and there a momentary doubt as to the meaning or the sequence. The reasoning is close and compact, and everywhere calls for *thinking*. If the page had been less cut up by subdividing numerals, and had been made up less consequentially than is at present the case of unexpanded statements, it would have been easier for the reader, but perhaps less distinct to the logician and harder to be impressed on the memory. If it had been full of apt illustrations, or in the form of an attractive story, the extension that would in that case have become necessary of the limits of the volume would have defeated the author's purpose. Furthermore, it would have required him to trench on the province of "William the Baptist." There are entertaining books already on this curious topic—as for instance, "Fairchild on Baptism," and Dale's four volumes. There are also works of exhaustive learning and profundity—notably Dale on Classic, Judaic, Johannie, and Christie, Baptism. What was desiderated was something which though sufficiently comprehensive was at the same time short, terse, straightforward, accurate, and effective. This desideratum Dr. Hawes has now (and for the first time) exactly supplied; and has in addition been amusing and witty, and yet dignified. Other short treatises of the kind are in existence, but they are either "milk for babes," or else they betray an inadequate acquaintance with the Greek language, or with the literature of the subject. Dr. Hawes has given us "strong meat," but in a form analogous to beef-juice. The style of the writing is plain, nervous, idiomatic, racy; not unlike that of Spurgeon or Cobbett. In one or two cases it may be too colloquial, or even provincial; and in one case the types have permitted the third person singular of the preterite to stand "wet" instead of "wet-*ted*." These are trivial specks indeed in comparison with the great merits of this welcome discussion. The dictionaries and the Fathers are boldly and wisely set aside in this volume. The word and example of Christ and his contemporary servants are relied on against every species of competing evidence. The Immersionists are shown up from the English as well as the Greek Bible itself as having no countenance from the *prepositions*. Dr. Hawes then fixes the adversary in this dilemma. We either go to the original or *not*. If *not*, the whole argument from BAPTIZO vanishes into thin air. Nor can "into" and "out of" be tortured into "under" and "out from under." If we do go to the original, everything (prepositions and all) are in our favor. The subject of "burial in baptism" and "in the liquid wave," is well handled, and so is the relation between Christian Baptism and John's. Our approval of this little treatise if discriminating is emphatic and hearty.

H. C. ALEXANDER.

BROADUS' COMMENTARY ON MATTHEW.

COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW. *By John A. Broadus, D. D., LL. D.* American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia. Cloth. 9 x 6 $\frac{3}{8}$ inches. pp. 664. \$2.25.

This Commentary was given brief and appreciative mention in the July number of this Review, and the promise was made that it should receive the more extended notice to which it is entitled by its merits and the reputation of its author. It belongs to a series that the American Baptist Publication Society is issuing under the title of "An American Commentary on the New Testament," with Dr. Alvah Hovey as General Editor. The basis of exposition is the English text in the Common and Revised versions, and the design is to provide an accurate and readable Commentary, suited to those who have little or no acquaintance with the original language of the New Testament. The admirable work of Dr. Hackett on the Acts is included in the series, and if the other volumes reach the high standard set by Dr. Hackett and Dr. Broadus, the whole will be a credit not simply to Baptist, but to American scholarship. No concealment is made of the fact that the interpretations are made along the line of Baptist views, but so far little, if any, complaint of "offensive partisanship" can be justified.

To this volume, Dr. Hovey has prefixed a General Introduction on "The Canon of the New Testament," "The Order of the Books," and "The Greek Text;" while Dr. Broadus has given no Special Introduction to Matthew, but has contented himself with referring to accessible writers with whose views he coincides. In the estimation of Dr. Broadus, this, his latest and most elaborate production, is doubtless his *magnum opus*. He tells us that it has been in hand for twenty years and that for several years it has engaged his chief attention. On it he has concentrated the discipline, and in it he has gathered the fruits of all his studies and labors. The preacher, the pastor, the teacher, the scholar, the Christian, unite here in the interpreter, and it is easy to see how each has brought his complement of training and furniture to produce the valuable work that lies before us. We discover here all the qualities we have learned to associate with Dr. Broadus from knowledge of him and his writings. We find ample learning, accurate scholarship, conscientious exegesis, and reverence for the Holy Scriptures, presided over by eminent good sense and saturated with manly and fervent piety, and all these uttering themselves in a style simple, clear, and felicitous. In this Commentary, Dr. Broadus has achieved something which is not only instructive in itself, but helpful to the preacher and to every one that attempts to interpret God's Word to others. We deal almost altogether with the English version, and Dr. Broadus has here adapted the critical and historical method, which is the true method, to the exposition of the Scriptures in the English text. In accomplish-

ing this, Dr. Broadus has had the benefit of many years' experience in his position in the Baptist Seminary, where class after class has passed under his hands in New Testament Interpretation in an English course. The result is that we have a combination of the excellencies for which Meyer and Matthew Henry may serve as types. Critical, doctrinal, historical and practical are interwoven, and together make up the finished exposition. It is true that homiletical and practical remarks are frequently grouped under a distinct heading, but this is simply an expansion of this important element. Dr. Broadus has rendered a service of great value in putting forth a work that illustrates so signally the benefit of genuine scholarship to the preacher in making him a sound and trustworthy expositor of the Scriptures. Underlying his interpretation, is a thorough acquaintance with Text-criticism, Grammar, and Archæology, and through long and sympathetic study of the New Testament times, and by personal observation in the East, he has fitted himself to regard our Lord's teachings from the point of view of a contemporary. This has not obtruded itself in pedantic display, but it has given tone and color to the whole exegesis.

A notable quality in Dr. Broadus is the ability to carry in mind opposing interpretations, and, without mentioning them, so to shape his exposition as to meet views different from his. This is a supreme quality in the compend of Christian truth drawn up by the Westminster divines in the Shorter Catechism. It is something for which every minister should strive, that he may truly and effectively preach "to the times."

Equally worthy of remark is it, that this is an eminently readable Commentary. The current runs smoothly and transparently and we are borne on easily from verse to verse. At times there are full discussions of important topics, but these do not break the continuity of the exposition, and all questions that are raised in Text-criticism or Grammar are treated in foot-notes. To facilitate consultation on special passages and subjects, a large number of cross-references has been inserted. And the contents of the Commentary have been made more accessible by an Index of the principal topics, while another Index has been appended giving a list of the authors quoted or referred to, with some information regarding their country, age, and religious positions. We had marked several passages on which to offer some comments, but we shall be compelled to satisfy ourselves with stating the general attitude of our author, and his views on some subjects of present interest. Dr. Broadus should be named a conservative-progressive. He has his eyes open to greet any new light that may break forth from God's Word, but he does not believe that the light that has illumined the path of God's people for centuries is darkness. In consequence, his interpretations are the well-considered conclusions of one who is free from the weakness of seeking novelty and originality, as the term goes, at the expense of truth. At the same time, he has

sought the help afforded by the most recent investigation, and none can complain that he has neglected or overlooked any of the sources that the latest scholarship brings to the aid of the expositor. It is, therefore, the more pleasing and assuring when we see his feet planted in the old paths, where the drift of sentiment, popular or scholarly, threatens them. He holds, for instance, that our Lord teaches (Matt. xix. 7.) the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy: "Jesus speaks of the law, in Deuteronomy as coming from Moses. It is very hard to reconcile this with the fashionable theories as to a late date of Deuteronomy, and indeed of the whole Pentateuch: it is necessary to maintain either that Jesus was mistaken, and this as to the word of God, or else that he used the phraseology of his time in a highly misleading fashion." To the same effect he expresses himself in his comment on Matthew xxii, 43: "How then doth David in spirit call him Lord": and singularizes a distinction of vast importance in our conception of our Saviour's utterances on the subjects embraced by Biblical Criticism, when he says: "It is true that the knowledge of Our Lord's human mind was limited (Comp. on xxi: 19); but that is a very different thing from saying that it was erroneous, and that he used error as a means of instructing and convincing others." To all parties, on the "wine question" we would commend these sober words (on xi: 19): "He (Jesus) was accustomed to drink wine, as was common, almost universal—pure wines which those light and abounded in that country, and which, taken in moderate quantity, and mixed with a double quantity of water according to custom, would stimulate about as much as our tea and coffee."

Passing by other wise and timely judgments of our author, we bring our notice to a close by summing up all in a cordial commendation of the work to preachers, Sunday-school teachers, and all others who wish not simply to study the Bible, but desire to learn how best to study it and make its treasures available and useful to others. We believe that a thorough acquaintance with this Commentary will largely correct the vicious habit of "accommodation," by which some preachers, with the best of motives, handle the Word of God deceitfully and make it of none effect. There is reason to fear that the ministry as a whole gives too much countenance to the methods of the "popular" preacher, who astonishes his audience by the novelty of his interpretations; who no longer regards his text as an utterance of God to be expounded and applied in its true intent, but merely as a cross-bar, on which he

"Plays such fantastic tricks before high Heaven
As make the angels weep."

C. R. HEMPHILL.

THE PHARAOKHS OF THE BONDAGE, ETC.

THE PHARAOKHS OF THE BONDAGE AND THE EXODUS. *Lectures by Charles Robinson, D. D., LL. D., Madison Avenue Church, New York.* The Century Company, New York, 1887, pp. 199.

ABRAHAM, JOSEPH AND MOSES, IN EGYPT, *being a course of Lectures delivered before the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey, by Rev. Alfred H. Kellogg, D. D., of Philadelphia.* Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., New York, 1887, pp. 160.

In the two works named above, we have a summary of the latest results of investigation into the portion of Egypt's history, commencing with the sojourn of Abraham in that land, recorded in Gen. 12:10-20, and closing with the Exodus. Dr. Robinson's lectures, as he tells us in his preface, were "all delivered by a Pastor, in the ordinary course of his pulpit ministrations upon the Sabbath, and are published in the form in which they were first delivered." Dr. Kellogg's lectures were "delivered before the Theological Seminary at Princeton," and naturally present us with a more critical and elaborate examination of the matters treated of than would be appropriate to lectures before an ordinary Sabbath-evening congregation.

New light has been thrown upon this most important portion of Egyptian history, in the last few years, in several ways.

(1.) By the published translation of the "Great Harris Papyrus of Rameses II." "This Papyrus is a large one, measuring some 133 feet in length, and admirably preserved. . . . The historical part of it was first translated and published by Dr. Eisenlohr in 1872," and subsequently by the eminent Egyptologists, M. Chabas and Brugsch. "In the earlier part of the document Rameses recounts his good deeds, and commends to the people the son whom he was at the time associating on the throne. He then tells the story of his own succession, prefacing this portion with a very brief but important statement respecting the period of anarchy that had been brought to an end by Setnekht his predecessor, now generally regarded as the founder of Dynasty XX. (*Kellogg's Lectures*, p. 103, 4.)

(2.) The discovery in 1881, at Deir-el-Bahari, of a tomb, or sepulchral chamber, as it might more properly be called, hewn in the solid mountain-side, in which had been collected, in some strange way, the confined mummies of many of Egypt's greatest sovereigns. These have now all been transferred to the Bulak Museum. "The mummies," writes Robinson, "were carefully identified, and these august personages began to appear like real beings, brought up afresh before the tribunal of human judgment as to their character and acts. . . . In the summer of the last year, 1886, the mummy of Seti I., and that of his extraordinary son, Rameses II., with that of Rameses III., and that of Thotmes III., the obelisk-maker, were divested of the resinous shrouds they were buried in, and the inscriptions were read with skilled knowledge

of the characters the priests had used in the funeral rites and liturgies. So now there is visible in the Museum at Bulak a long row of mummies, whose very names fill our whole imagination with amazement. There is the king who knew not Joseph, there is the father of Pharaoh's daughter, and the founder of the Dynasty that dwelt in Zoan. They are dead as stones, but each 'being dead yet speaketh,' as plainly as did Abel." (*Robinson's Lectures*, p. 28.)

(3.) In Ex. 1: 11, we read, "And they," *i. e.*, the children of Israel, "built for Pharaoh treasure-cities (store-cities, N. V.), Pithom and Raamses." Pithom, one of these store-cities, has recently been discovered and partially disintombed, "Until recently Egyptologists have been divided as to even the Dynasty of the Exodus Pharaoh; some being strongly in favor of assigning him to Dynasty XVIII, while others, following Dr. Rogue's lead, preferred Dynasty XIX. Happily, the labors of the Egypt Exploration Fund Committee have decided the question as between the two Dynasties. It was M. Naville, the Committee's able explorer, who, while unearthing the mounds at Tel-el-Maskhuta, had the good fortune to discover that they covered the long-sought store-city Pithom, one of the two such towns built for Pharaoh by the Hebrews. And he was able, by the evidence of monuments found upon the spot, to connect the place in a very convincing way with Rameses II, of Dynasty XIX, as its founder, proving beyond appeal that Rameses II was one, at least, of the Pharaohs who oppressed the Hebrews." (*Kellogg's Lectures*, pp. 124, 5.)

In consequence of the new light thrown upon this portion of the history of Egypt, in these several ways, we can now answer, with some degree of certainty, more than one of the questions which have long perplexed the careful student of the Bible.

(1) According to Dr. Kellogg's determination, Abraham's sojourn in Egypt was during the reign of one of the Hyksos, or Shepherd Kings, whilst Joseph was carried thither, some 200 years later, after the Shepherd Kings had been finally expelled, and a native Egyptian Dynasty (the XVIIIth) established instead. The hospitable reception of Abraham, "rich in cattle" as he was, and his subsequent peaceable dismissal, after the famine had passed away, when compared with the public sentiment in Joseph's time, incidentally exhibited in giving a reason for the separate settlement of Joseph's brethren in the land of Goshen—"for every shepherd is an abomination unto the Egyptians," (Gen. 46: 34)—accords well with this idea. Who the Pharaoh of Joseph's day was, cannot be determined with absolute certainty; but the strong probability is that it was Thotmes III, one of the Pharaohs whose embalmed body has recently been found at Dier-el-Bahari, and now adorns the Museum at Bulak. This view of matters is confirmed by the fact that when Isaac purposed to go down into Egypt, because of a famine prevailing in Canaan, some eighty-five years after Abraham's visit, "The Lord appeared unto him, and said, Go not down into Egypt;

dwell in the land which I shall tell thee of." Gen. 26: 2. At this time the protracted contest which resulted in the final expulsion of the Shepherd Kings must have been raging in all its fury; and Isaac, had he carried out his purpose, would, in all probability, have lost his property, if not his life.

(2) Between the date of Joseph's death and the birth of Moses, a change of Dynasty occurred, the XVIIIth Dynasty came to a close, and the XIXth was established. This event seems to be referred to in Moses' words: "And Joseph died, and all his brethren, and all that generation. Now there arose another king in Egypt, which knew not Joseph." Ex. 1: 6-8. This XIXth Dynasty was of comparatively short duration, and numbered among its kings the Pharaohs of the oppression, who "made the lives of the children of Israel bitter with hard bondage in mortar and brick, and in all manner of service in the field." Ex. 1: 14. The recently discovered store-city of Pithom, built at this time, furnishes unquestionable proof that its builder was Rameses II, the third king of this Dynasty, according to Manetho. The ruins of Pithom "show that the several courses of bricks were usually laid with mortar, in regular tiers; and a deeper interest still is awakened by the announcement of the fact that a part of the work was done with bricks having straw in them, and a part with those of an inferior quality, in some instances destitute of straw." (*Robinson's Lectures*, p. 98.) Comparing this fact with the statement in Ex. 1: 14 and 5: 7, one cannot but be struck with the confirmation of the Mosaic narrative thus furnished.

(3) Who the Pharaoh of the Exodus was, and whether or not he perished with his army, when, by God's direction, Moses "stretched forth his hand over the sea, and the waters returned and covered the chariots and horsemen, and all the host of Pharaoh that came into the sea after them," (Ex. 14: 28), are questions which cannot yet be determined with absolute certainty. Mineptah I. has generally been regarded as the Pharaoh in question; and his character, as learned from Egyptian sources, given by Lenormant in the words, "He was neither a soldier nor an administrator; but one whose mind was turned almost exclusively toward the chimeras of sorcery and magic," corresponds well with the character of the Pharaoh of the Exodus as given in Moses' narrative. The Great Harris Papyrus, written by one of the scribes of Rameses III, the second Pharaoh of the XXth Dynasty, states distinctly that the XIXth Dynasty closed in disaster, and this disaster accompanied by an emigration from Egypt, for some reason, so great as to disorganize the government. In the words of Dr. Kellogg: "This emigration was most disastrous in its effects upon the country. In some way, those left behind found themselves without legitimate head, and as a consequence, government not only, but society as well, speedily resolved into confusion and anarchy. Then the document tells how the country was left a prey to its always envious neighbors, and how there resulted, eventually, a foreign despotism, which, in turn, was fol-

lowed by a reaction, of which the Papyrus speaks, in the shape of a national uprising, and how the end came in the re-establishment of a native Dynasty, in the person of one Seti the Victorious, Rameses' predecessor. It can scarcely be denied that such is a fair summary of the teaching of this very brief but suggestive narrative of the royal scribe of Rameses III."

"Do we then strain out of this document, in any illegitimate or forcible way, a covert allusion to the Hebrew migration and its results? Beyond question, the Hebrew tradition adequately explains the story of Rameses. (1) The Exodus of the Hebrew population of Egypt," with the mixed multitude "that went out with them, was surely large enough to leave the northeastern part of the Delta comparatively empty. (2) The destruction of Pharaoh and of his chosen captains and horsemen would sufficiently account for the land of Egypt being left 'without a head,' rendering it needful, in the first instance, that each home should look out for itself, just as the Papyrus states,—a condition of things that would inevitably lead to the jealousies and ambitions of which the Papyrus also speaks. (3) History would simply repeat itself in the invasion story. No better opportunity for foreign intervention could be furnished than intestine struggles would afford. (4) And history would also simply repeat itself in the re-establishment of the native line by a shrewd chief, ready to take advantage of his opportunities." (*Kellogg, pp. 110-11.*)

(4) In his third lecture, Dr. Kellogg gives an interesting discussion of a matter which has hitherto received but little attention from Egyptologists, viz: the connection of Joseph with the rise and progress of the religious revolution which, according to the monuments, occurred during the existence of the XVIIIth Dynasty. Moses tells us: "And Pharaoh . . . gave Joseph to wife Asenath, the daughter of Poti-phera, priest of On," or Heliapolis. Gen. 41 : 45. Such an association as this with the Egyptian priesthood on Joseph's part, would suggest, at the least, some influence exerted by him on the religion of Egypt. On this point Dr. Kellogg writes: "Is there anything in the further monumental history of the Dynasty that may be explained on the hypothesis of Joseph's presence and influence? We think there is. We refer to the rise and progress of that remarkable religious revolution that culminated, in the reign of Amenophis IV., in the establishment of a quasi-monotheism as the religion of the state. It was Lenormant who suggested that 'the form of religion established by Amenophis IV stood in a close relation to that professed at the time by the Israelite portion of his subjects.' Lenormant saw in the very name of the God so exclusively honored by Amenophis IV., "*Aten,*" a reference to the Semitic "*Adonai,*" and asks the question and answered it: 'Had the Hebrews part in this foreign and very imperfect attempt at monotheism? I believe they had.' He even finds some analogies between the cult

of the Hebrews, as finally established by Moses, and that shown on the monuments of Amenophis IV." (*Kellogg's lectures*, pp. 60, 61.)

(5) In our day, when all this portion of sacred history, under the operation of the Higher Criticism, seems, in the estimation of some at least, to be losing its substantial character of matter-of-fact story, and becoming little better than airy myth, when a Harvard Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature can write: "We may probably look upon it as an historical fact that the Israelitish tribes at a certain time (perhaps about B. C. 1330) left the frontiers of Egypt, and made their way towards Canaan, but we know little of the particulars of the movement. The story of Exodus (Chapters II-XIV) tells us of the event as pious Israelites long afterwards thought of it, but we cannot be sure that their recollections were correct. Many of the particulars given in the narrative are improbable. . . There are many reasons why we cannot think that this narrative gives a veritable history of the events," (*Dr. Toy's History of the Religion of Israel*, pp. 18, 19,) it is re-assuring to old-fashioned believers in the Scriptures as "the Word of God," to have the very store-cities built by the Israelites during the oppression, partly of bricks without straw, disintombed by the hand of the explorer, to recover a manuscript history of the disastrous consequences to Egypt of the Hebrew exodus, written by a royal Egyptian scribe, and to have the old mummied Pharaohs, whose very existence has been questioned, to rise from their graves, and "rebuke the madness of" the Critics.

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG.

CREATION OR EVOLUTION.

"CREATION OR EVOLUTION?" A Philosophical Inquiry, *by George Ticknor Curtis*. D. Appleton & Co., N. Y., 1887.

The name of George Ticknor Curtis has long been familiar to American readers. His works, especially his "History of the Constitution of the United States," and his "Life of Daniel Webster," have won for him, deservedly, a place among the foremost writers and jurists of the day. In undertaking a philosophical inquiry into the claims to acceptance of the competing theories of creation and evolution, he may be thought to be stepping out of the ordinary course of thought and study of men of his calling. Yet his course in so doing is not without precedent, and not without reason. The Hon. Wm. E. Gladstone, late Premier of Great Britain, has recently taken part in a discussion of the cosmogony of Moses; and two of the standard works in the department of Christian apologetics, works which form a part of every complete theological library, were written by lawyers, and owe much of their peculiar excellence to the legal training of their authors, and to their application of the principles and rules of judgment established in our courts, to the decision of the cases discussed: I refer to "Lyttleton on

the Conversion of St. Paul," and "West on the Resurrection of Christ." In the work before us, Mr. Curtis tells us, he approaches the subject discussed as a lawyer, and in the examination of the case presented, he has endeavored to apply fairly the principles and laws of evidence universally admitted in our courts of justice, with which his long practice in those courts has rendered him familiar.

On this subject he writes—and I think his remarks will command assent on the part of the ingenuous reader—"The doctrine of evolution addresses itself not only to the scientific naturalist, but to the whole intelligent part of mankind. How is one who does not belong to this class of investigators"—*i. e.* professional scientists—"to regulate his belief in the theory they propound? Is he to take it upon their authority? or, is he, while he accords to their statements of facts all the assent which, as witnesses, they are entitled to expect from him, to apply to their deduction the same principles of belief that he applies to everything else which challenges belief, and to assent or dissent accordingly? No one, I presume, will question that the latter is the only way in which any new matter of belief should be approached. I have not supposed that any scientist questions this; but I have referred to the constant iteration that the doctrine of evolution is now generally admitted by men of science, that the assertion, supposing it to be true, may pass for just what it is worth. It is worth this and no more; that candid, truthful and competent witnesses, when they speak of facts that they have observed, are entitled to be believed as to the existence of those facts. When they assume facts which they do not prove, but which are essential links in the chain of evidence, or when the facts which they do prove do not rationally exclude every other hypothesis excepting their own, the authority of even the whole body of such persons is of no more account than that of any other class of intelligent and cultivated men. In the ages when ecclesiastical authority exercised great power over the beliefs of men upon questions of physical science, the superiority was accorded to the authority which claimed it, and the scientist who propounded a new physical theory that did not suit the theologian was overborne"—as illustrated in the case of Galileo, so often referred to. "It seems to me that it is a tendency of the present age to substitute the authority of scientific experts in the place of the ecclesiastical authority of former periods, by demanding that something more than the office of witnesses of facts should be accorded to them. . . . Sometimes this is carried so far as to imply presumption in those who do not yield assent to their theory . . . and those of us who are not professors of the particular science are charged with ignorance or incapacity if we do not join in the current of scientific opinion. But, after all, the new theory challenges our belief. If we examine it at all, we must judge of it, not by the numbers of those who propound or accept it, or by any amount of mere authority, but by the soundness of the reasoning by which its professors support it." Pp. 22, 23.

Approaching, in such a spirit as is above indicated, the argument for evolution, Darwin gives us in his words: "In North America the black bear was seen by Hearne swimming for hours with widely opened mouth, thus catching, like a whale, insects in the water. Even in so extreme a case as this, if the supply of insects were constant, and if better adapted competitors did not already exist in the country, I can see no difficulty in a race of bears being rendered, by natural selection more and more aquatic in their structure and habits, with larger and larger mouths, till a creature was produced as monstrous as a whale." (*Origin of Species* p. 165.) What ought I to do with it? I admit the truth of Hearne's statement as to matter of fact, that he did see a "black bear swimming for hours with open mouth, catching insects in the water; I have no reason to question his competency or credibility as a witness in this case—but when, on the strength of this fact, Darwin says—"I can see no difficulty in a race of bears being rendered, by natural selection, more and more aquatic in their structure and habits, with larger and larger mouths, till a creature was produced as monstrous as a whale," I must demur. I can see difficulties in the way of such an evolution,—difficulties so many and so great that I cannot believe it, unless some better proof than the admitted fact in the case furnished be presented me.

Mr. Curtis writes—"The principles of belief which we apply in the ordinary affairs of life are those which should be applied to scientific or philosophical theories, and inasmuch as the judicial method of reasoning upon facts is at once the most satisfactory and the most in accordance with common sense, I have here"—*i. e.*, in the volume before us—"undertaken to apply it to the evidence which is supposed to establish the hypothesis of animal evolution, in contrast with that of special creation," p. IX. As a consequence of his pursuing this course, I am not surprised to hear him say, "The result of my study of the hypothesis of evolution is, that it is an ingenious but delusive mode of accounting for the existence of either the body or the mind of man; and that it employs a kind of reasoning which no person of sound judgment would apply to anything that might affect his welfare, his happiness, his estate, or his conduct in the practical affairs of life." p. X.

In his discussion of "Creation or Evolution," Mr. Curtis covers a wider range of topics, all, however pertinent to the matter under consideration, than is common with scientists who have written on the subject. To me, one of the most interesting chapters in the book is the one bearing the title of "The Platonic Kosmos compared with the Darwinian theory of evolution." After setting forth in detail, the Platonic theory of the origin of our Kosmos, Mr. Curtis writes, "I know not how it may appear to others, but to me the parallelism between the Platonic and Darwinian theory is very striking. Both speculators assume the existence of a Supreme Intelligence and Power, presiding

over the creation of animals which are to inhabit the earth. Behind the celestial or primitive gods the Greek philosopher places the Demiurgus, to whom the gods stand in the relation of ministers and servants to execute his will. The modern naturalist assumes the existence of the Omnipotent God; and although he does not directly personify the laws of natural and sexual selection which the Omnipotent power has made to operate in nature, they perform an office in the transitional gradations through which the animals are successively developed, that very closely resembles the office performed by the gods of Plato's system in providing the modifications of structure which the animals undergo. In the two processes the one is the reversed complement of the other. Plato begins with the formation of an animal of a very exalted type, and by successive degradations, induced by the failure of the animal to live up to the high standard of its rational existence, he supposes a descent into lower, and still lower forms, the gods all the while providing a new structure for each successive lower form, until we reach the shell-fish fixed on the earth beneath the water. Darwin begins with the lowest form of animated organization, and by successive gradations induced by the struggle of the animal to maintain its existence, he supposes an ascent into higher and still higher forms, the laws of natural and sexual selection operating to develop a new structure for each successive higher form, until we reach man, "the wonder and glory of the universe," an animal whose immediate ancestor was the same as the monkey's, and whose remote progenitor was an aquatic creature breathing by gills and floating by a swim-bladder," pp. 72, 73. After discussing, at some length, the arguments by which Plato and Darwin have supported their respective theories, Mr. Curtis reaches the conclusion, "If Plato had known as much about the animal kingdom as is now known, he could have arrayed the same facts in support of his theory, by an argument as powerful as that which now supports the doctrine of evolution." P. 74.

In this necessarily brief review of "Creation or Evolution?" I have not sought to give the reader even the briefest summary of the argument it contains—for this I must refer him to the book itself—but simply to indicate the general character of the work, and to give the reader an idea of what he may expect in its perusal. After a careful reading of the book, I must say, that whilst on one or two points I could wish the author had what I believe to be my "better faith," on the whole, it is one of the fullest, and fairest, and most interesting discussions of the subject which has been given to the public, and will fully sustain the already high reputation of its author.

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG.

OUR COUNTRY.

OUR COUNTRY: ITS POSSIBLE FUTURE AND ITS PRESENT CRISIS. *By Rev. Josiah Strong, D. D.* For the American Home Missionary Society. Introduction by Prof. Austin Phelps, D. D. Seventy-Fifth Thousand. Baker and Taylor Co., 9 Bond Street, New York.

Americans, according to our author, are living in extraordinary times—times in which volcanic forces are rapidly accumulating in the hollow centre of this Republic. As Dr. Strong depicts these eruptive forces, not in poetic and imaginative language, but in the unvarnished prose of facts and figures, it is difficult to see how the general upheaval can be delayed many years longer. Among the perils which he notes, the following are the most potent:

1. *Immigration.* Under the influence of the attractions of this country, and the causes which are expellent from Europe, there is a mighty annual influx of foreign-born people into the United States. The rate of in-flow is constantly increasing. It is largely from the ignorant, immoral, irreligious and pauper classes of the overcrowded European continent. For example, sixty per cent. of the saloon-keepers are foreign-born. They are importing among us all sorts of political, social and religious ideas. Any thoughtful man can see the danger, which threatens on many sides, from this motley-minded population.

2. *The Liquor Power.* This can thrive only by wrecking homes, and good homes are at the very base of a good civilization. According to *The North American Review*, the whiskey-interests are supported by \$1,000,000,000. It is thus a tremendous power at the polls, in legislative halls, in the court-room, in business houses, in social circles. All this vast power is evil and unscrupulous, and is a foe to the best institutions of the land. Prohibitory and local option laws, here and there, are restraining this influence, but the slowness of progress along this line reveals the strength of the liquor party.

3. *The wealth* of this country is simply phenomenal. "In 1880 it was valued at \$43,642,000,000; more than enough to buy the Russian and Turkish Empires, the kingdoms of Sweden and Norway, Denmark and Italy, together with Australia, South Africa, and all South America—lands, mines, cities, palaces, factories, ships, flocks, herds, jewels, moneys, thrones, sceptres, diadems and all—the entire possession of 177,000,000 people." We are threatened with Mammonism, materialism and luxuriousness. What Matthew Arnold said about Chicago, may be said about our whole country—we are "too beastly prosperous." But the chief danger from wealth, so far as it affects the political fabric, springs from what has been called "the congestion of wealth." Our enormous riches are rapidly being amassed in the hands of corporations and a few individuals. These vast sums enlarge themselves very rapidly every time they are turned over. They are largely under the control of the speculator, who, in no sense, is a producer of wealth.

He handles money already made. Hence these sharp collisions between labor and capital. Monopolies and money-tyrants, far more oppressive than the average slave-master before the civil war, are springing up very rapidly. This friction will increase until there will be an insurrection against this plutocracy. Labor organizations and "strikes" are unmistakable "signs of the times."

4. *Socialism*. This is a disorganizing power to which other causes have been contributing factors. It finds many of its boldest adherents in the citizens of foreign importation or of foreign extraction. Its high endeavor is to reconstruct society. It would change the present competitive system into a co-operative one. Its cardinal doctrines is: "From each according to his abilities; to each according to his wants." It is consequently a levelling principle. Moral, political, social and religious institutions must go down before it. No moral principle will deter its advocates from the use of infernal means for accomplishing their ends. As this doctrine of socialism is spreading, and yearly receiving new applications, it is obvious that it is impelling on to revolution.

5. *Romanism*. "In 1800, the Catholic population was 100,000. In 1884, according to official statistics, it was 6,628,176. At the beginning of the century there was one Catholic to every 53 of the whole population; in 1850, one to 14.3; in 1870, one to 8.3; in 1880, one to 7.7." "From 1870 to 1880, the churches of all evangelical denominations increased 49 per cent., while Catholic churches multiplied 74 per cent." "The average annual growth of the latter from 1870 to 1880 was 176,733, while from 1883 to 1884 it was 231,322." But why refer to Romanism as a cause of national alarm? Because every cardinal, archbishop and bishop in the Catholic Church is required to take an oath of allegiance to the Pope, in which he swears: "Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said Lord (the Pope), or his aforesaid successors, I will to my utmost persecute and oppress." Lafayette, himself a Romanist, said: "If the liberties of the American people are ever destroyed, they will fall by the hands of the Romish clergy." Rome is tolerant only when she dares not be intolerant. Hence the fear at the rapid increase of the Pope's adherents in this country.

Put all these things together and other facts which Dr. Strong mentions, and he will be sustained in the opinion that our Republican institutions are destined shortly to be tried to their utmost.

In our judgment, all these evils are but the logical results of a radical misconstruction of the great announcement in the Declaration of Independence, "all men are created equal." Hence the government has no right to put limitations upon immigration, nor to check the liquor traffic, nor to limit the accumulation of wealth in the hands of a single management, nor to regulate those evils which give a pretext to socialism, nor to check the growing power of Rome, which is an enemy to her dearest institutions, nor to enact and enforce Sabbath-laws, and so on. The principle of abolitionism, which put this interpretation upon

Constitution for a special purpose, is now bearing fruit. The government, without contravening this interpretation, is powerless to protect itself.

To prevent this mighty upheaval, which the above facts prophesy is near at hand, Dr. Strong points to Christianity as the only adequate power. If the masses, whether home or foreign born, could be imbued with the evangelical principles of the gospel, they would be under the most powerful restraints known to human society. If the minds and hearts of capitalists could be filled with the doctrines of God's word, they would hold their wealth as the trustees of God, and distribute it according to the precepts of religion. There would be no need for any socialistic agitations, for applied Christianity would equalize all things to the satisfaction of all citizens. Hence the profound need of evangelization.

But the Church cannot carry out her high commission in this matter without adequate means to project, sustain and advance her enterprises. God had the power and wisdom to have devised a method of Christianising the world without the employment of human agents and means, but as a matter of fact, he has sovereignly chosen to work out this great result through a Church which has necessary expenses. He requires men to hold their property as his stewards, and so much of it as his Church really requires to prosecute her work to a complete success, God requires his creatures to bring into his treasury. The Church has a right, a divine right, to be liberally supported in the accomplishment of that great work whereto God has called it.

The book is a powerful plea for Home Missions. It may be termed the *patriotic* argument for this great cause. The very life of our Republican institutions and fabric depends upon its success. This alone can save us from the fate of the Republics of ancient Greece and Rome.

The little volume is a powerful demonstration of the absolute importance of the Christian religion. Nations, with all their wisdom, wealth, armies and navies, cannot long survive without it. We wish this volume, so attractively written, and so full of profound and practical information and suggestions, were in the hands of every American citizen.

R. A. WEBB.

VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

HIS STAR IN THE EAST, a study in the Early Aryan Religions. *By Leighton Parks, Rector of Emmanuel Church, Boston.* 12 mo., pp. 292. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1887.

A volume as beautifully printed and bound as even the Riverside Press is capable of, and written in most fascinating style, with some

show of study. The author confesses, however, that he was "without the knowledge of oriental languages which would enable one to make original research." He relies upon translations for his material. The book, which grew out of a series of Lectures before the Lowell Institute, is decidedly "progressive," as the word is now used. It is an attempt to trace the true knowledge of God as shown in Vedaism, Brahmanism, Buddhism, and the various idolatries of the East. Legimitately done, this would be a useful study. But the author's object "is to call attention to the witness that they bear to man's need of the Gospel, and to show that that need has been answered, just in so far as any people, or rather any individual, was prepared to receive it. The assumption that the heathen once had a perfect revelation which they deliberately rejected, is far more likely to 'cut the nerve of missions' than any theory of the mercy which 'endureth forever.'" He evidently sympathizes with those who believe, "that the Bible is not the limit of revelation," and that "it may be that a study of some of the great religions will show them that this is truer than they have dared to admit." In the author's mind the Bible and the Sacred Books of the Hindoos are but separate parts of one revelation. "The 'Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world' has been seen in the East, and the true way to make disciples is by declaring unto them Jesus as Agni, Brahma, Buddha, or Sosios, as He was first declared to the Jew as *the Christ*." He laughs at the argument for the Bible from miracles, and as to the testimony of fulfilled prophecy says, "The new science of Biblical criticism has shown that there is no such literal agreement as we fondly supposed." To resort to such arguments, to-day, as Paley and Butler used, he pronounces "a mark of skepticism." Concerning missions, he says, "All went well as long as the moral sense of mankind did not revolt from the dogma that every soul that had not heard the Gospel should be damned. But no man can be found who believes that to-day!" He hesitates not to acknowledge the logical result of the new interpretation of the doctrine of the immanence of God, and to commend what he calls Christian pantheism. He lauds the Bramo Somaj as a "drawing slowly but surely nearer to the Christian doctrine of the perfect manifestation of God in Jesus Christ." He pronounces Agnosticism and Nihilism, Democracy and the study of the science of comparative religions as "some of the forces for the coming of the kingdom of God which are working while men sleep." The book is a practical illustration of the absurdities to which the human mind will be swept when it leaves the safe anchorage of God's Word, the only infallible source of truth. What is it but the spirit of anti-Christ that could lead an acknowledged minister of the Gospel to declare that all who resist any who come to Christ through these religions "speak a word against the Holy Ghost," and to maintain that our blessed religion only exceeds in the *degree of its revelation* the religion of the idolators whom he describes!

LIFE AND TIMES OF JESUS, AS RELATED BY THOMAS DIDYMUS. *By James Freeman Clarke.* Boston: Lee and Shepard. 1887.

The name of the author will indicate the character of the book. The literary ability and brilliancy of James Freeman Clarke render anything from his pen readable, nay, even fascinating. This, however, will not atone for his loose views of Christ, nor for his attempt to account for many of the miracles of Christ by natural methods. And how strangely misled is the mind that can admit the great miracle of all miracles, the miracle which declares Christ "to be the Son of God," and yet deny that Divinity which makes all other miracles possible to Him! This admission appears in the following words, (Pref. p. x.) "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 undeniably. Without some such event, Christianity would have been buried forever in the Master's grave. The resurrection of Christ was the resurrection of Christianity. With all respect for those who believe that the apostles imagined 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."

THE LIFE OF CHRIST IN THE WORLD, Sermons, *By the Rev. Arthur Brooks, Rector of the Church of the Incarnation, New York.* 12mo. pp. 360. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House. 1887. \$1.50.

This volume contains twenty-five sermons, which will be found most stimulating to thought, as well as satisfying and refreshing. The preacher's style is beautifully smooth and finished, and yet force and directness are not wanting. The collection of sermons here given deserves to become popular.

PEOPLE'S COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW, containing the Common Version, 1611, and the Revised Version, 1881 (American Readings and Renderings), with critical, exegetical and applicative notes, and illustrations drawn from life and thought in the East. *By Edwin W. Rice, D. D.* Pp. 316. Philadelphia: The American Sunday School Union. 1887. \$1.25.

This commentary is admirably adapted to general use among Sunday-School teachers and scholars. Its author is painstaking and careful, and manifests practical experience in the department of work for which the book is designed. As may be expected, controversial points are avoided, except so far as to make a mere statement of the different beliefs. The writer seems to have made it his special object

to make clear the various scenes and customs of the Holy Land referred to or suggested in the text, and to use them for setting forth the work of Christ in a life-like manner. To this end he resorts to pictorial illustrations as well as to direct statements. His object is "to assist every one to read the Gospel as if he were in Galilee or Judea, and familiar with the scenery, the people, and the habits of life, speech and thought current in Palestine when Jesus was upon the earth." This the author has happily accomplished. The giving of the King James and the Revised Versions, in parallel columns, adds value to the book as a popular, or "People's" commentary.

OUR INDIA MISSION, a thirty years' history of the India Mission of the United Presbyterian Church of North America, together with personal reminiscences. *By the Rev. Andrew Gordon, D. D., the oldest Missionary.* (With forty illustrations.) 8vo. pp. x. 516. Philadelphia: Andrew Gordon, 914 Filbert street. 1886.

The Church at large, not less than his own denomination, is to be congratulated that Dr. Gordon's life was spared to make this record of missionary toil, self-denial and success. The death of the author a few weeks ago will enhance every one's interest in the book. "Our India Mission" is a history of but one of the many missions established in that country, and hence restricts itself to somewhat narrow bounds, in the main; incidentally, however, such descriptions are given of the customs, manners, language, climate, races, history and topography of the country as to be most instructive to the general student. The minuteness of detail, in many instances, adds wonderfully to the interest of the book, and to the intelligent appreciation of the difficulties under which our beloved missionaries labor, as well as of the difficulties and dangers to which the newly converted or inquiring heathen are subjected. The accounts of the efforts and struggles of the native laborers, and of husbands or parents who were forcibly separated from their wives and families, seeking a reunion and mutual enjoyment of the religion of Christ, are most touching as well as thrilling. The author's account of the Sepoy Rebellion will constitute a valuable contribution to the information of American readers. A striking feature of the book is the skill with which the writer has introduced the statistics. Under his deft hand bare figures have become life-like and full of interest. There is no attempt to be learned or profound anywhere manifest in the book; the style has all the simplicity and artlessness of one who has lived almost, as it were, out of the world, with no thought but of the great business of his life. The naturalness, combined with earnestness, makes every page eloquent. It is a book that cannot be laid down till one has finished it.

WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH THE SUNDAY SCHOOL AS AN INSTITUTION? . By *George Lansing Taylor, D. D.* 24 mo. pp. 46. New York: Wilbur B. Ketcham, 71 Bible House, 1886. 30cts.

Prepared as an essay before the New York "Methodist Episcopal Preacher's Meeting." The discussions it called forth and the emphasis with which it taught a sound doctrine, created a demand for its wider circulation, which is met in this booklet. The following synopsis of its contents will illustrate the value and comprehensiveness of the essayist's treatment of his subject. I. The importance of the Sunday School and what it should be in the present and future system of Church work. This is not to be determined by its past history. "The present mal-adjustments of the Sunday School to the wants of the Church," says the author, "are explained in the light of its *origin outside* of the Church, as a lay missionary movement; but to comprehend the demands of the *present* and the *future*, the sooner we utterly forget that origin, except as a model of zeal, the better." II. Is the Sunday School meeting the demand of the times? No, for six reasons. Its weaknesses are the slender qualifications of too many superintendents and teachers, the fact of the loss of many of our older youth from its instructions, bad methods of obtaining scholars, the growing separation of feeling between the Sunday Schools and the Churches, manifested in non-attendance at Church services, and by the dangerous mistake of calling the Sunday School "*The Children's Church*," and the serious element of separation of feeling arising from the separate, or quasi-separate, organization of the Sunday School societies, boards, etc., from the general governing bodies of the Churches. III. The comparative failure is not, primarily, the fault of the officers and teachers, nor of the pastors, but is found in the wrong plan of the Sunday Church work, and in a wrong organization of working forces, growing out of that wrong plan. "We need to deal with the organic place and relation of the whole institution to the Church. . . . The truth to be seen and comprehended is that, in the development of the Sunday School, we have brought about a new force of Church work and worship, *viz*: the *Teaching Service*; and we need to do this work, as we do the *Preaching Service*, with the presence, labors, sanction and government of the pastor, the whole congregation, and the common governing body of the Church. . . . The very name and idea of 'Sunday School,' except in the sense of mission schools, should be abolished. . . . The historical absurdity has been committed of taking a form of organization made necessary for *lack* of Church work and Church material, and *importing it bodily into the Church*." IV. Some of the consequences of the present mal-adjustments are, an overloaded Sabbath, an overworked Church, the impossibility under such circumstances of the best use of Church workers, the practical exclusion of the ministers from one of the most momentous parts of their work as pastors and leaders of the children and youth, the stripping the pastor of

the authority rightly inhering in his office, of guiding the spiritual instruction of the children by choosing his own assistants in that work, and the introduction of another governing body to divide and burden and complicate the administration of the Church. V. The re-adjustments needed are, to recognize the fact that what we call the "Sunday-School" is in reality a public Church service, to abolish the separate office of superintendent and make every pastor the head of the Sunday-School as much as of the Church, to make the teaching service a thing for the whole Church and expect the whole Church and congregation to be in it, to let the common governing body of the Church govern that part of the work just the same as all others, subject to the discipline of the denomination, to let the common revenues of the Church support this service, like all others, and let them receive its contributions in like manner, and to let special training for Sunday School work be a part of the Theological Seminary education of every preacher. VI. Some of the advantages accruing from these proposed changes will be the unification of the Church and Church work, an elevation of the standard of instruction, the establishment of the proper relation between the pastor and the youth of his charge.

The book is a marvel of comprehensiveness and suggestiveness. Its statements and reasoning are sure to lead to a better understanding of this most practical of all questions in the internal economy of the Church.

THE GROWTH OF CHURCH INSTITUTIONS. *By the Rev. Edwin Hatch, M. A., D. D., Reader in Ecclesiastical History in the Oxford University.* 12 mo. pp. 227. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3, Bible House, 1887. \$1.50.

Like all of Thos. Whittaker's works, handsomely printed and bound, and most readable. Dr. Hatch traces in this work the changes which the Church has gradually undergone in her history from the Apostle's day to the present time, and seeks a justification for the present institutions of Episcopacy in the nature of Christianity. It is as strong an argument as can be made in that line, and as such should be in every well appointed library. The author does not pretend to deny the marked difference between the present and the Apostolic order of Church government. He frankly says, "The diocesan system as it now exists is the effect of a series of historical circumstances. It is impossible to defend every part of it as being primitive, nor is it necessary to do so. It is sufficient to show that it is the result of successive readaptations of the Church's frame-work to the needs of the times." In thus giving up the idea of a *jus divinum*, except so far as the Spirit's presence and work in the modern Church make it God's plan of government, he follows the lead of many eminent Anglicans who realize the futility of seeking for a justification of their system in the Scriptures.

METHODS OF CHURCH WORK, RELIGIOUS, SOCIAL, AND FINANCIAL.

By Rev. Sylvanus Stall, A. M., author of "How to Pay Church Debts," etc. pp. 304. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1887.

Many godly ministers are at a loss to know just how to "take hold" of their work, in many of its departments. To such, this book will be most helpful. It suggests methods for organization, for seeking to reach special classes, for the conduct of religious meetings and classes, for developing the social features of the Church, and for conducting its financial and benevolent affairs. Some of the methods recommended or suggested would scarcely stand criticism, but a wise pastor, with a true heart, will know how to discriminate, and will avoid over-stepping the boundaries of scripturalness or prudence. In the case of some ministers, a growing class, there is danger of too much method. To these the book should be forbidden, not so much because it is productive of evil as that they need reconstruction.

PSYCHOLOGY, THE MOTIVE POWERS, THE EMOTIONS, CONSCIENCE,

WILL. By James McCosh, D. D., LL. D., Litt. D. President of Princeton College, Author of "Method of Divine Government," etc. 12mo. pp. 267. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1887.

This volume follows the author's "Psychology; The Cognitive Powers," which appeared a year ago, and with it forms a complete text-book for students. It is designed to be a hand-book that will be free from details and history, which a more voluminous work would require. Its importance as a contribution to sound philosophy, and the name of its honored and venerated author cause us to reserve it for a careful analysis.

SOCIALISM AND CHRISTIANITY. By A. J. F. Behrends, D. D., Pastor of Central Congregational Church, Brooklyn, N. Y. 12 mo. pp. 308.

New York: The Baker & Taylor Company, 9 Bond St. 1886. Cloth \$1.00; paper 50 cents.

Like "Our Country," by the same publishers, this work should be widely distributed. No question is more vital than that which it discusses, or enters more largely into the life of Church and State at the present time. The author of this book has studied it well, and has made such a careful investigation of Socialism in all its aspects, and especially of the political philosophy upon which it bases its claims, that he is well prepared to deal with the problems discussed. He has evidently sought to study the question in the same manner in which he would have others study it. "Whoever would understand the social question, and contribute to its solution, must have on his right hand the works of Political Economy, and on his left the literature of Scientific Socialism, and must keep the New Testament open before him." (Rodolph Todt). The result of his pursuing this plan is that he has

given us a thoroughly scientific as well as practical and popular view of the whole subject. This book and "Our Country" should be read together. They are calculated to inform and awaken American citizens.

PEOPLE AND PASTOR. DUTIES INVOLVED IN THE IMPORTANT RELATION. *By the Rev. Thomas Murphy, D. D.* 24mo. pp. 142. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1887.

Dr. Murphy himself is said to be one of the most successful pastors in the Presbyterian Church. As his previous works have shown, he has the matter of practical church relations, thoroughly in hand, and knows how to deal with it intelligently and helpfully. The book above named will add to his reputation. It should be generally read, for it deals with matters which few pastors can, without extreme reluctance, speak of to their own people. Attending the ministry of the pastor, criticising the sermon, bearing evil reports to the pastor, guarding his good name, paying his salary, praying for him, are some of the topics treated.

PLEADING FOR PAYER, and other sermons preached in 1886. *By C. H. Spurgeon, of London.* 12 mo. pp. 384. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1887. \$1.00.

The volume has no Introduction or Preface. But who would expect either? If the evangelical spirit, the spiritual character and the lifelong work of Charles Spurgeon have not given him the entire confidence of the Christian world, he could not gain it by words at this late day. The volume contains seventeen sermons, and while complete in itself, belongs to the series so admirably selected and published by Carter Bros.

ALL OF GRACE. An earnest word with those who are seeking salvation by the Lord Jesus Christ. *By the same.* Robert Carter & Bros. 1886. 50 cts.

ACCORDING TO PROMISE; OR THE LORD'S METHOD OF DEALING WITH HIS CHOSEN PEOPLE. *By Chas. H. Spurgeon.* A companion volume to "All of Grace." 12 mo. pp. 130. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1887. 75 cents.

These are brief practical Homilies on Scripture themes, the most of them based on appropriate texts of Scripture. They possess all the characteristics of the renowned author—spirituality, scripturalness, directness, fidelity, and experimental richness and fullness. It is a little book that cannot fail to carry cheer and comfort and strength to God's people if they will but read and heed its teachings.

GOD'S WORDS TO HIS CHILDREN. Sermons spoken and unspoken. *By George MacDonald, LL. D.*, pp. 286. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1887.

Dr. MacDonald is better known in the literary than in the theological world. For some years of his life a minister in the Congregational or Independent Church in England, he retired to devote himself to literary work, and reappeared only as a lay member of the Church of England. The sermons here collected are rich and suggestive, always characterized by magnetism, and glowing with unmistakable piety, and cause one to wonder that their writer did not devote his entire life to the sacred work.

MORNING FAMILY PRAYERS FOR A YEAR, founded on selected passages of Scripture from the Old and New Testaments, *By J. R. McDuff, D. D.* New York: Robert Carter & Bros. \$2.00.

The author's book of "Family Prayers" was issued thirty years ago and has reached a circulation of fifty-five thousand. No better proof could be given of the adaptation of this volume, beautifully printed, in large, clear type, to the many heads of families who need such aid in their daily household worship. The prayers are eminently scriptural, brief, varied and comprehensive.

HAIFA, OR LIFE IN MODERN PALESTINE. *By Laurence Oliphant, author of "The Land of Gilead,"* etc. Edited, with an introduction, by Charles A. Dana. Svo., pp. 369. New York: Harper & Bros. 1887.

This interesting account of modern Palestine consists of a series of letters originally written to the *New York Sun*. The author is a resident in the land which he describes, and is evidently either a member of or in full sympathy with the Societies which are seeking, successfully in some instances, to colonize certain portions of Palestine. As the title indicates, he deals more with the modern life and resources and hopes of the Holy Land, than with its wonderful historical associations. For this reason the book is of special value to the student. Archaeological and historical subjects, however, cannot well be avoided in any work upon Palestine, and the reader will find here enough to attract and interest him, while he is given full and accurate information concerning those topographical, commercial and agricultural features of the Land which have to do with its present or future development.

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 3.—JANUARY, 1888.

I. REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

The word Revival implies the previous existence of life ; more properly, it means resuscitation or resurrection from the dead. But according to usage, and with reference to the secondary meanings of the word *life*, it means calling into active exercise a life which has become torpid or has been slumbering. Hence, it has special application to the church, not to the world outside. In Acts 2: 41 ff. we have an account of a revival in the proper sense of the word ; for all the statements there concern the members of the visible church of God. What is commonly called a revival—a general religious movement among the unregenerate—was called by our fathers an “awakening.” There is a sense in which such an awakening may be called a revival, to-wit : a revival of God’s work, (Hab. 3 : 2)—that work of salvation, of calling in His elect—which He has been doing from the beginning. This work seems at times, and in some places, almost to cease ; the Lord seems to abandon His church and give it up to the power of Satan, as in the days of Elijah, at the crucifixion of Jesus, and in the “Dark Ages.” Then comes a time of reviving, a great movement among the dry bones, and a great multitude stand up for the Lord. (Josh. 24—1 Sam. 12.—Judg. 2.—1 Chron. 29.—Hezekiah, Josiah, the Maccabees, Pentecost, the Wilderness, the Brethren of the Common Lot, the Reformation, the Kirk of Shotts, Northampton,

the Wesleys, etc.) Great revivals have generally followed seasons of great declension, notably in our own country, the great revival of 1740-45.* They demonstrate that God does *not* forsake His church, and that the religious nature of man is indestructible.

II. The only efficient agent in producing a revival is the Holy Ghost; a revival cannot be "gotten up;" it must "come down," hence begins with prayer. Acts 2:1 ff.

III. The only instrumentality to be used is the Word of God,—bringing the soul into contact with it by reading, preaching, singing, the sacraments, and the exercise of discipline. Error may be mingled with the truth in the course of a revival; but it is the truth alone which is the means of awakening the unconvinced and of quickening the spiritual life of believers. The truth of God is seed and error is seed, (Matt. 13:24-27); and each produces according to its kind. See John 17:17, 19.

IV. Questions connected with revivals.

1. *What is to be thought of "religious excitements?"*

Answer—They are not to be indiscriminately condemned. There are excitements which destroy the balance of the soul's powers, and there are excitements which elevate and invigorate those powers while the balance is maintained. A pair of scales may be in a state of equilibrium, because both scales are empty. This may illustrate a state of indifference. Or, a weight may be put into one of them only and the other kicks the beam. This is a state of morbid excitement, and, when existing in a very high degree, a sort of phrenzy or madness. Or, equal weights may be put into both scales; the pressure is increased, but the equilibrium is preserved. This may illustrate the effect of a proper religious excitement. Such an excitement does not derange the powers of the soul. Rather, they are more thoroughly *arranged*, brought nearer to their normal state, the ideal state, which has been disturbed by sin. The reason is, that the emotions in this case are the offspring of the truth—produced by the realities which are suited to move the soul. I may illustrate my meaning by what Paul says (I Cor. 14) in reference to the excitements attending the exercise of spiritual gifts at Cor-

*See Hodge's Hist. of the Presb. Ch. Vol. II. pp. 13 ff.

inth. As to those operations of the spirit, he affirms that they tend to and are designed for edification; that their legitimate exercise is perfectly consistent with decency and order; and this because they do not destroy the self-control of those who have them. "The spirits of the prophets," says he, "are subject to the prophets." That mysterious energy of the spirit by which the prophets spoke did not so excite them as to derange them. It would not do for those Christians in their public assemblies to say that they were so carried away by the spirit, that the *afflatus* was so strong that they could not help speaking even when others were speaking. You *must* help it, says the Apostle, for God is not the author of confusion, but of decency and order; the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets. The error of the Greeks, recently emerged from heathenism, was an error implied in the very word they used for prophesying, a word near akin to that by which they expressed madness. The heathen notion of inspiration was that the *afflatus* of the divinity was too much for the feeble powers of the human organ, and consequently that his powers became deranged. The New Testament never uses the Greek word alluded to of any of God's prophets. On the contrary, it teaches that, no matter how strong the *afflatus*, "in the very torrent, tempest and whirlwind" of it, the subject thereof "must acquire and beget a temperance that may give it smoothness." The prophets were indeed sometimes overcome and prostrated by visions of God and of angels, but these were effects upon the body. Their minds were not deranged. So far is it from being true that the energy of the spirit of regeneration and of sanctification, of faith and love, of hope and joy, destroys the balance of the soul; it is, on the contrary, an energy whose principal effect is to restore that balance and especially to restore its rights and prerogatives to the conscience, that regulative and imperial faculty of the soul.

It follows from this account of the nature of religious excitements that—

(a). No excitement is to be considered as genuine because it is uncontrollable; and this, not only for the reasons already given, but also for the reason that other sorts of excitements

notoriously not religious, that is, not the effects of the gracious operations of the Spirit, are uncontrollable also. Saul was greatly excited when he lifted up his voice and wept, and said in the presence of his own men and of David and his men, "I have sinned;" but he sinned on. Judas was greatly excited when he threw down the money and declared that he had betrayed the innocent blood. But he went and hanged himself.*

(b.) No excitement is holy and genuine because the subject of it professes to have great spiritual enjoyment. See Matt. 13: 20; Mark 6: 20. "Satan," says Dr. Plumer again,† "has his devices for *pleasing* the people as well as for *disgusting* them in matters of religion. What is more calculated to gratify a carnal mind than a strong delusion leading one to think himself a Christian, and yet not disturbing his lusts? Besides, man is naturally fond of frolic, and many excitements in religion are so conducted as to suit this propensity. Unconverted men have as little enmity to a religious frolic as they have to one of another sort, provided, always, that the thing is not to last too long, and that these matters are to resume their usual course, and all parties are to be at liberty to return to their covetous practices, their selfish gratifications, their avoidance of rigid self-denial and their indulgence of sin."

(c.) Religious excitements which exist only in social and public meetings—private and closet duties being neglected—are to be suspected. After due allowance has been made for the legitimate operation of the social and sympathetic part of man's nature in the matter of public worship, it may be said with Dr. Plumer, that "when any man or number of men can pray fervently and very earnestly in a social meeting, yet when alone have but few words or little earnestness and less power, they may know that their hearts have deceived them." See Zech. 12: 10-14.

(d.) All religious excitements are to be dreaded which make men careless as to the state of their own hearts. "At no time more than in a general awakening should the extent, spirituality and holiness of the law, the unspeakable deceitfulness and wickedness of the heart, the sovereignty of God, the trying fires

*Plumer's Past. Theology, p. 236. † *Ibidem*, p. 237

of the last day, the perfectly lost and helpless state of the unregenerate, and the fulness and freeness of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, be kept constantly in view by ministers, Christians and sinners."

(e.) A religious excitement attended by "bodily exercises" is to be dreaded. Not that these exercises are proof of the spuriousness of the excitement, but that while they are as little proof of its genuineness, they are so considered by ignorant people, and the Spirit of God is dishonored. Moreover; there is more danger of self deception; that is, more people are in danger of deceiving themselves, when these exercises attend the excitement, because, by the operation of sympathy, they spread more rapidly than the ordinary signs of emotion.* Such narrations as that of Davidson will make every sober Christian pray against these exercises. It will not do, however, because these phenomena can all be accounted for upon natural principles, to say that there is no real presence of the regenerating and sanctifying Spirit in such scenes. They prove nothing either way, save that the nervous system is powerfully affected. The presence of the Spirit can be proved only by effects which are in harmony with His own blessed nature and with His Word. (John 3: 8, Gal. 5: 18-24, Eph. 4: 20 and ff.)—This leads us to the next question about revivals.

2. *What are the evidences that a genuine revival has taken place?* This question may be answered in a general way by reference to such passages as those just cited. But let us take an instance of a revival known to us by God's testimony to have been genuine, and see what the effects were—(Acts 2: 37-47.)

(a.) This revival began with a deep conviction of sin on the part of the professed people of God—the members of the Jewish Church. A so-called revival in which are not awakened the unconverted members of the church, including both the communicating and the non-communicating members, in which there

*As to the nature and varieties of these bodily exercises, see *ad nauseam*, chap. vi. of Davidson's Hist. of Presb. Church of Kentucky, pp. 142 ff. As to the propagation of them by sympathy, see same, pp. 148 ff. See also Alexander's Religious Experience, pp 77 ff.

are no "searchings of heart" and bitter bewailings of unfaithfulness on the part of the true people of God—is hardly worthy of the name. See II Chronicles, chapters 29 to 31, the revival under Hezekiah; especially chapter 30, verses 7-9, 13-19. So, also, chapter 34, the revival under Josiah, especially verses 23-33.

(b.) An increased attention to those duties of which *God* is the direct object, mainly His worship—(Acts 2: 42)—His word more valued, and the fellowship of believers in the ordinances of worship, sacraments and prayers deeper and more pronounced.

(c.) A marked increase of attention to those duties of which *believers* are the direct object, (verses 44-45.) Liberality in giving is a good sign of a genuine revival.*

(d.) An increased attention to those duties of which *the impenitent* are the direct object—(v. 47.)

In short, a revival shows itself to be genuine by its effects upon the *religious*, the *fraternal* and the *missionary* life of the church.† It is deplorable that even in our own branch of the church, the number rather than the quality of those added to its communion should be so much regarded.

3. Another question is, whether *the frequent occurrence of revivals is a test of the faithfulness of a minister of the gospel?* †

Some are called to sow, others to reap (John 4: 35-38); some are eminently qualified to awaken sinners, others to edify saints. The difference between sowing and reaping is strikingly illustrated in the foreign missionary work, which has been hitherto mainly a sowing work. The reaping done by Paul and Barnabas came after centuries of the preaching of Moses in the synagogues (Acts 15: 21). See the Acts of the Apostles, *passim*. The ingathering under the Apostles in Palestine was the reaping of that which had been sown by their Lord, (Comp. Acts 2 with John's Gospel, and Acts 8: 5-8 with John 4: 5-42.) Every

*The statistics of the General Assembly of 1887 show that while there has been an extraordinary addition to the numbers of our church, there has been little increase in the contributions. This fact, if it be a fact, is a very painful one.

† See A. Monod's Sermon, entitled, "La Vocation de l'Eglise."

‡ See Plumer's Past. Theology, chap. 21, pp. 239, 241 ff.

minister is to be faithful in his place, and leave results to God who is sovereign. See Isaiah 49: 5, 53: 1, Rom. 9: 15-16, II Cor. 2: 15-16.

4. *What means are to be used for obtaining a revival and for promoting it?**

(a) The means have been already mentioned in a general way: they are God's Word and the ordinances, mainly of worship, by which the Word may be more readily and impressively brought into contact with the heart and conscience. And here, it is of the very last importance that we should adhere to God's commands and abstain from our own inventions. We should carefully distinguish between means that God, in His sovereignty, may use, and means that He authorizes us to use. The sudden death of some one in the congregation would give great emphasis to the warnings of the minister; but no one would say that it would be right in men to cause a death in such circumstances, in order to make the truth impressive. †

(b) The means ordained of God are adapted to the nature of man as a rational and responsible being. The emotions which we ought to seek to awaken, are the emotions which the truth has a tendency to produce: and we ought to aim at no other. The means are moral, not physical in their nature: they operate

* See Plumer *ut supra* c. 22 pp. 244 ff.

† The plea so often urged that good is done, that souls are converted by the use of such measures, is a very sorry one. The answer is easy. 1. No soul is converted except by the power of God, and in pursuance of His decree of election. No man can convert a soul, whom God does not choose to convert. 2. It is the very plea by which many corruptions were introduced into the church in the third and fourth centuries. Some of the heathen were brought in and converted, but what multitudes were ultimately destroyed! The venerable Dr. John H. Rice, of Virginia, in a letter to Dr. Archibald Alexander, dated March 4th, 1828, says: "He (Mr. Nettleton) affirms that wherever these measures have been tried, they have run down any revival that may have occurred, have divided the Church, and put the judgment and feelings of all that have not been brought in utterly against religion. From the little that I saw, I would say that if good is done by these irregular means, it is done at a frightful expense. *It is like slaying hundreds to save one.*" See Dr. Maxwell's Memoir of Rice, p. 338.

morally, not mechanically. Hence, some kinds of preaching, praying, singing, administration of the sacraments, are better suited to obtain a revival than other kinds. The gifts of ministers vary. Some are better fitted to awaken, others to edify and comfort. Paul and Barnabas were sent out together, no doubt, because their gifts were not the same, and they were intended to complement each other. For the very same reason that God selected men and not angels to be preachers, the men themselves must not be all of the same mould, and the same man must not always be exactly like himself. One of the most significant statements concerning the great preachers above-mentioned, is that in Acts 14: 1, "It came to pass in Iconium that they so spake that a great multitude, both of the Jews and also of the Greeks, believed." The result was due, in part, to their manner of speech, the matter being the same gospel which they preached everywhere. The man of doctrine and the man of "consolation" (παράκλησις) both surpassed themselves on that occasion.

The odious distinction, however, between ministers indicated by the use of the phrases "revival men," or "revivalists," in application to some of them and not to others, ought never to be made. "If a revival man," says the great preacher whom we have several times quoted, "is one who loves to see hearts broken in view of the cross of Christ and labors to that end, then all converted ministers, not in a back-slidden state, are revival men. If by this distinction it is intended to designate those only who have frequent and precious seasons of refreshing, it is a wrong use of the words; for many whose ministry is exceedingly blessed are never so called. Neither can a desire to witness a day of God's power, nor soundness of evangelical views, nor earnestness in publishing the gospel, nor solid and lasting success in the ministry be pleaded as exclusively belonging to those who regard themselves as the peculiar friends of revivals." So much as to the *manner* of dispensing the word and ordinances.

As to the *matter*—the presentation of certain doctrines of the word is better suited to obtain a revival than that of others. See the Acts of the Apostles. The reading of the genealogies in the first chapters of I Chronicles—Hermann Melville relates—was

the means of awakening a careless sinner on one occasion ; but nobody would say that such a passage is as well suited to alarm and awaken as that in John 3 : 1 ff, or that in Mark 9 : 43-50, and a multitude of others that might be named. The preaching which presents "the three R's," as they were quaintly called by Rowland Hill—Ruin by sin, Redemption by Christ, Regeneration by the Spirit—is the best suited for revival because it is the preaching of the very core and marrow of the Word. (I. Cor. 1 : 17-31 ; 2 : 1-5 ; Matt. 3 : 1-12.) Let us guard against imagining that preaching to believers, dwelling upon their privileges and hopes, their temptations and perils, is not suited for revival work. Dr. Nathan L. Rice, of Kentucky, who was eminently blessed in this kind of work, is reported to have always begun a "protracted meeting" by preaching a series of sermons to believers.

It is impracticable and unnecessary to go into details upon these matters. Within the limits just stated, there is great room for variety in the forms of presenting the truth ; and this variety will be determined by the circumstances of cases and the judgment of the workman who has been taught by the Spirit rightly to divide the word of truth. The Memoirs of Dr. Nettleton contain many specimens of this variety in the mode of presenting truth both in public and in private.*

UNAUTHORIZED MEANS.

These are used in various degrees of offensiveness, often with circumstances of irreverence and indecency. In the time of Finney, the Pelagian revivalist, they were called "new measures,"

*The mention of Dr. Nettleton prompts the writer to add that the name of that great "revivalist" has been egregiously abused to sanction the use of "new measures" or "revival machinery." The truth is, he abhorred these things and wrote against them. Finney, the Pelagian, was the great worker and defender of that machinery in his day, and Nettleton was his antagonist (See Finney's Autobiography, c. 1 c). The writer was informed by a venerable minister who was an attendant upon the ministry of Dr. N., in Prince Edward County, Virginia, in 1828, that Dr. N. would not even hold "inquiry meetings" until the increase of the work made it impracticable any longer to see inquirers privately. (See Dr. John H. Rice's remarks as to Nettleton's opinion, quoted in the note on a preceding page.)

and later they have gone by the appropriate name of "revival-machinery." They embrace all those measures over and above the means which God Himself has appointed which have been invented by "evangelists" or "revival preachers" for the purpose of awakening careless sinners; such as "the anxious seat," the "altar," to which "mourners" are invited in order to be specially prayed for; the reading of letters (which, perhaps, have been procured by solicitation) from young converts or from inquirers; "silent prayer" of the congregation; the calling on certain classes in the congregation to arise and separate themselves from the rest; the roaming over the assembly of certain persons for the purpose of making appeals to individuals and of producing excitement by mere motion; the calling upon certain descriptions of people in the audience to sing certain hymns and the requiring of the rest not to sing; the demand for unusual postures in parts of the worship, as, for example, kneeling in singing, etc., etc.

There is one feature which is common to all "revival machinery;" and this is to lead awakened sinners to *commit themselves* in order to get them over that indecision and fear of man which have kept them back and to render it impossible for them to return with consistency. The measures used for bringing about this commitment are various. Some of them were described in the last paragraph. To these may be added the exacting of a promise "to give themselves to religion at once." These measures, as has been suggested, while they are intended to commit the actors, are intended also to awaken the attention of others, and to serve as means of general impressions.

Now some of the objections to this machinery are the following:

(a.) They lead to a reliance on other means than truth and prayer and on other power than that of God. Sinners are very apt to place dependence on this act of commitment. "I have taken one step, and now I hope God will do something for me" — "is language" which, Dr. Griffin says, "I have heard more than once."*

* See his letter in the appendix to Dr. Sprague's lectures on Revivals. In the same appendix may be found twenty-three letters from

(b) These measures divert the attention of the sinner from the truth of God as impressed upon his own conscience. Dr. Ichabod Spencer remarks in his *Pastor's Sketches* (we quote from memory) that he never knew anybody to be converted by a funeral sermon, and he accounts for it by the fact that those who are really afflicted by the death are too much absorbed in the contemplation of their loss to attend to the truth which is set forth by the preacher. So in this case, the sinner is not allowed to meditate upon the truth he has just heard, but his attention is called away by a proposition to change his seat. So also the congregation is invited to cease meditating upon the truth and to watch the motions of some who are walking up and down the aisles, or to be on the tip-toe of expectation to see who are going to rise and go forward. What has truth to do with these tactics? They are evidently designed to work on the senses, the imagination and the passions; they are merely for effect.*

(c.) Hence, when often repeated they become mere forms, like those of Rome. Rome ascribes a magical or a mechanical effect to her sacramental forms; a like effect is virtually ascribed to this revival machinery. In both cases, the sinner is invited to submit himself to the manipulations of the minister of religion, with the hope of "getting through," and it is no breach of charity to add that in both cases the Christians who are made are man-made and machine-made.

There is another point of resemblance. In the case neither of the priest nor of the "revivalist" is there any necessity for spiritual gifts, for a spiritual frame of mind, or for piety or any—the most eminent and venerable ministers of the time, of different denominations, such as Archibald Alexander, Francis Wayland, Samuel Miller, Edward Payson, Bishop McIlvaine, Ashbel Green, Moses Waddel, Thos. De Witt, et al.—and showing a significant agreement of views as against "the new measures." He would be a bold man who should venture to set up his opinion against such an array. Dr. Sprague's book was published in 1833.

* On the "anxious seat" and the principle of public "commitment" see remarks (Dr. Chas Hodge's?) in *Princeton Theological Essays*, 2d series, pp. 122 ff.—and Dr. Sam'l Miller's letter in the appendix to Sprague on Revivals, pp. 261 ff.

thing indeed but the power of physical endurance—and *brass*. We do not deny that some of these measures have been used by good men and with an earnest desire to do good; but there is nothing in their own nature which forbids their being used with effect by men who have not one spark of genuine piety. Accordingly we find that they have been successfully used by wicked men and hypocrites. The Roman priest performs the ceremonies of the ritual and the business is done. The character of the priest has nothing to do with the efficiency of the ritual. Whether he be a Hophni or a Zadok, makes no difference in the result. The recipient or patient "gets through" alike in either case.

(d.) This suggests another thought, that these measures most naturally affiliate with a Pelagian or semi-Pelagian system of doctrine. The mummeries of Rome have an intimate connection with the semi-Pelagian position of that body. It is not a question of vital importance which of the two was first in the order of time, the abuse in practice or the error in doctrine. If both belong to the same organism, it matters not whether the head or the foot came in first. It is enough for us to know that the head and the foot are members of the same body, and that if the one be admitted the other will be apt to follow in due time. No such ordinance as that which the Papists call baptism could have a prominent place in a body which was not at least semi-Pelagian in doctrine. And so it may be truly said that the machinery in question is thoroughly semi-Pelagian in its affinities. It was introduced in modern times by churches of that doctrinal tendency; it was worked *con amore* by the Pelagianizing party in the Presbyterian Church in the years preceding the schism of 1837, and if not condemned again and put down, it will bring on another semi-Pelagian schism or something worse. It is altogether out of harmony with the doctrine of our church concerning the agency of the Holy Ghost in regeneration. One or the other must, in the long run, be given up.

The connexion here asserted between Pelagianism and the use of revival machinery is fully vindicated by the history of the famous revivalist, Charles G. Finney. In a review of his sermons in the *Princeton Review* for 1835 (republished in the

Princeton Theological Essays, 2d Series, pp. 77 ff) it was shown that he denied the doctrines of total depravity, of regeneration (in the Calvinistic sense), of the direct agency of the Holy Ghost upon the soul, etc.; that he held to the notion of the "self-determining power of the will," and to the related doctrine of sin and holiness as consisting in volitions only, etc., etc. He asserted the perfect, unqualified ability of the sinner to regenerate himself (pp. 103 ff.) The great aim and effort of the preacher is to persuade the sinner to convict himself. Hence the use of extra measures. He says (page 83), "God has found it *necessary to take advantage* of the excitability there is in mankind to produce powerful excitements among them before He *can* lead them to obey." "There is a state of things in which it is *impossible for* God or man to promote religion but by painful excitement."

(e). The use of this machinery brings a multitude of unconverted people into the church who would not otherwise come into it. The appeal is made to mere natural sensibilities and sympathies; people, especially the young, honestly mistake this natural feeling and mere impressions on the imagination for religious conviction or for the sentiments which result from religious convictions, and without time for testing their sentiments and for manifesting their real nature and origin, they are hurried into the church and assume the irrevocable vow. A few months are sufficient to reveal the fact of self-deception to a multitude of these "converts;" but they are in the church; they commit, the greater part of them, no "offence" to warrant their excommunication; and they remain in the church, while they are of the world. Hence another fruitful source of apostasy from the faith. By the terms of the supposition, such church members have no spiritual relish for the distinctive truths of the gospel; in particular, there is nothing in them which says amen to the teachings of God's Word concerning the desperate power and malignity of sin, and concerning the almighty and sovereign power of the Holy Ghost. The real problem of sin has never been anxiously revolved by them, and they are, consequently, unable to appreciate the Bible soteriology, whether

of the Son or of the Spirit. Now, as a spiritual experience of the power and reality of the truth is the only security for its preservation; as it is the presence of the invisible church within the body of the church visible which determines and perpetuates the faith,* it is plain that the church, in which the greater part is unconverted, is in danger of losing its faith. The world in the church!—this is the great peril. This is doing more to help the cause of Rome and of infidelity than all the crafty books that are circulated in their interest. This is the peril against which the church has been warned from the very beginning; and it is a peril into which the use of revival machinery is aiding to plunge us.

(f.) There is an argument *ad hominem*, which may be addressed to Presbyterians in our own churches, and which ought to be conclusive with them against these “measures,” even if they are not convinced that the measures are in themselves wrong, and that is that they are a clear addition to the covenant which has been made with one another by the congregations constituting “the Presbyterian Church in the United States.” This covenant is contained in our standards. We have agreed as to what “the ordinances in a particular church” shall be, (Form of Government, chapter 2, section 4, article 5,) and in the “Directory for Worship” the features of the worship to be observed in all our congregations are described. No congregation has the right to introduce any other form of worship, and at the same time remain a constituent part of that church to which these standards belong. It is not improbable that many machinery-using churches in our communion would be scandalized by the introduction into our non-machinery using churches of a liturgy. But why should they? The covenant is violated, it is true; but the machinery has also broken it. We do not hesitate to say, that if the covenant has to be broken in one way or the other, we should consider the breach by liturgy much the least offensive and dangerous of the two.

* See this point ably illustrated in the discourse delivered by Dr. Latimer, on the occasion of his inauguration as Professor of Church History and Polity in Union Seminary in Virginia.

(g.) This part of the discussion may be appropriately closed by a testimony or two of the General Assembly. There are many testimonies of this sort, as may be seen by consulting Baird's Digest, Book 3, Part 4, which bears the title, "Revivals." We shall content ourselves with a quotation or summary from the pastoral letter of the Assembly of 1832, of which the venerable James Hoge was Moderator :

"1. In a time of the revival of religion let it be remembered, that while all proper means are to be used to deepen and cherish serious impressions and to awaken and alarm the sinfully secure, *an undue excitement should be carefully avoided.* If instead of distinguishing between deep and genuine and salutary convictions of sin, and the mere effusions of animal passions and nervous sensibility, the latter are encouraged and stimulated, as leading to a desirable issue, the most baneful effects are likely to ensue—effects, multiform in appearance and character, but in all, deplorable and pernicious. Therefore, 2. We advise, that with tenderness, but yet with unshaken firmness, all bodily agitations and noisy outcries, especially in worshipping assemblies, be discouraged, and as far as possible prevented. 3. Guard against every species of *indecorum in social worship*, such particularly, as is manifestly apparent when several individuals pray or exhort or converse at the same time. 6. *Let not the settled order of churches be disturbed.* In the absence of pastors or other authorized ministers of the gospel, let the elders or deacons or other Christians of standing and experience, rather than young converts, take the lead in the social exercises of religion. 7. *Listen to no self-sent or irregular preachers*, whatever may be their pretensions to knowledge, piety and zeal. 8. Let no doctrine inconsistent with the Scriptures as explained and summarily taught in *the doctrinal standards of our church* be promulgated and favoured in any of our churches. 9. *Let not apparent converts be hurried into the churches*, and brought to the Lord's table, without a careful examination; nor ordinarily without a suitable period of probation, by which the reality of their religion may be better judged of than it can be by any sudden indications, however plausible. Nothing is more directly calculated to injure the cause

of God and the credit of our holy religion than *urging or permitting individuals to make a public profession of religion*, as soon as they have experienced some serious impressions, and flatter themselves that they have been renewed in the temper of their mind. All experience shows that such persons often and speedily dishonour the profession, and not unfrequently become open apostates, and sometimes avowed infidels. 10. Finally—*let no measures for the promotion of religious revivals be adopted*, which are not sanctioned by some example, or precept, or fair and sober inference, drawn from the word of God. . . . If such a warrant can be fairly made out, let the measure be adopted; but otherwise, let it be promptly abandoned; for it must be remembered that the Bible contains not only a *safe*, but a *complete* rule of duty.” The italics in this extract are in the original as printed in the Digest. (Ed. Phila. 1885, pp. 199 ff.)

The opinions of the most eminent ministers of the past generation, as given in the appendix to Sprague’s Lectures on Revivals, are in the same line with these testimonies of the Assembly of 1832; but we must content ourselves with a simple reference to that work. Under these testimonies and opinions we shelter ourselves from those, if there be any, of our readers who are disposed to charge us, on the ground of the views we have expressed, with being hostile to revivals and to vital piety. The same charge was brought against our fathers—men with whom we would not venture to compare ourselves for a single moment as to knowledge or piety.

A few words may be added upon the danger to the peace and character of the church from so-called “evangelists.” Our history is instructive upon this subject. The schism of 1741 was occasioned, in great part, by the excesses and extravagances of itinerating ministers who, instead of preaching in destitute neighborhoods, invaded the pastoral charges of settled ministers, often without their consent, or with a consent extorted by the clamors of the people. The greatest contempt was shown for these settled ministers, no matter how long or how faithfully they had labored, if they had not been what the evangelists were pleased to consider “successful.” They were treated as “blind leaders of

the blind," cold-hearted, unconverted; and their people were not only encouraged but exhorted to forsake their ministrations for those of the warm-hearted, zealous, inspired evangelists. These evangelists were generally good men; among them such men as Whitefield and the Tennents; but this fact made the results all the more deplorable. See Hodge's History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, part II. chaps. 4 and 5.

Another great evil which resulted from the same causes was the lowering or the attempt to lower the standard of the education of the ministry, and the encouragement to the laity to usurp the functions of the ministry. These two things go hand in hand as we see now, in our own times. If preaching is nothing but exhorting sinners to flee from the wrath to come, why may not an uneducated, zealous layman do it as well as a trained and ordained minister? Thus the order of Christ's house was broken down; and but for the faithful testimony and labors of the noble men who were stigmatized as "graceless and unconverted" (see the extraordinary sermon of Gilbert Tennent, in Hodge's Hist. of Presb. Ch. Part II. pp. 152 ff), the Presbyterian Church would have been ruined. Let it be added, with thanksgiving to God, that some of these good but erring men afterwards confessed their error and deplored their uncharitable judgments and speeches.

THOS. E. PECK.

*History repeats itself. Carolstadt, the contemporary and friend of Luther, denounced human learning as useless, if not injurious to the student of Scripture; went into the shops of the lowest mechanics and consulted them about the meaning of difficult places in the Bible; insisted that ministers ought not to study, but to support themselves by the labor of their own hands; persuaded the students of the Wittenberg University to abandon their studies and even the boys in the lower schools to throw aside their books and enter immediately upon the business of religious teaching. Carolstadt persevered in his unhappy course for years; and although he afterwards came, in great measure, to his senses, acknowledged his fault and professed to mourn over it, still the cause of truth had been dishonored, and incalculable mischief done, which it was impossible to recall. See the admirable letter of Dr. Samuel Miller in the appendix to Sprague's book before cited, pp. 248 ff. Well might Baxter say—"The work of God is divine; but our mode of dispensing it is human; and there is scarcely anything we have the handling of, but we leave on it the prints of our fingers."

II. BOARDS IN THE NORTHERN CHURCH.

The occasion of the division of the Presbyterian Church was the adoption of the Spring resolutions by the General Assembly in 1861. The causes of that rupture, for they were many, lay back of 1861 or anything done by the Assembly of that year.

We propose to deal in this article with one of these causes only, indulging the hope that others will present through this *Review*, and before the meeting of the next General Assembly, other causes quite as potent as the one here presented.

Had there been no war, still the rupture would have come ; and should the two churches unite again under the welding heat of sentiment which is already being warmed up for the centennial year at Philadelphia, there will certainly be another division after the cooling down of the pathetic, when the time comes for actual work. Or we might more properly say the division will come in *our* church rather than have the reunion. The true Presbyterian Church, as we find it set forth in the word of God, can never, in loyalty to Christ, carry on her work by a system of *Boards*, such as is now being operated by the Northern General Assembly. And it may be further asserted that it is the fixed purpose of that Northern Assembly not to abandon its Boards or their system of working.

Those Boards are *unscriptural* and therefore *unpresbyterial*. When the Constitution of the entire Presbyterian Church in America was adopted, there was no such thing known to the church as *Boards*. Not one of them had an existence. The theory of that Constitution "was that the supervision and control of every church within the bounds of every Presbytery, and connected with it, as well as the aggressive mission work within those bounds, belonged exclusively to that Presbytery." The Board system supervened, gradually gaining strength. If our recollection is not at fault, the first determined effort to get rid of them was made very soon after the rupture of 1837-38. And after a trial of sixteen years, the battle to drive them out of the church and substitute committees, as we now have them in the Southern Church, waxed so warm that one of the most distin-

guished men of the many who did honor to our church in the days of our fathers, in a calm review of the Boards, and the aggressions which they had made upon the fundamental principles of our Bible Presbyterianism, used this language: "Great issues are at stake, and constant changes needful. And changes must come, the more for the peace of the church if they come through natural channels,—but come they must, either peaceably or forcibly, through the Boards or over the Boards." As far back as 1848 the great ability of Dr. Plumer was put to its utmost tension in a very exhaustive report on the one single question of *economy* to the church, without attempting to justify the existence of any such external human machinery to carry on the church's work of evangelizing the world. But when he had given battle in that low plane he was utterly routed. Had it been possible, but it was not, to find in the Scriptures a plea for the establishment of these external agencies, still there was not even an *excuse* for operating them, as they were then operated. The well established fact was, that the responsibility to the General Assembly was a mere *nominal* responsibility, while the patronage of the Boards and their secretaries was sufficient at all times to hold the balance of power in the General Assembly. The only guarantee left to the church against an absolute usurpation of power was a guarantee contingent upon the personal integrity of a set of men who knew they had the reins in their own hands, and might coax or drive the church to any extreme.

While the *power* of these Boards was almost unbounded, and certainly unrestrained, it was exercised in such a way as to embolden these secretaries to a still greater stretch of that power. They in a number of cases were chosen by a bare quorum of less than one-third of the members of the Board, and in one case it stands as history that—"one Secretary was elected by a majority of *one* vote, which one vote was subsequently discovered to have been given in mistake by a gentleman who did not know even that he was *not* a member of the Board." This officer continued to *hold* after the fact was discovered, and exercised and performed all the functions of his office, with such an

influence over four or five hundred men as might, in the nature of the case, fall to him, when these men felt that their support really depended upon him.

All these facts and all this danger to the church and her great work were not hid away in a corner. They "excited alarm," and were brought prominently before the old church in the annual meetings of her Assemblies.

The actual facts and their evil consequences were exposed and laid bare before the church by some of the best and ablest men from the South—true blue men, the ring of whose orthodoxy was like the ring of silver. How were they met? Let us turn to some of the journals and reviews of the old church, and some deliverances of her Assemblies and see. Perhaps as hot a contest as had been made up to that time was an effort in the General Assembly of 1854, to bring the church as near as possible to the true Scripture idea of doing her own work. That Assembly and its doings, especially touching the Boards, were extensively handled in the public prints, both North and South. Many of these are in the possession of this writer, but one extract will be a true sample of the spirit of the whole Northern press at that time. We quote the *Biblical Repertory*, July, 1854, p. 560. "Dr. Musgrave closed the debate by one of the most effective speeches delivered on the floor of the Assembly for a long time," and further, on page 561: "The sense of the house was so strongly evinced in favour of Boards and in opposition to merely speculative objections to their existence that we presume the controversy will not be renewed." The power and authority of the church had been handed over to an outside corporation, a human institution, irresponsible to the church in any higher sense than a mere nominal responsibility. When the tried and loyal men from the South demanded a restoration to the church of her true power and authority, they were met with, "The sense of the house was so strong in favour of the Boards, that the controversy will not be renewed." But the presumption was unwarranted, for the controversy was renewed again and again, until Thornwell made that masterly argument at Rochester which to this day remains unanswered and unanswerable. The *wedge*

was there *driven*, and any casual observer could see that the split was inevitable; the fibres were cracking and breaking from one end of the log to the other. There was then no war, no man had been elected president on a purely sectional platform, the avowed purpose of which was hostile to the old union. And yet the church was going apart—certainly going apart on this question of Boards. The slavery question had been settled by the Assembly of 1844 on *scriptural* grounds. Less important issues could be postponed.

But the Board question could not be settled. It was up before every General Assembly. The North was in the ascendancy then, as it would be now if there should be another union, and having seized the church by the throat, that majority grappled with her till it tore from her the chartered and vested right to manage her own affairs. And having transferred that right to these Boards, it was never their purpose to come back to the scriptural doctrine. That doctrine still lives in the hearts of many of the sons of those Southern men; but when they now rise to its defence they are met with the statement, “you are waving the old Confederate flag.” There was no “Confederate flag” in the days of our fathers, and yet they contended with more earnest determination than many of their sons of to-day are doing.

The New School church, which is now the *magna pars* of the Northern church, had adopted a voluntary system, a human device, a batch of wet nurses for the church of God. The notion rapidly grew and became almost universal that the *church* as such could do nothing. If it was at all an organization of the people of God it must still look to human contrivances to carry on its work. In itself it was feeble and utterly incompetent to the work.

That church was keenly watching this conflict, and not unfrequently gave a blow when they saw an opportunity. The whole attempt was to force the South to abandon the idea that “the church was the agent of God to do his work: to *do* it, not to *see it done*: to do *his work* and no other work.” Voluntary associations of every class and kind to do all sorts of work, good and bad, had risen in the East as rapidly and rank as potato sprouts

in a hotbed. It was, at that time, claimed and rightly claimed that the idea of Boards was on *Eastern idea*. It was not claimed to be scriptural, but it was better than Scripture. It was Eastern! It was Puritan! It was Yankee!

With his whole mental vision focused upon this one idea, the great leader of the New School, Albert Barnes, uttered these words, "Virginians and Kentuckians and all the people south and west of them have a peculiar prejudice against Eastern people, or 'Yankees,' as they call them * * * an intense horror of having the Presbyterian Church Yankeeified." There was more in the remark than even Mr. Barnes understood with his semi-Pelagian theology and Erastian church government. He wondered, as do his followers to-day, why Southern people could not abandon principle and conviction and pass quiescently over to their ideas—we had almost said to their convictions and principles; but why should mention be made of things which may be in fancy only, for there may be ideas which are not principles, and notions which are not convictions. The rapid strides of power made by these Boards in the old church reached its highest pitch, perhaps, when Dr. Janeway, Secretary of the Home Mission Board, during the late war, issued his orders that *home missionaries* along the line of the border States would not be allowed any salary from the Board's treasury till they could give to Secretary Janeway satisfactory *proof* of their loyalty to the Federal Government! This writer remembers well reading one of these infamous orders. He will never forget the anxious concern and distressed expression upon the face of that missionary, as he said, "This *order* will starve my children. Had I better take that oath and feed and clothe my family?" This was the power of a Board and its secretary, the natural, legitimate outgrowth of what the church had been sowing. It was the *exercise* of the power of a Board over the heritage and people of God. The church was made thus to play the mistress to her inferior, her garments were rolled in filth, for she was sporting with the ungodly. But never in that day, or this, has that church uttered one word of disapproval or censure. And,

indeed, how could she and still retain Boards to do the work she should do herself?

But some one may say, doubtless will say, "Those were war times, and now they and all their sad scenes and memories should forever pass or be buried out of sight. The Northern Assembly has given up that *one man* power, and their mode of procedure now is very much like our own." Well, when the brother gets through such pious meditations and reflections, I would be glad to call his attention to the following extract, where he will see the "strong hand" of the *one man* reaching out over "standing committees and departments" as the "ultimate authority:"

NORTHERN ASSEMBLY—BOARD OF PUBLICATION AND SABBATH-SCHOOL WORK.

By the action of the last General Assembly the name of the Board of Publication has been changed and now is, "The Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work." The colportage and Sabbath-school work are consolidated in one department. The executive officers of the Board are: the Rev. Elijah R. Craven, D. D., Secretary; the Rev. James A. Woren, D. D., Superintendent of Sabbath-school and Missionary Work; the Rev. J. R. Miller, D. D., Editorial Superintendent; Mr. John A. Black, Business Superintendent. In the work of the Board hereafter the missionaries are to give special attention to the organization of new Sabbath-schools in destitute places.

Thenew by-laws make the Secretary, Rev. Dr. Craven, the chief executive officer of the Board. Formerly each Standing Committee and department acted in some measure upon their own discretion and often in conflict with the policy of some other branch of the great work, with no ultimate authority except by the vote of a large Board. It has a head now, and a good one, who will hold the helm wisely and with a strong hand when needed. The reduction of the Board from forty-eight to twenty-four members will give efficiency to its operations.—*St. Louis Evangelist.*

Dr. Craven is vested with quite as much power by the "last General Assembly" in Sunday-school matters as Dr. Janeway was in Home Missions; and if not to *exercise* them, for what purpose? This one man power is to be exercised upon the part of Dr. Craven, as Secretary of a Board, and is vested in him by one of the by-laws of that Board. But the Northern Assembly went much further than this and gave, by its actions on Home Missions, one of the most ominous signs of spiritual despotism

ever adopted by any General Assembly before or during the war. We refer to the rule which empowers the Board to take to itself in its Missionary Synods the fee simple title to church buildings aided by their money. This rule works to enslave congregations in the frontier and destitute parts of the country. The resemblance between this tenure and that of popish churches in the Bishops, with the same tyrannical consequences, forces itself upon every thinking man in our church. It makes one recoil from the very thought of *organic union* or any other kind of union with a body holding such views and vesting such powers in its Boards.

Ecclesiastical Boards are based upon the idea of *independency or congregationalism* in Church government. They are contrivances patched up and suited to a form of church government which denies a scriptural bond of union so perfect and unique in itself that it logically passes from Session to Presbytery, Presbytery to Synod, Synod to Assembly. If there is union at all with those who advocate Boards, it is imperfect union, *not* intended to be *lasting*. The union must come from without not from within, spring out of and be dependent upon political relations. There can be no lasting and durable concert of action, for there is no internal bond of union. They never can be worked therefore in a Presbyterian Church system. Two forces cannot co-operate in any system except they be agreed. The Presbyterian Church being a divinely ordained institution, has to violate its own principles to work harmoniously with Boards. Their principles and the principles of the church cannot be in active operation at the same time without being in conflict. The church never can do her work with them half as well as she can do it without them. They belong not to her, and they are not in accord with her. They may answer a purpose in churches where no high conception of government prevails than is found in those practices which govern nominating conventions and political or social assemblies. But for a church like ours, with a perfect system of government, "recognizing no external agency with any right to interfere," systematically organized for the Master's work, they hinder, retard and obstruct that work. Where they act to the full extent

of their power, church action must cease, and when the church acts with vital force and power the Boards must cease.

One of the most pointed verifications of this truth we find in an editorial of a recent date in one of the Northern Presbyterian journals. The editor is trying to enlighten one of our Southern ministers on the subject of Boards. I sometimes read his paper because I find in it a kind of editorial smartishness which enables him to say some sharp things without knowing it, and some truthful things without anticipating the effect of the rebound.

“Dear Bro. Lapsley:—One of the evils which we are inclined to complain of in our branch of the church is that the Assemblies interfere with the Boards too much. The Assembly has as absolute control of the Boards as you have over your children, or the merchant over his clerks. Some of the Boards are protected from too much regulating by committees of the Assembly by the nature of their work; for example, Foreign Missions. But the Board of Publication is in easy reach and the wonder is that it is not dead long ago. There has not been an Assembly since the re-union which has not gone for that Board with axes and saws and augers to ‘improve’ it. Next to that comes Home Missions. We had a hard tussle of it a few years ago to prevent the giving of every Presbytery absolute power over the Board. They would have made 210 pieces of it. We compromised by giving each Presbytery absolute control of the work of the Board in the Presbytery’s own bounds. The Presbytery makes out a catalogue of its requirements in men and money. The men are provided by the Presbytery. The Board are (is) allowed to discriminate in regard to the money so that the whole sum shall be evenly and justly distributed with regard to necessity and utility. But for that one saving clause which leaves the funds in the control of the Assembly”—(The fact is, the funds are left in the control of the Board. See minutes of Northern Assembly, 1883, pp. 643 and 644, which is the rule of the Board to-day), “that Board would break down.”—*The Interior, in June, 1887.*

That is a very strange and *funny* piece of composition. The

Assembly "has as much control—as a father over his children—a merchant over his clerk," But he must not exercise that control. If a father should "go for" his children "with axes, and saws and augers" it must follow that there is something fearfully wrong about either father or child. And in the dilemma the *Interior* can take its choice. The fact that when a child "is in easy reach" of its parent the "wonder is that it is not dead long ago" forces the conclusion that something is wrong, and dreadfully wrong, with either parent or child. If the relationship existing between a merchant and his clerk is such that the interference of the merchant will be disastrous to the clerk, then, to say the very least of it, they cannot work together, and for the good of the merchant they ought to go apart. If the safety of a child consists in getting as far away from the parent as possible, the child must be a dreadfully bad child or the father a fearfully cruel father. Certainly they are not in harmony and it might be well for both to separate them entirely. But they finally "compromised" with the Presbytery, and that "one clause" saved the Board from "breaking down." Compromises always imply differences so wide that they cannot be reconciled and therefore both parties must surrender something, each to the other. We then have the church *surrendering* part of her *principles* to bring her into harmony with her Boards. They also surrender part of their *principles*. Then the two must be, fundamentally, very far apart.

We thank the *Interior* for the article. But some one will say, "that article is taken from a Northern Presbyterian journal, but we want to know what the Northern Assembly says." Very well; let us see. That Assembly met this year" (1887) in Omaha, Nebraska. The Committee of *Home Missions* made its report on the sixth day. The report was adopted unanimously. We copy from the report:

"9. Distribution of Resources.—As to the proportion of money to be used in the various forms of work, [School work and Church work], conducted by the Board, we refer to the Board itself without instruction. So many special providences of an open door and the money to enter it, have been granted by our good Lord, that we believe it best for the Board to follow his leadings day by day."

And again from the same report :

“ All instructions are hereby removed and the Board is bidden to go anywhere in this broad land in accord with the Presbyteries on the ground, wherever they find the most hopeful opening to make the best use of all the moneys they can possibly get.”

Just how much is meant by “ accord with the Presbyteries ” will be clearly seen a few pages further on in this article.

Here is a complete handing over to be done by *human contrivance* “ without instruction,” and with “ all restrictions removed,” the very work which God committed to His church, to do, *as a church*. The Assembly having thus with presumptuous imbecility confessed herself *unfaithful*, finds an abundance of time to devote to *secular and political* matters, as in the “ complaint of Rev. J. H. Baird against the Synod of Pennsylvania for favoring a prohibition amendment ” to the State Constitution.

There has been for a long time a “ remnant ” in the Northern Assembly dissatisfied with the *modes of operation* of the Board of Home Missions rather than the *fact of its existence*.

In 1880, “ overtures were received from seventeen Presbyteries and one Synod asking for the appointment of a special committee to consider the modes of operation of the Board of Home Missions in its relations to the Presbyteries.” The committee was appointed and to it “ the overtures were referred, with instructions to meet in conference with the Board of Home Missions in New York to afford opportunity to the Memorialists or any of the lower judicatories of the church, or any minister or elder to present their views and to confer with the Board concerning any measures which, in the judgment of either, might tend to increase the efficiency of the Board in the good work committed to its care. The committee was also instructed to report to the next Assembly.”

It may here be observed that the above action exalts the Board into the dignified position of a *court*, and the memorialists, “ seventeen Presbyteries and one Synod,” are lowered to the position of *petitioners* to whom an “ opportunity ” is “ afforded ” to “ present their views ” before the Board at its place of business in New York. It may further be noted that the

whole work of Home Missions is "committed" to it—the Board.

This committee was continued and enlarged by the Assembly of 1881, "and to the Assembly of 1882, they made a report, recommending the adoption of certain principles and rules of action for the Board which a majority of the committee believed would tend to increase the Board's efficiency and remove that dissatisfaction with some of its modes of operation, which the overtures and other communications submitted to the committee revealed as existing in some considerable quarters of the church, and which the committee also believed would tend to bring all the Presbyteries more fully into harmony and earnest co-operation with the Board in the great work committed to it."

It may be noted here that the fact is made very prominent that the work of Home Missions is committed to the Board. The Presbyteries, even in their own bounds, are to "play second fiddle" to the Board. For "to it" the "great work is committed." This committee made its final report in 1883, which was amended and adopted.

"In lieu of the principles and rules recommended to the last Assembly, we now propose for adoption the following :

"1. Within the bounds of a Presbytery the work of the Board of Home Missions should be carried on in harmony with the Presbytery, according to the principles and rules hereinafter stated; but discretion should be allowed to the Board in outlying districts, where direct Presbyterial control is difficult or impracticable.

"2. The Board should not, in ordinary cases, decline to grant an appropriation recommended by a Presbytery, unless in its judgement, after viewing the whole field to be supplied, it should appear that the funds at its disposal are all needed for more deserving or more promising work, and whether it does thus appear must be determined by the Board. But in all questions touching the organization of churches, or the character of ministers, the Board, in case of difference between itself and the Presbytery, should abide by the final judgement of the Presbytery.

"3. The formal issuing of commissions should be discontinued and in lieu thereof the Board shall issue to the missionary an agreement for the amount to be paid him."

These are the "principles and rules" to govern the Board in its relations to the Presbyteries.

The first one of these rules brings out two facts.

1st. That there are in the bounds of every Presbytery *two* bodies vested with partial jurisdiction, the Board and the Presbytery,—the one a divinely appointed *court*, the other a humanly constructed *machine*.

2d. That the *court* has only partial and co-ordinate jurisdiction in parts of its own bounds, but no jurisdiction at all in the other parts of its bounds, while the *machine* has co-ordinate and equal jurisdiction in some parts of the bounds of the Presbytery and *absolute jurisdiction* in the remaining part, with no rule, law or principle to govern it, except its own discretion. And to the *machine* the work is committed.

The second one of these rules brings out the facts,

1st. That the Board has *all the power of the purse*.

2nd. That the Board can refuse to grant aid to any Presbytery and put *all* its money in Texas or Florida to the utter starving of missionaries in the great northwest if “it shall appear that the funds at its disposal are *all* needed for more deserving and more promising work,” and whether it does thus appear, must be “determined by the Board.”

This, perhaps, is the explanation of the fact, that notwithstanding that Board is always reported behind with its finances, nevertheless it has funds for Texas or Florida whenever a sickly little church, or an unemployed minister can be reached and captured by the Board’s agents in these States. And it may suggest another fact, that if organic union were effected these churches and preachers would have to take care of themselves. For there would be no further need then to “compass land and sea to make one proselyte.” Churches or preachers who can be bought up by a promise of money to build houses, which when finished do not reach the value of “California box houses,” or a promise of a little money to pay salaries for a few years, will never amount to anything, in any way. When the money runs out, both the churches and the preachers will run down. The writer knows of two or three instances of this kind in Texas. The money is no longer supplied and the houses are deserted to bats, or converted into sheep sheds, or rented for other purposes, and the preachers are drifting about in various

agencies. The principle is a wrong one, and we do not fear it. The people must learn that the most lasting churches are those where the people help themselves. A church which will not give its own money to support its own cause, build its own house, and support its own preacher is thoroughly *heretical*.

It is the duty of the minister to teach and enforce this great truth, and the agent of a Board who comes among our churches and teaches our people that all these things which they should do for themselves will be done by his Board, for them, is "worse than an infidel." He will find when the loaves and fishes are exhausted they will "walk no more with him."

But there is one thing to which most serious and earnest objection is here offered. It is the constant twaddle about "our common Presbyterianism." The Presbyterianism must be *very common* indeed that can want to co-operate with, or take part in, a system of church work carried on as the Northern Assembly carries on its work in the South, especially in Texas. Our people should be taught and shown that the differences between the two churches are *real* differences, so numerous and so serious that they cannot be removed, that the two churches are not agreed in either *principle* or *polity*. When we find a Northern Presbyterian church in one of our towns or cities, we should treat it, when it deserves to be so treated, with the same Christian courtesy and fraternal regard extended by us to any other evangelical denomination. We should no more hesitate to establish a church where they have one than we would to do the same thing, where we find any other denomination of Christians, Cumberland, Baptists, or Methodists. When their people move among us, we should lay no special claim to them more than we would to a Congregationalist, for it is a fact that the Northern and Southern Presbyterian churches are not one; that is one of the fallacies by which they pick up many of our people on the frontier, saying, "we are all one," when we are not one. Neither are the churches separate parts of a whole, which are to be brought into one. Waiving the question of interpretation of the *Confession of Faith* where the difference is really greater and more serious than any difference which ever

existed in this country between two great political parties as to the interpretation of the *Constitution* of the *United States*, waiving also the question of the wide difference between them as to the secular and spiritual power of the courts of the church, we declare that the two can never work together on any plan of co-operation now known to either. The following facts will make this clear :

1st. The Southern Presbyterian Church, as a church, demands a perfect and entire conformity to the word of God in all her practical work, no less than in the formulas of her faith. The model of the church is the work of the Almighty. Her doctrine is revealed by Him, and the *order of procedure* is furnished by Him. To the church as a spiritual commonwealth He has committed the means of saving His people out of the world. He has made the church perfect in all her parts for the accomplishment of every end to which she is called. For this He has furnished a *form of church government*, beginning with the deacon and up through all the courts to the very highest, the *methods* for work, in which are the most perfect that can be instituted for effectually doing whatever is to be done. He has enjoined upon her to do steadily and unremittingly all that her ability enables her to do, and with that doing there is a promise of accruing ability to do more, until the world by her shall be brought to Him.

This simple, beautiful, scriptural system, addressed directly to the faith of God's people, has been characterized by the representatives of the Northern Assembly as the "*Jus divinum* theory in its dotage."

2d. The Northern Presbyterian Church, as a church, holds that the church of God, as organized, is not sufficient to do the work of the Master. She takes refuge behind many kinds of human contrivances, and fluctuates between the word of God and the ingenuity of man. It is this defect in her system which gave rise to all her voluntary societies. Declaring herself insufficient to do the work, she professes to be all sufficient to commit it to human contrivances, by them to be done. And then, strange to say, gives herself to work which was never addressed

to either her faith or practice. She thus takes a position which *revolutionizes* the whole theory of the church, as it is found in the Word. For that Word says the church must do the work of the Master, and *she* says the Master's work may be *committed* into the hands of Boards, and all that is required of her is to *see* that the work is done.

The germs of revolutions are seldom seen by the masses. But when they have progressed sufficiently to take shape and form they often claim to be fighting in defence of, and to propagate, those very principles which they are certain to overthrow and destroy. The seeds of apostasy are planted, and grow, and ripen in a similar way. There was at first simply a defection in the Northern Church from the one simple doctrine of the Scriptures that the *church of Christ is herself a great Missionary Society*, "competent, in her organized capacity, and fully provided in her constitution, with all the agencies for carrying on her work." This simple defection enthroned itself in the bosom of that church, and she at once become as incompetent to do her work *herself* as the *Congregational Church*, out of whose defects, at this very point, grew up all voluntary associations, church fairs, lotteries and raffles, which prevail to such an alarming extent in the North, and are gradually working their way into the South. The result is that instead of showing the Lord's people that their money must come into the Lord's treasury as a part of the actual worship of God, come in faith, and as a religious act, commemorating our Lord, and our devotion and obedience to Him, come as the widow's mite came when He himself sat over against the treasury watching the rich men cast in of their abundance—that church teaches, that the *Boards* will use "all the money they can possibly get."

But it is claimed that the defection is after all a mere difference in method and amounts to but little. An ex-moderator of our own Assembly while arguing in favor of organic union found that our church had been granted the legal power, if she so chose, to "have Committees, or Boards, or Agencies," and then declared that he had found a provision in our own *charter for Boards* that we therein recognized "Boards" as an agency for carrying

on church work. Of course that class of men see no difference. And they invariably let out the true inwardness when they try to settle this great question as a matter of sentiment; even to the boast that they "were deeper down in the rebellion and did more fighting than some who are now opposed to organic union." But these gentlemen might be reminded of the fact, that *Benedict Arnold* did more fighting in the Revolution than either *Thos. Jefferson* or *Alexander Hamilton*. True men, the world over, commend these patriots for maintaining their independence after *Benedict* had renewed his loyalty to George the Third. It is not a mere sentiment. It is a principle and has enough in it to reach across the whole diameter of revealed truth. It has enough in it to change the position of the church towards God and man, towards His people and a ruined world. And, formulated under the name of Boards and put to work, it is ready to traverse the doctrines of the Reformation and confront the teachings of the Apostles.

But the question comes up, is the church not bound to work through means of some kind, and has not the Northern church done a grander work through her Boards than our church through her committees?

To the first of these questions we answer yes. But the means must be *legitimate*. It must not be the fruit or product of the church entering into a free-love copartnership with a gay and godless world. The command to "multiply and replenish the earth" can never be pleaded to justify any woman in rearing a house full of illegitimate children. Some have overlooked and others have preferred not to see that in our church the work is committed to the *Presbyteries* and that is the *starting* point. The work is thus in the hands of a church court and under its control. In the Northern church, the work is to be operated not by a church court, but by a human contrivance called a *Board*. In our church, the Presbytery controls the missionary and regulates his pay, he drawing it through the Presbyterial Committee. In the Northern church the "Board shall issue to the missionary an agreement for the amount to be paid him." Certainly our committee at Atlanta would never attempt to issue an agree-

ment with a missionary as to his salary, and then send him to Texas without even consulting the Presbytery into whose bounds he proposed to come and do his work. The Presbytery is the only court vested with authority or power to allow him to labor within her bounds and that power must not be infringed by the Assembly itself, much less by an agent which it had no authority from the word of God to create or employ.

The second of these questions may be answered by a comparative view of the progress of the two churches for the last five years:

COMPARATIVE VIEW OF THE PROGRESS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHUCHES,
NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN, FOR THE LAST FIVE YEARS.

Increase of Members.

In the Northern Church	16	per cent.
In the Southern Church	18	1-2 "
Sabbath-schools, Northern Church	16	1-3 "
Sabbath-schools, Southern Church	25	1-2 "

Additions on Examination.

Northern Church	67	2-3 "
Southern Church	83	1-3 "

Certificate.

Northern Church	26	7-12 "
Southern Church	31	1-6 "

Licentiates.

Northern Church	26	2-3 "
Southern Church	26	3-4 "

Contributions.

For all purposes, Northern Church	25	1-9 "
For all purposes, Southern Church	11	1-2 "
For Foreign Missions, Northern Church	33	4-5 "
For Foreign Missions, Southern Church	28	1-4 "
For Education, Northern Church, (loss)	58	9-11 "
For Education, Southern Church, (gain)	22	1-9 "
Amount given per member, Northern Church	\$15	91
Amount given per member, Southern Church	9	41

The above table was prepared by one who is thoroughly competent, and perfectly accurate.

When the reader takes into consideration the immense wealth of the Northern Church, and the comparative poverty of the Southern church his verdict must be in favor of the latter and her committees.

R. K. SMOOT.

III. THE HITTITE EMPIRE.

An age which has heard the monuments of Egypt break the silence of sixteen hundred years and proclaim the history of remote antiquity from records contemporary with the events, and which has witnessed the resurrection of Assyria and Babylonia through the excavation and decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions, can scarcely be expected to manifest great surprise at the recovery of another lost empire or evince unusual interest in the interpretation of its mysterious hieroglyphics. "Let but a Rising of the Sun, let but a Creation of the World happen *twice*," says the philosophic Teufelsdröckh in Sartor Resartus, "and it ceases to be marvellous, to be noteworthy, or noticeable." Our sensibilities are quickly dulled. The wonderful soon becomes commonplace. The nineteenth century is now beyond surprise. This readiness with which we accustom ourselves to the marvellous may account to some extent, in the judgement of charity at least, for the prevailing apathy in regard to the third great triumph of Oriental archæology—the rehabilitation of the lost Empire of the Hittites. And yet, while this exploit of modern scholarship and enterprise cannot of course equal the other two either in dramatic features or in far-reaching and varied value, it is nevertheless a brilliant achievement, and one of profound interest and importance not only to the antiquary, the philologist and the historian, but also to the Scriptural apologist and exegete.

After the discovery of the planet Uranus by Sir William Herschel, in 1781, astronomers began to observe that the orbit of this distant traveller betrayed irregularities which could not be accounted for by the attraction of other known planets, and when it was further shown that the discrepancies between the observed places and the computed places of Uranus followed a definite law, Le Verrier and Adams undertook to calculate the position and size of an unseen planet still farther from the sun which would explain these perturbations. When the telescope was turned upon the point in the heavens called for by their calculations, the new planet Neptune was discovered and the anomalies

in the motion of Uranus were explained. In like manner, when Dr. Henry Schliemann, by his excavations in the Troad about ten years ago, added to the world's treasures of Greek antiquities a multitude of sculptures, vases, plaques, and other objects, archæologists began to notice that the primitive Greek art represented by these specimens had been influenced by a peculiar culture which could be traced to Asia Minor, but could not be identified. About the same time certain curious monuments in a style of art quite distinct from both the Egyptian and the Assyrian sculptures were discovered or re-discovered in the Karabel pass not far from Smyrna, at Boghaz-Keui, in the Valley of the Halys, and at various other points in Asia Minor. A short time before this, four hieroglyphic inscriptions, unlike any that were ever known to scholars before, were copied from blocks of stone at Hamath on the Orontes. As it was already known from Egyptian and Assyrian records that a warlike people, called by the Egyptians *Khita*, and by the Assyrians *Khatti*, and identified by modern scholars with the Biblical *Hittites*,* had once occupied Northern Syria, with capitals at Carcemish on the Euphrates and Kadesh on the Orontes, and as it was certain that the modern Hamath could not be far from the site of the ancient Kadesh, it was conjectured that the Hamath inscriptions were relics of the Hittites. This was confirmed shortly after by the identification of Jerablus on the Euphrates as the ancient Carcemish and the discovery there of monuments inscribed with the same kind of hieroglyphics. But the missing link which connected these monuments with those in northern and western Asia Minor was not found till 1879, when Prof. A. H. Sayce of Oxford, the greatest of living archæologists, discovered that the monuments in the neighborhood of Smyrna and in the Valley of the Halys, were also inscribed with these Hittite characters. This was the discovery that demonstrated the real extent of the Empire of the Hittites and identified the unknown factor in early Greek art. For the number, position and character of these monuments, scattered thus for nearly one thousand miles, could mean nothing less

* This identification seems to have been first suggested by De Rouge'.

han this, that the same people whose political centers were at Kadesh and Carcemish had once dominated the whole of Asia Minor, and that the Hittite Empire once reached from Palestine to the Black Sea and from the Euphrates to the Bosphorus.

And yet, this great people, skilled in war, literature and art, the conquerors of the fairest portion of Western Asia, the inventors of a syllabic system of writing, the creators of an independent style of sculpture, and the intermediaries between the civilization of Babylonia and that of Greece, had absolutely vanished from secular history, and the very existence of such an empire had been forgotten. So completely had they dropped out of view that the sporadic and scanty allusions to the Hittites in the Old Testament which were the only remaining traces of such a people* and some of which implied that they were a great military power, were misunderstood and minimized even by Christian apologists and openly cavilled at by sceptical critics. It is proposed in this paper to sketch the contents of the Egyptian, Assyrian and Hebrew references to the Hittites, indicating the supplementary or divergent character of these records, as the case may be, and arguing the correctness of the Scriptural representations, and to give a succinct summary of our present knowledge of the Hittites as to origin, ethnic affinities, language, culture, manners and religion.

I. About 1700 years before Christ the alien Hyksos, who had ruled over Egypt for several centuries, were overthrown and expelled by the native Egyptians under Amosis, the founder of the celebrated 18th dynasty. With the recovered throne Amosis bequeathed to his successors a legacy of fierce hatred against the Hyksos and other inhabitants of Western Asia. This feeling vented itself in a war of vengeance which continued under successive Pharaohs for nearly 500 years. The first who "washed his heart," as the inscriptions put it, that is, gratified the hereditary desire for vengeance, was Thotmes I, who overran Asia as far

*Dr. Schliemann calls attention to the fact that Mr. Gladstone has pointed out a reference to the Hittites (*οἱ Κίηταιοι*) in Homer. See Schliemann's *Ilios*, pp. 136, 137, and Gladstone's *Homeric Synonymism*, pp. 121, 127, 171, *et al.*

as Mesopotamia, and returned laden with booty which included horses and chariots—a very significant fact, inasmuch as the introduction of war chariots among the Egyptians synchronizes approximately with this incursion and implies an innovation upon their methods of warfare not unlike the change produced in naval warfare by the invention of the revolving iron-clad turret. As we might therefore suppose, the invasions of Asia now follow each other in rapid succession. Thotmes III, “the Egyptian Alexander,” the greatest warrior in all the long line of Pharaohs, made fourteen successful campaigns in seventeen years. On the very first of these royal razzias he found his way barred near the Kishon by a powerful coalition of Syrian princes under the command of “the king of Kadesh.” Here accordingly was fought the great battle of Megiddo, in which, after a stubborn resistance, the allies were defeated. In the list of the spoil we find abundant evidence of the wealth and civilization of these hard-fighting Hittites. It includes among other things 924 war chariots, 31 of them plated with gold, suits of brazen armor, furniture of ivory, ebony, and cedar inlaid with gold, bowls and dishes of gold, a silver image with the head of gold, precious stones, and thousands of pounds of gold and silver rings. Time after time in his subsequent campaigns Thotmes encounters these well-organized Hittites, once he burns their capital, and yet on his ninth expedition he finds it necessary again to storm “the fortress of Kadesh.” Indeed, notwithstanding the boastful descriptions of conquest on the Egyptian monuments, the Hittites were growing stronger all the time, and at the beginning of the 19th dynasty they actually disputed with Egypt the supremacy in south-western Asia, and Sapalel, their king, secured a treaty with Rameses I on equal terms. Seti I, however, claiming that Mauthanar, the next king of the Hittites, had broken this treaty, fell upon them unexpectedly, surprised Kadesh, and overran their territory. Even this was but a temporary reverse, for shortly afterwards we find Rameses II, the Pharaoh of the Hebrew Oppression, marching against the Hittite capital. This king, the *grand monarch* of the Egyptians, commonly called Rameses the Great, was the vainest of the vain and covered the Nile valley with his

monuments. The event in his life which has received the most elaborate laudation was a notable deed of arms performed in the battle of Kadesh. Not only was the prize poem of the Royal Scribe, Pentaur, which celebrated the king's exploit with the grossest exaggeration, inscribed upon the walls of various temples,* but the scenes of the battle are actually chiselled and painted on the living rock of the Ramesseum at Aboo Simbel. This great battle-piece is 58 feet long by 25 feet high and contains over 1,100 figures†—no unworthy forerunner of the vast cycloramas, such as "Gettysburg" and "Manassas," now on exhibition in Philadelphia, Washington, and other American cities. This imperishable panorama pictures the battle of Kadesh in all its details, and immortalizes the Pharaoh's prodigies of valor even more effectively than the extravagant heroics of Pentaur. And here, as always, the foemen most worthy of his steel are the fair-skinned Hittites, proclaiming their Northern origin not only by their complexion but also by their close-belted tunics and tip-tilted boots, fighting in compact masses of infantry or well-ordered lines of chariotry, three warriors to each chariot, and undoubtedly holding their ground too, notwithstanding the hyperbole of the picture and the grandiloquence of Pentaur, for the campaign ends with a treaty of peace equally favorable to Hittites and Egyptians. The stipulations of this treaty were inscribed by the Hittites upon a silver tablet and copied by the Egyptians upon their temple walls beside Pentaur's poem and the tableaux of the battle.‡ If any further evidence of the power and culture of the Hittites were needed,

*The Third Sallier Papyrus, now in the British Museum, contains a copy of this poem. The reader may see a translation of it by E. L. Lushington in *Records of the Past*, II, pp. 65-78. A later, fuller and better translation is given in Brugsch's *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, II, pp. 56-65.

† *A Thousand Miles up the Nile*, A. B. Edwards, II, p. 69. An interesting study of this huge painting, with a carefully drawn plan and explanations, by H. G. Tomkins, may be found in the *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, VII, pp. 399, sqq.

‡ Translations of this famous document are given in full in *Records of the Past*, IV, pp. 26, sqq., and in *Egypt Under the Pharaohs*, H. Brugsch, II, pp. 71-76.

it is afforded by the fact that as a sequel to this treaty they secured a dynastic alliance with the Pharaohs by the marriage of the daughter of Khita-sar, their king, to Rameses II himself, "the central figure of Egyptian history." According to the granite records of Egypt then, the Hittites reached the zenith of their power in the 14th century before Christ. This of course implies a growth of many hundred years, and, as we have seen, the Egyptian records carry the existence of the Empire of the Hittites back to the 17th century B. C. Nor is even this remote date the limit of their antiquity.

II. The most ancient records in existence are not Egyptian, as commonly stated, but Babylonian, and one of the earliest military heroes of whom we have any authentic accounts was Sargon I, king of Agadé', who swept Western Asia with his conquering army more than 2,400 years before Christ!* In a great

* In 1882 Mr. Hormuzd Rassam, the Babylonian explorer, brought to the British Museum several clay cylinders of Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon, who lived about 550 B. C. Nabonidus was studious rather than warlike and seems to have had a special fondness for archaeology. He inscribed many cylinders with accounts of the researches he made while repairing the temples of the gods. In his excavations under the temple of the Sun-god in Sippara, which was built or rather rebuilt by Nebuchadnezzar, he was disappointed by his failure to find the foundation-stone—the one bearing the records, and therefore dug deeper. When he had gone fifteen cubits farther, he made a great discovery, which he records as follows: "That temple I excavated, its ancient foundation-stone I sought, fifteen square cubits I dug down to the foundation-stone of Naram-Sin, the son of Sargon, *which for 3200 years no king before me had seen.*" This is the statement which has so recently startled all students of oriental antiquity. And well it might, for, adding the date of Nabonidus, 550 B. C., to the 3200 years he mentions, we have 3750 B. C. as the date of Naram-Sin, and as Sargon, his father, had a very long reign, we may safely settle upon 3800 B. C. as his date. For those who regard the cuneiform records as the end of controversy there seems to be no escape from this staggering conclusion, notwithstanding the reluctance of some scholars to accept it. For, aside from the well-known accuracy of the Babylonians in their calculations, the evidence is of precisely the same character as that upon which 2200 B. C., or thereabouts, had been universally accepted as the earliest date in Babylonian history. Those who accepted that must accept this. The conclusion is confirmed by the character of the writing on the famous small oval-shaped stone of Sargon, which bears this

work on astrology, called "The Observations of Bel," written by order of Sargon and consisting of seventy tablets, we find, among many other supposed correspondences between prodigies observed in the heavens and events occurring on earth, the following: "On the 16th day (of the month Ab) there was an eclipse; the King of Agade' died; the god Nergal (*i. e.* war) devoured in the land. On the 20th day there was an eclipse; *the King of the land Khatti attacked the country and took possession of the throne**."

inscription: "I, Sargon, the king of Agade', to the Sun-god in Sippara have dedicated;" for the characters belong to that remote transitional stage, known as *line* writing, when the cumbrous hieroglyphs were falling into disuse and the convenient wedges had not yet been invented. It can be shown also from the annualistic tablets which give lists of the Babylonian kings, with the number of years that each king reigned, and which carry us back in this way to about 2400 B. C., that Sargon and Naram-Sin were at least earlier than that date, for they are not mentioned in these tablets, while still another ancient document recently deciphered gives the names of *sixty* other kings who reigned before 2,400 B. C. The consistency of all these data and the remarkable manner in which the various tablets confirm each other are in striking contrast with the deplorable state of the numbers upon which our systems of chronology are based. It is notorious that the Biblical numbers have been systematically corrupted, to say nothing of the acknowledged incompleteness of such genealogical lists as that in Gen. 11:10-26; so that in attempting to fix the date of even so great an epoch as the Flood chronologists are hopelessly divided, ussher placing it 2348 B. C., Jackson 3170 B. C., and Bunsen about 10,000 B. C. In fine, there seems to be no reason why the explicit statement of the painstaking and devout Nabonidus should not be accepted by those who have been so ready to make apologetic use of the cuneiform numbers in other cases. If so, then the expressions about the "starveling chronology" of Archbishop Usher and "the narrow horizon of classical antiquity" would be fully justified.

Just as I had finished this article and was about posting it, *The Hibbert Lectures* for 1887 came to hand fresh from the press. The volume is an intensely interesting one by Prof. A. H. Sayce on *The Origin and Growth of Religion* as illustrated by the religion of the ancient Babylonians. Twenty pages of the Introductory Lecture are devoted to the discussion and defense of 3800 B. C. as the date of Sargon. That this Corypheus of archæologists, who was the ablest of the doubters on this point, should himself be forced to this conclusion is very significant. Granting, however, that this is all very formidable, still the patient and wise will wait for more light.

* *The Story of Assyria*, Z. Ragozin, p. 34.

The word *Khatti* in the cuneiform records never refers to any other people than the Hittites. The astounding antiquity thus demonstrated may well rouse even the wonder-sated imagination of the 19th century, for it means that the Hittites were a powerful people 4,500 years ago! This solitary allusion of course antedates by many centuries the rise of the Assyrian Empire. It is in the annals of Assyria, however, 2700 years later, that we find the next cuneiform mention of the Hittites. The real founder of the Assyrian Empire, the first to establish his authority over that vast area of 75,000 square miles reaching from the Zagros mountains to the Euphrates, and from the Niphates to the alluvial line which marks the boundary between Assyria and Chaldea, was Tiglath-Pileser I. (1120-1100 B. C.) Around this great name gathers not only much of the glory of ancient Assyrian history but also much of the interest of modern cuneiform research. In 1857, when there were still many doubters concerning the ability of epigraphists to translate correctly the wedge-writing of Assyria, four cylinders, each a foot and a half high, were discovered in the four corner-chambers of an exhumed temple on the Tigris. When they reached the British Museum it was seen that they all bore the same inscription, and, as it was an unusually long one, comprising about 1,000 lines, the Royal Asiatic Society determined to test the science of the decipherers by requesting Sir Henry Rawlinson, Mr. Fox Talbot, M. J. Oppert and Dr. Hincks, the four scholars then most prominent in Assyriology, to make independent translations of this unpublished text. At the end of a month, the time agreed upon, the four manuscripts were received and compared, and their agreement silenced forever all scepticism in regard to the correctness of the general results of cuneiform investigation. From this quadruple inscription we learn that Tiglath-Pileser I. waged war almost continually against the Hittites, once smiting their Euphratean capital Carcemish, and repeatedly raiding their territory. After his death the struggle between the two empires seems to have continued, for, more than 200 years later, the record of the atrocious cruelties of Assurnazirpal (883-860 B. C.) includes an account

of a campaign against the Hittites, an account which makes it plain that their great confederacy had seen its best days. Henceforth the power of the Hittites steadily declined. Many of the readers of this QUARTERLY have seen in the main saloon of the Library at Union Seminary the plaster cast *fac simile* of the Black Marble Obelisk of Shalmaneser II, the son and successor of the bloody Asshurnazirpal, which was unearthed by Sir A. H. Layard at Nimrud in the year 1848. This famous pillar bears the record of over thirty campaigns by Shalmaneser, who is powerful enough to exact tribute not only from the king of Israel, "Jehu the son of Omri," as he incorrectly calls him, but also from "the kings of the Hittites." A century later, *i. e.* about 700 B. C., Sargon II, the same who captured Samaria and destroyed the kingdom of Israel, gave the *coup de grace* to the empire of the Hittites also by the defeat of Pisisris, their last king, and the capture of their capital. Henceforth Carcemish is but the seat of an Assyrian satrap. Now let the reader grasp the fact that the hoary power thus extinguished had existed for 1,700 years!* What is the brief century of America, or even the millenium of the British Empire—what is the age of Greece, or Rome, or Assyria, in comparison with such a duration as that?

III. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that we should find the name of this ancient people in one of the oldest Biblical documents in existence—the table of nations in the 10th chapter of Genesis. Beginning with the 15th verse, and remembering that, as Augustine says, nations not men (*gentes non homines*) are intended by the names in this table,† we read: "And Canaan begat Sidon his first-born, and Heth; and the Jebusite, and the Amorite and the Girgashite; and the Hivite, and the Arkite, and the Sinite; and the Arvadite, and the Zemarite, and the Hamathite." (I Chron. 1 - 13). Since the writer goes on to describe the territory of the Canaanite as extending from Sidon to

*The date formerly assigned to Sargon I is much later, about 1700 B. C. or 2,000 B. C. But even this implies the existence of the Hittites as a military power for a thousand years or more.

†Of course he does not mean that *all* the names are gentiles.

the Dead Sea, it would seem that "Heth" in the foregoing quotation refers particularly to that branch of the Hittites who had settled in Palestine. But in Gen. xv, where God renews the promise to give the land of Canaan to Abram's seed, and where the country is described as reaching from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates, "the Hittites" who are mentioned among the other inhabitants must be the great body of the nation, lying between Mesopotamia and the Mediterranean, for certainly none of the other tribes named here ever extended as far as the Euphrates. (Josh. 1:4). So that "T. K. C." is himself beside the mark, to put the case mildly, when, in his article on the Canaanites in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, he says that "the Hittites seem to have been included among the Canaanites by mistake.* Historical evidence, both Biblical and extra-Biblical, proves convincingly that they dwelt beyond the borders of Canaan." For, as we have just indicated, and shall presently prove, when the Biblical writers refer to "the Hittites," they mean sometimes the nation occupying Northern Syria and sometimes the colony living in Central Palestine, and they no more thought it necessary to explain that both belonged to the same stock than they did to explain that the Manassites east of the Jordan and the Manassites west of the Jordan belonged to the same tribe. Take the case of the people mentioned just before Heth in Gen. 10:15. No one would deny that the Carthaginians were Phœnicians simply because they no longer lived in the mother country. Now if Sidon threw out colonies over vast reaches of sea and planted them hundreds of miles from home, why should it seem strange that Heth should throw out a colony a little way to the south along the central hills of Syria?

Doubtless we shall be reminded that neither the Egyptian nor the Assyrian records ever speak of any Hittites in Southern Palestine, but always locate them in the north. This is true. But the Assyrians and Egyptians saw no Hittites in Hebron

*How Mr. Cheyne reconciles this statement with his view that "the position of Heth in the table of nations (Gen 10:15) may also be regarded as a vestige of an accurate geographical tradition" we do not know. See his article on the Hittites in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

because they themselves did not go to Hebron.* The great military road left this city far to the right, and, running along the coast, only struck inwards in the neighborhood of Megiddo. The Egyptians found Hittites *here* in uncomfortable numbers, as the reader will remember. And further, as Prof. Francis Brown has pointed out, if the silence of these records be taken as conclusive against the existence of Hittites at Hebron, then these same Egyptian and Assyrian records will mutually disprove the importance of Kadesh and Carcemish, for without the Egyptian records we should not know that Kadesh was a Hittite capital, and without the Assyrian records we should not know that Carcemish was a Hittite capital. Will the objectors to the Palestinian Hittites claim that non-mention in this case is disproof? And, we may add, there is an exact parallel in the case of Central and Western Asia Minor. Neither the Egyptian nor the Assyrian records ever speak of any Hittites in this great peninsula, but we now have incontestable proof that they *were* there. So in regard to the Hittites in Southern Canaan. The silence of profane history proves nothing in such a case. Is the explicit statement of an ancient document, the historical credibility of which has been abundantly demonstrated, to be set aside because certain other ancient records do not happen to make the same statement, though containing nothing to the contrary? Imagine the havoc resulting from the application of such a principle. How easily the existence of inconvenient facts could be disproved by such theorists as those who deny the existence of Hittites at Hebron.†

*See *The Presbyterian Review*, April, 1886, p. 288.

†In Num., 13:22, there seems to be an abrupt interpolation of an apparently minute and unimportant fragment of history, as Winterbotham calls it: "Now Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt" Mariette's theory that one of the Hyksos dynasties was Hittite certainly seems to be favored by this passage. Hebron was a Hittite city. Zoan was the Hyksos capital. What more likely than that two successive waves of a great migration or invasion of Hittites, moving southward, would build first Hebron and then Zoan, the interval of seven years marking the time between the complete conquest of Palestine and the complete conquest of the Delta? And it is at least worthy of notice that the monument of Menthu-nesu, now in the Louvre, speaks of the destruction of Hittite palaces on the borders of Egypt

It is from these Hittites at Hebron that Abraham purchases the cave of Machpelah, weighing out to Ephron the former owner 400 shekels of silver. The record of this transaction in Gen. 23, is also obnoxious to some of our captious critics and is pronounced "unhistorical" on the ground, forsooth, that this is a peaceful transaction, whereas we know that the Hittites were a warlike people. To this we reply, would not Chedorlaomer have testified that Abraham was a warlike sheikh? and yet Abraham is the other party to this amicable transfer of land. Is the fact that the people of our own country are now engaged in peaceful business pursuits inconsistent with the other fact that twenty-five years ago they were desperate fighters? And further, does not the Bible itself represent the Hittites as a warlike people on occasion? Why else should they occupy the forefront of prominence throughout the Pentateuch when the tribes that are to be driven out of Canaan are enumerated? Besides, Joshua states distinctly that when Israel crossed the Jordan the Hittites fought against him with the other tribes of Canaan, (Josh. 24: 11). That he means these same peaceful Palestinian Hittites is placed beyond question by the description of their habitat in Josh. 9: 1. And again, at the battle of Merom, where the confederates made their last united stand, we find the Hittites and their famous chariotry playing a conspicuous part. Josh. 11: 1-9.

In Judges 1: 24, we have another reference to the Hittites, probably in the wide sense, as the man through whose treachery the house of Joseph gained an entrance into Bethel is said to have gone to "the land of the Hittites." This was necessarily northward, and the expression seems to imply a migration of considerable distance. The city founded there by this traitor has never been certainly identified, though some would place it at

in the time of the 12th dynasty. Manetho, the Egyptian, states that the Hyksos built Jerusalem after their expulsion from Zoan. Can this be referred to in Ezekiel 16: 3, where Jehovah says to Jerusalem—"thy father was an Amorite and thy mother an Hittite"? Some, however, who accept the historical connection between Hebron and Zoan as to origin, and admit that the building of both cities was the result of one great migration southwards, do not on that account believe that the Hyksos were Hittites. See e. g. *Abraham, Joseph and Moses in Egypt*, A. H. Kellogg, pp. 90-91.

Luweizeh in the plain of Huleh,* some at *Kamid el Louz* in the *Buka'at*†, others at *Qalb Louze*‡, and others even at *Lystra* §.

Passing from the book of Judges, the next Biblical mention of the Hittites as a people is an exceedingly interesting one, especially from the point of view of lower criticism—II Sam. 24: 6. We are here told that when David wished to number his subjects, Joab and his company of census-takers went eastward across the Jordan and then moving northward “came to Gilead and to the *land of Tahtim-hodshi*.” The fact that this does not mean anything has not deterred our extremely conservative Revisers from retaining it unchallenged, although they must have known that the highly probable emendation based on the LXX. is now generally accepted by students of the text, viz: “They came to Gilead and to *the land of the Hittites, to Kadesh*.” (הַחִתִּים קָדֶשׁ) || The southern capital of Heth was the northern limit of Israel.¶

Solomon's merchants supplied the kings of the Hittites and the kings of Syria with horses and chariots, as we learn from I Kings 10: 29, (II Chron. 1: 17), a passage which not only points to their northern position, but also implies the survival of their martial spirit and their well-known skill in chariotry. But the most striking intimation of the power of the Hittites is found in II Kings 7: 6. Samaria, the capital of Israel, was besieged by the army of Ben-Hadad, king of Syria. So close was the siege and so long continued that the beleaguered city, cut off from all supplies, was experiencing the worst horrors of

* C. R. Conder. † W. M. Thomson. ‡ H. G. Tomkins. § J. F. Riggs. || See *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, E. Schrader, I, p. 92. So Thenius, Hitzig, Wellhausen, Wright, and others. Botcher's view that we should simply divide the first word as it stands and read תַּהַתִּים—“Under the sea,” is scarcely worthy of notice, as it has no support whatever, and does not diminish the difficulty, being itself as senseless as *Tahtim-hodshi*. But see *The Edinburgh Review*, April, 1884, p. 470.

¶ The site of Kadesh is also a disputed point. The most probable view is that of Capt. Conder, who finds it at *Tell Neby Mendeh* on the Orontes, where the name *Kadis* is still preserved. See his interesting descriptions, *Heth and Moab*, C. R. Conder, Chapters I and II.

famine. King Jehoram, despairing of relief, had determined to surrender the capital, when Elisha predicted that on the morrow food in Samaria would be abundant and cheap. Incredible as this seemed, the king postponed the surrender, and on that very night "Jehovah made the host of the Syrians to hear a noise of chariots and a noise of horses, the noise of a great host: and they said one to another: Lo, the King of Israel hath hired against us *the kings of the Hittites** and the kings of the Egyptians, to come upon us. Wherefore they arose and fled in the twilight; and left their tents, and their horses, and their asses, even the camp as it was, and fled for their life." The Hittite charioteers must have been the terror of the time when the very thought of them stampeded the whole Syrian army. Prof. W. F. Newman, however, intent upon exposing the "unhistorical tone" of this narrative and sympathizing fully with those who assert that the story does not contain "a single mark of acquaintance with the contemporaneous history," informs us that the particular ground of alarm attributed to the Syrians "does not exhibit the writer's acquaintance with the times in a very favorable light." † But, as we have shown that the Assyrians who were contemporary with Ben-Hadad and Jehoram and who may be presumed to have had some "acquaintance with the times," regarded the Hittites as their most formidable foes in the west, it would seem; as Dr. Wright says, that "the sacred writer *was* thoroughly acquainted with the times in which he wrote, and with the facts which he narrated, and that it was Prof. Newman's acquaintance with the times of which he wrote that does not appear in a very favorable light." ‡

Having noticed the Biblical references to the Hittites as a people, we must now glance at the passages in which individual Hittites are mentioned, for the names given these persons by the sacred

*The state of knowledge on this subject among the older commentators is well indicated by the remarks of Thomas Scott on this passage: "It is not known who the kings of the Hittites were, or where they reigned. *Indeed, the whole of the supposition was improbable.*" See *Scott's Bible in loco*.

† *History of the Hebrew Monarchy*, pp. 178-179.

‡ *The Empire of the Hittites*, Wm. Wright, p. 119.

writers raise an important and difficult question. The Hittite from whom Abraham bought the cave of Machpelah was Ephron the son of Zohar. Esau, the grandson of Abraham, took to wife Judith the daughter of Beeri the Hittite, and Bashemath the daughter of Elon the Hittite. The king who sent presents to David after he had smitten Hadadezer was Toi. Two of the soldiers of fortune in David's army were Ahimelech the Hittite and Uriah the Hittite. Clearly these are Semitic names. Were the sons of Heth Shemites?

IV. This brings us to the last set of questions which we proposed to consider in this paper, those touching the race and language, the literature and art, the customs and religion of this great people. As already intimated, such names as Ephron, Zohar, Judith, Beeri, Bashemath, Elon, Ahimelech, and Uriah are quite unlike those found in the Egyptian and Assyrian records, such as Sapalel, Mauthanar, Thargathazas, Khitasar, and Pisiris. The former are Semitic, the latter are non-Semitic. Does this disprove the connection between the Hittites of the Bible and the Hittites of the monuments? In view of what has gone before it is impossible to grant this. But further, the difficulty is materially lessened by the fact that the Bible itself says they were Hamites (Gen. 10 : 6, 15), and by the consideration that some of the Hittite names preserved on the Egyptian monuments are also Semitic. "Kadesh" and the last syllable of "Khita-sar" will be recognized instantly by every tyro in Hebrew. Moreover, the Semitic names of individual Hittites who were living among Hebrews as their wives or intimate friends are easily explained, since it was not uncommon for a descriptive name in the language of his adopted country to supersede the original name of such a stranger.* It was part of his naturalization, so to speak. What more natural, in view of the significance of Hebrew nomenclature, than to call a proselyte from the dark heathenism of Heth

* There seems to me to be little force in Dr. Wright's view that Gen. 26 : 35 gives the Semitic name and Gen. 36 : 2 the Hittite name of one of Esau's wives, since "Oholibamah" is as distinctly Semitic as "Judith." Still the mere fact that a Hittite woman has two names after her marriage with a Semite is worthy of notice. Perhaps the most we can say is that one of them may be a Hittite name Semitized.

Uriah—"Jehovah is light," or 'to call that Hittite hero who seems at one time to have been as intimate with David as Abishai *Ahimelech*—"Friend of the King?" Finally, we have an exact parallel, which I think has been overlooked by all other writers on the subject, in the case of Joseph, the Semite, who, upon becoming an Egyptian official, found his name changed from Joseph to *Zaphnath-paneah*, that is from Hebrew to Egyptian. Will any of those who contend that the Biblical Hittites must have been Shemitic also contend that Joseph must have been Hamitic? Yet the evidence is the same in the two cases. Having disposed of this point, which has been unduly magnified by the cavillers, and returning to the Biblical statement that the Hittites were non-Shemitic,* let it be observed that the occasional use of Semitic words by Hittites no more proves that their language was Semitic than the occurrence of Egyptian words in the Book of Exodus, proves that the language of the Hebrews was Egyptian. Again, not only are most of the Hittite names on the monuments distinctly non-Semitic, as we have seen, but the structure of compound names among them is quite unlike that of Semitic compounds, since, in such a name as *Khita-sar*, the qualifying noun precedes while in Semitic it invariably follows.

But until the Hittite hieroglyphs are deciphered it seems useless to attempt a more definite classification of their language. And the key to this script has never been found.† The Rosetta Stone unlocked the literary treasures of Egypt, and the trilingual inscriptions of Persian kings opened the door of the libraries of Assyria, but the only real clew to the language of the Hittites is a brief bilingual inscription of only four words on a small silver knob called the Boss of Tarkondemos. The silver original, probably made in the 8th century, B. C., has been lost, but mutu-

* The reader will please notice that in this article the terms "Semitic" and "Shemitic" are not used interchangeably.

† Capt. C. R. Conder's claim to have found the key to the Hittite inscriptions is not conceded by any authority. His views are set forth at length in his work on *Altaic Hieroglyphs and Hittite Inscriptions*, (1887). They are controverted in *The Independent*, June 23, 1887, p. 779. *Sunday School Times*, April 9, 1887, pp. 238-239.

ally confirmatory facsimiles guarantee the correctness of extant copies.* On the center of this convex surface was the figure of a warrior, represented as striding and holding in his left hand a spear, and on each side of the figure were Hittite characters, one inscription being a duplicate of the other, while outside of a circle enclosing the figure and the hieroglyphs ran *a cuneiform inscription* all round the rim. This priceless fragment has been deciphered by Prof. Sayce, and reads as follows: "Tarriktime, king of the land of Erme." And in this way he has determined the value of a few Hittite characters.† But unfortunately the legend was too short to furnish a key to the other inscriptions, and a long bilingual text is still the chief desideratum.‡

It seems clear, however, that the language is neither Semitic nor Judo-European. Lenormant, Clarke, Campbell, and Sayce, while differing in many particulars, are yet agreed that the language is Alarodian. This is a formidable consensus. Professor Campbell of Montreal "traces the course of the Hittites, as he

* A photograph of a cast of the silver disc is given in *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, VII, p. 443, but the cuts usually given are equally correct and more distinct.

† It was an American scholar, Dr. Wm. Hayes Ward, who first showed that the writing of the Hittites was a horizontal boustrophedon, a fact which is strangely ignored by Dr. Wright in his book on *The Empire of the Hittites*.

‡ For political reasons the great powers of Europe still permit the Turkish government, that enemy of learning as well as liberty, to stand in the way of human progress, and the excavation of ancient cities in the territory of the Turk is still prohibited. Otherwise the mounds that are now known to cover the ruins of Hittite cities would speedily be opened, and doubtless the scanty stock of Hittite inscriptions would receive additions that would fill up many of the lacunæ in the history of the Hittites, and solve many of the problems that now perplex the student of their civilization. In 1884, when Dr. Ward, the leader of the Wolfe Exploring Expedition to Babylonia (the object of which was merely to investigate the practicability of further excavations but not to make any), asked through the American Minister at Constantinople a firman for that purpose, it was twice refused by the Sublime Porte because the interpreter translated the word "explore" by a term implying excavation, and it was only after long and minute explanations that the letters were granted. See the Report of Dr. Ward to the Archaeological Institute of America, in *The Independent* of May 20, 1886.

thinks, far to the eastward, affirming, on what he claims to be the evidence of language, that after the fall of Carcemish [but why not earlier, if, as Prof. Campbell thinks, the Caucasus was the original home of the family?] they pushed eastward, and leaving a name (Cathæi) as a memento in the Punjaub, settled, as Katei, on the headwaters of the Yenisei, invaded China, as Khitan (whence Cathay) [Tyler, on the other hand, seems to think that the queue sometimes worn by Hittites may point to ancient Tartar influence at Carcemish.] populated Japan and Corea, crossed Behring's Straits and appeared in the American continent as the Mound-builders, the Huron-Iroquois, and the Aztecs; while from the same center in Western Asia they had also made their way to remote Europe, cropping out again as the Basques of Spain and the Etruscans of Italy. He adduces in support of his surprising results a great variety of ingenious comparisons and arguments. He will, however, pardon others for wishing to make haste slowly in these untried fields."*

Complexion and costume both indicate that the Hittites were of northern origin. In the battle paintings they are of lighter yellowish color than their Canaanite allies or their Egyptian adversaries, and are clad for a cold climate, wearing boots and tunics. All Hittite sculptures as well as the Egyptian pictures represent these boots as being turned up at the toes like Turkish slippers. The tunics are fastened round the waist with a girdle. The caps are usually high and pointed. The men are thick set, mostly beardless, and sometimes wear queues. Most of these characteristics, as well as the large head, high cheek bones, short nose and oblique eyes, favor the conjecture of Tartar origin.

That the Hittites were a literary people, is suggested by the very name of one of their Southern cities, *Kirjath-sepher*, "Book-town," perhaps the seat of a library, and demonstrated by their invention not only of hieroglyphics, but of syllabics. The Egyptians mention Kirab-sar, "writer of the books of the miserable chief of the Hittites," indicating also that the books were of some soft material and not of silver, clay, or stone, and even picture for us the scribe of the Hittite king standing at his side

* *Presbyterian Review*, April, 1886.

at Kadesh ready to record the incidents of the battle. As we noticed above, the treaty of peace between Khita-sar and Rameses II was recorded by the Hittites upon a silver tablet. This was their favorite metal. They lived in the vicinity of very ancient silver mines. They manufactured ornaments and vessels of silver as well as gold. Abraham paid them for Machpelah in silver. It seems that they even coined silver. Their familiarity with this metal and their use of silver plates as writing material have an important relation to their lapidary inscriptions and sculptures. There is little doubt that, as in the Boss of Tarkondemos, the inscriptions on silver were made by driving the metal from the concave side so that raised characters appeared on the convex side. Now the most marked characteristic of Hittite art is that the characters and figures are cut in relief, as if the embossed records on silver had determined the character of their records on stone, raised rather than incised, cameo rather than intaglio. Besides the work in relief, Prof. Sayce mentions solidity and roundness as characteristics of Hittite art. He also tells us that the mural crown and the double-headed eagle carried by the crusaders to the German states, were of Hittite invention.

The remnants of Hittite sculpture are interesting, but cannot be satisfactorily discussed without plates.* Especially interesting are the two warrior figures in the pass of Karabel, supposed by Herodotus to represent Sesostris, but now known to be monu-

* Plates are given in the *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, vol. iv. part 2, vol. vii., parts 2 and 3. These are reproduced, together with others, in Wright's *Empire of the Hittites*, the second edition giving twenty-seven plates of inscriptions and sculptures. The references in this article to the book just named are to the first edition, 1884. This work has been severely and justly criticised. The style is loose and repetitious. The facts are not stated with the precision of science. The arguments are often unsound or overstated. The tone is not temperate and there is a constant appeal to prejudice. But it is the only attempt yet made to bring together all the materials into a volume. The best short article on the subject is the one by William Hayes Ward, in the *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. This has all the excellencies that Wright's book lacks, but is too meagre now. The growth of knowledge in the field of Archaeology is so rapid that books on these subjects are soon antiquated.

ments of his most formidable foes ; also the " Niobe " of Homar, not far from the figures of the pseudo-Sesostris, and now known to be the effigy of a Hittite goddess ; and the bass-relief of Ibreez, representing Saudan, the god of corn and wine, receiving the homage of one of his worshippers.

Whether the kinship of the Hittite language to the Accadian can be established or not, there seems to be no doubt that " Hittite art was originally borrowed from Babylonia, though modified by the borrowers in a peculiar way," and it is no less certain that many features of Hittite religion were borrowed from the same source. The most interesting and important of these proto-Chaldean importations was the great nature goddess of Carcemish herself, Athe or Atargatis, or Astartha, known in Babylonia as Ishtar, worshipped by Solomon as Ashtoreth (1 Kings, 11. 5), called by the Greeks and Romans Astarte, and perhaps best known to us as Artemis or Diana of Ephesus, where the Greeks built for her worship a temple so splendid that it was accounted one of the seven wonders of the world.* It once perplexed scholars greatly that this goddess was so different from the ordinary Diana of the Greeks and " was represented in a form entirely alien from Greek art." One characteristic was that the head wore a mural crown. Other features of the representation were such as are found on the cylinders of primitive Chaldea.* But since it has been shown that the Hittites gave this goddess to Greece, and that the original seat of her worship was the Tigro-Euphrates valley and not Europe, there is no longer cause for wonder. It was quite natural that, as Madame Ragozin says, neither goddess nor worship should be quite divested of certain Asiatic peculiarities and a certain barbaric splendor, foreign to the usual chaste refinement of Greek thought and taste. More-

* The Semiramis of Greek myths was but the Assyrian form of the same goddess. For a full discussion of the various forms and names assumed by this deity in passing from Babylonia to other nations and of the debasing character of her worship, see *The Hibbert Lectures*, 1887, pp. 221-314. The name " Kadesh " implies that this Hittite capital was a chief seat of this degrading worship where women were devoted to impurity in the name of religion.

* *Troja*, H. Schliemann, Preface.

over, in view of the vast extent and influence of this cult, it is now more clearly seen that there was no exaggeration in the cry of the mob—"Great is Diana of the Ephesians," or in the strong statement about "her magnificence whom all Asia and the world worshippeth" (Acts 19 : 34, 27). Besides this New Testament connection, the worship of this Hittite goddess has a most interesting relation to a certain fancy of the Greeks, and through this to the history of several famous cities. At Boghaz-Keni considerable remains of the Hittites have been found, the walls of a city, the foundations of a temple, and sculptures on the native rock, representing a religious procession. Among the female figures are Astarte and twelve of her armed priestesses. Now, "in early art the Amazons are robed in Hittite costume, and armed with the double-headed axe; and the dances they performed with shield and bow, in honor of the goddess of war and love, gave rise to the myths which saw in them a nation of woman warriors. The Thermodon, on whose banks the poets placed them, was in the neighborhood of the Hittite monument of Boghaz-Keni and Eyuk, and at Komana in Cappadocia; the goddess Ma was served by six thousand ministers."* Further, according to Greek tradition, Ephesus, Smyrna, and four or five other cities of Asia Minor were founded by the Amazons. That is to say, substituting the language of modern science for that of Greek fancy, these cities were founded by the Hittites.

So far then from being a petty tribe in the land of Canaan, as commonly supposed, the Hittites were a mighty nation, whose empire reached from Hebron to the Hellespont, whose arms withstood for centuries the shocks of Egypt and Assyria, whose genius created the earliest civilization of Asia Minor, whose letters, art and religion profoundly influenced those of Greece and Europe, and whose history, after an eclipse of milleniums, now shines again, albeit dimly, through the granite and clay records of her enemies, awaiting that perfect day when the spade of the excavator shall disentomb her cities and the skill of the paleographer shall decipher her inscriptions, and she shall proclaim to the world through her own records the story of her illustrious career.

W. W. MOORE.

*Sayce's *Herodotus*, p. 430, quoted in Wright's *Hittites*, p. 74.

IV. WHO WAS MELCHIZEDEK ?

The only really historical notice we have of Melchizedek is contained in Gen. 14 : 18-20, and is in these words : “ And Melchizedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine : and he was priest of the most high God. And he blessed him and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth : and blessed be the most high God which hath delivered thine enemies into thine hand. And he gave him tithes of all.”

The new version renders the passage : “ And Melchizedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine ; and he was priest of God most high, possessor (margin, *maker*) of heaven and earth : and blessed be God most high who hath delivered thine enemies into thy hands. And he gave him a tenth of all.”

In Psalm 110 : 4, it is said, “ The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek.”

These are the only passages in the Old Testament where Melchizedek is named ; and upon them is based what is said concerning him in the New Testament, this latter being an inspired interpretation of the former. The New Testament passages referred to are all contained in the fifth, sixth and seventh chapters of Hebrews, and are as follows : “ As he saith also in another place, thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek—named of God a High Priest after the order of Melchizedek—a hope both sure and steadfast and entering into that which is within the veil, whither as a forerunner Jesus entered for us, having become a high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek. For this Melchizedek, king of Salem, priest of God most High, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him, to whom also Abraham divided a tenth part of all (being first, by interpretation, King of righteousness, and then also King of Salem, which is, King of peace ; without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like unto the son of God) abideth a priest continually. Now consider how great this man was, unto whom

Abraham, the patriarch, gave a tenth out of the chief spoils. And they indeed of the sons of Levi that receive the priest's office have commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though these have come out of the loins of Abraham: but he whose genealogy is not counted from him hath taken tithes of Abraham, and hath blessed him that hath the promises. But without any dispute the less is blessed of the better. And here men that die receive tithes; but there one, of whom it is witnessed, that he liveth. And so to say, through Abraham even Levi, who receiveth tithes, hath paid tithes: for he was yet in the loins of his father when Melchizedek met him. Now, if there was perfection through the Levitical priesthood (for under it hath the people received the law) what further need was there that another priest should arise after the order of Melchizedek, and not be reckoned after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change of the law. For he of whom these things are said belongeth to another tribe, from which no man hath given attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord hath sprung out of Judah; as to which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priests. And what we say is yet more abundantly evident, if after the likeness of Melchizedek there ariseth another priest, who hath been made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life: for it is witnessed of him, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek."

On these Scriptures we can base the following indisputable propositions:

1. Melchizedek was king of Salem;
2. He was also priest of the most High God, God most High;
3. He was in some way greater than Abraham;
4. Abraham acknowledged Melchizedek's superiority by paying tithes to him;
5. In some sense, it can be said of Melchizedek that he was without father, without mother, without genealogy;
6. In some sense, it can be said of him that he had neither beginning of days nor end of life;

7. In these two last respects, he was made like unto the Son of God ;

8. In some sense, he remained a priest continually—his was a perpetual priesthood.

Let us examine these several points as far as may be necessary for a proper understanding of the matter in hand :

1. Melchizedek was king of Salem.

The word Melchizedek means “my King is righteous”—or, as the writer of Hebrews expresses it (Heb. 7 : 2) “King of Righteousness.” The word Salem, according to Dr. Young, means “summit,” according to the writer of Hebrews, it means “Peace.” In the examination hereafter to be made, we shall find that the author of Hebrews makes an “accommodation” of both these terms and admirably uses them to strengthen the argument he is making touching the priesthood of Christ.

But for the present, let us inquire concerning Salem : where was it ?

There was a *Salim*, near which was *Ænon* (fountains) where John was baptizing (John 3 : 23) because there were many waters there. Indeed the very name means fountains, and doubtless it was chosen by John for his baptizings and so called for the reason that there were abundant waters there. Dr. Young identifies this with the *Shalim* standing a little south of a place now called *Aynum* (which may be a corruption of *Ænon*) at the head of the valley of Shechem. With this view Dr. Burt seems to agree when he says : (*Land and Story*, page 279, note) : “From Gerizim looking east, one sees at the further side of the plain of Mukhna (Moreh) a village bearing the name of Salim or Shalim. Near this is a locality to which the name of Enon has been assigned, as if it were the place where John the Baptist prosecuted his ministry as recorded in John 3 : 23.” In Genesis 33 : 18, we are told that as Jacob journeyed from Padan Aram he came to Shalem, a city of Shechem, in the land of Canaan ; but Dr. Burt doubts whether this can be identified with the place mentioned in connection with the ministry of the Baptist. “The Salem of John’s gospel is thought by some to have been further north and to have been the same (Salem) of

which Melchizedek was king." And Dr. Thomson, (*Land and Book—Central Palestine*, p. 153), in speaking of this Shalem to which Jacob came, says: "It can scarcely be the Salim near Enon, at which latter place John was baptizing, for there is no Enon in its vicinity; neither is there 'much water there.' A small place called 'Ainun is several miles further north, but it has no fountain at all, and in the summer the few inhabitants have to resort to the great fountains at the head of the Wady Fari'a."

The Salim where John baptized cannot be this Shalim near Shechem, because from the notices contained in Matthew 3:5, (Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan,) and Mark 1:5, (And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan,) and the general tenor of the statements made concerning John, it is evident that his ministry was confined to lower Palestine and the region of the Jordan; and this Shalim near Shechem was out of the circle of his ministrations and altogether too near to the Samaritans who would have no dealings with the Jews, and *vice versa*, (John 4:9,) and the place itself was in the country of Samaria.

The language of both Matthew and Mark is *restrictive*, speaking of the attendants upon John's ministry as coming from *Judea* and *Jerusalem*, and the region round about Jordan, and of his ministrations being held in the wilderness of *Judea*, apparently confining the whole subject to Judea and the *Jews*, and giving no room for supposing that it could be meant to include Samaria and its people.

I maintain, therefore, that Dr. Robinson is wrong in identifying John's Salim near Enon with the Shalim near Shechem. Nor can it be the Salim discovered by Van de Velde, six miles south of Beisan (Bethshean) and two miles west of the Jordan, for *that* Salim, for reasons just given, is also too far north.

There is a Shalim mentioned in I Samuel 9:4, where it is said that Saul and his servant, in hunting for his father's lost asses, passed through Mount *Ephraim*, and through the land of *Shalisha*, and through the land of *Shalim*, and through the land of

Benjamin. The boundaries of Ephraim and Benjamin were partly co-terminous, and doubtless the four districts mentioned lay adjoining each other; and though it is claimed that this Shalim of Saul cannot be identified, it seems to me that Dr. Barclay (in *The City of the Great King*) proves almost to a demonstration that *John's* Salim and *King Saul's* Salim are one and the same place—and that it was situated about five miles northeast from Jerusalem.

Dr. Barclay's statement is so interesting that it will bear repeating. It is as follows:

“Although this conjecture—that Ain Farah was Ænon—must be set down to the mere random suggestion of the moment, yet a more intimate acquaintance with the geography of the neighborhood has brought me to an assured conviction that this place is indeed no other than the ‘Enon near to Salim, where John was baptizing, because there was much water there.’ But it may be well to assign the principal reasons by which I have been led to form a conclusion so different from the generally received opinion in relation to Enon and Salim. Biblical geographers have generally concurred in opinion with Eusebius and his commentator, Jerome, in supposing that Enon was near a town in Galilee called in their day ‘Alim, Vicus Salumias, Salem or Salim, about eight miles from Scythopolis or Bethshean,’ (the Beisan of the present day,) first brought to light by those fathers in the fourth century. And this venerated patristic tradition has perhaps never been called in question, but is uniformly received in trust down to the present day, and that too, not on account of a definite locality characterized by ‘many waters’ or ‘much water,’ but simply because there happens to be water of some sort somewhere in the neighborhood of a village called Alim, Shalim, Salem, Shulumias, Salumias, the ancient ‘Shalem, a city of Shechem,’ before which Jacob pitched his tent. But surely, never was tradition so poorly sustained—indeed it is self-refuted. Enon, they allege, was not only near to Salim, but also near the Jordan. (*Et ascenditur usque nunc locus * * juxta Salim et Jordanem.*) Now, Salem is at least twenty-five miles from Scythopolis, and twenty from the nearest point on the Jordan.

Enon being only eight miles from Scythopolis, with what propriety can it be called 'near to Salem,' when it is necessarily more than sixteen miles distant, and that too in a country teeming with towns and cities? And if near to Salem, how could it be near also to the Jordan, being necessarily at least ten miles from each, even if situated midway? Nor does even tradition speak of any place 'near to Salem' answering John's description of Enon.

"Perceiving therefore the incongruities of the traditional allocation of these places, and finding that Ain Farah answers so admirably to Enon in every respect, except the vicinity of Salim, I could but institute an investigation of the matter. And being unable to hear of any ruins called Salim thereabouts, I secured the services of an Arab of that neighborhood and commenced a regular 'furrage' (as the Arabs term an exploration); and on inquiring, when within a mile and a half of the fountains, "Shu ismo hatha wady?"—"What is the name of this wady?"—had the satisfaction of hearing him pronounce the identical word; and soon was conducted to the site of an ancient city. It is true that on further inquiry of others, it was pronounced somewhat differently—Sillim, Silim, Sulim, Saleim, Sallem, Selam, etc.,—quite as near an approximation, however, to the present Hebrew orthography as could be expected from the slippery tongue of Arabs. For they use the vowels very arbitrarily; and, indeed, nothing is more common than the same exchange of consonants, apparently without rhyme, rhythm or reason. * * This valley (Wady Selim) commences on the eastern slope of Mount Olivet, rather more than a mile above the city (Jerusalem); and passing between a small village called Isawiyeh and Annatta, (the ancient Anothoth), runs almost due east about three miles, when it unites with Wady Ruwaby at Kirbet el Kubr Sufre. There is also a valley commencing at Tell el Ful, called usually Wady Sunam, but sometimes also Suleim or Senam or Selam, which, after running about two miles somewhat parallel to the above, unites with Wady Zreek, and is then known under the name of Wady Farah, the valley in which the fountains gush forth, rather more than a mile before their junction. The position of Salim would seem

to have been well known: and if situated either at the ruins on the ridge around Deires Sid, near some wine and oil-presses, or at Kubr Sufre, it would have been quite a conspicuous object from Mount Olivet. It would thus be well known not only to all the ‘dwellers at Jerusalem,’ but all Israel being compelled to attend the feasts ‘from Dan even unto Beersheba,’ its location would be familiar to all: and hence the position of Enon would be well understood by the apostle’s reference to this ‘city set on a hill.’ We have no account that John exercised his ministry anywhere else than at Enon, in the wilderness, and at the Jordan; nor is it at all probable that he ever preached elsewhere (unless it was when he reproved Herod) during the brief period of his ministerial career. If, therefore, Enon and Wady Farah be identical, it is probable in the highest degree that Enon is the place alluded to in the passage where the Saviour inquires of the people, ‘what went ye out into the wilderness for to see?’—for it abounds in reeds, and is, as it probably always has been, the dividing line between the wilderness and the cultivated country, or rather an oasis a short distance in the wilderness of Judea where the Saviour was tempted of the Devil. The first entrance into the desert was three miles from Jerusalem, and that place was called Bath Chadudo—one of the scape-goat stations, according to the Talmud. * * * * *

“The etymology of the term affords another argument in favor of this identification. Its Hebrew name is ainoon and not Enon: and this is almost exactly the Chaldaic Hebrew for fountains. The perfectly limpid water of the upper fountain, being received into a somewhat hemispherical or bowl-shaped excavation in reddish and greenish mottled marble eight or ten feet in diameter, and about half as deep, is not inaptly compared to a bird’s eye, when reflecting the hues of the sky. And it is to this fact, according to many excellent scholars, that the etymology of the term points. But there is another matter of interest connected with these waters. On inquiring of the *natives*—if such we may term the nomadic bipeds that roam through these wilds—where these waters emptied into the Jordan, I learned that on sinking into the earth and again emerging just below the junc-

tion of the Wady Fuwar and Farah, the stream is called Kelt; and after flowing or rather tumbling eastward about ten miles, passing directly by the castle of Jericho, empties into the Jordan a mile or two below. Now the recognition of the Hebrew word Cherith in the Arabic garb Kelt may seem rather far-fetched to a person unacquainted with such latitudinous transitions of names in Palestine: but it is nevertheless true that Kelt is an Arabic corruption of Kerith, and accordingly we find this same stream at Jericho styled 'Flumen Krith,' by some old authors. But in corroboration of this assertion, I quote the following passages in relation to the stream at Jericho from the *Biblical Researches*; 'So far as it depends upon the name, this Wady Kelt may have been the brook Cherith where the prophet Elijah hid himself and was fed by ravens. The Arabic form Kelt and the Hebrew Cherith are indeed not exactly the same, though the change from *Resh* to *Lamedh* and that of *Kaph* into *Koph*, are sometimes found.' And in relation to the position of Cherith, Dr. Robinson further remarks very appropriately that 'there is also an apparent difficulty in the circumstance that the brook Cherith is said to be *before* Jordan, which is usually understood as meaning *east* of Jordan. But the difficulty vanishes if we translate it *towards* Jordan; and that this may be done is shown by Genesis 18:16 and 19:28, where the angels and Abraham, in the vicinity of Hebron, are said to have looked '*towards* Sodom,' the expression in Hebrew being the very same as here."

There is still another view which maintains that the Salem of which Melchizedek was king, was none other than the city of Jerusalem, which, let us now examine.

In his *Early Days of Christianity*, Funk & Wagnalls, 1883, Exeursus X., page 612, Canon Farrar says: "One passage alone is adduced from Scripture in proof that Salem may be used as a shortened poetical form for Jerusalem, namely, Psalm 76:2, 'In Salem also is his tabernacle and his dwelling-place in Zion.' But not to dwell on the fact that this can only be a poetic license, and that we should not expect to find an isolated recurrence of it in a plain historic narrative, the meaning of that verse cannot be regarded as indisputable. The Psalmist may be referring to

the Salem of Melchizedek as a different place from Jerusalem. Again, the word may mean 'peace;' and both the Septuagint and the Vulgate render it 'His place has been made in peace.' Besides this, in the days of Abraham, and for centuries afterwards, Jerusalem was only known by the name Jebus. But though the Targums render Salem by Jerusalem in this passage of Genesis (Gen. 14 : 18, 19), it was an old tradition that the Salem intended is the city near Shechem which is mentioned in Genesis 33 : 18, and John 3 : 23. There was a town of this name near to Ænon, and its site has been traditionally preserved. The former passage is again doubtful. The passage is rendered by the Targums, by Josephus and by many ancient scholars, not—"Jacob came to *Shalem*, a city of Shechem"—but "Jacob came *in safety* to the city of Shechem." The Samaritans always maintained that it was at Gerizim that Melchizedek had met Abraham; and St. Jerome tells us that the most learned Jews of his day regarded *this* town as the Salem of Melchizedek, and the ruins of a large palace were shown there which was called the palace of Melchizedek. It is therefore doubtful whether Jerusalem is intended, especially since the writer touches so very slightly on the name. The word Salem means rather "peaceful" than "peace;" and hence some again have supposed that "peaceful king" was a title of Melchizedek, and one which marked him out still more specially as a type of the Messiah; but this is a late and improbable conjecture. It may, however, be justly maintained that the typical character of Melchizedek would be rather impaired than enhanced by his being a king of Jerusalem. For Jerusalem was the holy town of the Aaronic priesthood, and it might seem more fit that the Royal Prince should have been connected with some other sanctuary as a type of Him in whose day "neither in this mountain nor yet in Jerusalem should men worship the Father, but should worship him in all places acceptably, if they worshipped in spirit and in truth."

Touching the views advanced in this extract, I remark that while it may be granted that the meaning of Psalm 76 : 2 may not be so plain as to be "indisputable," and there is, of course, a possibility that "the Psalmist may be referring to the Salem of

Melchizedek as a different place from Jerusalem," the probabilities are against that conclusion. The expression—"In Salem is His tabernacle and His dwelling place in Zion"—is a sample of the peculiar parallelism characteristic of Hebrew poetry, of which the Psalms are *full* from beginning to end, and in which the idea advanced in the first line is duplicated in different words and form in the second :

"O God, keep not thou silence ;
Hold not thy peace and be not still, O God, (83:1).

"Hear my cry, O God,
Attend unto my prayer," (69:1).

"In *Judah* is God known,
His name is great in *Israel*;
In *Salem* also is His tabernacle,
And His dwelling place in *Zion*," (76:1-2).

Zion was a part of Jerusalem, and, by a figure of speech in universal use among the writers and speakers of all nations, was by the Psalmist put for the whole. And when he came to duplicate the idea, according to the peculiar structure of Hebrew verse before referred to, he made use of the same figure of speech by putting another part of the city for the whole. There is no doubt in my mind that the Psalmist meant Jerusalem in both lines of the couplet. And if it be said that the use of the word *Israel* dislocalizes the reference, so that it might attach to any place in the whole land of Palestine ; it is a sufficient answer to say that the Psalm was composed in the time of David, long before the disruption of the Jewish Kingdom, and while Jerusalem was as much the capital of Israel as it was of Judah.

The claim of the Samaritans, that Mt. Gerizim was the place where Melchizedek met Abraham, standing alone and unsupported by other competent testimony is not worthy of serious consideration when we recall the notorious fact that the Samaritans claimed and still claim *everything* that could or can be supposed to supplant Jerusalem and exalt their own city as the centre of God's worship, and by so much enhance its and their own importance as the recipients of God's peculiar favor.

The word used in Psalm 76 : 2 is the same word that is used in Genesis 14 : 18 and in Hebrews 7 : 1-2, and Dr. Barclay, who resided many years at Jerusalem and attentively studied it and its surroundings and history with unusual care and diligence, says that the verse in the 76th Psalm seems to him "to be decisive on the subject."

Josephus is to the same purport, saying (*Antiquities*, 1-10-2) "So Abram, when he had saved the captive Sodomites who had been taken by the Assyrians, and Lot also, his kinsman, returned home in peace. Now the King of Sodom met him at a certain place, which they called The King's Dale, when Melchizedek, King of the city of *Salem*, received him. That name signifies The Righteous King; and such he was without dispute, insomuch that on this account he was made the priest of God; however, they afterwards called Salem *Jerusalem*."

In the 5th chapter of 2nd Samuel we have an account of the taking of a part of Jerusalem by David—that part that was still occupied and strongly fortified by the Jebusites; and concerning the same event, Josephus (*Antiquities* 7-3-2) says: "It was David therefore that first cast the Jebusite out of Jerusalem, and called it by his own name, *The City of David*; for under our forefather Abraham it was called (Salem or) Solyma," upon which the translator has this note: "Some copies of Josephus have here Solyma, or Salem, and others Hierosolyma, or Jerusalem. The latter best agree to what Josephus says elsewhere (*Wars* 6-10-1) that this city was called Solyma or Salem before the days of Melchizedek, but was by him called Hierosolyma or Jerusalem. I rather suppose it to have been so called after that Abraham had received that oracle Jehovah Jireh—the Lord will provide (Genesis 22 : 14). The latter word, *Jireh*, with a little alteration, prefixed to the old name Salem, *Peace*, will be Jerusalem; and since that expression 'God will see,' or rather 'God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt offering,' is there said to have been proverbial till the days of Moses (Gen. 22 : 14), this seems to me the most probable derivation of that name, which will then denote, 'that God would provide peace by that Lamb of God which was to take away the sins of the world'" (John

1:29). In the place referred to in the foregoing note, to-wit: *Wars* 6-10--1, Josephus in speaking of Jerusalem says: "But he who first built it was a potent man among the Canaanites and is in our tongue called (Melchizedek) the Righteous King, for such he really was; on which account he was (there) the first priest of God and first built a temple (there) and called the city Jerusalem which was formerly called Salem."

Dr. Thomson (*Land and Book, Central Palestine and Phœnicia*, edition of 1882, page 124), after discussing this matter, concludes by saying: "No doubt, therefore, Abraham met Melchizedek at Jerusalem, and having restored the goods and the captives to the king of Sodom, he returned by way of Bethlehem to his own home on the plain of Mamre. I cannot avoid the impression that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews meant that the Salem of which 'the priest of the Most High God' was king was Jerusalem, and in the 76th Psalm the Holy City is by implication called Salem. Josephus asserts that they afterwards called Salem Jerusalem. Such a chain of evidence cannot be broken by the weight of a hundred Samaritan traditions, detailed with so much confidence by Ya'kob esh Shelaby of Nablus, sheikh of all the holy Samaritans."

Dr. Burt (*The Land and its Story*, page 203) says: "Jerusalem, as probably identical in part with the ancient Salem, which in Abraham's time was the residence of Melchizedek, 'King of Righteousness,'—Jerusalem, as the city and hill Jebus, which in Joshua's time was the seat of Adonizedek, 'Lord of Righteousness,' has slender connection with history. In the opinion of some persons, Salem was the lower city, of which Jebus was the upper; and the name Jerusalem, given to the entire city, is, as they suppose, a combination of the two names, Jebus and Salem."

This is the ordinary derivation of the name of Jerusalem. The derivation of Mr. Whiston given above—Jireh-Salem—is ingenious, but that is all that can be said of it.

After what has been said, it can be safely asserted that whatever or whoever else he was, Melchizedek was king of Jerusalem—its *first* king of whom we have any account.

In ordinary cases this statement would be sufficient to end

the discussion, but from the uniqueness of his appearance in history and the apparently wonderful statements made concerning him in other parts of Scripture, Melchizedek is justly regarded as an extraordinary personage; and critics and Bible students have not been satisfied with the simple conclusion that he was king of Jerusalem; and numerous and varied have been the theories advanced touching his personality, and on this subject all sorts of notions and fancies have been indulged in. Only one of them all can be true. These theories have been based upon and these fancies have arisen out of the record concerning Melchizedek contained in the Epistle to the Hebrews, before quoted—and this, in my judgment, because of false or defective interpretations of what the author of that Epistle says about Melchizedek.

It has been supposed that he was :

1. The son of God appearing in human form ;
2. The Messiah ;
3. The Holy Ghost ;
4. An angel ;
5. A power, virtue or influence of God in some way ;
6. Shem, the son of Noah ;
7. A son of Shem ;
8. A Chaldean ;
9. Mizraim ;
10. Canaan ;
11. Ham ;
12. Enoch.

It will be noticed that of these various suppositions, the first three would make Melchizedek divine; the fourth would make him a heavenly visitor to earth; the fifth would give him a vague sort of existence hard to define in the mind or put into words; and the remainder, while agreeing that he was simply a man, invest him with some mystery which the supporters of the several theories fancy is in some way connected with him as he is presented to us in the Sacred Scriptures.

The discussion of the first five of these hypotheses involves an examination of the Old Testament doctrine of theophanies, a subject intricate and mysterious, and requiring too much elaboration for treatment in this connection; and only as much of that subject will be treated here as may be thought necessary to what may be considered a satisfactory discussion of Melchizedek's supposed connection with it.

As to the hypothesis that he was the Holy Ghost, it may be said that whatever may be true touching divine manifestations in human form and to the physical senses, there is no evidence,

express or implied, that the third person in the Trinity, as held by the orthodox churches, ever chose to work or manifest himself on earth otherwise than in a spiritual manner. He makes Himself known to the *spirits* of men, not to their physical senses. That this is true surely needs no argument with one who believes the Bible to be the word of God; and being true, it effectually disposes of this hypothesis, and we can dismiss it as utterly without foundation. The same can be done with the theory that Melchizedek was a Power or Influence of God in some unusual and peculiar sense. There is no Scripture to support it. Besides, if it means anything, it is closely akin to the theory that Melchizedek was an ensarcosis of the Holy Spirit, and must share its fate. Nor is there anything to be said bearing affirmatively upon the supposition that he was an angel. Against it much might be alleged. Suffice it to say, that, without exception, every angelic appearance of which we have any account was only temporary. There is no instance to be found in which these heavenly beings made any protracted stay among men. In every recorded case, they were commissioned to do some act or deliver some message, and when the commission was executed they disappeared. They were all ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who should be heirs of salvation (Heb. 1: 14), and when their service—in any and all given cases—was accomplished they tarried not.

The teachings of the Old Testament concerning angels and the manifestation of the divine being to the children of men is hard to be understood, and those who have studied the subject with great patience and thoroughness are at variance among themselves as to what that teaching is. The difficulty of distinguishing between created and uncreated beings in the various passages and the apparent intermingling of the one with the other—the speaking in one place of a being as uncreated and in another of the same being as created and inferior—gives to the matter a degree of mystery before which we may well stand appalled when we undertake to grasp it with our finite understandings. At any rate, that is the feeling of the present writer; and for myself, I shall be content to take what God has been pleased to reveal, and

shall endeavor not to be wise above what is written, as to this and every other doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures.

Whatever may be the truth as to his personality, it is very apparent to my mind that Melchizedek was not the Son of God in the sense in which that fact is asserted of him by some—in the same sense, namely, in which Christ was the Son of God, that is to say, *Melchizedek was Christ*; because in that case, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, writing under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and giving a divinely infallible interpretation to what Moses had written, would never have said (Heb. 7: 3) that Melchizedek was *like* unto the Son of God—it can never logically be said that one is *like* himself. Comparisons are made and analogies found between different individuals. Nor would it have been said (Heb. 6: 20) that Christ was made a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek, for independent of the consideration that in that verse Jesus and Melchizedek are spoken of as two separate and distinct entities, it would be nonsense to say, in that connection at least, that Christ was made a priest forever after his own order.

It is safe, therefore, to conclude that Melchizedek was not a Power or Influence of God (whatever that may mean in that connection), nor the Holy Ghost, nor the Son of God in any sense, kind or degree.

We turn, then, to the remaining hypotheses, and undertake an examination of them, in order to see on what foundation they rest. And this let us do even against the advice and protest of Dr. Joseph Parker: “And now wonderful things take place. The King of Sodom goes out to meet Abram, and another king of mysterious name came forth with bread and wine, and with a priestly blessing on his lips. He is called Melchizedek, and Abram gives him a tenth of all. Some are anxious to know all about Melchizedek, but I prefer that the cloud of mystery should settle on his name. This wish to know everything in the letter is the curse of the human mind. Curiosity deposes reverence, and sight clamors against contented and holy faith. Oh, beautiful beyond most other scenes is this priest standing in the cloud, as if he had come up from eternity and was rather a voice

than a man. And beautiful to think that his bread and wine had been brought from some high sacramental board, mayhap from the upper sanctuary where is the Lamb slain from eternity. I would not question this messenger. He is king and priest, perhaps he is but a shadow projected by One unseen! Leave the mystery. Do not pluck the stars from their places." I have no such feeling as Dr. Parker seems to have; and I submit that there is nothing in the text to serve as a foundation for what I can hardly refrain from calling Dr. Parker's rhapsody over a simple *fact* occurring in the life of the father of the faithful and deriving all its importance from Abraham's connection with it. But to resume:

"There is something surprising and mysterious in the first appearance of Melchizedek, and in the subsequent reference to him. Bearing a title which Jews in after ages would recognize as designating their own sovereign, bearing gifts which recall to Christians the Lord's Supper, this Canaanite crosses for a moment the path of Abram and is unhesitatingly recognized as a person of higher spiritual rank than the friend of God. Disappearing as suddenly as he came in, he is lost to the sacred writings for a thousand years. The faith of early ages ventured to invest his person with superstitious awe. Jewish tradition pronounces Melchizedek to be a survivor of the Deluge, the patriarch Shem. It should be noted that this supposition does not appear in the Targum of Onkelos—a presumption that it was not received by the Jews till after the Christian era—nor has it found favor with the Fathers. * * The way in which he is mentioned in Genesis would lead to the immediate inference that Melchizedek was of one blood with the children of Ham among whom he lived, chief (like the king of Sodom) of a settled Canaanitish tribe. * * And as Balaam was a prophet, so Melchizedek was a priest among the corrupted heathen, not self-appointed but constituted by a special gift from God and recognized as such by him." (Smith's *Bible Dictionary*.)

A note in Geikie's *Hours with the Bible* says that the Jews, ever fond of the marvelous, affected to regard Melchizedek as a son of Shem—a relic of the long-perished golden age of the world.

It is true that Shem was still living in the days of Abraham, but that is the only proof, so far as I have been able to find, that Melchizedek was Shem or a son of Shem. And a similar remark will dispose of the several claims or hypotheses that he was Ham (Shem's brother), or Mizraim (Ham's son), or Canaan (also Ham's son). There is absolutely no evidence that he was any of these; and the hypothesis that he was Enoch is utterly preposterous, not only because there is no evidence to support it but also because it would necessitate a return of Enoch to the earth again after "he was not, for God took him." (Gen. 5:24).

After recounting the incidents, as detailed in Genesis, connected with the battle of the Kings, the capture of Lot, the retreat of the captors and the pursuit by and victory of Abraham, Geikie (*Hours with the Bible*, in loco) says: "Returning slowly southwards, rich with the plunder of the camp, and with a long train of rescued Canaanitish prisoners of war, Abraham was met by two princes of the country, at some spot known as the King's vale. * * The one was the new King of Sodom who came, doubtless, to do homage to his deliverer as the great man of the day, for Abraham's victory had raised him above any of the local chiefs. * * But the chief personage who thus came out to welcome the victorious patriarch was one around whom legend has delighted to gather. Melchizedek, the King of righteousness, ruler of Salem, 'priest of the most High God,' who appears in this incident for a moment and then suddenly vanishes, has in all ages, alike from his name which itself commands respectful awe, his faith and office at such a time and in such populations, and the silence observed respecting his origin or history, been a favorite subject for speculation. We know neither his parentage, nor the place of his birth, nor his successor in his office and dignities, and hence he offers a striking type of our divine Lord.

It is quite possible that, like Abraham, he may have been one of the early Pilgrim Fathers who had left Chaldea, to escape the growing bitterness and intensity of idol worship, which were making fidelity to the faith of purer ages impossible. His name and that of the place over which he ruled are purely Semitic, and may thus point to his belonging to the clans of that

race beyond the Euphrates. * * Melchizedek's pure and holy faith in the most High God was doubtless a relic of the anciently universal recognition of the one creator, and is one of the proofs incidentally afforded in such other cases as that of Abimelech, King of Gerar, Jethro the Midianite, Balaam from the mountains of Assyria and Job the Arab, that God has at no time left himself without a witness even in lands secluded from the direct privileges of His people. El Elion, the name given by Melchizedek to God, was not indeed new or unknown, for El or Il—'the mighty one'—was the ancient Supreme God of the Semitic races of Babylonia and was known in Palestine by the Phœnicians; and even the great title Elion—'the Highest'—had been adopted by them, corrupt and idolatrous as they had already become. With them, indeed, both names only marked one divine Being among many, though perhaps the highest; nor is it to be overlooked that while Melchizedek uses the general expression 'the most High God,' Abraham, in repeating it, prefixes the personal name Jehovah (Gen. 14:22); as if to claim for Him the exclusive right to supreme divinity. With this weighty addition, though not without it, he recognizes the God of Melchizedek as He whom he himself worshipped."

Along the same line of discussion, Prof. Day (in a note in Oehler's *Old Testament Theology*, 1883, page 63) says: "It is a point of special importance that there is manifestly an acknowledgment of the God whose priest Melchizedek is, in the way in which Abraham does homage to Melchizedek. Melchizedek is called priest of El Elion who appears later among the Phœnicians as Saturn. Abraham receives a blessing from this priest and gives him the tenth of the booty. Certainly, he distinguishes in a way (verse 22) his God Jehovah from the El Elion, but yet their identity is acknowledged. We have here, therefore, traces of an older, purer monotheism on Canaanitish ground, which is, at first sight, remarkable, because elsewhere the relation of the Old Testament God to the Canaanitish religion is sharply antagonistic. But here Movers' researches come in, in the most interesting manner. It is by him shown that the worship of El or Kronos goes back to *another origin* than

that of the Phœnician Baal, to which the Phœnician polytheism is attached, and that the former worship belonged specially to the Giblites in Byblus and Berytus, who are always definitely distinguished from the Phœnicians. We may maintain therefore, with the greatest probability, that we find here, in the midst of the Canaanitish religion, a remnant of an older and purer religion, which was perhaps preserved by a Semitic race dwelling among the Canaanites."

There is no evidence that Melchizedek was either Shem or Ham, or a son of either, or Enoch, or a Chaldean; nor need we concern ourselves about such a point. There is a possibility that he might have been any one of these, but there is no probability that he was. If conjecture is to be resorted to, Prof. Day's is as good as any—probably the best. But there is nothing either in reason or Scripture that should lead us to indulge in conjecture at all. When what is said of him is properly understood, it seems plain to me that there is no more reason for supposing Melchizedek to have been some person other than Melchizedek than there is for supposing that Moses was some person other than Moses.

The whole difficulty on this subject has arisen, I apprehend, from the (mistaken) interpretation which has been given to the language used by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (7 : 3) where it is said Melchizedek was "without father, without mother, without descent (or pedigree), having neither beginning of days nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually." It is claimed that such language cannot truthfully be applied to a *man*—that such things cannot be asserted of *any* man. If a being is without father, or mother, or descent, or beginning of days, or end of life, he must be more than man, more than angel, more than archangel—he must be God. The argument is sound and the conclusion correct, if these things were asserted of Melchizedek as an *individual*, a *being* as such, an existing entity as such.

But it is very apparent that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is *not discussing Melchizedek as a man, but as King and Priest—especially as PRIEST—and drawing an analogy*

between his *priesthood* and *Christ's*. And here is the key to unlock all the "mystery" and dispel all the "superstition," which have clustered around Melchizedek. This is so apparent, from an inspection of the Scripture itself—which is our best and should be our only guide—that it seems amazing that any one should ever have fallen into an error on this point. Let us see.

In Heb. 5 : 10, Christ is said to have been "called of God an high priest after the order of Melchizedek"—not a man, nor angel, nor any other order of being or office, but *PRIEST*. In the last verse of the 6th chapter, identically the same language is used concerning him ; and in the 7th chapter, although the fact is mentioned that Melchizedek was a king, the point of comparison made between them touches upon their *priesthood*, and that alone. Unless, then, we are ready to wrench these scriptures from their obvious connection, divorce them from the context and apply them to a subject not found in them, we are bound to say that the things predicated of Melchizedek in Heb. 7 : 3—where all the apparent difficulties have been found—are predicated of him in his character of priest of the Most High God, *and not otherwise*.

The expressions "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life," are used concerning Melchizedek as a *priest*, and are to be interpreted accordingly. The words "without descent" are in the new version "without genealogy"—and correctly so. The Greek word is not "agenetos" (unborn, without birth, *i. e.*, superhuman, divine,) but "agenealogetos" (without genealogy); and if this simple fact had been kept in sight, it would have saved a world of trouble and misinterpretation. The words "*apator, ameter, agenealogetos*," applied to Melchizedek in this connection, simply mean that of him "neither father, nor mother, nor pedigree" stands recorded in the Holy Scriptures—nor for that matter anywhere else. And all the misinterpretations and false interpretations above alluded to have arisen, in part if not wholly, from inattention to the meaning of *agenealogetos* and in failing to construe *apator* and *ameter* in connection with it, as they evidently should be. It is as if they had had in mind Melchizedek simply

as a *being*, and then translated "never had a father, never had a mother, was never born," which would doubtless, if true, have made him at least superhuman, if not uncreated—divine.

But the author of the Epistle is discussing Christ's *priesthood* in connection with Melchizedek's—or Melchizedek's with our Lord's, as you please—and shows wherein the two priesthods resembled each other; and then brings the historical proof of the superiority of Melchizedek's priesthood over Aaron's. In close connection with this historical proof, he quotes the prophecy or promise in the Psalm that Messiah should be a priest after the order of Melchizedek; and argues thence that Christ's priesthood was superior to Aaron's. I emphasize the fact that the matter under discussion in Hebrews is our Lord's *priesthood* and nothing else, and what is said concerning Him and Melchizedek must be interpreted with reference to that fact. The resemblance between Christ's and Melchizedek's priesthood and the superiority of both over the Aaronic priesthood are shown in that they both were, as to their *priesthood*, so far as the records show, without father, mother or genealogy. As a priest, Melchizedek was the first and the last of his line; as a priest, he had no predecessor and no successor—there was no genealogy either to or from him. The same is true of our Lord as to *His* priesthood; whereas, under the Mosaic economy, no one was allowed to belong to the priesthood unless he could show an unbroken descent from Aaron, and of course belonged to the tribe of Levi (Numbers 3: 10; 18: 7; Ezra, 2: 62). As a *priest*, our Lord had no genealogy, did not spring from a priestly stock, and did not even belong to the tribe of Levi.

We must likewise emphasize the fact that the writer in the Epistle to the Hebrews is discussing our Lord's priesthood and nothing else, when we come to give meaning to the expression "without beginning of days or end of life." If this expression is used concerning Melchizedek as an entity, as a being, it must mean that he was God, for none but God has ever been without *beginning of days*, whatever may be said about *end of life*; but when applied to Melchizedek as a *priest*—the very subject the writer of the Epistle is discussing—the meaning becomes plain, simple,

natural, unstrained ; and it is evidently intended to be asserted simply that as to his priesthood there was and is no record of its beginning or ending—not that Melchizedek was not born like any other human being or that he never died like other human beings, but simply and only that touching the beginning and the end of his priesthood there is no record. Prof. Dwight (*Meyer on Hebrews*, 1885, page 578) says : “The view held by Alford and some other writers, that Melchizedek is here declared to be a person differing from common men in a mysterious and wonderful manner—not having been born in the ordinary human way, and not having been removed from the world by death—rests on the assumption that the author of the Epistle could not have used the case of Melchizedek as illustrative without intending to make some dogmatic statement respecting him, an assumption which is neither necessary nor capable of proof. This view is also exposed to three serious, if not fatal objections : (1), that the author of the Epistle is so far from making any full and clear affirmation on the subject, that even such writers themselves are compelled to admit (as Alford does) that ‘when they come to inquire *what* high and mysterious eminence is here allotted to Melchizedek’ they ‘have no data whereon to decide ;’ (2), that the Old Testament, in the story in Genesis, gives not even the slightest hint of any such mysterious eminence, and makes no allusion whatever to Melchizedek elsewhere except in the Psalm passage ; (3), that we have no reason, independently of what is supposed to be discovered in these verses, to believe that any man since Adam has been actually without father or mother, beginning of days or end of life, and, on the other hand, every reason to believe that no such man has existed.” In another part of the same note, Prof. Dwight says : “With reference to the interpretation of the passage, it must be noticed that the subject under discussion, in this section of the Epistle, is the priesthood of Christ, and that the comparison of Christ with Melchizedek relates only to this point. When it is said, therefore, that Melchizedek was without father and mother, and that he had neither beginning nor end of life, the meaning of the writer is not that Melchizedek as a man differed from all

other men, having no descent from ancestors and existing always, but that, *in respect to his priestly office*, he did not depend on the tracing of a genealogy, as the Levitical priests did, but had his priesthood 'continually abiding.' * * * We may believe that the writer did not intend to make any formal declaration respecting Melchizedek, for the purpose of explaining to his readers who or what the Old Testament personage was. Such a declaration was unnecessary and was hardly to have been expected. But in his setting forth of the exalted character of Christ's priesthood, as compared with the priesthood known to the Jewish system, he takes this remarkable case of a priest, who suddenly appears on the scene, in the Old Testament history, having his priestly office in its full privileges and prerogatives, and disappears again as suddenly, still having it and still in life—a priest who rests his claims on no tracing of his genealogical line and who, so far as the narrative goes, has no recorded beginning nor ending of his official life."

JOS. H. ALEXANDER.

St. Charles, Mo.

V. CHURCH ORGANIZATION IN HEATHEN LANDS.

The General Assembly at St. Louis, last May, failed to answer a question on ecclesiastical law submitted to it by seven Presbyteries, viz, Orange, Wilmington, Mecklenburg, St. Louis, Potosi, Tombeckbee and Chesapeake. Three of these had sent overtures to the Assembly of 1886, at Augusta, Ga., but for want of time to consider the question properly, "the whole matter was referred to the next Assembly." There were overtures also bearing on the same subject from the Presbytery of East Hanover and from the missionaries in Brazil. All of this shows the unsettled and troubled mind of the church at large on this subject.

The question had been before the church as one of vital importance and great difficulty for years. As far back as 1876

a committee had been appointed by the General Assembly to consider and report on the subject. When the Confession of Faith was adopted and the administrative policy of the church agreed upon, Foreign Missions was not before the mind of the church. She was contending for life. An aggressive work was not seriously thought of for years afterwards. The first efforts of the church in heathen lands were experimental and the progress was very slow. Years elapsed before the heathen were converted in numbers sufficient to raise the question of an organized church among them. When the necessity arose, in the absence of any constitutional provision for the emergency, our missionaries, going forward in the dark, fell into many errors. When application was made by them to the General Assembly for instruction as to how they should proceed, that venerable body made blunders, some of which were ludicrous enough to produce a smile from even the gravest reader. Reports drawn by the finest minds in the church were earnestly considered and adopted only to be protested against, reconsidered and then laid aside. After studying the question a year or more a chairman would resign and give place to a substitute. Or, after studying the question a year the committee would report themselves "not prepared to present any results of their labors to this Assembly, and ask to be continued and have their number increased." Again, an exceedingly able committee reports agreement on a part of the subject but adds that "after two years of conference they are unable to agree" on the rest. Again, one member of committee on the subject reported orally, (to the Assembly at Lexington, Ky.,) declining to make for himself and those who agreed with him a written report that would only embarrass the Assembly "with two rival papers."

At last, after eleven years, the General Assembly at St. Louis, comes to one mind on the proposition "that the views are so divergent in the church on this subject and all the efforts to harmonize them have so signally failed through successive years, that it is safe to conclude no legislation can be proposed which will settle the question."

This is most humiliating. Can it be that our church has no

constitutional provision for the organization of a church in heathen lands, and that, after so many years of profound study and earnest debate by the soundest and strongest minds in her midst, no amendment can be proposed on which a decided majority may agree? And on such a question as this: the extension of the kingdom of Christ among the unevangelized races! Is no further "legislation" to be attempted, and must the subject be withdrawn from the church courts without answering the memorials of so many Presbyteries and missionaries? This is, indeed, what was recommended and what was done at St. Louis.

The report goes on to assign a second reason for withdrawing the question from the Presbyteries, viz: "Because a practical solution has already been found in the outworking of our missionary operations in heathen lands." A practical solution has been found of this most difficult and important question, *therefore* we must not attempt to amend the constitution by showing our missionaries how to proceed in the great work. How do these things hold together as premise and conclusion?

One would expect to hear a conclusion just the opposite of this. If the providence of God has come to the relief of the church and solved this question of ecclesiastical law, then the committee should have hailed it as a God-send and framed an amendment accordingly. For this purpose the committee was appointed. All the memorials from the Presbyteries and elsewhere, bearing on this subject, were placed in their hands in order that they might have all the available light and might lay the matter before the Assembly in a form for final action. The first committee appointed on the question was charged with "the whole subject of the office and powers of the Evangelist, his relation to the General Assembly and the Presbytery at home, his relation to the church gathered among the heathen, and his relation to his fellow evangelists in the same missionary field." The said committee was furthermore charged with the duty of reporting "to the next General Assembly by a proposed additional chapter to our Form of Government, or otherwise." The committee at St. Louis, whose report we criticize, was not ignorant of these instructions, for the chairman of this committee was the chairman

of that which made the first formal report on the subject and incorporated the above instructions in its report. (See Min. 1881, p 387.) At that time it reported adversely to the addition of a new chapter to the Form of Government and moved the adoption of a paper interpretative of the law as it now stands. The report was adopted but, as we have seen, failed to satisfy the church, which has continued to seek a constitutional amendment from that time to this.

We do not intimate a charge of delinquency or unfaithfulness against the committee but criticize it for failing to embrace an opportunity to solve a problem of such importance in the light of that providence to which it calls the attention of the church. While it was a question for speculation no action, it seems, could be recommended on which the church would harmonize. But when it emerged from the cloudland of abstract thinking to stand out in history clear as the light of day, the church would have hailed the occasion with joy and thanksgiving and made the necessary change in her organic law. And, surely, no easier task could be desired than to formulate an amendment to the Constitution with a concrete case as a copy before the eye.

It is tantalizing almost to provocation to think that, when we were on the verge of such a Canaan of rest after the long wanderings, we were not signalled to cross over and take possession, but, with a backward wave of the hand, were remanded to the wilderness.

Is it not possible that the Assembly made a mistake in saying that "a practical solution has already been found in the outworking of our missionary operations in heathen lands?" To what does this declaration point? What is the fact on which these resounding periods turn? Where will we find "a practical solution" of the whole subject of the office and powers of the evangelist, his relation to the General Assembly and the Presbytery at home, his relation to the church gathered among the heathen and his relation to his fellow evangelists in the same missionary field? It must be in some one or all of those heathen lands where we have evangelists at work. Let us see.

In Brazil, our missionaries are authorized by this St. Louis Assembly to "form a Brazilian synod separate from both the assemblies in this country and constituting in Brazil a distinct and independent church free from foreign control." This was wisely and well done. But it does not solve the various questions about the powers and relations of the foreign Evangelist, nor does it furnish "the additional chapter to our Form of Government." It only sanctions the formation of a national church when the material has grown to a size that requires it. The mind of the church is laboring on the question how to plant the church; how to ordain native evangelists; how to organize sessions and Presbyteries; how to gather the material out of which a national church may be organized.

Many blunders, some ludicrous and some serious, were committed in Brazil and elsewhere years ago when our missionaries were building without a plan. We want an amendment to our Form of Government to prevent a repetition of the same or similar blunders. We have missionaries now at work in different lands where the question of a national synod is not mooted. We are arranging to occupy new territory, to break new ground, to sow the first seed. When those whom we propose to send soon to Africa gather converts enough to be organized into a church and constitute a session, how will they proceed? Where will they find a mode of operating, a clear statement of law or a precedent as their guide? It is not claimed that we have a constitutional rule. Indeed our constitution is singularly defective in this particular. It almost ignores the subject of the methods by which the world is to be conquered for Christ. There is no rule of action for our toilers among the heathen. But the act of the St. Louis Assembly seems to declare that we have precedents to go by. This is what we suppose is meant by the phrase "practical solution." If so, where shall we find them? Perhaps we may find one in China. Our church has had some experience there—and some that is very practical, from which we should learn much wisdom. Our missionaries have been there a long time; their labors have been blessed. Years ago "the outworking of our missionary operations" there

resulted in the erection of a Presbytery. We shall probably find the precedent here. What are the facts about it?

In the minutes of the General Assembly for 1874, p. 480, we read that a Presbytery was organized to be known by the name of Hangehow. At the same meeting it was resolved (p. 523) that said action "shall not be interpreted as violating that provision of the Constitution which vests in the Synod alone the power to erect new Presbyteries." Two years after this it was "resolved that the General Assembly has no constitutional power to establish or dissolve Presbyteries, and accordingly, that the brethren, of whom the Assembly of 1874 proposed to constitute the Presbytery of Hangehow, are now, and have been *de jure* members of the same Presbyteries to which they belonged at the time of such action." (Min. 1876, p. 237.)

In this abortive effort to erect a Presbytery in China our church presents the humiliating spectacle of a General Assembly's acting contrary to law and confessing that it has done so, yet insisting that its act must not be so construed. But all of this is annulled by another Assembly, two years later, which declared these acts unconstitutional and therefore null and void. Not that there was a line in the Constitution to guide in setting up a church in the heathen lands, but because the fundamental principles of Presbyterianism had been violated. If there had been such a line all these blunders would have been avoided. No Presbytery has been erected in China by our church from that day to this, to our knowledge; so then, the "practical solution in the outworking of our missionary operations in heathen lands" is not found in China.

We have had some experience also in Brazil. In the Minutes of 1871, p. 29, we find that the General Assembly organized the Presbytery of Sao Paulo. This seems to have been annulled by the act annulling Hangehow. But, as some government was needed in China and Brazil, the Assembly authorized a "Mission" under its Committee, vested with power over the missionaries. This aroused an indignation among our brethren in Brazil that finally broke out in the most pronounced opposition and resulted in irreparable disaster.

Matters dragged along until the missionaries there from the Synod of Virginia memorialized their Synod to permit them to be organized into a Presbytery composed of members from the Northern and Southern churches. Their request was declined because of the unsettled mind of the church on the powers and relations of the foreign evangelist. These same brethren memorialized the Assembly at St. Louis and were answered by the act now under consideration. But we have already seen that the "practical solution" is not found here.

We know of but one more field, where "the outworking of our missionary operations" may solve the problem—that is Mexico. Here, we have a church session and a Presbytery, built up from the ground by the Rev. A. T. Graybill "on the full tide of successful experiment." There is nothing now in the way of our evangelizing the whole of Mexico. The church there has reached such a stage of development that it can hold on its way to the highest pitch of power without any constitutional hindrance. Here, we may confidently expect to find our object. What now are the facts? How was the first church organized, and how were the first ruling elders ordained? It was done by Mr. Graybill alone, acting on the commission of his Presbytery in Virginia. How was the Presbytery of Tamaulipas organized? In like manner, with the exception, *i. e.*, that, as Mr. Hall had then come to help him, he was asked to lay hands with him on the heads of the Mexicans, whom he was ordaining. The elders of the church, whom *he* had ordained, were also asked to lay their hands on with his and Mr. Hall's, and they complied. Thus, the church, in its complete form, was set up and went on its way.

Now where was the Presbytery, by the laying on of whose hands these Mexican evangelists were ordained? Was it Montgomery Presbytery in Virginia? Had Mr. Graybill stated the case to his Presbytery, and gotten its consent? If so the fact has escaped us in reading the official record of the case. Montgomery Presbytery seems to have known nothing of it officially until it had been done. Was it a *quasi* Presbytery, composed of Messrs. Graybill and Hall, and some Mexican elders? Our Constitution

knows nothing of such a body as this. It was Mr. Graybill, acting singly or separately, and he alone that planted the church and carried it up to this stage. Is it plead in his defense that he was acting as a commissioned evangelist from his Presbytery in Virginia, vested with full power to do all this? He thought so and in his conscience is quite clear of all blame. In the absence of all constitutional rules he did right to go ahead as best he could. Too much honor cannot be shown this devoted and Heaven-blest servant of the church for his meek and gentle spirit, for his ardent love to God and the church, for his courage and self-sacrificing and indefatigable work in carrying the gospel to "the land of assassins" and planting the church there. But can his course be held up as a precedent? Has he furnishd "the practical solution" of this problem? Surely not. It was a mistake such as all men make when, full of zeal in a new work, they blaze a path untrodden before.

The Houston Assembly of 1885 sent down to the Presbyteries for adoption an overture which reads, in part, as follows: "When sent to foreign countries he may also be entrusted with power by his Presbytery to ordain ministers of the gospel as pastors or as evangelists; this grant of power, however, must be made for each specific case and may only be made previous to the organization of a Presbytery in the field where he labors." This was, in effect, to ask the whole church to endorse what Mr. Graybill had done, by authorizing a like procedure in future when the evangelist may have a special grant of power from his Presbytery to do so. But the church declined, which was the same thing as to condemn it as irregular. Mr. Graybill was driven to this irregular course by the want of any rule in the Constitution. The General Assembly approved his course no doubt for this reason. But when the church was asked to amend its organic law with a paragraph making like procedure a permanent rule, for setting up Presbyterianism in foreign lands, she declined. Presbytery is not an expedient, a device that may be modified at will to meet the ever-varying exigencies of the church, either at home or abroad. Strict construction of law, founded on the express letter of the divine word, or on "good and necessary

inference therefrom," has ever marked the history of the Presbyterian Church the world over.

We know of no other attempts at organization made by our church in heathen lands, and as none of these afford us "the practical solution" of the difficulty of ruling beyond the sea, we conclude that the St. Louis Assembly failed to answer the question on ecclesiastical law submitted to it by so many Presbyteries. The church is still without a law or policy and the same or similar blunders and difficulties are likely to arise at any time in the future as those that blot our records of the past.

Are we to leave it so? Is the Constitution to remain in this age, whose chief glory is the extension of the church in heathen lands, as it came into existence when foreign missions was hardly dreamed of and, if mentioned seriously, laughed off as a joke even by ministers of the gospel? A venerable missionary exclaimed a few years ago "the church is only playing at missions." When she begins to gird herself and come down to earnest work shall we have no rule to work by? Must this question, which burns in the hearts of so many Presbyteries and missionaries, be extinguished by the act of the last Assembly?

HOW TO ORGANIZE.

The General Assembly at St. Louis wisely decided that it is best not to extend its ruling power over the church into heathen lands. Thus, "The inherent difficulty in the case lies in the attempt to rule the church across the sea. The solution is found in recognizing the autonomy of the church as a free Christian commonwealth, and investing it with the power of self-government as soon as it is organized."

This is a grand sentence. It contains the germ and substance of the whole matter. The only phrase in it open to criticism is this, "and investing it with the power of self-government as soon as it is organized." This implies (1) that the church in the foreign field *must be* organized from without. We concede that it may be when, in the exercise of their autonomy, they ask it, but in all cases need not be, and in some, should not be; (2) that the church organizing *conveys* power to the church organized,

that is, clothes or "invests" it with power. The power of rule exists absolutely in each individual soul until he seeks that of the session; and in the mass, until it creates a session to be the depository of this power. "Tarry ye in the city until ye be endued with power from on high." Here the power (*ζύναμις*) is bestowed upon the church by the gift of the Holy Spirit to the individual members thereof. Having this inherent power, it may distribute authority (*εξουσία*) severally according to its own free will.

With this exception, the sentence quoted above from the act of the last Assembly expresses the radical idea of this matter perfectly. The difficulty of ruling beyond the sea is "inherent;" it pertains naturally to the case and, as it always has, so it always will rise up to baffle and disturb whenever it is ignored in our work. The experience of the Northern Presbyterian Church, as we have been informed by one of our missionaries long in the service, agrees with that of ours. Yet their method is less liable to abuse than that adopted by our church. The ever-varying devices of the church to overcome these difficulties are abundant proof of this fact and are not to be construed into a sign of weakness or vacillation. It is simply the experience of an earnest and mighty spirit that will not sleep when the cause is liable to harm.

According to the fundamental principles of Presbytery the *sole want* of a church, in order to adopt an aggressive policy, is *a Session*. By the distribution of the powers under our Constitution as it now is, those of the Session are restricted. But according to the Scripture the power of the whole is in the Session. When no higher court exists the Session is omnipotent. But in heathen lands there is not even a Session. What, then, is to be done? That's the question. How are we to bear rule, where no constituted authority exists? The usual answer is, Let the church at home send out an evangelist clothed with extraordinary power, with all the power of a Session and a Presbytery—power to do everything necessary to plant the church.

We confess that, to our mind, it seems reasonable that, if the church at home is to exercise any ruling power at all

abroad, it should use all that is necessary. If the Constitution may confer on the evangelist any power, it may confer all he needs to do the work, to which he is called. If the home Presbytery may entrust to him "power to organize churches and ordain ruling elders and deacons," as is now the case, it may add the power of discipline also over members and officers, until the church is completely set up. If the power of ordaining and organizing, which can be exercised only by a court, may be delegated under extraordinary circumstances to an individual, why should he not have the power of discipline also? And, as all appeal to the church at home is encumbered with difficulties insuperable to the proper administration of justice, why not make this power absolute? This view is held in the church and has been formally brought before the General Assembly for its adoption. Why should the Constitution bestow a two-thirds and not a three-thirds power? Discipline is not more delicate or momentous than organization and government. A desire to keep up the appearance of sovereignty in the Presbytery by retaining certain reserved and undelegated rights when the thing itself is already gone, is unworthy of such a body as the church.

Moreover, the law is objectionable because it is virtually prelatical. It confers ruling power upon one, while Presbyterianism retains it for a court composed of several members. It is not an answer to this to say that the Presbytery at home only uses a member to do its work and holds him responsible to itself for the manner in which it is done; that it is the court acting by a commission. This is inadequate because the essence of Presbyterianism lies, not in joint power as opposed to several, but in this, that power cannot be exercised except over those who have conferred it. Republicanism is representative. All the power in the republic comes from the people who compose that republic and must be exercised over them for their good; while our Constitution grants power to evangelists to be exercised over people *volens volens*.

It may be replied to this, But our Church owns all whom it converts; when our evangelists convert the Chinese they there-

fore belong to us, we stand to them *in loco parentis* and are in duty bound to bring them under our rule. If so, what becomes of the Christian liberty of those in whom the Holy Ghost dwells? Can he in whom the Spirit of the Lord dwells be subject to the authority of men "except so far as it represents the authority of Christ" and except he has in conscience put himself under that authority? This is surely one of the incidental forms of Christian liberty.

Why should the liberty of the heathen be abridged into a form less than that of the convert at home? Do those who are converted by our preachers belong to us? or have they not the right to say where they will cast their citizenship? When a home missionary converts a soul and baptizes him, he does not thereby bring that soul into the full communion of any particular church. This is done by a vote of the Session on his own application. The meaning of the application is, I want to be under your control as rulers in the house of God. The act of the home missionary brings the individual into "the kingdom" but not into any particular church. When the Ethiopian eunuch was converted and baptized by Philip he did not thereby become a member of the church at Jerusalem or Gaza. On his own application he might become a member of either. When the chaplains in the Confederate armies, during "the war between the States," baptized soldiers, these soldiers did not become members of any particular church until voted in by the Session. When Mr. Graybill baptizes a Mexican in a ranch he reports his name to the Session of the church at Matamoras or some other convenient centre.

For the Presbyterian Church in the United States to *assume* jurisdiction over souls converted by her missionaries, is a violent stretch of authority. The dogmatic power of the church does not involve, as a necessary correlative, the diacritic power. To convert a soul to God only brings him under the power of the Holy Ghost. His self-will and accountability are still intact. He may join the Presbyterian Church or the Episcopal, or he may join neither, and thus deprive himself of all the benefits of church order. When this soul converted is a heathen, in a land

where no church is of any denomination, he may, in the exercise of his Christian liberty, choose to seek the care of a church in the United States or in Scotland. But it will still remain with that church to say whether it is for the glory of God to bring this convert under its power.

Rome claims power over the whole world and every individual in the world by express and exclusive grant from the Lord Jesus. Autonomy is nowhere found in her borders or in the world, according to her doctrine. All power is given to her on earth over human wills and human souls. But surely Presbyterianism sets up no such claim as this. Prelacy also claims her power through Rome. She is consistent in claiming authority over those whom she regenerates. Her power does not come from the people but from Rome. Along the line of the Apostles from Peter down to those of the present day in her fold, the Great Head transmits it.

It is urged, in support of the policy we oppose, that the Scriptures authorize it. Is not the evangelist an extraordinary officer, clothed with extraordinary powers for an emergency? Is it not so written in Titus, 1: 5,—“Ordain elders in every city?” Was not Titus an evangelist?

If the Apostle had been here stating the peculiar duties of the evangelist and had mentioned ordination as one of them, then the inference would have been reasonable. But such is not the case. He is giving him instructions or orders as to his work and *emphasizing one thing of prime importance* that must be done by all means. In setting in order the things wanting in Crete he must see to it especially that the power in the individuals be joined in representatives who shall exercise it for the good of the mass. But it is not said *how* this is to be done. When done under his direction, according to the principles of government in the church, he does it himself, by an idiom common in many if not in all languages. Titus *must* ordain elders, and to interpose his influence and show the people from the Scriptures how they were to proceed in the election and ordination, would be in strict compliance with his orders. To all but Prelatists this interpretation must be entirely agreeable.

Seeing then that the Scripture cited does not authorize the exercise of such power by one man and that the principles of our government require a Session to be the depository of all the power in the congregation, the question arises

HOW IS THE SESSION TO BE FORMED IN HEATHEN LANDS?

The first step is an election by the votes of the people. In the home church the case is settled by law. "Ruling Elders, the immediate representatives of the people, are chosen by them." This should be so among the heathen also.

In a republican government, whether civil or ecclesiastical, all power resides primarily in the people. Their will is the supreme law and their good the supreme end. They are to be the judge of their highest good and the way to attain it. All power proceeds from them, however it may be exercised. Sometimes it is exercised by their immediate representatives, at other times by those more remote. When the immediate representatives act the majority is one of numbers. When the remote representatives act the majority is one of power. But the ruling power, in both cases, is the people. In the Session, Presbytery and Synod, they rule by their immediate representatives. In the General Assembly, they rule by the remote. This principle is acknowledged in the civil government which is republican. The people elect immediate representatives to rule in the Legislature. These elect others to rule in the Senate. It is therefore not only "inherently difficult" but contrary to all just ideas of republican government, for the church at home to send rulers to those who live beyond the sea, and who had no voice in their election.

That rulers must be elected by the votes of the ruled is clearly taught in Scripture. The principal reliance of Prelatists for an appointing power is that, already examined, in Titus 1:5. Without referring to what has already been said on this, we may rest on the opinion of Neander to set it aside. His impartiality, learning and judgment will not be questioned on this subject. In his Church History (Vol. I. p, 189) as cited by Hackett on Acts 14:23, he writes thus: "When Paul empowers Titus to set pre-

siding officers over the communities who possessed the requisite qualifications, this circumstance decides nothing as to the mode of choice, nor is a choice by the community itself *thereby* necessarily excluded."

In Acts 6:5, 6, deacons were elected by the people. We may infer from this that all offices should be filled by a popular election unless a clear case of another kind is produced. With this instance in our favor the burden of proof falls upon those who would dispense with such an election.

In Acts 14:23, we read, "And when they had ordained them elders in every church." Dr. J. A. Alexander writes, in his commentary on this verse, as follows: "The use of this particular expression, (*χειροτονήσαντες*), which originally signified the vote of an Assembly, does suffice to justify us in supposing that the method of selection was the same as that recorded in 6:5-6, where it is explicitly recorded that the people chose the seven and the twelve ordained them."

In II Corinthians, 8:19, the people elect a travelling companion for the Apostle Paul, and this fact is cited by him as a sufficient reason for the confidence of the people in him as one suitable to take charge of the money collected for the poor saints. The voice of the people in popular elections was entitled to much weight, according to his mind.

The second step in constituting a Session is the ordination of those elected. In the Book of Church Order of our Southern Church, this is required to be done by "the minister with prayer and the laying on of the hands of the Session." But in the foreign field there are no elders to lay on hands and no commission from a Presbytery across the sea can do so. We hold that the people who elect should ordain by laying on their hands with prayer.

The Form of Government of the Northern Presbyterian Church dispenses with the laying on of hands at the ordination of elders. With them, it is a mere method that may be modified at will.

The sum of our argument in favor of ordination by the people in heathen lands is this: (1) It is in accordance with the

Scriptural doctrine about the source and nature of church rule. (2) Every attempt to organize in any other way yet made, has been virtually in accordance with prelatical or unrepublican ideas and in violation of the settled order of our church. (3) It is perfectly simple and practicable under all circumstances and in every part of the world. (4) The amendments to our Book of Church Order, founded on this doctrine, need be only three and they very simple.

H. M. WHITE.

VI. PRESBYTERY VS. EPISCOPACY.*

The General Council of the Episcopal Church which met last fall in the city of Chicago, addressed an overture to their "fellow Christians of different communions" on the subject of *Church Unity*.

In their declaration they recognize as "members of the Holy Catholic Church" "all who have been duly baptized with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost;" express an earnest desire "that the Saviour's prayer, that we all may be one, may, in its deepest and truest sense, be speedily fulfilled;" disclaim any desire "to absorb other communions;" and propose "to forego all preferences of their own," "in all things of human ordering," and to co-operate with other Christians "on the basis of a common faith and order." But, in further explanation of their position, they affirm that Christian Unity can be restored only by a return of all Christian communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Cath-

*1 "Declaration and Resolutions adopted by the House of Bishops and House of Deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Church, convened in the city of Chicago, October 27, 1886." Journal p. 79.

2. "Some Thoughts on the late General Convention. An extract from the Bishop of Alabama's address to the Council of his Diocese, May 11, 1887."

3. "The Recent Past," by Bishop Wilmer, Chapter on "The Presbyterian Communion."

4. "An Open Letter (addressed by Rev. J. H. Stringfellow to Mr. W. C. Clarke) adopted 'as his own' by Bishop Wilmer, July 19, 1887."

olic Church during the first ages of its existence, and that these principles are "the substantial deposit of Christian faith and order committed by Christ and His apostles to the Church unto the end of the world, and therefore incapable of compromise or surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards and trustees for the common and equal benefit of all men." "As inherent parts of this sacred deposit" and as the basis of union they mention "The Holy Scriptures," "The Nicene Creed," "The Two Sacraments" and "The Historic Episcopate."

Bishop Wilmer, in reporting the action of the General Council to the Council of the Diocese of Alabama, took occasion to ridicule the idea that the Presbyterian form of government was taught by the Apostles and followed by the primitive church. He declared such a theory to be "*the most baseless fable ever believed by man.*" In answer to a request for his exact words he stated that he could not recall his exact language, but gave the following as the substance of what he said: "That the Apostolic church entered into that dark and unhistoric night of persecution (when to be a bishop meant to be chief martyr) under Apostolic and Episcopal government. When the church emerged from that horrid night of persecution into the historic era we find everywhere 'Diocesan Episcopacy,' and I concluded from these unquestionable facts that the idea of a primitive Presbyterian form of government, thus suddenly transformed into Episcopal government, was entirely baseless, and without precedent in human affairs."

In his published address he repeats this assertion and quotes Chillingworth as saying "When I shall see, therefore, all the fables in the Metamorphosis acted and proven true stories, then I will begin to believe that the Presbyterian government, having continued in the church during the Apostles' time, should presently after (against the Apostles' doctrine and will of Christ) be whirled about like a scene in a mask, and transformed into Episcopacy." He then concludes that "the theory of an original Presbyterian polity" "is *utterly baseless* in fact and without precedent in human affairs" and asserts that "the founders of the Presbyterian form of polity—notably Calvin—advocated no

such theory." In his book, *The Recent Past*, he expressly asserts that the Presbyterian form of government "can be traced back no further than to the Reformation."

It will be seen from these quotations that the Episcopal Church makes the form of government an "*essential*" of that unity for which the Saviour prayed, and that, according to Bishop Wilmer's interpretation of the overture, by the Historic Episcopate is meant *Diocesan* Episcopacy, that is, the oversight of one Bishop, *superior in rank* to presbyters, over a diocese, over the ministers and churches in a given territory. He asserts that Diocesan Episcopacy is found everywhere at the end of the persecution period and argues that therefore it must have existed in the time of the Apostles and that therefore all other forms are baseless. In the "Open Letter" which he endorses "as his own" he asserts that the Mosaic ministry "was Diocesan," and that "*the temple is the model after which the church is formed.*"

Here then the contrast is drawn between the Presbyterian form of government, "a baseless fable," "utterly baseless," and the "Historic Episcopate" "committed by Christ and His Apostles to the church," "founded in fact and verified by all history," "incapable of surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards." All, therefore, who would further the unity prayed for must renounce their "baseless Presbyterian form of government" and accept the "Historic Episcopate." In opposition to this position the following is presented:

THE IDEA OF AN ORIGINAL PRESBYTERIAL GOVERNMENT IS NOT A BASELESS FABLE, because—

1. *The principle of representative church government is taught in the Old Testament by the divine institution of the eldership.* To this the Bishop replies, "The elders of Israel were a social and political body and not ecclesiastical." It would be equally true to assert that Moses was only a political leader. The elders of Israel, in a government in which the civil and ecclesiastical elements were so intimately associated, may have discharged certain political duties, but that they performed ecclesiastical duties as representatives of the people, is evident from Lev. 4: 14-15 and Num. 11: 16. When the people were to

make an offering for sin, "the elders of the congregation shall lay their hands upon the head of the bullock before the Lord." This was an offering made "before the *tabernacle*" "before the *Lord*" "for sin." "Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom thou *knowest to be elders of the people* and officers over them, and bring them to the tabernacle of the congregation, that they may stand with thee. * * And I will take *my spirit* which is upon thee and *will put it upon them*; and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee." Verses 24 and 25, "And the Lord came down in a cloud, * * and took of the Spirit that was upon him and gave it to the seventy elders; and it came to pass that when the Spirit rested upon them, *they prophesied*."

2. *The synagogue government was the model after which that of the Apostolic church was fashioned.*

The Bishop says this is a "guess," "that the synagogues were the bitterest persecutors of the early church," and that "Paul argues, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, that the temple is the model, after which the church is formed." If Paul argues, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, that the temple is the model, the Bishop fails to point out the passage and must reconcile with his statement the fact that, in chapters eighth, ninth and tenth of that Epistle, Paul proves the inferiority of the Levitical priesthood and shows how it has been abolished by the coming of the one great High Priest. If the synagogue persecuted the early church, so did the officers of the temple; so that, according to that argument, the temple must be given up as a model.

If it is a "guess" to suppose that the synagogue was the model after which the Apostolic church was fashioned, it is rather strange that so many learned Episcopalians agree upon the guess. Stillingfleet, Litton, Vitranga, Lightfoot and Archbishop Whately (besides many others) adopt this view. Whately says: "The Apostles did not so much form a Christian church as to make an existing congregation Christian by introducing the Christian sacraments, * * *leaving the machinery of government unchanged*, the rulers of the synagogue, elders and other officers being already provided in existing institutions." Lightfoot:

“They would naturally, if not necessarily, adopt the normal government of the synagogue, and a body of elders, or presbyters would be chosen to direct religious worship.” “The duties of the presbyters were two-fold. They were both rulers and instructors in the congregation.” Edward Litton, in his book, *The Church of Christ* writes: “That the church really did derive its polity from the synagogue is a fact upon the proof of which it is needless to expend words.” And adds: “The question is conclusively settled by Vitringa, in his learned work: ‘*De Synagoge Vetere.*’” Stillingfleet: “I shall therefore endeavor particularly to show how the Apostles did observe the model of the synagogue in the public service of the church; in the community of names and customs; in the ordination of church officers; in forming Presbyteries in the several churches, and in ruling and governing those Presbyteries; and even in forming Christian churches out of Jewish synagogues.”

Perhaps the best way to establish the fact that the Christian church was modeled after the synagogue, is to point out the resemblance between the two. 1. In each synagogue, as in each Apostolic church, there was a plurality of presbyters. The record as to the church is (Acts 14 : 23) “And when they had ordained *elders* in *every* church.” Bishop Burnett says “In the synagogues there was, first, one who was called the bishop of the congregation; next, the three judges of everything about the synagogue, by the Greeks called the *Presbuteroi*, or elders. These ordered and directed everything that concerned the synagogue or the persons of it. Next to them were the *parnassim*, or deacons, whose duty it was to gather the collections of the rich and distribute to the poor.” What better description of the officers of the Presbyterian church? The pastor, the elders who rule with him, and the deacons who attend to the temporal affairs of the church, and distribute its alms. If there were elders in the synagogue and elders in each Christian church, with similar names and duties, may not the church have followed the government of the synagogue in deciding to have such officers? If the Apostolic church had a plurality of ruling elders in each congregation why should not the Presby-

terian church find in that practice a warrant for the office of ruling elder? 2. In both, these elders or presbyters were the rulers who governed everything about the synagogue or church. 3. In both, these presbyters were divided into two classes at least one of which "labored in word and doctrine," while the others only "ruled well" (I. Tim. 5 : 17.) 4. In both, there was ordination by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, (I. Tim. 4 : 14.) 5. In both, there were deacons whose duty it was to care for the poor. The names, duties, qualifications, powers and ordination, of the officers, in the two, were similar. This is not true of the officers of the temple as compared with those of the Apostolic church, and hence we conclude that the synagogue and not the temple was the model after which the Christian church was fashioned.

3. *All the principles of the Presbyterian form of government are taught by the Apostles.* The essential features of our system are :

(a) A government by presbyters, the chosen representatives of the people—these presbyters, all of one order, but divided into two classes, those who rule only and those who rule and teach, all equal as to the ruling function. (b) These presbyters rule jointly in courts, and not severally, or in their individual capacity. (c) Unity is realized by a series of courts, rising one above the other until we reach the highest in which the church throughout the entire world might be represented.

Turning to Apostolic teaching, we find : (a) That they recognize the right of the "brethren" to elect men to act as deacons. (Acts 6 : 6.) When *the people* had chosen them, the Apostles ordained them for a specific purpose "to serve tables." (b) They teach a plurality of presbyters in each church. (Acts 14 : 23.) "And when they had ordained them *elders in every church.*"

(c) They teach that these elders were of one order, but two classes, *rulers* only and those who *ruled and taught.* (I Tim. 5 : 17.) "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in word and doctrine." (d) These elders were the same as bishops in *name* (Acts 20 : 17, 28.) "And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus and called the

elders (presbuteroi) of the church, and when they were come to him, he said unto them, 'Take heed therefore unto yourselves and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers (*episcopoi*, bishops) to feed the church of God.'" The terms *presbuteroi* and *episcopoi* are applied to all of the elders of the church of Epesus in duties so far as ruling is concerned, (1 Pet 5: 1-2.) "The Elder swchich are among you I exhort who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ * * *feed* the flock of God which is among you, *taking the oversight* thereof;" also in *character*. (Tit. 1: 5-9.) "Ordain elders in every city, * * if any be blameless, for a *bishop* must be blameless, etc." Thus being equal in rule and authority, possessing similar names, qualifications and characters and called to the discharge of the same duties, they must have belonged to the *same order*. This Whitby, Lightfoot and a host of others admit. Whitby says: "Both Greek and Latin Fathers do with one consent, declare that bishops, in apostolic times, were called presbyters and presbyters bishops, the names being then common." If interchangeable then, why not now, as in the Presbyterian church. (e.) These presbyters *ruled jointly* in courts called Presbyteries. Acting in their joint capacity they *ordained* Timothy. (I Tim. 4: 14) "Neglect not the gift that is in thee by prophecy, with the *laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*;" *settled disputes*. e. g. the question as to circumcision brought before the elders and Apostles assembled at Jerusalem (Acts 15: 6.) They discussed the matter and came to a conclusion as a court and sent a message as the voice of that court; as a collective body they *took the oversight* of the flock of God. (f). In these courts we find the principle by which the idea of church unity may be realized. The representatives from the various churches, meeting in a common body, would bind together all the churches in a brotherhood. There could be any number of Presbyteries, and extending over any territory from the Presbytery of the single church of Epesus to that of all the churches in a much larger district, as that which assembled in Jerusalem. In all these courts, from the lowest to the highest, there would be presbyters, and only presbyters, and

hence the name Presbyterian. Recognizing Christ as the sole and Supreme Head of His Church (Col. 1 : 8). "And He is the head of the body, the Church," these courts would rise one above the other until they reached the highest in which might sit elders to represent the churches throughout the entire world.

To the views presented under the last two heads, Bishop Wilmer, through his representative in the "Open Letter," raises certain objections.

(1) He seeks to avoid the force of Acts 6 : 1-7 touching the purpose for which *deacons* were ordained, by pointing out the fact that one of the men elected deacon *afterwards* preached. He charges me with "giving only half the truth and putting constructions upon scripture words and phrases that they will not bear." But where is the ground for such a charge? Are we not expressly told (Acts 6 : 3) for what purpose the deacons were ordained? "Whom we may appoint over *this business*." What business? To "serve the tables" while the apostles preached and prayed. "But we will give ourselves continually to the ministry of the word." Where is the misstatement? Suppose Philip did preach in after years, had he not then been ordained an "*Evangelist*?" He is expressly so called in Acts 21 : 8, and *as such he preached and baptized*. The fact that one of the seven deacons was ordained "evangelist" and preached, no more proves that deacons should preach, than the fact that the Presbyterian church should ordain as evangelist a man who had served as a deacon, would prove that the Presbyterian church authorizes her deacons, as such, to preach and baptize. Besides, women, who were not permitted to preach, were and are yet eligible to the deaconship (Rom. 16 : 1). "Phœbe, a deaconess of the church of Cenchrea." Hence preaching could not have been a part of the deacon's duty. Nor was it so according to Ambrose, in the historic era (A. D. 370-397). He says, "Deacons do not now preach to the people." Jerome, his contemporary, says, "Let them hear the Apostles. It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables. Let them know why deacons were appointed." Chrysostom (fourth century) says that "preaching of the Gospel was *not* committed to them."

If, therefore, deacons have neither ruling nor preaching functions, if all presbyters and bishops are equal *quoad* the ruling function, then there can be but *one order of church rulers*,* viz: presbyters—elders or bishops as we may prefer to call them—divided into two classes, as is evident from 1 Tim. 5:17. It is interesting to recall Calvin's interpretation of this passage, especially as the Bishop awards to him an honor (that of being the founder of the Presbyterian government) which he does not claim for himself, and inasmuch as the Bishop also denies that Calvin held to the "theory of an original Presbyterial form of government." Calvin says: "From this passage (I Tim. 5:17) we may gather that there were *two kinds of presbyters*, because they were not all ordained to the work of teaching. For the words plainly mean that some ruled well to whom no part of the public instruction was committed. And verily, there were chosen from among the people grave and approved men, who, in common council and *joint authority with the pastors*, administered the discipline of the church." He says further: "In calling those who preside over churches by the appellations of bishops, elders, presbyters and pastors, *I have followed the usage of the Scriptures*, which apply all of these terms to express the same meaning."

(2) Bishop Wilmer, (Open Letter,) also objects to our giving such an interpretation to I Tim. 4:14, and says, "Had you remembered II Tim. 1:6, you would have put it down that Timothy was ordained by the hands of the Apostle Paul." It was *not* forgotten that Paul, in II Tim. 1:6, claims to have put his hands on Timothy, but if Paul there refers to ordination, (which scholars dispute, saying it was for the bestowal of miraculous power,) it is easier to understand how Paul could have taken part in the ordination as an elder, as Peter says he was a co-presbyter, (I Peter 5:1), and as a member of the Presbytery, than how the Presbytery, the estate of elders, could

* The Apostles were plainly extraordinary and temporary officers who have no successors who can show the "signs of Apostleship"—none who have "seen Christ" are "inspired," able to *work miracles* and to *confer the power of bestowing the Holy Ghost* for miraculous signs.

have been *in Paul*. The word, presbytery, is used in only two other places, in one of which it is translated "elders of the people" (Luke 22: 66), and in the other (Acts 22: 5), "the estate of the elders." Hence, we conclude that the many presbyters constituting the Presbytery, in which Paul sat as a member, ordained Timothy. If the Presbytery had the right of ordaining then, why not now?

(3.) The Bishop further objects to our inferring the *perfect equality* of the presbyters, and that they ruled jointly, from the record given in Acts 15. He says: The question "was decided by the Apostle James, for the narrative distinctly tells us that James gave his sentence." Scholars generally hold that the expression, "my sentence" is only the expression of an individual opinion given in the midst of debate, just as any speaker might say, "My judgement is" this or that. Thus Alexander (*in loco*): "*My sentence is*, literally, *I judge* (as in the Remish version; Wiclif, *I deem*) a common formula, by which the members of the Greek assemblies introduced the expression of their individual opinion, as appears from its repeated occurrence in Thucydides, with which may be compared the corresponding Latin phrase (*sic censeo*) of frequent use in Cicero's orations. That James here settles the whole question by a decision *ex cathedra*, is as groundless an opinion as that Peter had already done so by his *dictum*. There is no trace in the narrative of any such superiority on either side. The whole proceeding is analogous to that which continually takes place in our church courts, when the roll is called to give the members an opportunity of stating their judgment upon some important question. Even in Tyndale's version, copied by King James's Bible, *sentence* no doubt means opinion (*sententia*) not a final decision." Besides the contest plainly sets aside the Bishop's interpretation. v. 22. "Then pleased it the apostles and elders to send men," etc. v. 28. "For it seemed good unto the Holy Ghost and to us," etc. Chap. 16: 4. "They delivered them the decrees for to keep that were ordained by the apostles and elders." Is it not plain that the elders had a part in "ordaining" the "decrees?" Did *James* or the Apostles and elders ordain the deacons?

4. *The church at Ephesus furnishes a specific example of a Presbyterian Church.* From Acts 20: 17, 28, we learn that it was governed by a plurality of elders, that these elders are called bishops, and that they had the oversight of the church. It was a rule by presbyters and therefore Presbyterian. Following for substance the line of thought suggested to me while in the Seminary by one whom I delight to honor, I submit the following: If you take the word church in this passage to refer to a single congregation, you must admit that there presided over it a plurality of bishops and that, therefore, they were not diocesan bishops, but parochial. This is like a Presbyterian, but not like the Episcopal Church. If you understand the word church to refer to more than one congregation united under one government, then you must admit that those churches were governed by presbyters and not by a single bishop. This is just as it is in the Presbyterian Church, where a Presbytery takes the general oversight over the churches in a given district and not as it is in diocesan Episcopacy. In either sense of the word church therefore, the presbyterial form of government is taught. That these presbyters ruled jointly, is evident, for "if all were rulers of equal authority (and we have shown they were) there could have been no decency nor order in the exercise of their power except by agreement, that is, by an agreement of a majority," and from such passages as I Tim. 4: 14, Acts 22: 5 and Luke 22: 66, in all of which the word *πρεσβυτέριον* occurs. "The lexicon gives *πρεσβυτέριον*: a college or order of elders or presbyters or a senate, that is a corporate unit of which the elders are the members." "This undoubtedly is the meaning in Luke 22:66; and Acts 22:5, for there it is the Sanhedrim; and it is not likely that a word used only three times in the New Testament should in two of them denote beyond all doubt a college of presbyters and in the remaining instances the office of a presbyter as some have held." The presbyterial form of government, therefore, so far from being a baseless fable was taught under the Old Testament dispensation, followed in the synagogue, adopted by the Apostles and held by the primitive church. In after years, "little by

little," as Jerome tells us, the presbyters were "defrauded out of their original rights," and in certain parts of the Church the "custom arose of elevating one presbyter above the rest who should rule over the churches and officers of a district." But there never was a time when there were not *protests* against these usurpations, as will be seen from the testimony given under the next head.

5. *Other witnesses testify to the existence of the Presbyterian form of government long before the date assigned by the Bishop of Alabama.*

(1) Presbyterians do not pin their faith to what the Fathers say. When they agree with the Bible, we believe them; when they contradict scripture, we refuse to accept their statements. Still the Fathers, in whom the advocates of prelacy trust, bear witness to the existence of our form of government, in their time. Jerome, (A. D. 380.) "Let us diligently attend to the words of the Apostle, saying, 'That thou mayest *ordain elders in every city.*' * * A presbyter, therefore, is the *same as a bishop*; and before there were, by the devil's instigation, parties in religion * * the churches were governed by a *common council of presbyters.*" Chrysostom, (A. D. 398): "Whatever he (Paul) said of bishops, agrees also to presbyters. In ordination alone they have gone beyond the presbyters, and of this they seem to have defrauded them."

(2.) The Waldenses and Culdees bore witness to the existence of Presbyterianism in the early ages of the church. How far back they can be traced is a disputed point. Bishop Wilmer's "Open Letter" says they had no existence before the sixth century. But Reinerius Saccho, who lived two and a half centuries before Luther, and who was a bitter enemy of the Waldenses, says: "They were more pernicious to the Church of Rome than any other sect of heretics, for three reasons: 1. They are older than any other sect, for some say they have been ever since the time of Pope Sylvester, A. D. 314, and others say, from the time of the Apostles. 2. They are more extensively spread. 3. The Waldenses are more pious than any other heretics; they believe truly of God, live justly before men, and receive all the

articles of the creed." The editor of Mosheim's History, with the learned Beza, gives this explanation of their name: "from their valleys in the Piedmont, which, in their language, is called Vaux, hence Vadois, their true name; hence Peter of Lyons was called in Latin *Voldus*, because he had adopted their doctrine; and hence the term Voldenses and Waldenses used by those who write in English or Latin." They existed long before Peter of Lyons. "In the library of the University of Geneva is an ancient manuscript, dated sixty years before Waldo is mentioned, which speaks of the Vaudois;" and their enemy, mentioned above, "mentions authors of note who make their antiquity remote as the apostolic age." They are still in existence and claim apostolic origin. Their representative in the Pan Presbyterian Council said "they were not Reformed, because they had never been Deformed."

(3) The Culdees may be mentioned as another body of witnesses to the early existence of presbyterial government. In the *Culdee Church* by Rev. T. V. Moore, D. D., it is clearly shown that Christianity was introduced into Scotland near to or during the apostolic age, that the Scottish Church is older than the English, and that the Presbyterian Church "has, through this ancient church, a more unbroken historical connection with the primitive church than even the Anglican Church." Only an outline of the reasoning, together with a few quotations from historians, can be given in this article. Bishop Wilmer asserts ("Open Letter") that "the Culdees can be traced no further back than the *tenth century*, and that they were corrupt."

Now, Tertullian, who lived about sixty years after the death of the Apostle John, says, "Those parts of Britain that were inaccessible to the Romans (*i. e.* Scotland) had become subject to Christ in his day," so that it must have been introduced there years before that time, to have prevailed to such an extent as described in his statement. Baronius says, "Christianity was introduced into Britain A. D. 35. Thence by missionaries, it was carried, doubtless, at a very early age, into Scotland." Buckhannan, in his history, says, "The Scots were taught Christianity by the disciples of John." Neander tells us that "after Christianity had been in the southern part of Scotland for many years

Columba transplanted it, (of course in that form in which it had long existed there) about A.D.565 among the Northern Picts." On the island of Iona he established a Christian college where many missionaries were trained who afterwards preached the gospel in Northern Scotland, in Britain, France and Germany. "These ministers were called Culdees, and the churches which they formed Culdee churches, the word Culdee probably being a corruption of the term *Cultor Dei*, a worshiper of God." These people, whether called Culdees before the time of Columba or not, were, from the first, worshipers of the true God and *held the Presbyterian form of government*. In acknowledgment of this Bishop Stillingfleet writes: "Some whole nations seem to have been without any bishop at all, if we may believe their own historians." Is it not better to receive the testimony of "their historians" than of Bishops and their "representatives" in Alabama? So, if we may believe the great antiquaries of the Church of Scotland, that church was governed by their Culdee, as their presbyters were called, without any bishop over them for a *long time*. Johannes Fardonius is clear and full as to their government, *from the time of their conversion* (near, very near, to the time of the Apostles) to the coming of Palladius, A. D, 430, *beyond the end of the persecution period*. He says: "They were governed by their presbyters and monks* following the order of the primitive church" which we have seen was presbyterial. From the "Pictorial History of England" we learn that while there is some dispute as to the form of government of this people, *Selden* "maintains it to have been Presbyterian" while others hold "that they were subject to Episcopal authority;" "but," says the author, "the former is the opinion that has been more generally held and that seems most conformable to the expressions of Bede, the earliest authority on the subject." He adds, in direct contradiction to the position of the Bishop of Alabama, "There is a general agreement as to the purity and simplicity

* Originally monks were nothing more than Christian men "forced by persecution to retire from the world and live in deserts and places most private in hopes of finding that peace among beasts which was denied them among men."

both of their doctrines and lives. Even Bede, though indignant at their rejection of the authority of the Roman bishop, testifies that they preached only such works of charity and piety as could be learned from the prophetic, evangelical and apostolic writings," D'Aubigne says: "Kneeling they were set apart by the *laying on of the hands of the elders.*" Time would fail us to tell of the 365 bishops to the 365 churches of Ireland, in the time of St. Patrick, and of the 900 bishops of North Africa, in the time of Augustine.

(4). The very authorities with which the Bishop seeks to show that there was no trace of Presbyterianism in the early ages can be turned against him. Neander (whom the Bishop quotes in his "Open Letter") says--in writing about the beginning of that historic era of which he makes so much, 312-359, (Vol. III. p. 220, Bohn's Edition), "Yet a Chrysostom and a Jerome still asserted the primitive equal dignity of the presbyters and bishops, very justly believing that they found authority for this in the New Testament." The good Bishop tries to find comfort in Gibbon; but he says, in describing the character and duties of Christian ministers of the first and second centuries: "The public functions of religion were solely entrusted to the established ministers of the church, bishops and presbyters, two appellations which in their first origin appear to have distinguished the same office and the same order of persons." After showing how, for public order, they elected presidents or moderators, and then made them permanent, he adds that it is under these circumstances that the lofty title of bishop began to raise itself above the humble appellation of presbyter. Of the third century he thus speaks: As the legislative authority of the particular churches was insensibly superseded by the use of councils, the bishops obtained, by their alliance, a much larger share of executive and arbitrary power; and as soon as they were connected by a sense of their common interests, they were enabled to attack with vigor the original rights of the clergy and people. The prelates of the third century imperceptibly changed the language of exhortation into that of command and scattered the seeds of *future usurpations.*" (Hist. VII. pp. 272, 275, 276, 277.)

Pages could be filled with concessions of bishops and distinguished scholars of the English Church to show that the High Church position, taken by the Bishop of Alabama, in his interpretation of the overture on union, is not in harmony with the teaching of our church in its better days. The men of Calvin's day could afford to recognize him as a minister and consult him in regard to their prayers and forms, and, in later days Dean Stanley can find it in his heart to use the following language concerning Bishop Lightfoot—the two thus uniting in the declarations—“*The most learned of all the bishops of England, whose accession to the great see of Durham has recently been welcomed with rare unanimity by the whole church of England, has, with his characteristic moderation and erudition, proved beyond dispute, in his celebrated essay attached to his edition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, that the early constitution of the apostolic churches of the first century was not of a single bishop, but of a body of pastors indifferently styled bishops or presbyters; and that it was not until the very end of the apostolic age that the office, which we now call Episcopacy, gradually and slowly made its way into Asia Minor; that Presbytery was not a later growth out of Episcopacy, but that Episcopacy was a later growth out of Presbytery,*” and that “the office which the Apostles instituted was a kind of rule not of bishops but of presbyters.”

Thus the BIBLE, the Fathers, historians, bishops and arch bishops, all bear witness to the idea of an original primitive, apostolic presbyterial form of government. We must therefore be permitted to retain it, notwithstanding the judgment of the Bishop and the decree of the Council. “We ought to obey God rather than men.”

W. C. CLARK.

VII. THE TRUE BASIS OF STATE LEGISLATION ENFORCING OBSERVANCE OF THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

To the reflecting mind there are in our present social condition evidences of the operation of influences which argue unfavorably for the safety of our free institutions. It may not be unprofitable, as preliminary to the views I propose now to present, to enumerate a few of the most prominent among those influences.

But little over one hundred years have passed since the men of 1776, with that memorable declaration of principles, in which they appealed to the Supreme Ruler of the universe to attest the rectitude of their intention, did, "in the name and by the authority of the good people of these Colonies," launch upon the world a political system such as mankind never before witnessed—a system created by and for the people, and dependent upon their virtue, intelligence and patriotism for its maintenance. This system has been subjected to the test of war and has survived it. Even the late internecine struggle, where men of the same race and like faith, political and religious, met in the clash of battle, and upon which the world looked as the doom of republican government on this continent—even that test seemed only to prove the wonderful vitality of our free institutions, when in the hands of men devoted to the great principles of political and religious liberty which underlie them; for the people of each section seemed to feel that they, rather than their opponents, understood and maintained those principles in their true and essential meaning; while, with that historic characteristic of the race, when the issue had been decided by the arbitrament of the sword, the losing party accepted the decision, and returned to the union of the States with a shield untarnished by a single dishonorable act, and a fealty and patriotism as pure as can be found on earth.

But in the period beginning with the close of the late war, there have been rapidly developed signs of danger, because they evince the operation of influences whose tendency is to undermine public virtue and lessen in the popular heart that love for and

intelligent appreciation of the great foundation doctrines of our political creed. Public virtue, no less than general intelligence, diffused among the people, is an absolute necessity to the safety of republican institutions; and whatever indicates a failure of public virtue, upon which it is universally conceded our institutions rest, is ominous of a decline of that patriotism without which no republic can long survive.

Among the evidences of a decline of public virtue and a corruption of public morals may be enumerated an inordinate desire for wealth, without regard to the means by which it is acquired—a growing disposition to make the possession of wealth, like charity, cover a multitude of sins—an entire forgetfulness of the fraud, cruelty and injustice practiced in its acquisition, in the sycophantic devotion to the man surrounded by the social *eclat* and influence which the possession of wealth is made to produce; so that what in modern phrase is called “society,” in many places, counts among its prominent members persons whose only claim to popular consideration is measured by their dollars—dollars often stained with the life-blood of the helpless victims of the fraud by which they were acquired. Political ambition unsustained by money is often hopeless of success, unless sufficiently corrupt to become the willing slave of a power which seeks to prostitute legislation to selfish aggrandizement. This struggle for the accumulation of property is designated by the rather high-sounding title of “Material Progress,” and nothing seems too sacred or venerable to escape the iconoclastic hand of its moving genius.

Both in religion and politics, things held in veneration in the earlier days of the republic are now profaned without remorse. Attendance upon the public services of the house of God, which in many places was once a test of social position, is now so much neglected that in the centers of trade and commerce public sentiment finds expression in such words as these—“women for religion, men for business.” Doctrines held as sacred as Bible truth by a former school of political thought are now laughed at as straight-laced and swept away without scruple, when their enforcement would be an obstacle to the accomplishment of some scheme of public plunder concealed under the attractive phrase,

“material improvement of the country;” until it has become a recognized fact, tacitly approved by the masses of the people, that the national revenues are to be distributed in the halls of legislation by a system of bargain and sale, wherein one member consents to the claim urged by another in consideration of a promise of like favors.

Wealth, which at an earlier period was more equally distributed, is now centering at given points, and aggregating in the hands of a few, and by them used to increase their power, in selfish disregard of the rights of others; so that the many are ruined that a comparatively small number may become princely nabobs, by whose *ipse dixit* prices are fixed and the supply of the very necessities of life controlled. Corporations of great power, and wholly reckless of the rights of those with whom they deal, oppress the masses, who in turn, driven to extremes by unjust exaction, combine for their own protection. This results in the formation of immense voluntary associations, having no sanction of law to command the fealty and no legal authority to compel the obedience of their members, which, hence, frequently precipitate riots, causing loss of both life and property, besides producing far-reaching antagonisms, injurious to the welfare of the whole people, both material and social. This results again in thousands of idle persons being turned loose upon the country whose demoralization is increased with each day of idleness, until the loss of habits of continued and remunerative industry sends them to swell the vagrant and criminal classes of society.

For many years millions of persons from the rottenest and most corrupt classes of European society have been poured upon our shores, who being wholly ignorant of the principles of republican government, and strangers to all of our institutions, social, religious and political, confound liberty with license, and religious toleration with a denial of all religion. Pandering to such sentiments and taking occasion from a wide-spread discontent among the masses of the people, there have come to the front the anarchist and the communist, the one preaching a crusade against all government and the other denying all private rights of property; while commingling with the whole, and influencing

the whole, are the disciples of infidelity and atheism, who, like the redhanded fanatics of the French Revolution, deny the authority of all revealed truth, and would tear down the altars of religion and rear on their ruins the soulless, spiritless form of materialism, around which hangs the mysterious veil of annihilation, on which there falls no ray of light from the future—neither the soft beams of hope, nor the fierce glare from the region of the lost.

To sum up the whole, patriotism seems to give place to individualism; *pro bono publico* to *pro virili parte*; honesty and virtue to fraud and licentiousness. The demand of such classes is, that education shall be only mental and physical; that human governments have nothing to do with the moral side of man's nature, and morality and purity of life must be relegated to individual choice and encouraged only by private effort. I think it cannot be questioned that the operation of such influences are dangerous to institutions such as ours, which must depend for their safety, almost entirely, upon the virtuous intelligence of the people.

Even in governments less dependent upon the people than ours, such influences, wrought out to their ultimate results, have destroyed splendid civilizations and wrecked powerful empires. The records of the past attest this fact, the verity of which was so fully recognized by an eminent author of English history, that he pronounced man incapable of advancing in civilization, beyond a given point, and declared that when that point was reached retrogression began which, inevitably, resulted in mental and moral obscurity. But while conceding, as we must, the tendency of human nature to degenerate under the influence of a vicious indulgence, the opportunity for which is afforded by the accumulation of material wealth in the hands of a favored class, and which is stimulated by the discontent of the oppressed and impoverished classes, we are happily reminded that the civilization of this period has in it an element wholly absent from that of any past era, and which, it is believed, will operate as the conserving force that is to rescue it from the operation of the terrible law of retrogression.

Man in the past had no ideal man to work up to—no influence outside of himself to sustain and encourage him; his gods were the work of his own unaided imagination; his standard of virtue and morality originated and existed only within himself; the native cruelty of his nature was only refined by culture, but retained all of its original *fierceness*, as illustrated by the fact that helpless innocence was subjected to brutal torture in the midst of an architectural splendor and an exquisite artistic taste never since surpassed, while poetry and eloquence flourished in the midst of the greatest licentiousness and corruption of morals, practiced on public occasions in the name of homage paid to their deities, whose attributes were as degraded as the morals of their worshippers were corrupt, until, at last, cruelty lost all its refinement; vice became beastly; culture and enlightenment were lost in mental and moral obscurity, and man became a moral imbecile, incapable even of admiring the glories of a past amid whose wreck and ruin he walked.

But, the man of this era has ever before him an ideal man in the life of the incarnate Son of God, the perfections of whose character he cannot fail to admire, and whose magnetism, unconsciously, draws man to it; while in the doctrines He taught there is a moral force which bears men up and strikes from their natures those shackles that vice is continually welding. This, it is believed, is the conserving influence which must, at last, permeate the civilization of this era, and bearing men ever upward and onward, make it the grandest, as well as the most perfect the world has ever seen.

But that this influence may have its full work and our civilization be influenced thereby, it is of prime importance that man, both as an individual and a citizen, should continually have this ideal man before him; it should be the one fixed point towards which the mariner both of the church and the state should have his eye continually turned. Strike that star from the sky of the nineteenth century and heathenism with its bloody human sacrifices and dark superstitions would supplant the mercy seat and an intelligent faith; and in place of a free people living under a republic, where the home is sacred from invasion, thought and

expression are free, and every man at liberty to pursue that vocation which most accords with his wishes, there would be repeated the brutal massacres of the Coliseum, the cruelty of the Egyptian task-master and the annual sacrifice of thousands of human lives to gratify the whims and fancies of royal libertines. Public virtue would cease, and purity of life would be remembered only in the legends of a forgotten past.

The Christian religion is, indeed, the religion of human liberty. Freeing man from the bondage of sin on the one hand, and the requirements of the ceremonial law of Judaism on the other, it first suggested the idea of "liberty without license and authority without despotism," an idea which taking hold upon the popular thought of the age, when loosened by the throes of the Reformation from the mass of ignorance and superstition consequent upon ages of ecclesiastical tyranny, shook the thrones of Europe, and found its highest expression and most perfect development in that splendid political system of our forefathers, founded on the principles announced in their famous Bill of Rights. Says Mr. Bancroft :

"But, from Protestantism came forth a principle of all-pervading energy, the common possession of civilized man, the harbinger of new changes in the state. The life-giving truth of the Reformation was the right of private judgment. This personal liberty in the affairs of conscience had, by the illustrious writings of Descartes, been diffused through the nations which adhered to the old faith, under the more comprehensive form of philosophical freedom. Everywhere throughout intelligent Europe and America the separate man was growing aware of the inhering rights of self-culture, and the enjoyment of his whole moral and intellectual being. Individuality was the ground-work of new theories in politics, ethics and industry."

That great French jurist and philosopher, Montesquieu, says :

"Christianity is a stranger to despotic power. The mildness so frequently recommended in the gospels is incompatible with the despotic rage with which a prince punishes his subjects and exercises himself in cruelty. * * * * When the Christian religion two centuries ago, unhappily, became divided into Catholic and Protestant the people of the North embraced the Protestant faith, and those of the South adhered to the Catholic. The reason is plain. The people of the North have and will ever have a spirit of liberty and independence which the people of the South have not."

Judge Story, in his commentaries on the Federal Constitution, calls the Christian religion the religion of liberty, and says: "Indeed in a republic, there would seem to be a peculiar propriety in viewing the Christian religion as the basis on which it must rest."

But, still more to the point, is the language of a distinguished Judge of South Carolina, speaking from the bench of her appellate court, in a case involving the constitutionality of the Sunday laws of that State. He says:

"What gave us the noble safe-guard of religious toleration which made the worship of our common Father as free as the air we breathe and His temple as wide, capacious and lofty as the sky he has spread above our heads? It was not that spirit of infidelity, which deified reason, denied God and was stained with more blood than ever flowed on Aztec altars. It was Christianity, robed in light and descending like a dove on our ancestors, which gave us this provision. It was the same spirit which, when the war of the Revolution was about to begin, sanctified a fast and prostrated a nation before the Lord of Hosts, to ask His blessing and assistance. It was the same glorious spirit of mercy and love which proclaimed the birth of the Saviour, and as a consequence, peace, good will toward men."

We see, then, that the ideas which lie at the foundation of Protestant Christianity are equally the ideas which underlie our political system, and, hence, a civil policy which would write on the nation's escutcheon: "This government knows no God, and recognizes no religion," would strike out the very foundation on which the system rests, and leave the fabric to totter and fall, and in its place to be reared the soulless despotism of an age that knew not God. And, yet, there are men in this enlightened age, who profess to hold that such is the character of our government. That because the fathers of the republic, smarting under the lash of ecclesiastical despotism, and with a just contempt for the hollow formalism and hypocrisy of an established church, incorporated into their organic law a provision that every man should be at liberty to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and no man should be taxed to support any particular religious establishment, nor order of ministry, therefore, it was the intention of the fathers to so completely separate

church and State that no institution of Christianity, however unsectarian and non-ecclesiastical in its nature, can be countenanced by the State, and that any law enacted for that purpose would be unconstitutional and void—is the position of those who oppose all legislation looking to a proper observance of the Christian Sabbath. Hence we see the importance of our subject; for I regard a correct civil policy on this subject as of prime importance to the maintenance of civil liberty on this continent.

The Sabbath has well been called the great civil bulwark of Christianity. Indeed, it is the only one. The constitution wisely forbidding all politico-ecclesiastical institutions, the observance of the Sabbath is the only means by which the State can formally recognize Christianity in the concrete. And to say that our government is based on the principles taught by Christianity, and then to say that we cannot recognize that institution of the Christian religion, whose obligation is as universal as the moral law itself, is to announce an absurdity. If this be true, by what means can the government inculcate those principles upon which its existence depends? By what means can it manifest to the world its character as a Christian State, made by and for a Christian people?

Sir William Blackstone, after remarking on the indecency and scandal of engaging in secular business on the Lord's day, in a country professing Christianity, enumerates the benefits to the State arising from a proper observance of that day, in these words:

“It humanizes, by the help of conversation and society, the manners of the lower classes, which would otherwise degenerate into sordid ferocity and savage selfishness of spirit. It enables the industrious workman to pursue his vocation in the ensuing week with health and cheerfulness. It imprints on the minds of the people that sense of their duty to God so necessary to make them good citizens, but which, yet, would be worn out and defaced by an unremitting continuance of labor, without any stated times of recalling them to the worship of their maker.”

All the American States have, as a part of the body of their statute law, what are known as “Sunday Laws” which, with exceptions varying in different States, proscribe secular business

on the first day of the week. In some of the States, persons who religiously observe the seventh day of the week are exempted from the operation of the law. This, of itself, creates confusion and uncertainty in the administration of the law, by making a specified act a crime when committed by one person and not so when committed by another; and is a surrender of principle dangerous, because it tends to diminish the sanctity of the day, by manifesting uncertainty as to the day for whose observance there is divine authority. But, omitting all discussion of this point, I come to what I conceive to be the important question: wherein lies the authority of the government to enforce the observance of the day? The position to which the courts, driven by the influence of an infidel spirit, and seeking to avoid a debatable question, have come, is: that the observance of the day is not enforced because it is the Christian Sabbath, but as a matter of sanitary expedience, the authority for which they find in the police power of the government. They have surrendered what I conceive to be the true position and that taken by the courts in the early days of the republic, and which is this: That this is a Christian country, and looking to the conservation of public order, peace and morality, and the protection, within well guarded limits, of the religious ideas immemorially pervading our history and stamped upon the character of our laws and institutions. It is our right and duty to set apart the Sabbath day, as a recurring period of ceremonial rest and voluntary worship. Thus, it will be observed, that the distinction between the two doctrines is clearly defined and sharply marked. The one was maintained when the spirit of the great apostles of civil and religious liberty controlled the administration of the laws—the other at a day when the blatant spirit of infidelity had driven the judicial mind to seek refuge in the haven of expediency, shrinking from the denunciations of those who claimed that their constitutional rights were infringed by requiring them to observe a day consecrated by a religion in which they did not believe; apparently not reflecting, that every inch of ground yielded at this point was a surrender of that which is as important to the perpetuity of our free institutions as the doctrine of

representative government itself: for upon it depends those public virtues without which a representative government is impossible. No man acquainted with the social history of the country has failed to observe the evil effects of this course.

The day has, to a large extent, lost its sanctity in the eyes of the people. Legislatures, yielding to the plea of necessity, have in many instances relaxed the rule. Corporations whose employees are counted by millions, and who, becoming themselves demoralized, in turn demoralize other portions of society, are exempted from the law.

The operation of railroads, steam-boats, iron-furnaces and large manufacturing establishments on Sunday imposes on persons not in their employ the necessity of labor on that day, by reason of business connections. Pleasure excursions by rail and water, games and other diversions are uniformly carried on on the Sabbath, where in addition to the sin of profaning the Sabbath vice, in its most seductive forms, spreads its net for the young and unwary. Another serious and by no means remote danger from this surrender of principle is, that the same spirit which has triumphed once, may go further and insist that, if the day is to be observed merely as a matter of expedience, then, any other day will do as well, and we may find ourselves in a land where the Sabbath is unknown, and in its place, days dedicated to licentiousness and godless amusements, such as those with which ancient governments supplied the demand of the people for relaxation and pleasure.

It is idle to say that the religious sentiment of the people will prevent this. The removal of all sanctity in the eyes of the people from the Lord's day will operate as a powerful means for the destruction of that sentiment. As our patriotism is stimulated by commemorating the event which gave birth to our political institutions, so our religious sentiment is preserved by the observance of the day consecrated to the worship of Him from whom that sentiment comes. Once teach the people that the elective franchise is merely a matter of political expedience and not the exercise of an inalienable right, and the doom of representative government would be sealed. It would then be only a question

of time. Equally true is it, that when the sanctity of the Sabbath is lost its observance will, in time, cease entirely.

I shall now endeavor to demonstrate, that the earlier doctrine of the civil courts on this subject is the one most consistent with the spirit of our laws and institutions, and not in conflict with the constitutional rights of any class of citizens.

From the earliest period when the civil governments of Europe came under the influence of Christianity, the observance of the first day of the week as a day sacred to the commemoration of our Lord's resurrection was enforced by law. In A. D. 321, Constantine decreed it *dies non juridicus* for all purposes except manumission of slaves, and a day of rest from all business, except agriculture. In A. D. 425, Theodosius II extended the prohibition to theatricals and games. The history of Sabbath legislation in England can be traced back to the 10th century, in the reign of Athelstan, when we find strict laws rigorously enforced on the subject. The early writers on English law continually mention it as *dies non juridicus*, and, in 1678, the British Parliament, in the reign of Charles II, passed an act which has been substantially copied in all legislation on the subject, both in England and America.

At first, the English courts treated the law as highly penal, and gave it such a strict construction as, virtually, to defeat its purpose; but they never treated it as an act based upon either political or sanitary expedience. I have already given the views of Blackstone on the subject. The courts of England looked upon Christianity as being so completely interwoven with the laws and institutions of the land as to constitute a part of its common law. Thus, we hear such language as this from Lord Chief Justice Hale, speaking from the court of King's Bench in a trial for blasphemy: "Christianity is a part of the law of England, and to reproach the Christian religion is to speak in subversion of the law." Another distinguished Judge refused to permit the question, whether Christianity was a part of the common law of England, to be argued before him, declaring that it was so well settled that it was so, that argument would be a waste of time.

When the English colonists settled America they brought with them the laws and customs of the mother country. The common law was the basis of their jurisprudence, and its precedents the land-marks by which their courts were guided in their decisions. Most, if not all of the colonies, had "Sunday laws" as a part of the body of their statute law, and their courts, unlike the English courts, treated such statutes as highly remedial, intended to preserve public virtue and morals, and conserve in the popular heart those religious sentiments which they regarded as the bases of all virtue. They, therefore, gave the statutes a broad, liberal construction, and enforced them with a rigor which in some cases was carried to a point that no one would either advocate or submit to at this day. But their mistake was in the administration of the law and not in the principle upon which it was based. Their religious convictions were deep and strong, and in their intolerance of anything which seemed to cast a reproach on Christianity, they proceeded to the verge of fanaticism. When the colonies passed from a colonial condition to one of statehood, they carried with them their laws, customs and religious convictions, so far as those laws and customs were not changed by their constitution. The history of the colonies is too familiar to need any reference to it. The religious sentiment pervaded all the departments of life. Intensely patriotic, the people were also intensely religious; so much so that they, in many cases, identified religious devotion with patriotism. The Lord's day was to them a most sacred day; not a day of rest for the sake of rest, but they rested from their labors on that day because it was a day set apart as a memorial of the resurrection. When these people came to form their State governments, their laws and customs were brought with them. The common law, so far as not changed by their organic laws, remained the basis of their jurisprudence in their condition of statehood as it had been in their colonial condition. That deep, all-pervading religious sentiment, modified by the elimination from it of all intolerance, was still as strong as ever. They were just out of a war in which they had spent blood and treasure for the right to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences—a war in which they had, on

many public occasions, acknowledged God as the being who ruled in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of earth, and had appealed to Him for guidance and protection. Their armies had been led by a man pre-eminent for his faith in an overruling providence. Their soldiers had marched to battle panoplied with the prayers of pious mothers, wives and sisters, and, whether around the dark and hopeless bivouac at Valley Forge, or when the star of victory, flashing from the battlements of Yorktown, gleamed like a splendid meteor in their skies, and sent its joyous rays into every hamlet and village from Maine to Georgia, there still remained in the hearts of their grandest and best leaders a sublime confidence in God, and an humble submission to His will whether it brought weal or woe. The right for which they had fought was *the right to worship God*, not to ignore or despise Him. And little did they dream, when shaping their organic laws, that men would rise who would pronounce their work that of the infidel, and declare that under the provisions of their constitutions that memorial which had been given them by the God of their fathers, by which, as citizens and individuals alike, they were to remember Him, and in the keeping of which lay the safety of the glorious structure they were building, neither the Sabbath day, nor the religion by which it is consecrated, could be recognized by the State. Says Judge Story, commenting upon the first amendment to the Federal Constitution :

“Probably at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and of the amendment now under consideration, the general, if not the universal sentiment in America was, that Christianity ought to receive encouragement from the State, so far as was not incompatible with the private rights of conscience, and the freedom of worship; and an attempt to level all religions, and make it a matter of State policy to treat all with indifference would have created universal disapprobation, if not universal indignation.”

Says Chancellor Kent :—

“The Constitution does not secure the same regard for the religion of Mahomet or the Grand Lama as it does to the religion of Christ, for the plain reason, that we are a Christian people and the morality of the country is deeply ingrafted on Christianity.”

Says another eminent jurist :—

“The States which adopted the Federal Constitution were Christian governments, and it cannot be supposed they would adopt laws which would defeat the protection of a religion so dear to the hearts of the people.” . . . “And the spectacle of a free people bowing in willing submission to laws which have not the sanction of their spiritual faith would be an anomaly in history.”

The real object of the religious tolerance clauses in the constitutions was to prevent the establishment of a religious hierarchy which would control the patronage of the government ; and while the framers determined to make a politico-religious establishment forever impossible in America, they still clung with reverential tenacity to their religious faith and made the virtue and morality based on it the foundation of their governments. They recognized God as the author of all good government, and of the religious and civil liberty they had fought to win, and the one upon whom they must depend for its preservation.

This is attested by the language used in the preambles to their constitutions. Thus, in Connecticut, we find this language : “The people of Connecticut acknowledging with gratitude the good providence of God in being permitted to enjoy free government.” In Georgia, this language : “Acknowledging and invoking the guidance of God, the author of all good government.” In Maine : “Acknowledging with gratitude the goodness of the sovereign ruler of the universe and imploring His aid and direction.” In Massachusetts and South Carolina, this language : “We, therefore, acknowledging with grateful hearts the goodness of the great legislator of the universe in affording us, in the course of His providence, an opportunity, deliberately and peaceably, without fraud, violence or surprise, of entering into an original, explicit and solemn compact with each other, and forming a new Constitution of civil government for ourselves and posterity, and devoutly imploring His direction,” etc. Such are specimens of the language found in these constitutions. In some cases the religious tolerance clauses are prefaced with such language as this : “It is the right as well as the duty of all men in society, publicly and at stated seasons, to worship the Supreme Being, the great creator and ruler of the universe.”

Such language, used when they were engaged in the formation of governments for themselves and their posterity, shows the deep religious convictions of those people and their recognition of the fact that they owed the rights they then enjoyed to God, and were entirely dependent on Him for their preservation. When these governments had been formed, the States re-enacted the Sunday laws, substantially as they existed in colonial times at the date of the Revolution ; and, early in the present century, courts were called to pass upon the constitutionality of such legislation. The courts of Pennsylvania and New York took the high ground that Christianity was a part of the common law of those States, imported from England by the colonies and brought by the colonies into the States, and being a part of the unwritten law of the land and the basis of public virtue when the constitutions were adopted, and in no way modified by these constitutions, must be considered as at the base of our organic law and should be recognized and protected by law. The decision in New York, made about 1818, seems to have excited opposition, and in the Constitutional Convention of New York, in 1821, a member offered a resolution the purport of which was to declare the position taken by the courts to be unsound. This resolution was opposed by such men as Chancellor Kent, Chief Justice Spencer, Martin Van Buren and Rufus King, and was defeated by a large majority. In 1846, the same doctrine was announced in South Carolina. The courts of Arkansas and Missouri have held that the Christian religion is recognized as constituting a part of the common law of the land, and the Lord's day, being among the first and most sacred institutions of that religion, is entitled to profound respect and legal protection. Some of the most prominent of our law writers hold the same doctrine, which a few reflections will prove to be correct. The State incorporates and makes provision for the support of asylums for the poor, the maimed, the blind and the deaf. Until the days of Christianity no such institutions were known.

Certain acts and contracts are forbidden and made void by the law, because they are contrary to public morals. By what rule or standard are public morals determined? Certainly not by

that standard which approved the orgies of Bacchus on the carnivals of Venice! No ; it is the standard laid down in the Bible. The morality whose violation makes void the contract, or criminal the act is the morality of the Bible. An annual day of Thanksgiving, appointed by the President, has become so much an institution of the country, that it is now recognized by law. This day is expressly consecrated to grateful homage to be paid to the Supreme Ruler of the universe for blessings vouchsafed to the nation. Upon the daily sessions of our legislative assemblies, from the earliest days of the republic, the blessing of that Ruler has been invoked; and contests between citizens, who implead each other in our courts, are decided by witnesses who call upon God to attest the truth of their statements; while not an officer of the government is permitted to enter upon the duties of his office without calling on God to attest the pledge of fidelity he is required to make. Can it be possible in governments, organized as ours was—born of influences resulting from the teachings of Christianity—baptized in the blood of patriots shed for a free church as well as a free State—formed with prayers to God on the lips of their founders, which prayers they have left on record that all men, everywhere, might know that they were a God-fearing and a God-serving people, and were organizing governments intended to perpetuate both civil and religious freedom, to be conserved by the virtuous intelligence of the men to come after them—that it is in violation of their organic laws for the State by appropriate legislation to compel, on the part of its citizens, an observance of the day appointed for His worship by the God to whom their prayers were offered and in whose name they lifted up the banner of freedom? If so, then those constitutions are stamped with fraud and hypocrisy, and the provision intended to secure freedom of worship and those words of devout entreaty to the God to whom that worship is to be paid should be stricken out, and the honest-hearted patriots of that day should have boldly proclaimed that they meant to establish governments which would permit no recognition of God nor of the religion taught by Christ. But they having done no such thing, but, on the contrary, having arranged their governments as they did, I

insist, that the doctrine relating to the observance of the Sabbath, maintained by the courts in earlier days, is the only one consistent with the spirit of our laws and institutions, and that a doctrine which would ignore the divine obligation of the Sabbath is false to all the teachings of our past, and in violation of the spirit of our organic laws and the institutions based thereon, as proven by the history of the period when those organic laws came into being and the decisions of the courts in the former days of the republic.

It being conceded, as it must be, that it is the duty of prime importance resting upon the State to resort to all proper means necessary to the conservation of public morality and virtue among its citizens, and that virtue and morality are dependent upon an intelligent conception of the doctrines and an honest observance of the moral laws of Christianity, and that the proper observance of the Sabbath is necessary to the preservation of a knowledge of those doctrines and that moral law, it must be conceded, that it is the duty of the State to compel the observance, in the spirit, manner and form necessary to accomplish that end. And, if this be true, that no constitutional right of any citizens would be thereby violated; because the discharge of a duty imposed upon the State by the necessities of its surroundings can never be plead as a violation of the rights of any of its citizens. That provision in all the constitutions securing a free and untrammelled worship of God, is a recognition of the fact that it is man's right and duty to worship God, and that it is competent for the State to aid its citizens in the discharge of that duty by such legislation as may be necessary to such an end.

The above being true, it follows that no constitutional rights are violated by such legislation. These rights, if they exist, are to be found in the constitution. That instrument exempts man from being compelled to worship in any particular form or manner; from being taxed to support a religious establishment or particular order of ministry. But a law designed to compel men to abstain from secular business on the day appointed for divine worship, does not compel men to worship in any particular form, nor even to worship at all. The conscience is in nowise con-

strained by it. It is simply an enforcement by the State of the Divine law of the Sabbath, based upon the duty and authority of the State to enforce respect for that great civil institution of of the Christian religion, upon which the State rests.

Until, therefore, it can be shown that the organic law of the land expressly, or by reasonable implication, recognizes the right of any class of citizens to trample upon virtue and morality, and openly insult that deep religious sentiment which lies at the foundation of our civil institutions, and is entertained by a large majority of our citizens, it cannot be claimed that any right is violated by a law requiring the observance of the Sabbath in its true meaning.

Let us then come back to the doctrine, as announced by the courts of our earlier period, and maintain in its true spirit and in the spirit breathed into our laws and institutions by their founders, this great and important safeguard of virtue and morality upon which the hope of civil and religious liberty rests.

SAMUEL M. SHELTON.

VIII. NOTES.

BIBLE STUDY IN COLLEGE.

The colleges of our country were in the main founded by Christian men, and have been very largely manned and administered by Christian teachers. This last has been true even of State institutions. There has been a general disposition to exalt the Bible and religion, partly by a quiet and unobtrusive devotion to divine revelation, and partly by direct efforts to inculcate its truths. These efforts have been conducted rather on the pastoral theory, than as forming a part of the system of education. The direct teaching of the Scriptures has been almost, if not entirely, limited to Sunday Bible classes, in which the pupil's study is reduced to a minimum, and even the attendance of the pupil very cautiously and timidly enforced amid conditions unfavorable to enthusiastic study or teaching. In many cases the Sunday's reci-

tation has been transferred to Monday morning with greater effort at efficient study; but the success has not been of a high order in most cases. Now the Sunday Bible classes ought not to be abandoned, but rather improved by change of scene and conditions. They give an excellent opportunity to identify the life of the school with the organic church life of the surrounding community. A church home is most desirable for the student, and may be soonest realized by conducting doctrinal and devotional classes on Sabbath at the church as a part of church work, and not college work at all. There is much to be said on this plan of Sabbath work, but it would lead too far away from the purpose of these notes.

The Southwestern Presbyterian University has the following words in her fundamental law: "In connection with every course there shall be a faithful and comprehensive Biblical training, so as to make an intelligent Scriptural faith a controlling principle in the institution." The church's mission in the schoolroom is to sanctify secular learning. Has she succeeded in this as she might have done? Much has been done by a combination of forces, but herein is the reason for the existence of church schools; then why not make the English Bible a necessary part of all education—at least co-ordinate with the more important secular studies? It should be a three or a four years' course, as the case may be, with at least as many recitations a week as Latin, or Greek, or mathematics. Only in this way can the Bible be put on the pedestal in the institution to receive universal homage and to shed its sanctifying light over all the teachings.

It would seem useless to argue propositions so nearly self-evident, but for the fact that Protestant Christianity has failed to work up to this standard, and even now the matter is but just beginning to arrest the attention of educators.

1. The methods pursued by believers in other systems of religion are worthy of our consideration. The disciples of Confucius make the writings of their master the beginning and the end of the most elaborate training. The great Moslem Universities make no "infidels" by making their Koran the Alpha and Omega of their teachings. The school of the Papist with consummate skill uses both the matter and methods of instruction best fitted to secure "implicit faith and obedience," the chief end of all their education. Their methods are eminently wise (from their point of view) and pre-eminently successful. If then Protestant Christ-

ianity will, in like manner, exalt our Bible in the class-room, we may fairly expect vastly better results.

2. One leading object of education in schools is to secure a thorough mental training for the pupil. This is secured partly by mental effort and exercise, and partly by the assimilation of truth, analogous to bodily exercise and the digestion of food. The mind grows strong by what it feeds upon, coupled with its own voluntary activities. Mrs. Rhea, once a missionary to Persia, sent me word many years ago that in her experience of teaching in Persia, she found that for mere mental training there was nothing equal to the Scriptures. This is just what we might expect when we consider the superiority of the Bible over all mere human productions. As a text book, it is simple enough for the unlearned, profound enough for the man of genius, and absolutely free from the poison of human error.

3. The study of literature has always held a high place in education and is on the increase, and properly so. Much has been said of the value of the Scriptures for their literary excellencies, excelling all models. Literature is excellent in its style and expression because it is the apt rendering of the best in human thought. We might fairly expect God's rendering of his own infinite and glorious truth to excel all others. But may we not say, the Scriptures are the key to all literature? The truth of this proposition for all Christian literature hardly needs illustration. An accurate knowledge of ancient mythology is no more necessary to a right reading of Homer and Virgil, than is an accurate knowledge of Scripture to a right reading of Dante and Milton. More than this, the student of heathen mythologies needs to read them in the light of revelation if he would catch the real import of their literature.

4. Historical studies are claiming a yet larger attention in education, and well they may. The Bible goes back to the origin of the race and traces their fortunes for thousands of years anterior to the earliest profane history, and immense efforts are made to uncover and read the stony records of a long buried past only to confirm the peerless histories of Holy Writ. Bible history is the key to the study of all history. In the history of the Jewish people for 1,500 years, overlapping the nations of antiquity, and written by the God of history, we have a divine exposition of his relations to kingdoms and peoples, and of the

methods of his providence. The student of history from this standpoint sees God in history, and learns to realize that the "Seed of the woman," "Abraham's seed," David's "Son and Lord" is "Head over all things to the church."

5. The Scriptures sustain a double relation to all human science. They furnish numerous data with which induction must begin. If these be ignored, the induction is partial and the conclusions presumptively false. The covenant with Noah furnishes a bill of rights for the race which lawyers and statesmen may not ignore. No system of moral philosophy can be complete without the fact of the fall of man. Babel overlooked, works confusion in theories of philology. The fundamental data for social science are found in the family organization as expounded in God's word; and so on numerously, if not without end. The Scriptures also furnish principles which have the force of axioms for testing all human conclusions. In their face the wisdom of this world becomes foolishness. And not only fundamental principles of universal application are divinely given, but the concrete solution of all the great problems of the ages.

6. Bible study furnishes the unifying course for all sound learning. There is a unity which pervades all truth, analogous to and illustrated by the unities and adjustments in the physical universe. The supernatural is the logical condition of the natural and they stand correlated in creation and providence forever. We must study them both if we would fully comprehend either. The revealed assumes the natural; the natural presupposes the supernatural. They must be studied together and assimilated together in educational processes. To study the natural (mere secular learning) is like trying to build a wall of mere brick; 'tis at best but a toppling structure. Lay the mortar when you lay the brick; it unifies the whole and makes an enduring structure. So is the study of revelation and nature together. Let us change the figure. The good wife who made the Highland plaid for her warrior lord must needs use a mordant to set her dyes or else they lose their beauty when exposed to sun and storm. So the skillful educator will use revealed truth to give permanent beauty and harmonious adjustment to the endless varieties of knowledge in the web of truth; nor will the scorching rays of a hostile criticism, nor the chilling torrents of a cold skepticism ever mar its beauty. The Scriptures can be made the unifying course for all sound learning.

It is hardly extravagant to say that there is nothing valuable in the domain of human thought and action, whether civil, political, social, legal, moral, religious, ecclesiastical, philosophical or scientific, etc, for which we do not find a warrant in the Scriptures, or at least a concrete illustration ; and further, that there is no heresy in any of these departments which is not refuted directly or by implication by the infallible word of God.

7. The most obvious plea for Bible study as a necessary part of education I mention last—its moral and spiritual benefits. Man's nature is physical, mental and moral. Any system of education which leaves either of these unprovided for is both vicious and mischievous in its results. The discussion of the physical in education does not come within the scope of this article, though Scripture study does cast many a sidelight upon it. I have shown that the mind derives a full share of profit from Bible study as a co-ordinate branch of learning, and far more than a full share. But for moral and spiritual training and growth in education, revelation is the sole factor. An absolutely godless education would make devils and not saints. The soul grows, like the body, by what it feeds upon ; feed upon carnal food and the spirit dies. Nothing but revealed truth can sanctify secular learning and make it fit for the immortal soul to feed upon. It has been often said that "Academic studies tend to rationalism and scientific studies to atheism." It has been too often so, for obvious reasons ; but it will be so no more if scientific halls are permitted to resound with the thunder claims of Sinai's Lord, and if academic shades whisper with the still, small voice in Horeb, "what doest thou here?" Proud boasters of mere human learning are given to their own devices because they reject true wisdom.

The relations of the mental and the moral and the spiritual have been often sadly overlooked, and the propositions and relations of all truth violated, and the results have often been superstition, mysticism or rationalism. But we call for such an education as will produce a faith stronger than superstition, a devotion more disinterested than mysticism, and an intelligence before which rationalism is the very blackness of darkness. This at least is the ideal to which the church must work if she would educate the world for Christ.

Now are these views practical? This question cannot be answered in this brief article, if indeed I can answer it at all. I

may possibly have another opportunity to state and discuss the methods I have been reaching after and proving for many years in the class-room. It is to me a source of supreme gratitude that many educators are seeking light on the great problem of the church's place in education, and are seeking a new and higher definition for Christian education.

J. B. SHEARER.

Clarksville, Tenn.

AFTER SPRINGFIELD, WHAT?

A strong contention has recently developed in the American Board of Foreign Missions. No disturbance of its kind and character has ever before occurred within the circle of missions to pagan lands. It has been plain, to careful observers, from the first, that however it may issue in the American Board, all similar institutions must be mutually and much affected. The last annual meeting of the Board, the oldest among foreign missionary societies in America, was held in Springfield, Mass., in October, 1887. The events of that meeting are thought to be pivotal and prophetic. To appreciate their significance and forecast their probable bearing, it may be well to review some steps which led up to the Springfield meeting.

Previous to the year 1881, the world looked upon the evangelical churches and their theological seminaries in New England as fully agreed on the Biblical doctrine of the endless destruction of all men who die unreconciled to God. Not many years before the date named, Professor Egbert C. Smyth, of Andover Theological Seminary, the recognized leader of the present departure, vehemently contended against the installation of a minister as pastor of a church in Portland, Maine, because the candidate entertained some faint doubt as to the natural immortality of man, and whether future punishment may not terminate conscious suffering in the obliteration of the soul. He declared that he had never preached his speculations, nor published them. He merely considered the matter as a private speculation. But Professor Smyth would have none of it; and after an earnest contention the candidate was refused installation.

At this Springfield meeting, the official reports from the Prudential Committee of the Board brought out the fact, that only

ten years ago Professor Smyth, then a member of the Committee, voted, with all the others present, and after much consideration, to refuse to commission a candidate to serve the Board among the heathen, when there was nothing else to his discredit but this, that he favored the very doctrine of future-world probation which is at present rending the Board. Professor Smyth is teacher of church history. He knew as much of what has been taught and talked on the theme of eschatology when the Portland affair, and this later, of ten years ago, occurred, as he has known since he and his friends have been agitating the churches, within five or six years. There have been no new Bible and no new history to learn from. How therefore this change in their minds, in regard to the conditions of human destiny has come about, is left for each to judge for himself. Perhaps consistency is not important in matters of faith.

At all events, beginning about the date I give, the venerable Theological Seminary of Andover swung loose from the ground of her former faith, and has ever since been drifting further and further. Every professor on its ancient foundations, as a condition of getting his chair and collecting his salary, is required at the beginning and at the end of every five years of his service to solemnly swear to his acceptance of the creed of the Seminary, which is a model of strictness as concerns most of the statements of evangelical doctrine. Because these professors have so sworn, and some of them repeatedly, and yet are now teaching by precept and example another doctrine, it has brought on them charges of the most serious sort; not from one, or two, or a few papers and preachers and public teachers generally: but in chorus from all over the land.

It was this eruption at Andover that introduced disturbance in the American Board. Professor Smyth, being a member of the Prudential Committee of the Board, became the advocate of candidates who wanted to go out as missionaries, but who would not say they should teach that the present life is universally decisive of destiny. Several candidates had at least become friendly to the post-mortem probation theory, of which Andover is the herald in America, and others had avowed their sympathy with it. These candidates were not accepted. Then the conflict began. Much feeling of a very unbrotherly sort was soon developed. Divisions began to grow up between pastors in and around Boston, who

took sides for or against the hitherto unquestioned policy of the Board. Co-operations, which had in them the malignity of a conspiracy, were instituted and carried out against such as would not see as the new side saw. Statements were made to the injury of character which were not only false as falsity, but when once made their authors refused to openly admit their sin when it was exposed. Meanwhile, the weekly meetings of the Prudential Committee, which had been for nearly three quarters of a century celebrated for their sacredness and privacy, became scenes of strife, freely, and often grievously, mis-reported to the public.

Thus the way led to the annual meeting in DesMoines, Iowa, October, 1886. There the first distinct issue was made by the conservative against the new departure party. By an overwhelming vote the new dogma of post-mortem probation was declared to be "devisive, perversive and dangerous," and Professor Smyth, after many years of service, was defeated for the Prudential Committee. During the year between that and Springfield the manifestation of hard feeling between the sides, and the unexampled abuse of Dr. Alden, the Home Secretary, by the new side, prepared the way for the votes that have now been recorded, in what may prove a final condemnation of the new dogma.

The Springfield meeting was the largest on record. It was held where the new side could easily gather all its adherents. Enthusiastic confidence and zeal led them to gather in full numbers. The same was true of the conservative party. Previous to the meeting private conferences had been held by the friends of Andover, in Boston, as there were of them in Springfield. The old friends of the Board also held a private conference the morning of the day of meeting in Springfield. This latter gathering has been criticised and called by the condemning name of caucus, until a candid man who knows the facts in the case is filled with astonishment that men will deal so unfairly with the public. It was nothing more than a conference of supposed friends; and as the sequel shows, not all of those present were what they were understood to be. It was not a whit more of a caucus than the meeting of friends on the other side, in a hotel in Boston, a short time before the Springfield meeting. And yet the *Andover Review* (for November) conspicuously omits the least reference to such conferences of its friends, meanwhile that it devotes a full page of its precious space to give the correspondence pertaining to the

conference of the conservative side, and describes the correspondence as "some documents which (are not a part of the minutes) deserve a place here." What confidence can the reader of a hundred years hence safely have in this magazine as a faithful chronicler of a memorable and ever important meeting of the Board? Possibly such deplorable partizanship is inseparable from heated human controversy. But if we must say,

"'Tis true, 'tis true, 'tis pity;
And pity 'tis 'tis true."

But passing this, and omitting mention of the admirable patience and earnestness which characterized the full discussions at Springfield, I may state what seem to be a few substantial results. First of all, the previous utterance of the Board against the new dogma was re-affirmed. The new departure friends spoke much and eloquently; and then nominated candidates for leading executive offices on the Board. But of the 167 votes cast their candidate for President received but 56. And more significant still, Rev. Dr. E. K. Alden, the much abused Home Secretary, was re-elected; and the candidate of the new side received but 55 votes. In short, all the votes of the meeting bearing on the points of difference between the parties showed a large preponderance in favor of things as they have been, rather than in favor of a change.

The question may now be raised: After Springfield, What? Some results are already revealed. For one thing it has been learned that the honorary members of the Board, which are a larger body than the corporate, are more largely on the conservative side. Furthermore, the *New York Observer* has secured from hundreds of leading friends, all over the land, answers to questions, which show that the number who approve of the new party are inconsiderable compared with such as stand by and approve of the action at Springfield. From the present signs of the times, it seems not improbable that these other things will follow:

1. The strife of tongues which has seriously disturbed recent annual meetings of this venerable missionary society will not recur. Andover has declared: "Evidently discussion must go on;" but it anticipates this, because "the constituency of the Board is still open, though the organization may *remain* (italics

ours) closed." And elsewhere the same high authority speaks of the Board as having "put down a (the) hypothesis." This being so, we may expect after Springfield there will be a return to the old type of American Board meetings, at which the friends of missions came with confident hopes of enjoying services of exceptional spiritual emotion and power.

2. It is quite possible that the zeal with which promoters and patrons of the new hypothesis have pushed their departure may cool somewhat. It has been done for a few years at the cost of anything like consistency and kindness; and, in some instances, with a disregard of Christian grace or good manners. But seeing that such as they set out to suppress, the favor of God has specially prospered and promoted, the probability is there will be a reform, and a return to Christian courtesy and honor. The incontrovertible condemnation of the dogma is, that where it has the most ardent sympathy in churches and pulpits there is no account of earnestly aggressive efforts to win disciples. No theological improvement deserves approval if its friends are timid of speaking it right out; or if where it is the most clearly accepted the audiences at Sabbath and prayer-meeting services grow scant or stay scant; or where there is steadily a small or diminishing number coming out and confessing Christ. Tried by these tests, the new departure dogma deserves no favor. By and by these effects may be so carefully observed as to cause a general where there is now a partial discredit of it by those who have been its friends.

3. A third result may follow Springfield, and all going before it that makes its meeting memorable: the questions of the conditions of human destiny in the future world may be taken up and discussed, as they deserve. We can never forget with what force and fervor Dr. Charles Hodge said to our class in 1863: "Young gentlemen, the next and last great topic of theology which the church must clear up in coming years is, eschatology." The church has either opened or closely approached that labor, supremely more serious than any of "the twelve labors" of Hercules. The ground on which the Board has stood through the struggle is, *the universal decisiveness of the present life as related to the issues of the final judgment*. And, admitting that their hypothesis of an opportunity for repentance after death has been "put down," the new departure friends say: "The dogma of the

universal decisiveness of the present life, with whatever relieving theories may support it, is now on trial, not the foolish and pernicious speculation about a Christian probation for all men." So let it be. Truth and peace together call on those whose position and profession and preparation are supposed to fully equip them for the work, to work out this deep subject to the clearest possible conclusion that reason and revelation will afford. The question is not whether we may safely indulge an "Eternal hope," that those who pass out of the world at enmity with God will somehow be brought back to Him after death. Beyond question there are passages in Scripture which restorationists recite with plausibility, in support of their Universalist creed. It is also as evident that only an infinitesimal part of the human race has ever had any such offer of Christ as to make Him attractive for their acceptance. But whether every one possessed of moral sense has or has not enough knowledge and conviction to lead him to become so far "a new creature" as that he will die a redeemed soul, if he yields himself to the best he knows, that is the question! If every human being (of moral faculty) has this much, then the present human life is universally decisive. If not, then the ground will be clear for schemes of relief like this future probation.

J. L. WITHROW.

Chicago, Ill.

NATIONAL REFORM.

All thoughtful observers of social, religious, and political affairs in America, must see that here, as in all other countries, there are many glaring faults and threatening evils. Influences are at work, in several departments of our national life, which do undoubtedly tend to the destruction of the foundations upon which rests the laboriously constructed fabric of our Christian civilization. That there are agencies operating among us which are radically and unchangeably hostile to all truth and virtue, does not admit of question; but whether these influences and agencies are stronger than those that work for man's highest well-being; whether the infidelity and immorality, loud and aggressive among certain classes, are stronger than the conservatism and common sense of the majority of the American people, stronger

than the prodigious Christian activities operating everywhere, does admit of question and does allow us to entertain a hope, not without definite reason, that America shall not be lost to God and the highest interests of humanity.

While we should by no means lose our judicial calmness in the presence of the enemies of the public weal, but go steadily forward with the determination and the expectation to win the battle, it would be the greatest folly to underrate the numbers or resources of our adversaries. Among the formidable evils which threaten us, is the corruption and prostitution of the civil service to partisan purposes. To have all the servants of the people understand that they hold their places only until there shall be a change in the political complexion of the government, to allow them to be taxed for money to carry on campaigns for the purpose of keeping in power the party from which alone they can hope for favor, necessarily welds them into an association offensive and defensive, transforms public servants into public masters, and constructs what is potentially, and often actually, a conspiracy against the suffrages of the people. Whether this great evil has become sufficiently apparent to arouse the conscience of the nation to rise above party considerations and sweep it from the face of our political system, will soon be determined. But if the day has not come, it will soon; for underneath the surface there lie in the soul of the nation a sense of right, and a patriotism, which are stronger than party affiliations and the influence of political leaders who too often are actuated by nothing but a desire to accomplish their own selfish ends regardless of all else; and when the danger becomes so great as to force itself upon the attention of true Americans, they will destroy it without mercy.

The black devil of intemperance has become most formidable. It has absorbed untold millions of the public wealth, and what is worse, has destroyed tens of thousands of happy homes. It has feasted on human nature and virtue; it has grown insolent, and formed organizations to secure the enactment of laws for the protection of its infamous traffic. What are we going to do? Allow this monster to overwhelm us? By no means. There are signs of an uprising of the people of this land such as has never been seen before on any question, and by methods, wise and unwise, they are likely to banish, in large measure if not altogether, the vice of intemperance from society.

Who can consider the increasing desecration of the Sabbath by the mass of the people, under the leadership of the great railway, telegraph and other corporations, and by the government mail service, without dismay? The first day of the week is being robbed of its sacredness and religious character by many influences, but by none more insidious than the Sunday newspaper. London and the other great cities of the British Empire manage to exist without Sunday newspapers, but our American cities have come to consider these among the necessaries of life. No Christian should allow himself to be served with newspapers on the Lord's day. These things are undermining public morality. Some time ago, a prominent official of a great railway asked me half in earnest "whether preachers could not invent some way to make conductors and ticket agents honest?" The obvious answer was: "Yes, if you will stop your trains on Sunday and let the men come to church."

We hear a great deal about the dangers to our civil and religious liberties from the encroachments of Popery. The Roman Catholics are under the control of a foreign potentate, and must, at the peril of their souls, obey his mandates; and, under a wily and vigilant priesthood, nothing is left undone to secure political influence. They threaten the liberty of the ballot, and the integrity of the public school system, not only by endeavoring to destroy this institution as it now exists, but also, and, in many cases successfully, to divert public money to their own sectarian purposes. In connection with this we are reminded of the portentous flood of foreigners, in many cases from the worst classes of Europe and Asia, that is pouring in upon us. Thousands of these make industrious, law-abiding citizens, and all such are welcome; but multitudes come, exasperated to unreason by real and fancied wrongs, accustomed to respect neither God nor human rights, to find a fortunate field for the operations of communism, anarchism and nihilism. These dangerous elements mass in our cities and threaten the destruction of all the rights of persons and the rights of things under divine and human law. There is no doubt but that all they lack is the power to re enact among us the most diabolical scenes of the French Revolution. Now and again does a cloud dark and ominous arise along the northeastern or northwestern skies, whose mutterings are heard from sea to sea, causing a shudder to run through the nation.

These things are not secrets, but they stand out boldly on the face of public affairs in the United States. The great dangers which threaten European society are no longer subjects to be read of in books of travel or history, or in foreign correspondence. They are at our doors. The sounds of dreaded footsteps are heard at our own gates, and faces we fear to look upon are gazing into our windows. What shall we do? It is the question of the hour, in the lips of all students of public morality. What shall we do?

Various answers are offered to this inquiry. One is the formation of what is termed "The National Reform Association," whose noble design is to counteract or destroy these and other evils which threaten to overwhelm our religious and civil liberties. No fault can be found with its character or its intention. The Association is composed of good men who are endeavoring to do a good thing. Nor can there be any doubt but that they will do good, even though their methods be not the wisest possible. If no good thing were ever accomplished in this world except by efforts which were perfectly wise and judicial, there would be nothing done; for no human scheme, nor human operation of a divine scheme, can be perfect. At the same time a little friendly criticism may not be unfraternal nor discourteous; nor may a morsel of advice as to the line along which success may be attained be considered wholly impertinent.

From the tracts, and from their official organ, *The Christian Statesman*, issued from the headquarters of the "National Reform Association," in Philadelphia, one may readily learn the plan of procedure. The following is an authorized statement of the design of the Association:

"The object of the National Reform Association is to maintain, and to develop into harmony and completeness, all existing Christian features in the American government. Its work is based on the belief of these fundamental principles, viz: That Almighty God is the source of all power and authority in civil government, that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Ruler of nations and that the revealed will of God is of Supreme authority in civil affairs. Perceiving the subtle and persevering attempts which are made to prohibit the reading of the Bible in our public schools, to overthrow our Sabbath Laws, to abolish the Oath, Prayer in our National and State Legislatures, Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving, and other Christian features of our institutions, and so to divorce the American government from all connection with the

Christian religion; believing that a written Constitution ought to contain explicit evidence of the Christian character and purpose of the nation which frames it, and perceiving that the silence of the Constitution of the United States in this respect is used as an argument against all that is Christian in the usage and administration of our government, this Association seeks such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions and usages of our government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

This appears to be a well-intentioned scheme to advance the moral and political condition of the people of the United States by LEGISLATION in behalf of the Christian religion. The point of criticism we make is this: that *the Christian religion is not a proper subject for legislation*. Of course no one denies that it is proper to legislate concerning all moral and political matters. It is also granted that certain matters come within the range alike of politics, morals and religion, as, for example, divorce, theft, etc. These are fitting questions for the legislature, the court and the pulpit. It is eminently proper that strong laws should be enacted against such evils. The Christian religion works for the maintenance of the marriage relation and everything else in public morality, but it would be a hasty judgment that we should therefore establish the Christian religion by law. The State may legislate for some of the same ends as those sought by religion; but though they work for the same results in some cases, they are separate and independent institutions, and their methods, as well as their ultimate designs, are totally different. The legislature is to strive for the advancement of an earthly and visible State, but the Church for the establishment of an invisible spiritual kingdom. One deals with the external acts of men, considering motives only as they relate to definite deeds, and administers material punishments; the other enters into man's soul and claims authority over his inmost thoughts and desires. If the State adopts the Christian religion, it logically should go on and inflict corporeal penalties upon those who disobey any of its fundamental requirements. This takes us back in history three hundred years, over a weary path of blood and persecution. The State has nothing to do with the Church of God, and if called upon to protect it in any of its material interests it can only deal with it as it would with the Free Masons or any other human organization in society.

This matter comes up in a practical form in the question as to

the right of the State to teach religion in the public schools. There is a general tendency to exclude all religious instruction and thus leave nothing but a godless educational training for the youth of our land. This, it is earnestly urged, would produce a generation of skeptics and communists. It is dangerous to educate the head without the heart, and it needs no prophet to show that there are real perils before us. But no prophet out of the large number that have spoken on this subject, in behalf of the National Reform Association, has told us satisfactorily what is to be done about it. If religion is to be taught in the public schools, who is to decide what religion it shall be? or shall we have all religions? If the Christian religion, what form of it? Calvinistic or Arminian, ritualistic or non-liturgical? If we decide to have one, what about those who believe in other forms, but still have to pay taxes to teach what they do not accept as true? Shall they send their children to private schools of their own faith, and still pay taxes to support schools which they cannot patronize? These are problems not easy to solve. It is a serious question whether the State has a right to impart anything but a rudimentary education. Is the State to teach any religion? If so, shall it be a religion that all sects could agree upon as far as it goes? That would be a religion without Christ, a system of morals without the cross. God forbid.

“Speak they of morals, O Thou bleeding Love?
The great morality is love to Thee.”

There is a vague idea prevalent that somehow great things are to be accomplished for religion by secular legislation. The National Reform Association seems based upon that principle. It should confine its efforts to securing *moral* legislation for the safety of the State, and not seek *religious* legislation for the sake of the Church. It is striving to have God recognized in the Constitution of the United States, and of the individual States; to procure legislation which shall set the American people before the world as a Christian nation. These ideas were strongly advocated at the annual session of the Association in Saratoga, during the month of August last. The meetings were not largely attended, though it was in the height of the season. The interest was not great. The principal sederunt on Tuesday night was rather long, and a little languid, and the audience nearly all left the church, at the close, without being dismissed, though requested

to remain for a collection. The "National Reform" movement does not take like wildfire. Is it because the people have no sympathy with moral aims, or is it because there is a fundamental instinct in the American nation against the interference of the State in matters religious? The fact is, the State, with reference to the Church, is merely a police force. The business of the State is to maintain order, the function of the Church to teach religion. All crime is indeed irreligious, and marriage, temperance and the Day of Rest are religious, but they are also political matters; and the State can only regard them as such, and in their bearing upon public order and safety. God has appointed the Church to teach religion "to every creature," and all that the Church needs to ask the State is, *protect us in our property rights as citizens, and let us alone.*

In view of the great dangers which threaten the nation, those mentioned above, and others, what is the Church to do? It is to "preach the Gospel to every creature" from the pulpit, by house-to-house visitation, by the circulation of good literature, above all the Bible. "*Every creature*" who is born among us, or who comes to our shores from afar, is to be attacked for Christ with the Gospel of the cross. The crisis is upon us; the hordes are coming from every quarter of the globe; we have no time to parley, no time for interdenominational controversy, and waste of strength upon each other; we are to try to make "*every creature*" a Christian, and then there would be no trouble in settling these questions of public weal. To this end our greatest need is a mighty "baptism of the Holy Ghost and of fire;" and the way to get this is for the whole body of Christians to pray for it. It does not seem likely that the National Reform movement is going to save the country; the Gospel will do it if it is done. ROBERT. P. KERR.

THE "PERSONAL LIBERTY" MOVEMENT.

One of the latest and most insidious of the social heresies of these days is that which has recently appeared under the plausible pseudonym of "Personal Liberty League," or "Society for the Vindication of Personal Liberty." There is something fascinating to the ears of Americans about the very word "liberty." It brings to mind and heart those inalienable privileges of civil and

religious freedom, bequeathed to us by our illustrious ancestry, who so nobly fought, and as nobly fell, fighting for their assertion and triumphant vindication.

"Liberty" to a native-born, true-hearted, loyal American has a specific and significant meaning. It means the sovereign reign of law, the true spirit of obedience to law. It implies the existence of established institutions that conserve the public good, and secure the welfare of society. *Personal* liberty in this country is a condition unknown, except as defined by law, and subordinated to the public welfare. The interests of the State are paramount to the interests of the individual. Personal liberty, if it is a real condition at all, is that condition in which an individual may claim and exercise the right to do as he pleases, irrespective of the interests of others, and regardless of the public weal. Such liberty is license. Its logical and practical outcome is anarchy. And the "*vindication*" of personal liberty means organized and aggressive lawlessness.

The avowed purpose of the "Personal Liberty" movement, according to their printed statements, and actual efforts, is, (1) to expunge from the statute book of commonwealth and nation the so-called "Blue Laws" for the preservation, protection and observance of the Sabbath, and thus pervert the Holy Day into a mere secular holiday; and (2) to secure the repeal of existing laws in regard to the liquor traffic, and to oppose all restrictive and prohibitive legislation. In short, this movement seeks the dethronement of the Sabbath, and the enthronement of the saloon. It strikes at one of the most cherished and important of our civil and religious institutions, the Sabbath—the pillar of our freedom, and the safeguard of our liberties; and it strikes for one of the most dangerous and destructive of evil agencies, the saloon—the cess-pool of crime and the vestibule of hell.

And all this, which is openly, boldly and defiantly threatened, is done under the fair name and specious plea of "liberty!" O, Liberty, what cruel things are said, what bloody deeds are done, in thy great name!

The means by which it is proposed to accomplish its purpose are the press, the platform and the ballot.

Literature of the most incendiary character is scattered broadcast. Secret and public meetings are held, where the persistent preachers of such pestilent heresies declaim in bombastic, windy bursts of mixed German, gesticulation and gibberish, that

start a howl of fiendish applause from a gaping, motley crowd, whose only inspiration is their passion, and whose only god is their belly.

Societies are formed for political purposes, money is freely contributed, and every one who is in sympathy with the movement, or who can be bribed to support it, is pressed into service as a voter. Committees are appointed to interview the candidates for office, and intimidate them to co-operation by pointing to the ballot box as their political coffin, unless they pledge themselves to the accomplishment of these nefarious schemes. And such pressure has been brought to bear upon certain aspirants for public office that some have yielded to their demands, and not a few of the professional politicians have obsequiously pandered to the revolutionary wishes of this alien crowd, and have become blatant agitators themselves.

Naturalization agencies have been opened to secure papers of citizenship for all those who are entitled to this privilege, and these, after taking oath of allegiance "to the principles of the Constitution of the United States," and declaring themselves "well-disposed to the good order and happiness of the same," are marshalled to the polls for the declared purpose of resisting the laws they have sworn to support. The ballot is a mighty power in this land, and when it is cast by a constituency practically alien to our interests and institutions, in favor of unprincipled demagogues, whose greed for godless gain is greater than their desire for good government, it betokens ill to our country, and foreshadows a condition of affairs that calls for the best thought of the biggest brains of the good and great of our land.

In Philadelphia alone this movement, though of recent origin, already represents 40,000 voters, and in the late municipal election they accomplished their boast that the people of the city "would be assured on the day after the election" of the power of their organization. They were so encouraged by their partial success that they are now pushing their organizations into most of the towns and cities of the State, and are subtly planning to catch the legislature.

In New York City the movement claims to have a following of from 60,000 to 75,000; and the purpose there, as in Philadelphia, and most of the cities of many of the Northern States, is essentially the same as that above described.

Such a civil and political condition as this "Personal Liberty" movement indicates, is not to be dismissed with a thought. It is up for consideration. It is not a question for the mere politician; it rises above the level of professional politics. It is a question for statesmen; and he who could propose a wise and speedy solution of this problem would be in the highest sense the leader and deliverer of his country. The trouble is, our public men in the State are more politicians than statesmen, and have not the courage, devotion and true manliness to meet and master the stupendous sociological issues of the hour. Their faithlessness and fearfulness, however, are no reason why the Christian public should not be alive to the signs of the times. This condition is not a mere sporadic and spasmodic outbreak. It indicates a real disease in the body politic, deep-seated and infectious. There are a widespread and increasing discontent and dissatisfaction among the artisan classes of this country. There comes to our shores every year a vast and varied population, of widely-differing social habits, economic pursuits, and political beliefs. This heterogeneous mass is not being taken up and incorporated with our distinctive national life. These diverse nationalities are not compacted into a national solidity and solidarity. There is neither unity of blood, nor unity of language, nor unity of religion. Our population is composed of everything, and compacted into nothing. Such a body politic is ever liable to disorder and disease. Eruptions are already beginning to appear upon the surface, and they call for immediate treatment. It matters not what our inherited organism, our Constitution, may be, it will certainly yield, sooner or later, to the insidious encroachments of such maladies as those from which our body politic is now suffering, if the cause is not soon removed and a cure effected. And the treatment that is needed is, not counter-irritants, but heroic surgery.

A firm and unbending maintenance and execution of law—of those laws that have been formulated by the gathered wisdom of the ages, and embodied in the constitutions, the constructive administration, and corporate action of our country, based, as they are, upon Protestant Christianity—is the superlative need of the times, even though they demand the decapitation of daring offenders. The execution of the sanctions of the law in the case of the Chicago anarchists ought to have a wholesome influence upon the future regulation of public affairs. Wherever the public refuses

to applaud in the interests of society such a faithful and fearless administration of law, it is by no means a good sign for the future. We cannot afford to witness the desecration of the precious heritage God has given us in this land, and keep silence. Wherever that modern, hydra-headed monster, the saloon, rises up against the Christian Sabbath, and lays its unhallowed hands upon the holy ark of safety, where God Himself has enshrined His presence and blessing, it is high time for the people of God to rise up too, in the majesty of their strength, and solemnly protest against such wholesale desecration, and defend with a martyr-devotion, even unto the death, His blessed truth and kingdom.

Aggressive Christianity, faithfully applied by its preachers and professors, is the sovereign panacea that alone can effect the resolution of the complicated disorders connected with immigration, which, through our neglect, now imperil our Sabbath, our sobriety, our ballot, our liberty. The new and strange perils that have come upon us—socialism, anarchism, Romanism, saloonism, political corruption, and kindred evils—can be relieved only by organized, *applied* Christianity. And when these evils touch and tamper with the sanctity of the Christian home and the Christian Sabbath, it should be construed at once as an attack against the Christian Church itself. Such an attack the saloon is now making, and it is ominous both to State and Church. Blot out the Sabbath, demoralize the home, and you obliterate from the public mind and heart all reverence for God, and for pure and holy things; convert the Sabbath into a holiday, and the flood-gates of dissipation and crime will be opened, and history will repeat in the land we love the sad and tearful story it has told in so many other lands, just as fair and beautiful as ours, that have permitted the Sabbath to be voted out of the calendar.

Where the Sabbath has ceased to be regarded as a holy day, and has become for the most part a holiday, there we observe a very scarce attendance on church services in the morning, and the afternoon and evening are given up to pleasure-seeking, in consequence of which drunkenness, immorality and crime abound. On the other hand, where the day is the most strictly and extensively observed, there religion has the greatest power for the salvation of men—there we uniformly find the least immorality, drunkenness, pauperism and crime. No show of evidence is needed to prove these statements; they are simply undeniable; whence it is

evident that the enemies of the Sabbath are the enemies of the Christian religion. Sabbath violation is a fundamental evil. Some of the severest judgments of God are visited upon men and nations for the disregard of the fourth commandment; and this, for the best of reasons, as we can see, namely, that this sin is often the beginning and root of many others; whilst strict morality in this particular is a mighty defence against temptations in all circumstances. The Sabbath should be guarded with zealous care both by State and Church. And every effort on the part of foreign-born citizens to antagonize this fundamental civil and religious institute, and introduce the "Continental Sunday" into our country, should be opposed by prompt and efficient action. The "Personal Liberty" agitators demand "open saloons on Sunday," "free whiskey on Sunday," and they think it an unjust restraint of their "personal liberty" not to be allowed thus to ruin themselves and demoralize the community at pleasure, without let or hindrance. They should be brought, willing or unwilling, under the sway of law. It is well understood by them that to close up the places where intoxicating drinks are sold on the Sabbath would ruin most of them, at least in the cities, and a sense of such impending ruin of their infamous traffic is driving them to desperation, and this last movement is a life and death struggle.

It remains to be seen what will be done, whether the Sabbath or the saloon will be supported by the efforts and suffrages of the people. This is the living issue now, and it calls for thought, prayer and heroic action. God help them to make the right decision, and to act promptly in the use of all legitimate means for the furtherance of His will, and the glory of His name.

Philadelphia, Pa.

MASON W. PRESSLY.

IX. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

DR. MORRIS VS. FUTURE PROBATION.

IS THERE SALVATION AFTER DEATH? A TREATISE ON THE GOSPEL IN THE INTERMEDIATE STATE, *by E. D. Morris, D. D., LL. D., Lane Theological Seminary.* Second edition. A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway, New York: Crown 8vo., pp. 252. 1887.

This work is an able and scholarly, a temperate but, in our judg-

ment, convincing discussion of the question which it handles. The fact that it has passed to a second edition shows the favorable estimate which has been formed of its ability, and also the interest which is taken in the topic of which it treats. Systematic theology has been by many assigned to a back seat, and bidden to give way to biblical criticism and discussions of scientific hypotheses in connection with revelation. This question of a future probation, however, summons it to the front, and under the arraignment of the New Theology, which its supporters are pleased to honor with the title of Progressive Orthodoxy, is called upon to vindicate the conservative position of the Church universal. The fact is that theology is never permitted to rest quietly in the region of dogma. It is forced into the field of polemics by heterodox theories springing up in every generation. It must ever be in the front rank as a defender of the truth of God.

The doctrine of a future probation does not profess to be co-incident with universalism. It does not assert the fact of a universal restoration of the race, in consequence of a universal atonement. This is its claim, whatever its logical tendencies may be conceived to involve. It maintains, that for the dead heathen, that is, those who died unevangelized, a first opportunity will be afforded of attaining salvation by the presentation of the gospel to them after death, and that for those who had the gospel and rejected it in this life a second opportunity of securing salvation will be furnished upon condition of their believing the gospel in the future state, those only being excepted who on earth committed the unpardonable sin, or sinned the sin unto death. With these exceptions, there is the *hope* of salvation for the dead. Death does not close their evangelical probation. The pith of the doctrine, then, is the *salvability* in another state of all those who died without accepting the gospel, with the limitations mentioned. Prof. Morris enumerates four theories in regard to the possible salvation of men after death :

“The spontaneous or evolutionary theory, affirming that these salvatory changes will occur chiefly through the action of forces inherent in the soul itself ;

“The educational and disciplinary theory, which attributes the result rather to combined processes of training and chastisement providentially brought to bear upon the soul for its moral restoration :

“The papal or purgatorial theory, which relates to imperfect believers only, and refers their ultimate perfection to the influences of direct punishment divinely inflicted upon them in order to their complete purgation and preparation for heaven ;

“The probationary theory, asserting the salvation of a large proportion of the inhabitants of the intermediate state, not through such discipline or purgation, but through the presentation and application to them of the gospel, as it is in Christ.”

It is the last of these theories which the author proposed to refute.

It will be observed that he limits the question to salvability in the state intervening between death and the last judgment—why, he does not inform the reader. His method is, first, to consider the testimony of particular passages of Scripture bearing on the subject; secondly, to examine the argument from the general testimony of Scripture; thirdly, to adduce the witness of Christian symbolism; fourthly, to allege the witness of Christian theology; and fifthly, to cite the witness of Christian experience. He is justified in giving the discussion this wide scope by the fact that the advocates of the hypothesis do not confine themselves to the Scriptures, but endeavor to enlist in its support the suffrages of Fathers and theologians. He meets them with their own weapons.

The particular Scriptures, adduced in favor of the hypothesis, he groups under seven heads. The first four of these classes, which we have not space to note, the author criticises as furnishing only "inferential testimony or suggestion," but at the same time he subjects them to examination. The first of the classes affording, as is claimed, direct testimony is: Passages implying or directly revealing the fact of probation after death. Among these, which are confessedly few, the most prominent by far is 1 Pet. 3: 18-20, concerning preaching to the spirits in prison. Prof. Morris takes the same view of this passage as was expressed in a notice of Dean Plumtre's work in the last number of this QUARTERLY—namely, that it is too obscure to be used as a proof-text. He gives, however, his opinion—modestly suggested—as to the meaning of the passage; and we agree with him, so far as his construction goes. It is, that the apostle's aim was to encourage believers in carrying forward, through difficulty and trial, the work of proclaiming the gospel. The reference to Noah's ministry "is explained by the peculiar relations of the first judgment by water to that second and conclusive judgment by fire, on which the apostle so strongly endeavors in both of his epistles to fix the thought of the church in his day. *

* * * Those who had rejected the earlier invitations of divine grace [made by Christ through Noah], and died in disobedience, the apostle describes as now in Hades as in a prison." Add to this—we venture to suggest—that Peter designed to strengthen the faith of Christians by the consideration that, although the persecutors of Noah were vastly in the majority, they were suddenly overwhelmed by the judgment of God and are now in the prison of hell, and that, in like manner, their own cruel persecutors would not ultimately triumph, but would perish in a similar catastrophe, and the illustration appears complete. There was no reason why Christians should despond, but, in view of such a history, every reason why they should maintain their faith and hope in the face of persecution, and patiently and joyfully prosecute their work of proclaiming the gospel of Christ. We concur with Dr. Morris when he says: "The parallelism thus brought to light, is a thousand fold more likely to be the true interpretation of the text, than the alternative

explanation demanded by the dogma under consideration—an explanation for which we find distinct corroboration nowhere else within the revealed and revealing Word." It seems to us that the whole drift of the context requires this interpretation. There is nothing in that context to warrant the constructions of the Papist and the Future Probationist. They have read between the lines and interpolated the doctrine which they wish to be true. We have dwelt at disproportionate length upon this passage on account of the part which it has been forced to bear in this controversy.

The second class of passages mentioned by the author consists of those which illustrate future probation. The fable of this class is the Parable of Dives and Lazarus. It has been discovered in its light that the rich man's soul in torments became penitent, and that Abraham encouraged that disposition in him by a tender, fatherly address. Is it not wonderful, that hope for a soul in torments is extracted from a parable of our Lord in which he represents Abraham as distinctly informing it that there was no hope of its escape? What else means the *impassable* gulf? We cannot notice the other testimonies. But what need? *Ab uno disce omnes.*

The third class of passages examined is that which presents unbelief in Christ as the only ground of condemnation. This view the author properly meets by a denial of its truth. There is another ground of condemnation expressly asserted in the Scriptures—namely, the transgression of the moral law contained in the conscience. Paul affirms that those who transgress that law shall perish, although they had not the written law imparted to the Jew.

The author then presents in opposition to "these sporadic quotations the direct and continuous testimony of our Lord himself, and the corroborating witness of his apostles and of his Church, respecting this gospel as belonging exclusively to earth and time." We take occasion to append two passages which appear to us decisive. The first is Mark 9: 42-49. Christ, in this passage, first enforces the duty to refrain from giving offence to others; secondly, the duty to refrain from stumbling ourselves in seeking salvation. Hence the law of self-denial or self-sacrifice: whatsoever is an impediment in the way of our own salvation must be sacrificed. This leads our Lord to enounce the great principle that sacrifice must take place in every case: "Every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt." Salt preserves; fire consumes. A sacrifice salted with fire is a sacrifice ceaselessly consuming. He who resolves to serve God voluntarily offers himself a perpetually consuming sacrifice on the altar of that service (see Rom. 12: 1, "a living sacrifice"), but he shall escape the necessity of being made a penal sacrifice. He who refuses, in this world, thus to sacrifice himself will be hereafter offered a ceaselessly consuming sacrifice on the altar of penal justice. The alternative is: Sacrifice yourselves now, and you shall be eternally saved; spare your-

selves now, and you shall be eternally sacrificed—you shall be “cast into hell-fire, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” Awful negation of hope to the lost, thrice repeated by lips which were wont to bless! Men never got the doctrine of a future probation from the Author of these words.

The second passage is Heb. 9: 27, 28: “As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment,” etc. The point insisted upon by the writer is, we conceive, not that it is appointed unto men to die, but that it is appointed unto men *once* to die. It is not the certainty, but—if the word may be tolerated—the *oneness* of death which is emphasized. This is proved by the preceding context, in which the writer asserts that it was necessary for Christ to die only once: “Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others: for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” It is also established by the succeeding context: “So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many: and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time,” [not to die the second time, but] “without sin, unto salvation.” The case is clear. It is appointed unto men to die *once*. This excludes the possibility of another living to be concluded by another dying. If that were possible a chance would be afforded to men to seek a remedy for the mistakes of the first life. No, they die once, and “after this the judgment.” Death concludes the work of life, and judgment sets an irrevocable seal upon that conclusion. The case of Christ is similar, argues the writer. His once dying concluded the only mediatorial, atoning work he will ever do, and God’s judgment settled forever the results of that work. Neither will he renew the work, nor give it a new application. If then Christ’s case is, as the writer affirms, in this respect analogous to that of men, they, having once died, will have no second opportunity to work out their salvation. The very core of the hypothesis of future probation is that death will not terminate the opportunities of grace and salvation. This passage refutes the hypothesis, as though it was written for that end. We have tarried upon this section of the author’s proofs, because of a conviction that it is the most important and conclusive.

In the argument from the general testimony of Scripture, he refutes the claim that it supports the hypothesis under consideration. This is ably done, with the exception that he urges a theory of probation which we think inconsistent with the Scriptures. But of this more anon. The argument from the creeds and confessions of the Church universal is complete and overwhelming. Nothing of churchly authority is left to the maintainers of this doctrine, which contemplated from this point of view is seen to be the merest heresy. He brings out the fact that Dr. Farrar’s “only important witness drafted from the whole circle of patristic authorities is Origen;” and

he cites Dr. Plumptre's admissions, that "the Fifth General Council classes Origen with Arius, Nestorius, Apollinaris and Eutyches as an errorist worthy of reprobation, though without specifying the error which called forth its anathema;" and "that the Trullan Council, held at Constantinople, A. D. 691, formally condemned Origen among others as belonging to that class of teachers who invent changes for our souls and bodies, and impiously utter drunken ravings as to the future life of the dead."

The argument from the witness of Christian theology does not consist in an appeal to the judgment of theologians—that would have involved an endless task—but to the principles of theology as they lie in the author's own conception, particularly in their bearing upon the relevant question of probation. So far we have gone along with Prof. Morris in the main cordially and admiringly; but we regret to say that at this point we are under the necessity of filing our dissent from his views; and we have room to do little more. His whole theory of probation is out of harmony with the Calvinistic theology. That theology affirms that Adam was, after his creation, by a free determination of the divine will, appointed the Federal Head and Legal Representative of all men, and that they had their legal probation in him. When he, as a probationer, failed, they, as probationers, failed in him. It also affirms that Christ, the Second Adam, was appointed the Federal Head and Legal Representative of his elect people. When he, as a probationer, succeeded, they, as probationers, succeeded in him. In either case, the legal probation of men is finished. But the author takes the ground that men, as men, are now universally in a state of probation which is closed at death. Now either that probation is legal or evangelical. If legal, how can sinners already under condemnation fulfil it? Can they be justified by the works of the law? If evangelical, how can the heathen be in such a state of probation, since their very definition is that they are men destitute of the gospel? The only question which can be raised consistently with Calvinism is, whether the evangelical probation of those who live under the gospel will be continued in a future state; and that amounts to this, Will some of the elect be regenerated and justified after death? The principles of the Calvinistic theology make short work with the question of a probation in another state than the present. We suggest, whether upon the author's view, it might not be ingeniously maintained that, as the probation of men continues until death, the awful experience which men undergo in passing through that shocking transition, may not be designed to lead those who have died unbelieving to accept the offer of salvation which they refused on earth. No, the legal probation of men, of all men, has been finished before death, and the evangelical probation of those who have the gospel, according to the Calvinistic conception, tests the question whether they are among God's elect or not, whether or not they will accept the

righteousness of a glorious Substitute who finished the probation of his people before the New Testament dispensation was inaugurated.

We have also to demur to the author's endorsement of Pres. Edward's speculation touching the constituted identity of the race with Adam—a speculation based upon his philosophical crotchet of a continuous creation, and incapable of adjustment to his own better view of the federal headship and representative character of the first man. Nor can we see how the author's views as to the universal fatherhood of God, unless more qualified than they are in this work, and his doctrine that "in some deep sense" Christ died for all men individually, can be harmonised with the Calvinistic doctrines of regeneration, adoption and particular atonement.

But notwithstanding these theological statements to which we have been constrained to except, and apart from them, we cheerfully yield to the author the palm for a triumphant refutation of the heresy of future probation. The final argument from the witness of christian experience we have not room to notice. We hope that this work, so timely and so able, may be blessed of God to check the spread of an hypothesis which threatens to subvert the foundations of the orthodox faith, to chill the fervor of evangelical preaching, and to arrest the progress of the foreign missionary enterprise.

JOHN L. GIRARDEAU.

BOWNE'S PHILOSOPHY OF THEISM.

PHILOSOPHY OF THEISM. *By Borden P. Bowne, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University, author of "Metaphysics," "Introduction to Psychological Theory," etc.* Pp. x. 270. 8vo. Cloth, \$1.75. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1887.

The wide reputation of Professor Bowne insures a large and appreciative audience ready to listen attentively to this his latest word on a topic of such commanding dignity and importance; a topic, too, which long experience in his chosen field of study has furnished him rare qualification to discuss not only intelligently but with authority.

The form of the work is prepossessing; it is a portly volume, substantially bound, and printed in large restful type on clear white *extra-heavy* paper.

It opens the discussion proper with an *Introduction* of forty pages, following which we have seven formal chapters, *viz.* :

- I. Unity of the World-Ground.
- II. The World-Ground as Intelligent.
- III. The World-Ground as Personal.
- IV. The Metaphysical Attributes of the World-Ground.
- V. God and the World.
- VI. The World-Ground as Ethical.
- VII. Theism and Life.

The discussion ends with a *Conclusion* comprising twenty pages. It will be seen at once, therefore, that the work is an elaborate treatise, thoughtfully and faithfully prepared.

Much may be said in its favor; the tone of the book is decisive, it is healthy, it is hopeful. The author wins confidence by his evident knowledge and firm grasp of the subject, by his convictions and the courage of them. There is so nauseously much of the *suaviter in modo* attending modern apologetics, that it is at once novel and refreshing to light on an author who has faith, character and courage enough to exhibit somewhat of the *fortiter in re*.

The preface is a tonic. There is something bracing in the following: "Fundamental problems are seen to remain about what they always were in spite of the advent of the 'New Philosophy.' When that philosophy first appeared in the wilderness of the old philosophy and theology, announcing that the kingdom of science was at hand, high hopes were entertained by some, and gloomy forebodings by others, as to what the end would be. But as the attraction of novelty and denial wore off, it became clear that the 'New Philosophy' could not hit it off with criticism any more happily than the old. To the apostles, this was both a revelation and a sore disappointment. They meant well and were gifted writers, but they were lacking in patient reflection. They took more heed to their speculative ways and became less enthusiastic, but wiser men. Some proof of this is found in the fact that the British Association for the Advancement of Science has not favored us with a cosmological manifesto for the last dozen years. All parties have learned wisdom. Theists have gained breadth and courage. Anti-theists have found that the way of anti-theism is hard. The critic must allow that the theistic outlook was never more encouraging. The only exception to this general growth is in the case of the newspaper and magazine scientist—that well of omniscience undefiled. Here, as ever, one finds chiefly words and hearsay, an *exploitation* of what the writer does not know."

The style and character of the work are always vigorous, its conclusions are sound and fairly reached. We fear he sometimes concedes too much; a fear mitigated, however, by the reflection that, as this spirit of concession is evidence both of fairness and fearlessness, so perhaps it may prove strength rather than weakness in its effect upon such as really need the argument; moreover, to one who will faithfully follow him through the *whole* discussion, no damage will come.

The book contains much excellent analysis, and several very happy and forceful summations. In some minor particulars we think he is unfortunate: *e. g.* his discussion of the nature of time and space. Though he disarms criticism by avowing in advance that he has "no expectation of clearing up all the puzzles of metaphysics," yet he here attempts one of its most insolvable problems; he encounters the difficulty gratuitously, and worse still, he encounters it to no purpose; for in saying that time "is only the form of change in general; the cosmic process is not in time, but by its incessant change it produces the form of time;" and then adds that God, by creating, "gave time its existence"—in saying this, we very much fear, he will suggest to most readers the criticism, *vox et præterea nil!*

We must differ from him in his estimate of the difficulty attending God's foreknowledge of free acts; we do not believe that "a foreknowledge of a free act is a knowledge without assignable grounds of knowing." His difficulty doubtless derives its force from the confusion inhering in the familiar Arminian conception of a free act *i. e.* an act lawless, capricious, and therefore of necessity *uncertain*.

We do not consider our author happy in his discussion of the temporal and eternal in creation, and we cannot agree with the statement that a temporal creation seems an act of pure arbitrariness. Indeed we confess a most decided jealousy of this word *arbitrary*; as applied under any circumstances whatever to the Almighty; the word may be of honorable origin, but "evil communications corrupt good manners," and its regular associations are none of the best.

Again, the Professor is at fault, we think, in discussing God's will and its realization, asserting essential identity between the two; "with him willing must be identical with realization." If so, then the will emerges only at the instant of fulfilment. But this is obviously impossible, and we fail to find any relief in a distinction between the intention and the will, and still less in the aforementioned account of time and space which occurs just here.

We deny also that "a changeless knowledge of a changing thing is a contradiction." *E. g.* I have a present knowledge of the changes to occur on the face of the clock above me on the mantel, I have a changeless knowledge of that very changing thing, the minute hand, as it pursues its way. The face of that clock will change every moment during the next twelve hours. Lastly, in this line, we are not prepared to admit that "our formal judgments of right and wrong have no direct dependence upon theistic faith." Our author goes on immediately to add:

"It is at this point that the moral argument has been most mismanaged. How can the obligation of justice, truth, benevolence, gratitude be made to depend even on the existence of God? And with what face can we pretend that atheism would make these virtues less binding than they are? These are absolute moral intuitions."

Sometime ago I was amused by the proceedings of a cock; he called his hens most vociferously and continuously, going laboriously through the motions of picking up dainties, interspersing his pantomime the while with most insistent calls; finally his harem came running, to find absolutely nothing, no faintest sign or semblance of grub, grain, seed or anything on the hard bare path. Indeed, his cockship made no pretense of offering them anything; he simply strutted off to lead them to another part of the premises. *Now did the cock lie?* When I go out and take an egg from the nest of my hen, do I steal? When a farmer sticks a pig or slaughters an ox, does he commit murder? The answer in each instance is ready. But acts of the same nature committed against our fellow-men would be, respectively, lying, theft, murder. What constitutes the difference? In the last instance the distinction

is clear; the sacredness of human life is expressly grounded in the image of God. But Atheism reduces man to the level of the brute, differing from the latter in degree only; it sweeps away all essential distinction between them; man becomes then merely a wondrously developed beast. If there were no God, we confess we could see no more intrinsic crime in slaying a man than in killing a horse. True, such a conception seems impossible to us; impossible because of those "moral intuitions" to which our author refers; *but the beast has no moral intuitions*. This suggests a very pertinent question, Whence come these absolute moral intuitions? The answer is decisive.

Be it remembered, however, that these objections do not obtain against the argument as a whole, but only against certain details of it; details, moreover, that are somewhat of the nature, or effect at least, of digression. This suspicion of irrelevance suggests a criticism on our author's style; we fear he lacks clearness, his thought seems clear but his expression is at times really obscure; the book exacted more study than it ought to have done, and we feel by no means sure, even now, that we have fully caught the Professor's meaning in every instance. We repeat, however, that the points we have felt constrained to criticise unfavorably are minor blemishes; the work is an excellent one and will serve to strengthen the faith and hope of many in these days of aggressive infidelity and insinuating pessimism. We cordially thank the author for his tonic and heartsome treatment of Theism, as well and equally for his trenchant and vigorous satire on the crudities and contradictions, the emptiness and insolence of Atheism.

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

PROF. BRUCE'S "MIRACULOUS ELEMENT IN THE GOSPELS," ETC.

THE MIRACULOUS ELEMENT IN THE GOSPELS. A Course of Lectures on the "Ely Foundation," delivered in Union Theological Seminary, by *Alexander Balmain Bruce, D. D., Professor of Apologetics and New Testament Exegesis in Free Church College, Glasgow*. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. 1887.

THE PARABOLIC TEACHING OF CHRIST. A Systematic and Critical Study of the Parables of our Lord, by *the same*. Third Revised Edition. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. 1887.

THE HUMILIATION OF CHRIST, In its Physical, Ethical and Official Aspects. The Sixth Series of the Cunningham Lectures. By *the same*. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1887.

Professor Bruce has now added another to the series of works, each occupying a rather portly octavo volume, which has made him famous as a theological writer all over the English-speaking world. The present contribution in no way falls short of its predecessors in learning or ability, or in freshness of presentation, and is in some respects the most notable if not also the most debatable of the entire series. The subject

of this profoundly interesting and highly instructive discussion, is the Miraculous Element in the Gospels. The work, though constructed on a different method, is regarded by the author as a companion to his former work on *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*. In the fifth and sixth lectures on the miracles, a considerable number of the miraculous narratives are brought under thorough examination, and important remarks are made on nearly all such narratives of the Gospels. The author's object in those chapters is, however, not to undertake a homiletic exposition of the whole of each narrative, but to investigate the *reality of the alleged miracle*, or miracles, in each particular case.

The miracles are first considered by Doctor Bruce in their most general aspect, and more especially in relation to theories of the universe. They are then taken up in their relations to the order of nature; to the apostolic witnesses; to the evangelic records; to exegesis; to the worker, and to the Christian revelation. The Gospel miracles in relation to Exegesis, is the topic of two chapters, the fifth and sixth; in the first of which there is a special treatment given to what the author styles "the healing miracles of the triple tradition," and in the second to what he calls, in the chapter-title, "the miracles wrought on nature," but more commonly "the nature-miracles." The final chapters (the ninth and tenth) are entitled respectively, "The great moral miracle," and "Christianity without miracle."

In the preface this bold disputant utters a note of warning for the benefit of those who might otherwise very naturally mistake his meaning. Readers are apprized that "throughout the discussions in this volume the Gospels are regarded not from the view-point of a strict doctrine of inspiration, but from that of substantial historicity." The writer adds: "It is not dogmatically the highest point of view, but it is that which is most germane to apologetic inquiries." This caution was by no means a needless one, as without it the majority of Professor Bruce's orthodox critics might well have been excused for setting him down as an opponent of the good old doctrine of the divine plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures; and even as the matter now stands, it is not easy to perceive how the respected and admired author could, with adequate success, defend himself against such an accusation. It must nevertheless be allowed that he here seems to wish to be understood as personally holding "a strict doctrine" on this all-important subject, and explicitly avows the conviction that "it is" ("dogmatically," at least,) "the highest point of view" from which the Gospels can be regarded.

The earlier chapters of the book are masterly and admirable. All the modern theories of the universe, and several of the most prominent contemporary thinkers of Europe and America, are submitted to a thorough and remorseless examination. The discussion of the views of Strauss, of Spencer, and of Fiske, leaves little or nothing to be desired. Of evolution he says: "I feel no jealousy of the doctrine

* * * and see no occasion for cherishing such a feeling." Though not pretending to deal with evolution on purely scientific grounds, he owns that he is impressed by the grandeur of the view which it gives us of the universe, and that he is not indisposed to believe it, and is fully prepared, in the event the doctrine should be established, "to acknowledge the obligation to adjust our whole mode of thinking on religious questions to the new situation."* He assents to Dr. Matheson's spirited attempt to justify the position that the old religious faith can live with the new scientific faith; † and adds, "Evolution, as I understand it, excludes neither God nor the knowledge of God."‡ The accuracy of the last averment depends entirely on the definition that is accepted of evolution. The position taken up is almost manifestly indefensible, if by evolution is meant evolution as expounded by Charles Darwin. If, on the other hand, by evolution be meant evolution as expounded by certain Christian theists, (as, for example, Dr. Matheson himself, or Professor LeConte) the denial that evolution excludes God, or (in a certain sense) the knowledge of God, would itself hardly meet with contradiction in any intelligent quarter. But as Principal Smith pointed out so clearly in the Belfast Council, during the debate on the papers of Dr. Matheson, Professor Salmon and Dr. Young, the vital point of interest is not the question whether evolution in some form is consistent with theism, but the question whether evolution in any of its current forms can be reconciled with the declarations of God's inspired word. How important it is to know exactly what is to be understood by the term evolution will be evident from the fact reported in this volume,‡ that Dr. Cleland, of the University of Glasgow, contends for "a definite evolution issuing in 'terminal forms,' and guided by morphological design." He is represented as viewing the animal kingdom not as an indefinite growth like a tree, but as a "temple with many minarets, none of them capable of being prolonged, while the central dome is completed by the structure of man." || Precisely what is intended by this last statement it would be hard to say, but the general idea of the Scottish expert will be apt to strike some of the readers of this review as not unlike the one developed in Professor Drummond's famous effort to identify natural and spiritual laws.

Doctor Bruce comes out in all his strength in the second chapter, where he considers miracles in relation to the order of nature. Nearly everything he says in this chapter may be accepted without abatement or qualification. Too much praise perhaps is bestowed upon Bushnell, and too little upon Mozley, and yet the statements of Mozley as well as those of Bushnell must sometimes be taken *cum grano*. Our author, without appearing to weaken the relative apologetic value of the miracles, as Trench does, agrees fully with Trench in laying stress on the assertion that the "signs" of the New Testament are not to be regarded as mere credentials, and thus as accidents of the revelation,

* Page 27. † Page 28. ‡ Page 28. § Page 28—Foot-note. || Ditto.

but as divine lessons—and thus part and parcel of the very *substance* of the revelation. Dr. Bruce also agrees with Trench in thinking even more of the symbolical and spiritual instructiveness of our Lord's mighty works than of their bare probative efficacy.

The later Bampton Lectures of Dr. Row, where this attitude is the one assumed, are accordingly preferred to the earlier Bampton Lectures of Dr. Mozley, where the opposite attitude of the older apologists is the one presented and maintained. Bushnell's somewhat fantastic definition of the supernatural (agreeably to which it would be a supernatural act to fly a kite or even to cut a stick of wood) is commended above its deserts, but is also shrewdly criticised when viewed as a complete solution of the problem of miracles in their relation on the one hand to nature and on the other hand to God. It has been too often overlooked, and apparently even by the Duke of Argyll in "The Reign of Law," that Babbage's argument from his calculating machine, in the ninth Bridgewater Treatise, is strictly applicable rather to the doctrine of special providences than to the doctrine of miracles. The same remark holds true of Mozley's illustration of the clock, and of the Duke of Argyll's illustration from the strap of an omnibus, or the throttle-valve of a locomotive steam-engine. Such is the case unless, with Mozley, we make no difference in our definitions between a miracle and a special intervention of God in his ordinary providence, except that in the one case we *know* that the law of nature has been controlled *ab extra* and that in the other case we do *not*. Mozley indeed would make a sort of miracle out of every instance of a special providence, whereas upon his own premisses the true state of the facts would appear to be that the greatest miracles of the New Testament are after all only a more conspicuous and startling variety of special providences. Mozley is sharply and justly taken to task by Dr. Bruce, following in the wake of the author of "Supernatural Religion," for his concession to Hume that the impression we all have from birth of the stability and uniformity of nature is simply an unintelligent *instinct*. But no notice is taken by Dr. Bruce of Mozley's terrific argument *ad hominem* by which Hume's noted sophism is completely demolished. For if miracles are in violation of the uniformity of nature, what of that *if our conviction* of that uniformity be due to an irrational instinct?

The discussion in this volume of the theory of concentric circles of *law*, is a particularly striking and satisfactory one. Everything again depends on what one means. If the reference be to the *moral* laws prescribed by infinite wisdom and justice, of course every act of God, and consequently his miraculous acts are regulated by a higher law than those which govern physical nature. But if the reference be to some imagined system of *physical* laws superior to the laws of the natural world with which we are now acquainted, there is no solid evidence of the existence or operation of any such transcendent laws as those. Besides, this hypothesis would

demand, as in Babbage's engine, a recurrence at stated periods of the miraculous phenomena. It was apparently to meet such a difficulty in the case of the *moral* laws which regulate the divine procedure, that Jonathan Edwards contended that if the same conditions recurred God would do again what he did before with the unvarying certainty with which a stone falls to the ground when it is repeatedly dropped from the hand.

The distinction between a miracle and a special providence appears to be in this, that in a special providence the law of nature is *employed*, whereas in a miracle it is *superseded*.

The exceptions most likely to be taken to this book concern the discussions contained in the immediately succeeding chapters, and particularly the discussions of the third and fourth, where the miracles of the Gospels are considered in their relation to the apostolic witnesses, and to the evangelic record. Here more than anywhere else we shall do well to bear in mind the author's caveat, that he is occupying the low ground of the apologist rather than the high ground of the dogmatic theologian. The exhibit that is here made of the good intentions and plausibility of some of the most dangerous forms of hostile contemporary criticism is a brilliant and enticing one. Such English writers as Baden Powell, the younger Mill, the authors of "Essays and Reviews" and "Supernatural Religion," and such German writers as Paulus, Strauss, Baur, Holtzmann, Keim, Weizacker, and above all, Weiss, receive ample and dispassionate, often favorable, attention. The author's single object is to vindicate the reality and value of the miracles even if he has to give up everything else. Professor Bruce's animadversion upon Mozley because of his concessions to Hume may here be retorted against Dr. Bruce himself because of his own concessions to the destructive critics. Papias mentions the Logia of Matthew. Are we on that account to follow the Gallios of the naturalistic criticism in getting *everything* out of the Logia, even the "Matthew" of the *alleged* evangelist? The author may not be ready on all grounds to admit this and similar conclusions, but he certainly writes as if he was not aware of any paramount reason for thinking to the contrary. He expressly notes his preference for the modern plan of abandoning all attempts to harmonize the statements of the evangelists, and to attribute their numerous errors on minor points to an imperfect but honest use of earlier documents. After having to all intents and purposes cut away masts, bowsprit and rudder, and thrown the greater part of the cargo into the sea, our author fondly hopes that he has at least saved the keel and the capstan.

The writer well says that in Strauss and Baur skepticism reached its high-water mark. The *negative* criticism of Paulus and Strauss, and the so-styled *historical* criticism of Baur, Keim and Beyschlag, receive a lucid and fascinating treatment at the hands of our author, who is himself nothing if not frank, manly and critical.

More positive opinions of his own on such vital matters as the inspired verity of the sacred records would have been inconsistent with Dr. Bruce's peculiar scheme in this book, but would have given him a stronger standing-ground for unimpeachable orthodoxy. The fact plainly stares us in the face that, with the best motives in the world, the Glasgow professor has, perhaps inadvertently, made grave concessions to error in the supposed interests of the truth.

The final chapters of the volume (the eighth, ninth and tenth) on the Gospel miracles in their relation to Revelation, on the Great Moral Miracle and on Christianity without miracle, are highly impressive.

Few words are called for in reference to the three other works in this series, as they have all been before the reading public for some years. The standard work on the Parables has gone to its third edition; and the outward form given to it by the Messrs. Armstrong is one that is characteristically good and pleasant to the eyes. No material change has been made in the text. The treatment of the parables of our Lord is systematic, broadly, original, and as to the tone, confident and authoritative. For Trench's allegorizing Fathers, we have the brightest lights, true or false, of modern Germany. The result is a work that is at once critical and practical.

In "The Humiliation of Christ," Dr. Bruce broke new ground in English dogmatics, but was not without fore-runners and guides on the continent of Europe. His view is that the doctrine of "The Humiliation" is fundamental; and that our Saviour though sinless was *weak* and capable of mental and moral as well as physical development and discipline. The exhibition and criticism of the subtle *Kenosis* theories—ancient and modern—and of the tenets of the Lutheran and Reformed churches on this whole subject are singularly clear and able. The entire region through which the discussion moves is beset with pitfalls of the most hazardous speculation. Dr. Bruce's positions are often startling, and at times precarious, but are on the whole evidently meant to be conservative.

H. C. ALEXANDER.

DR. FAIRBAIRN'S "MORALITY."

OF THE DOCTRINE OF MORALITY IN ITS RELATION TO THE GRACE OF REDEMPTION. *By Robert B. Fairbairn, D. D., L.L.D., Warden of St. Stephen's College, Annandale, N. Y.* New York: Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House. 1887. 12 mo., pp. 331.

The title of this work is attractive. The book undertakes to supply a felt want. It is of great importance that the connexion should be distinctly pointed out in a Christian country between systems of Morality and the scheme of redemption. In some respects the author has made good his design. We think that he ought to have emphasized some distinctions, which he has omitted to notice. He uses the term *Morality* as generic, including Moral Philosophy, Ethics, and

Morality specifically considered. One is entitled, it is true, to employ his own terms, if he does not leave his readers in doubt as to the signification which he attaches to them. At the same time, it is desirable that he should indicate any peculiarities which distinguish their employment from that which is common and accepted. Moral Philosophy is ordinarily understood to mean a philosophical analysis of our moral nature, with its phenomenal facts and the fundamental laws by which they are regulated. It is consequently partly psychological and partly nomological. It is the former in its examination and registry of the facts of the moral nature, the latter in its treatment of the laws of that nature. Ethics is taken to signify a system of moral rules, reflectively constructed, by which the life ought to be governed. Morality, in its ordinary use, indicates the moral quality of states and acts. The author has apparently intended to embrace all these under the general designation of Morality.

There were three things which it behooved him to accomplish in accordance with the idea of the book: first, to develop his system of Morality, secondly, to give his views of "the grace of redemption," and thirdly, to specify the relation which ought to subsist between them. Especially was it incumbent on him to define and bring out clearly the relation in question. This he has done, to a certain extent. But since this was the novel and peculiar feature of the work, we could have wished that he had given it a more detailed and thorough discussion. The influence which he shows to be exerted upon man as a moral agent by the scheme of redemption and supernatural grace is twofold: They furnish light which the moral nature alone, in our present sinful condition, cannot afford, but which it imperatively needs; and they give a power, of which nature is destitute, to conform the character and life to the claims of the moral law. In this we heartily agree with him.

At the same time, he shows that the gospel does not create the great truths and laws of morality. These were communicated to man by a natural revelation. They attach to him as man, not as a regenerated man. They belonged to the scheme of Natural Religion. Hence the responsibility of those who are unevangelised for their moral conduct. Still, Christianity republishes and brings out into clearer light these original elements of man's moral constitution, and by creating new and redemptive relations enlarges the field of their operation, upon the principle that every relation carries with it corresponding duties. But the main point insisted on, and very properly insisted on, is that without the supernatural grace of redemption and the application of the blood of atonement no man is able to meet, as he ought, his moral obligations. This is of vital importance, and we cordially concur in what the author has urged in regard to it. The work has this for its characteristic feature, and we are glad in being able to applaud the execution of the author's design, so far as this is concerned.

We see no reason for his apparent denial to conscience of the pos-

session of a moral complexion, justifying its being ranked as a separate faculty or power, distinct from the intellect on the one hand and the feelings on the other. True, it embraces perceptions and sentiments, but they are specifically moral in their character. It is the morality of conscience, in its fundamental laws, its perceptions, its judgments and its sanctions, which stamps its peculiarity and differentiates it from the intellectual and emotional elements of the soul. His analysis of sin seems to us to exaggerate the mere want of balance between the powers of nature, serious as that evil unquestionably is, and to lean too much to the old theory that it consists in the subjection of the rational and moral parts of the soul to the animal propensities. We were disappointed in not finding the scriptural representation, that by the fall the spiritual life which had reigned in all the faculties was destroyed, and that it is this spiritual life—the life of holiness—which is re-created and restored by the grace of regeneration.

Of course we utterly dissent from the author's Arminianism, which, we are sorry to say, sinks in one part of his work into mere Pelagianism; as when, for instance, in urging the necessity of a Moral Theology, he uses these words: "It is almost universally recognized that morality, and the dispositions which beget morality, must recommend many a man, who has never been brought into contact with revealed religion, to the mercy and favor of God." Immediately afterwards, he quotes from Principal Shairp a most extraordinary encomium upon the poet Virgil as an example of "purity" and "unworldliness." Had neither of them read the Eclogues?

The book closes with a learned, interesting and, in the main, laudable comparison of Oriental religions with Christianity, in which it is shown that however valuable the moral precepts may be which those religions comprise, no information is communicated, no provision made, by which a sinner is helped in his mortal necessities.

The book is admirably printed and its "make-up" neat and inviting.

JOHN L. GIRARDEAU.

LOWE'S HEBREW GRAMMAR.

A HEBREW GRAMMAR. *By the Rev. W. H. Lowe, M. A., Lecturer on Hebrew, Christ's College, Cambridge.* New York: Thomas Whittaker. 1887.

The series of manuals now appearing in this country under the general title of "The Theological Educator," and bearing the *imprimatur* of Thomas Whittaker, is highly creditable to English enterprise. The names of C. H. H. Wright, Marcus Dods, and our own Professor Warfield in the list of contributors raise the presumption that the whole series will be characterized by thorough and progressive scholarship. But the volumes of every such series are notoriously unequal, and, in this instance, Mr. Lowe's Hebrew Grammar must be excepted from any general commendation that may be due to these neat and compact

Manuals, for it is neither thorough nor progressive. The author's position as Lecturer on Hebrew in Christ's College, Cambridge, implies good scholarship, of course, and his book manifests thorough familiarity with the facts of the language. It is not that kind of thoroughness that he lacks. He knows the *phenomena* of Hebrew and exhibits them, but if he knows aught of the underlying *principles* that control and mould the language this book contains no intimation of the fact. It is simply a congeries of pertinent but unsystematized remarks about the surface facts of Hebrew, with no attempt at scientific explanation of them. The question *why* never seems to occur to him, and all the brilliant results of modern philology are completely ignored. Should they be utilized in an elementary treatise? Let the splendid success of the recent grammars which *have* utilized them answer the question.

The fact is, Mr. Lowe belongs to that class of grammarians, now happily obsolescent, who, by their obfuscation of a simple and picturesque language, have created the wide-spread misapprehension that Hebrew is a very dry and difficult study. Whatever else this book may be it is not a grammar for beginners. Even an expert would find it difficult to thread his way through such a maze of minute rules. There is an excess of detail throughout, and the general laws are not so much as distinguished by coarse print from the multitude of exceptions. The author's fatal inability to discriminate the essential from the non-essential is shown by the fact that he devotes three precious pages of a beginner's grammar to lists of the masculine nouns which form plurals in ם and the feminine nouns which form plurals in ם׳, to say nothing of other useless lists. Economy of space is an object with him, and yet he occupies exactly one-third of a page in telling the student that the point over the right arm of ן sometimes stands also for Holem. As a practical grammar the book is utterly worthless. The arrangement would condemn it even if there were no worse faults. The last twenty-seven pages, constituting just one-third of the whole book, contain Tables giving the Alphabet, the Vowels, the Pronouns, the Verbs, and indeed all the paradigms. In the Preface "the student is advised to separate the Tables from the Grammar, so that he may be able to lay each Table before him while he reads the corresponding explanation in the Grammar"! Now what are we to think of an arrangement that requires such a mutilation of a book as that? If a Manual is worth anything it is worth keeping. Books are not yet so cheap that every theological student can afford to cut out one-third of his Hebrew Grammar on the first perusal, nor is time so abundant that he can afford to undertake the endless task of preventing the twenty-seven separated sheets from taking final leave of the remaining two-thirds of his haggled vade-mecum. The lack of logical and practical arrangement is illustrated again by the contents of the last four pages of the grammar. After having discussed Orthography, Etymology, and even Syntax, it seems to occur to him that he has said nothing about the Tone, though

he has all along been assuming the student's knowledge of this fundamental factor of the language ; so he devotes a couple of pages to the accents. In regard to *methegh*, the student is coolly informed that the rules for its use are given in Lowe's "Hebrew Student's Commentary on Zechariah!" The two remaining pages are filled with remarks on several tags and ends which he apparently forgot to mention in their proper places. One thing we must commend. He calls the Perfect the *Complete Tense* and the Imperfect the *Incomplete*. This nomenclature would obviate a well-known ambiguity.

As a text-book Mr. Lowe's grammar is twenty-five years behind the times. He seems to be unaware of the fact that the methods of teaching language have undergone a radical and saving change in the last two decades. No grammar that undertakes to teach a language by reversing the practical inductive method of facts before principles which is now firmly established in linguistic as well as natural science, has any chance of success in this day. A grammar that requires the student to cram fifty-nine solid pages of more or less unintelligible rules, that *does not contain a single exercise*, that pronounces aspirated ך and ך in the same way, that transliterates ך with a *v* and does not transliterate the half-vowels at all, that calls silent *shewa* "secant" and vocal *shewa* "linking," that speaks of a volatilized vowel as "removed," and that recognizes no difference between a tone-long vowel and a naturally-long vowel, is foredoomed to failure and has sufficient marks of antiquity to entitle it at once to a place in the limbo already occupied by such grammatical lumber as the books of Jones and Deutsch.

W. W. MOORE.

PRINCIPAL DAWSON'S "STORY OF THE EARTH AND MAN."

THE STORY OF THE EARTH AND MAN, by Sir J. W. Dawson, LL.D., F. R. S., F. G. S., Principal of McGill University, Montreal. Ninth edition. New York: Harper & Bros. 1887.

The treatise on Geology, named above, originally appeared as a series of articles in "The Leisure Hour," and was afterwards published in book form in 1873. The author's style is a very easy, pleasant one, and writing as he did for one of the popular periodicals of the day, his book is free from the stiffness and formality of a regular scientific treatise, and, for this reason, all the better adapted to the use of the general reader. Principal Dawson has won for himself a place among the foremost scientists of the day, as shown by his election to the Presidency of the British Association in 1886.

Born at Picton, N. S., in 1820, and devoted to the study of natural science from his boyhood, he was elected Principal and Professor of Geology in McGill University in 1855, which position he has now filled for thirty-three years—an ordinary lifetime. During these years he has published several volumes on geological subjects, besides many memoirs

embraced in the transactions of the various scientific societies of which he is a member. A native of America, he studied in Edinburgh, and in the course of his life has traveled largely in Europe, and more recently in Egypt and Syria, as well as in his native land, and in this way has enjoyed opportunities, exceptionally good, for studying personally geological phenomena in various parts of the world. This book, then, is not the work of a tiro in science, nor of one who has learned his geology from books alone, always giving, as books must, an imperfect representation of the phenomena they record.

The book, while furnishing a tolerably full treatise on Geology—as full, probably, as the general reader will care for—discusses more largely and carefully than most other treatises on this department of science, two topics of especial interest to the Christian scholar at the present time, viz., the age of man, and the relation of the hypothesis of evolution to Christianity.

I. *The Age of Man.* The nature of the question to be determined is well set forth in Principal Dawson's words: "In closing these sketches it may seem unsatisfactory not to link the geological ages with the modern period in which we live; yet, perhaps, nothing is more complicated or encompassed with greater difficulties and uncertainties. The geologist, emerging from the study of the older monuments of the earth's history, and working with the methods of physical science, here meets face to face the archaeologist and historian, who have been tracing back in the opposite direction, and with very different appliances, the stream of human history and tradition. In such circumstances conflicts may occur, or at least the two paths of inquiry may refuse to connect themselves without concessions unpleasant to the pursuers of one or both. Further, it is just at this meeting-place that the dim candle of traditional lore is almost burnt out in the hand of the antiquary, and that the geologist finds his monumental evidence becoming more scanty and less distinct. We cannot hope, as yet, to dispel all the shadows that haunt this obscure domain, but can at least point out some of the paths which traverse it," p. 282.

I. Referring the reader to the book itself for the arguments by which Principal Dawson supports his conclusion, I will give that conclusion in the author's own words, viz: "Archæology and geology thus meet somewhere in the pre-historic period of the former, and in the post-glacial of the latter," p. 283. "It seems not improbable that it was when the continents had attained to their greatest extension, and when animal and vegetable life had again overspread the new land to its utmost limits, that man was introduced, on the eastern continent, and with him several mammalian species, not known in the pliocene period, and some of which, as the sheep, the goat, the ox, and the dog, have ever since been his companions and humble allies," p. 289.

With this conclusion, that of Prof. Boyd Dawkins, as expressed in a memoir read before the British Association in 1882, agrees. He writes:

“Nor in the succeeding pliocene age can we expect to find man upon the earth, because of the very few living species of placental mammals then alive. The evidence brought forward by Prof. Campellini in favor of pliocene man in Italy seems to me, and also to Dr. Evans, unsatisfactory; and that advanced by Prof. Whitney in support of pliocene man in North America cannot, in my opinion, be maintained. It is not until we arrive at the succeeding stage, or the pleistocene,” or post-glacial, “when living species of mammalia begin to abound, that we meet with indisputable traces of man on the earth.”

2. Such is the date of man's advent on earth stated in terms of the geologist. What is that date stated in years? Principal Dawson rejects the idea, held by some, that the post-glacial era began many thousands of years ago. He writes: “I fail to perceive, and I think all American geologists acquainted with the pre-historic monuments of the western continent must agree with me, any evidence of great antiquity in the caves of Belgium and England, the kitchen-middens of Denmark, the rock-shelters of France, the lake habitations of Switzerland. At the same time, I would disclaim all attempts to resolve their dates into precise terms of years. I may merely add, that the elaborate and careful observations of Dr. Andrews on the raised beaches of Lake Michigan, observations of a much more precise character than any which, in so far as I know, have been made of such deposits in Europe, make him to calculate the time which has elapsed since North America rose out of the waters of the glacial period as between 5500 and 7500 years. This fixes at least the possible duration of the human period in North America, though I believe there are other lines of evidence which would reduce the residence of man in America to a much shorter time;” pp. 295, 296. With this conclusion, that of Dr. Southall, in the thorough examination of this whole subject contained in his “Recent Origin of Man,” agrees.

II. On the relation of the hypothesis of evolution to Christianity, Principal Dawson writes: “These speculations seek to revolutionize the religious beliefs of the world, and if accepted would destroy most of the existing theology and philosophy. . . . It is true that many evolutionists, either unwilling to offend, or not perceiving the logical consequences of their own hypothesis, endeavor to steer a middle course, and to maintain that the creator has proceeded by way of evolution. But the bare, hard logic of Spencer, the greatest English authority on evolution, leaves no place for this compromise, and shows that the theory, carried out to its legitimate consequences, excludes the knowledge of a creator and the possibility of his work,” pp. 317, 321. And in the closing chapter of the book he adds: “As applied to man, the theory of the struggle for existence and survival of the fittest, though the most popular phase of evolutionism at present, is nothing less than the basest and most horrible of superstitions. It makes man not merely carnal, but devilish. It takes his lowest appetites and propensities, and makes them his God

and creator. His higher sentiments and aspirations, his self-denying philanthropy, his enthusiasm for the good and true, all the struggles and sufferings of heroes and martyrs, not to speak of that self-sacrifice which is the foundation of Christianity, are in the view of the evolutionist mere loss and waste, failure in the struggle of life. What does he give us in exchange? An endless pedigree of bestial ancestors, without one gleam of high or holy tradition to enliven the procession; and for the future, the prospect that the poor mass of protoplasm which constitutes the sum of our being, and which is the sole gain of an indefinite struggle in the past, must soon be resolved again into inferior animals or dead matter. That men of thought and culture should advocate such a philosophy, argues either a strange mental hallucination, or that the higher spiritual nature has been wholly quenched within them. It is one of the saddest of many sad spectacles that our age presents," p. 396.

Such is the conclusion to which one of the leading scientists—a layman, not a divine—of our day has come. The judgment of one of our ablest theologians, lately passed away, the lamented A. A. Hodge, is in accord with that of Sir. J. W. Dawson. "You cannot, therefore"—writes he, "take this speculative evolution as a fact; the testimony of science thus far, with regard to the facts, is against it. It is a vain, vapid, pretentious philosophy of evolution, which has no scientific basis, and is absolutely devoid of any scientific authority. You must oppose this, first, in the interest of the convictions of your own reason and of the fundamental principles of human thought and intuitions; secondly, in the interest of natural religion; thirdly, in the interest of revealed religion." (*Popular Lectures on Theological Themes*, p. 175.)

In his preface to this ninth edition of his book, the author tells us: "Several corrections and additions, rendered necessary by the progress of discovery, have been introduced into the text, and notes have been added with reference to other new points. The general statements and conclusions remain, however, substantially the same as in 1873; the author having seen no valid reason to depart from any of them; while with respect to some, additional evidence in their favor has been furnished by the facts and discoveries developed in recent years." For the reader who desires a popular treatise on Geology, fully abreast with the science of the day, I know of no book better than "The story of the Earth and Man."

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG.

SCHURMAN'S "ETHICAL IMPORT OF DARWINISM."

THE ETHICAL IMPORT OF DARWINISM. *By Jacob Gould Schurman, Sage Professor of Philosophy in Cornell University.* New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons. 1887.

This, if I mistake not, is Prof. Schurman's first appearance as an author, in book form, before the public, and will undoubtedly secure for him full citizenship in the republic of Letters. The book furnishes

abundant evidence of a wide acquaintance with what has been written, since Darwin's *Origin of Species* appeared in 1859, in the department of philosophy to which the work belongs; a wide acquaintance with what has been not inaptly termed "the Darwinian literature."

Darwin's hypothesis of evolution, as held and defended by Profs. Huxley and Spencer, *i. e.* evolution in its atheistic form, Prof. Schurman utterly rejects. Quoting Darwin's description of "natural selection,"—"This preservation of favorable individual differences and variations, and the destruction of those which are injurious, I have called natural selection, or the survival of the fittest,"—he remarks, "the process, therefore, does not touch the origin of the variations, or even the accumulation of them. Natural selection produces nothing, either at the beginning or in the progress of the development; it means only that *when the variations have somehow appeared*, the most advantageous are preserved, and that *when these favored forms have been somehow propagated, and thereby somehow consolidated*, the most favored again survive in the struggle. Nature originates the modifications, nature propagates them, nature accumulates them through propagation; but how all this is done is a mystery on which science throws no light, and the personification of nature serves only to disguise our real ignorance," p. 86. And, subsequently, he adds: "One may still question whether in its native province of biology the account given of the origin of species is not ultimately as supernatural as the dogma it displaces. . . The gradual development of species is one mode of conceiving the action of supernatural causality, the sudden formation of them is another," pp. 94, 95.

Prof. Schurman's position on the subject principally discussed in the volume under examination is clearly set forth in these words: "Biology warrants the belief that non-moral beings existed on our globe long before the appearance of the only moral being we know—man; and natural selection explains the process by which the latter may have been descended from the former. But natural selection, as we have already shown, creates no new material; it merely sits in judgment upon what has already appeared. Given acts, or habits, or moral practices, natural selection is the name for the survival of the fittest of them; not the talismanic cause which originates any of them. However they originate, they must have a definite relation to the constitution of the being that manifests them; and to suppose that moral sentiments, moral notions, moral practices, could be grafted upon a primitively non-moral being is, in the first place, to take grossly mechanical views of human nature, and, in the second place, to transgress the limits alike of natural selection and of evolutionary science. Yet this is what is done by our evolutionary moralists," p. 146. This position he defends with great ability.

"Ethics as a science," Prof. Schurman contends, "is a branch of history." What he means by this he explains in his words, "If dropping these speculative puzzles, we shift our position altogether, and

raise the simple inductive inquiry, what acts have men everywhere and at all times considered right or wrong respectively, and what acts have some considered right or indifferent and others wrong? tables of agreement and difference can be drawn up to show what mankind at least has regarded as the essential content of moral law (and some explanation might even be suggested of the divergence in the outlying area beyond this common circle), though we should still be unable to say whether the end of life was pleasure or something else, or how this common human morality might be regarded by other spirits, as, for example, by God. For the rich harvest which this treatment of the moral field is sure to yield we shall have to wait until the spirit of science has exorcised the spirit of speculation from our contending schools of ethics," p. 205-6.

On this idea of "a science of ethics as a branch of history," I have two remarks to make, viz: 1. Such a science may give us rules by which to distinguish right from wrong, but for an authoritative code of moral law, we must look to the "Word of God" alone; and so perfect is the code there given us that we need no other. Thoughtful men of every country into which the Bible has gone, and of every age, have recognized in the decalogue, and in that summary of it which Christ gave us in His words: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," and, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," a divine authorship, and divine authority. 2. In pursuing the historic method proposed, we must carefully avoid the error into which such writers as McLennan, Morgan and others, who, as Prof. Schurman remarks, have examined "a single plot of the field," have fallen, of discrediting, or utterly ignoring the only book which gives us a history of man reaching back to the beginning, and which Lenormant remarks should "always form in sound criticism the base of all history." In nothing does the unscientific, uncritical character of the treatment of such subjects as the one under consideration by the class of writers referred to above appear more conspicuously than in the confidence they place in the histories of Berosus, and Manetho, and Herodotus, whilst they treat with entire neglect the history of Moses, far better authenticated than any one of them.

The closing paragraph of Prof. Schurman's book is one which may well arrest the most serious attention of the people of the United States in our day. Referring to the extreme laxity of view on the subject of divorce, now so common in New England and at the West, he writes: "This change in the constitution of the civilized and Christian family, with the consequent obscuration of domestic virtue, receives no countenance from ethical science. On the contrary, comparative and historical ethics show that the 'pairing' family has hitherto always been associated with a stage of culture immensely inferior to our own. And, from the interrelation of social forces, it might not unreasonably be apprehended that a return to the barbarous system of conjugal relations

would entail general social deterioration. If ethical science does show that the family, and the morality of the family, have had a historical growth, and that they vary with time and place, it does not thereby really derogate from their sanctity or authority within a civilization which has once absorbed them. Science, indeed, can tell us nothing of the validity of virtue, duty, or good. And if speculation, in the guise of moral philosophy, takes up the problem, it will find that the domestic virtues have the same warrant as justice or benevolence—that warrant being, in a last analysis, an inexpugnable consciousness of their right to us and authority over us," p. 264.

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG.

MAX MULLER'S "SCIENCE OF THOUGHT."

THE SCIENCE OF THOUGHT. *By Professor Max Muller, University of Oxford.* 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1887.

A new book by Max Muller cannot fail to command a wide success in all lands in which the science of philology has received adequate recognition from professed specialists, or is enjoyed by a discriminating public, as an intellectual diversion or pastime.

However thoroughly we may dissent from some of his fundamental views, the grace and charm of his style assure him a hearty greeting even from those that stand at the opposite pole of his science. A German by birth and education, the son of an eminent German poet, he is one of those rare and conspicuous examples of men who have become great writers in a language other than their mother-speech. The lucidity of his diction is a brilliant contrast to that ripeness of corruption which characterizes the prevailing philological style in Germany, as well as in America. Without controversy, he may be designated the Macaulay of comparative philologists. The present work is in the main an endeavor to elaborate and expand the peculiar views of linguistic science which were first formally given to the world in his memorable "Lectures," delivered in London more than twenty years ago (1861-63). Nothing can surpass the ease and felicity with which our author discusses the essential phases of his subject, the diverse stages of development, such as the discovery of Sanscrit, the happy grouping or combination implied in the term Indo-Germanic, the influence of phonetic decay in transmuted language from an analytic to a synthetic type, as well as from synthesis almost back to the original analytic form, as is notably illustrated in the evolution of our own English, the rise and growth of grammatical science among the Athenian sophists, the relations of the Aristotelian categories to our grammatical nomenclature, the diffusion of this nomenclature among the nations of Europe largely in consequence of the adoption of Latin grammar as a standard and basis of comparison. All this is set forth with singular perspicuity, and with a "fluidity" of style, to appropriate Matthew Arnold's phrase,

that fascinates as well as convinces. As an expositor of recognized philological truths, Max Muller has no peer among living scholars.

When, however, our author endeavors to apply the great principles of philosophy to the solution of linguistic problems, to discuss the relations of psychology to philology, we find ourselves at variance with his teachings in more than one fundamental point. We have especially in mind his favorite theory, which is merely the materialism of Hegel, of the *identity* of human language and human thought. "It is in words," says Hegel, quoted with approbation by Muller, "that we think." In his lectures on *The Science of Language*, already referred to, this doctrine is advocated, and in the present work it is urged with a tenacious devotion and minute elaboration worthy of a higher and a purer philosophy. Passing by the argument from the case of the dumb, as offsetting Muller's theory, we hold that it is at variance with the facts of consciousness. Every reflecting man is aware that he oftentimes indulges in trains of reflection which it is impossible to translate into words. In moments of exigency, in seasons of peril, nervous excitement or high mental tension, sustained and prolonged processes of thought flash as by inspiration upon the mind, thoughts embracing complex and complicated acts of reasoning which if translated into words might occupy pages if not volumes. Will any philosopher or philologist pretend that those instantaneous acts of reasoning by which, in a moment and as by an inspiration, we arrive at results that if embodied in words would require elaborate statement, do not offset the teaching of Hegel and Muller, to say nothing of their goodly company of followers?

We find ourselves much more in sympathy with our author when he discusses the relation between the doctrine of evolution and the development of human languages. It has always been to us a source of astonishment that so many of those who look with favor upon the doctrine have neglected to study its action and its agency in the sphere of language. The growth of speech is a perpetual evolution. There is no fracture of the chain, no sundering of the continuity, no elimination of the presence and the operation of a personal God. Greek passes from its classic epoch into its modern Romaic type. Latin is transmuted into its several Romance descendants—early English with its rich inflectional drapery, into the simple garb of its analytic form. The identity is sustained through all the stages of growth or decay, inflection or agglutination. From a slight and modest beginning in a few hundred roots, have sprung by a ceaseless evolution the luxuriance, the strange versatility, the wonderful power of adaptation that characterize the cultivated idioms of modern Europe. The possibilities, the splendid potentialities of all linguistic and literary achievement lay "hidden behind the cloud of years," in the simple germs of primitive speech. This feature of our subject is capable of indefinite elaboration, the great law of historic and literary continuity, the teaching of Arnold and of Freeman, as well as of Muller and his colleagues, falling within its limits.

In his exposition of the Kantian philosophy, we do not think that Muller has been especially happy. Have not all commentators upon the sage of Konisberg succeeded in simply "darkening counsel by words without knowledge?" Where is there to be found an intelligible or apprehensible interpretation? In this example the identity of thought and language seems utterly to fail.

In discussing the relation of psychology to human speech, Muller has omitted those epochs in the development of the English language that most clearly illustrate his own teaching. Note, for example, the characteristic form and spirit of English literature during the period embraced within the domination of the Lockian school. The revolution of 1688, the reflective era of Addison, Swift and Steele, and many rich, suggestive analogies will present themselves almost spontaneously to the student of literature and the student of philosophy.

We observe that Muller recedes, or seems to recede, from the position which he formerly held in regard to the imitative theory of the origin of language. Not that he accepts or admits its probability, but his views in respect to the much caricatured "ding dong" theory, which he, many years ago, appears to have regarded with favor, have been in no small degree modified since the delivery of his famous series of lectures upon *The Science of Language*. We lay down the book with a feeling of genuine regret. No ordinary review can exhibit in full its rare merits, or convey an adequate impression of the limpid, lucid English, which invests even an erroneous teaching with a charming plausibility that demands for its complete resistance the utmost calmness and sobriety of judgment.

HENRY E. SHEPHERD.

College of Charleston, S. C.

X. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE MYSTERY OF GOD. A Consideration of Some Intellectual Hindrances to Faith. *By T. Vincent Tymms.* Second edition. Pp. 358. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1887. \$2.50.

There are some questions which the preacher must assume settled in the affirmative. They are not *open* questions for the pulpit; indeed they lie at the basis of all pulpit teaching; they form the foundation stones of all the edification that the preacher builds. And yet it is unquestionably true that these very questions are constantly discussed, these foundation stones of his edifice are continually tested outside of the pulpit. Our current literature is filled with questionings, and the very atmosphere of modern thought is pervaded with insinuation and suggestion of doubt as to the primary premises upon which all preaching proceeds.

The book before us attempts to deal with just such questions. That there is abundant call for such apologetics, few will question; for while the most prevalent and powerful hindrances to faith are probably not intellectual, still such difficulties may not unjustly be esteemed stones in the mouth of many a sepulchre which divine power commands reverent thought to "take away" as condition and precedent to Almighty quickening.

Believing this far from improbable, we welcome every honest effort at removal of intellectual hindrances; and though we can seldom agree fully with every position maintained by such writers; though we sometimes fear they concede to opponents more than is either necessary or wise; though we often find their faith failing in that decisiveness which makes the conservative theology so sturdy and strong, at the same time we remember that such writing is not designed for the fully persuaded but for the doubter, and for this class those very features which seem weakness to the former may prove the rather an element of strength. As conclusion and confirmation of this view we give the author's own language:

"Only one who has himself been tempted to renounce faith, and leave the eternal morrow to take thought for itself, can have full sympathy with those who suffer from that malady of thought which is so rife in modern days. In issuing a new edition my earnest hope is that many whose faces I may never see will find herein the touch of a friendly spirit, and some encouragement to fight their doubts, and face the spectres of the mind, until at length they find a stronger faith. Human words at best are weak, yet—

"Words are things; and a small drop of ink
Falling like dew upon a thought * * *

may aid another mind to think of Him who is never far from any honest heart and to trust the mystic guidance of that Power which is with us—

"In the night,
Which makes the darkness and the light,
And dwells not in the light alone."

BOHLEN LECTURES, INAUGURAL SERIES. Four Lectures, delivered in the Church of the Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, in the year 1877, on the Foundation of the late John Bohlen, Esq. *By Alexander H. Vinton, D. D.* Second Edition. 12 mo. Pp. 130. New York: Thos. Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House. 1887. 75cts.

This collection of Lectures deserves to pass through many editions. Dr. Vinton is orthodox, evangelical and courageous. Four subjects are treated, viz: The Personality of God, the Tri-personality of God, the Atonement, and the Holy Ghost. The third named afforded the lecturer a splendid opportunity to deal some telling blows against the loose views of the Atonement taught by Schleiermacher, Coleridge, Maurice, Stanley and Bushnell, and to restate the true doctrine of Vicarious Atonement. In the fourth lecture, the Holy Ghost is considered in His relation to creation, providence, inspiration, the appearance of Christ,

conscience, regeneration, sanctification, and the ordinances of the church. In these points there was a tempting field for speculation or many allurements to lean toward theories which would push God as far away as possible in creation, or exalt man above measure in a self-determining power of the will, or invest the church and her ordinances with a power and grace to save. But throughout, the same grand adherence to the Bible and truth which led the author lovingly to put the crown upon the Saviour's brow, the same rich penetration into and appreciation of scriptural teaching, held him rigidly to the orthodox belief. The lectures are among the most thoughtful, and at the same time most practical and worthy of circulation, of any that have ever come under our notice.

FIVE LAST THINGS; DEATH, INTERMEDIATE STATE, RESURRECTION, JUDGMENT, ETERNITY. Studies in the Holy Scriptures. *By Rev. Jesse A. Spencer, S. T. D.* 12 mo. Pp. 170. Cloth, 75 cents. New York: Thomas Whittaker. 1887.

The subjects named in the title are dealt with in a simple, direct and instructive manner. The smallness of the volume precludes an extensive or exhaustive treatise on any one of the themes. To the general commendation of the book exception must be taken to the author's teaching the doctrine of an intermediate state and of the propriety of prayer for the blessed dead. While he holds these doctrines, however, he is very careful to express himself as decidedly against the belief in "the larger hope," the extension of mercy in a second state to those who reject or do not hear of Christ in this. With this exception the book is most useful and scriptural, a valuable contribution to the literature of eschatology.

CHRISTIAN FACTS AND FORCES. *By Newman Smyth, author of "Old Faiths in New Light," Etc.* Pp. 267. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1887. \$1.50.

The volume is composed of twenty sermons, preached in the writer's pulpit in New Haven. The discourses are clear and simple in style, and withal attractive, but marked throughout by the author's belief in the New Theology. They are really the Andover views in popular setting, the "old faith" in a "new light" which is neither biblical nor wholesome. In Dr. Smyth's view, the Apostle Paul is out of date, behind this age, and the "common experience of forgiveness and its moral necessities" is a much better proof of atonement than God's Word, and better suits the prevailing tendency to belief in universal restoration. Still, to all who would keep abreast of the current discussions, and who would see the application of some prevalent theological errors in regular pulpit work, this volume of discourses will be most useful.

FIFTEEN YEARS IN THE CHAPEL OF YALE COLLEGE. *By Noah Porter,* 1871-1886. Crown. 8vo. pp. 413. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1888. \$2.50.

These discourses are more in the nature of philosophical essays than of sermons. Most of them were delivered as Baccalaureate addresses to the graduating classes of Yale College. Dr. Porter's distinguished position, pre-eminent gifts and long experience fitted him to be an able expounder of the great principles and themes with which he deals, and upon which the Christian faith is built. The difficulties involved in these principles, and the objections to them, are treated with great force, and the discussion, while adapted to the philosophical or theologically trained mind, are brought within the range of that special class which he addressed, the intelligent and thoughtful young men about entering upon their life work.

THE HIDDEN WAY ACROSS THE THRESHOLD, or the Mystery which hath been hidden for ages and from generations. An explanation of the concealed forces in every man to open the temple of the soul and to learn the guidance of the unseen hand. Illustrated and made plain with as few occult phrases as possible. *By J. C. Street,* A. B. N., Etc. 8vo. Pp 598. Boston: Lee and Shepard, 10 Milk St. 1888. *Second Edition.* \$3.50.

The fact that this strange book has, within a few weeks from its publication, passed to a second edition, indicates either that there are a great many people who accept the wildest fancies of spiritualism or that many investigators or students desire to read for themselves what is held by the most advanced adherents of that belief. We are persuaded that it cannot be the former, unless it be true that modern methods of living and thinking have bred a thus far underestimated number of sensitively organized, nervous people. That it is the latter, is readily accounted for by the fact that the recent investigations and partial report of the Seybert Commission have given an unprecedented impulse in the direction of the study of this doctrine. To this may, perhaps, be added, a certain craze for the occultism of the East which is now prevalent in certain quarters, and which has even sought to make of the Christian religion an evolution from the religion of the Hindus. The author claims to be a student of and medium for occult forces, to have had frequent and special intercourse with "spirits," and to have received calls from the spirit world as well as this world to give the benefit of his knowledge to the un-"Illuminati." He devotes much space to showing how "to hold communion with immortals," and offers a book which he asserts to be a compilation containing thoughts from Intelligences in the form and out of it, from souls embodied and disembodied. As a contribution to the intelligent thinker and believer it is most valuable, as containing its own proof of the wildness and folly of such a faith. It almost makes a Seybert Commission unnecessary, because useless.

AN AMERICAN COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT. *Edited by Alvah Hovey, D. D., LL.D.*: 4 vols., Royal 8vo. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1420 Chestnut St. 1881-1887.

COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF MARK. *By W. N. Clarke, D. D., and COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF LUKE. By George R. Bliss, D. D.,* two volumes in one. \$2.75.

COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF JOHN. *By Alvah Hovey, D. D., LL.D.* \$2.25.

COMMENTARY ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. *By Horatio B. Hackett, D. D.* A new edition revised and greatly enlarged by the author. Edited by Alvah Hovey, in consultation with Ezra Abbot, LL.D. \$2.00.

COMMENTARY ON THE REVELATION. *By Justin A. Smith, D. D.,* in consultation with James Robinson Boise, D. D., LL.D. \$2.00.

American scholarship will never be at a discount where these rich volumes are known. The denominational auspices under which they appear, while, of course, emphasizing such features as appear to strengthen their own tenets, will not detract at all from the ability and usefulness of this series of commentaries. The work which commands the heart and brain of men like Broadus and Hovey and Hackett, cannot be narrow or weak.

The "American Commentary," of which the above-named volumes, with Dr. Broadus on Matthew, which was reviewed at length in our last number, is issuing from the press of the Baptist Publication Society of Philadelphia, at the rate of one or two volumes yearly. The general editorship is in the hands of Dr. Alvah Hovey, of Newton Theological Institute, Mass., a guarantee of the soundness and evangelical, as well as scholarly character of the work. The authorized and revised versions are given in parallel columns. The critical notes are given in such form as to be adapted to popular use, while yet retaining all the characteristics of scholarliness. The expositions and notes are given on the same page with the text, and below it, as in Alford's Greek Testament. The various writers have prepared their exposition in the light of the most recent developments in biblical learning and investigation as to the authenticity, the original text and the meaning of the New Testament Scriptures. The Commentary on the Acts incorporated in this series is the well known work of Hackett, with such additions by Dr. Hovey as would bring it abreast of the progress of text-criticism and give the benefit of the latest critical editions of the New Testament by Tregelles, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and to make it conform to the later edition of Meyer, to whom the author constantly refers. The Commentary on John has a special value because of the contributions to it, in the form of critical notes, by our own well known and admired John A. Broadus.

THE PULPIT COMMENTARY. *Edited by the Rev. Canon H. D. M. Spence, M. A., and by the Rev. Joseph S. Exell.* GENESIS: Introductions by Rev. Canon F. W. Farrar, D. D.; Right Rev. H. Cotterill, D. D., Rev. T. Whitelaw, M. A. Exposition and Homiletics by Rev. Thomas Whitelaw, M. A. Homilies by various authors. Eighth English Edition. GALATIANS: Exposition by the Rev. Prebendary E. Huxtable, M. A. Homiletics by Rev. Prof. T. Croskery, D. D., Homilies by various authors. EPHESIANS: Exposition and Homiletics by Rev. Prof. W. G. Blaikie, D. D. Homilies by various authors. Royal octavo, about 500 pp. per vol. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1887.

These volumes (Genesis 1 vol., Ephesians and Galatians 1 vol.) are admirable specimens of the American reprint of this valuable and well known English commentary. The increasing popularity of the work is indicated by the demand on this side the Atlantic for its issue from an American press. Its great success is readily accounted for. The array of contributors, their recognized ability and scholarship, and the plan of the work combine to attract an attention to it which is found to be not unwarranted as one enters into its expositions and homilies. A special feature is found in the scholarly introductions to each book. These, of themselves, would commend the work. The Homiletics, or brief sermon outline, given with each expository or critical section are suggestive and oftentimes helpful. The separation of the expository and practical, or hortatory, gives opportunity for the fuller development of each. The whole work is specially designed, as its name indicates, to be a *pulpit* commentary, a special aid to the preacher, but at the same time to place him, first of all, upon the solid foundation of a rightful exegesis of the Holy Scriptures.

DICTIONARY OF THE HOLY BIBLE, for General use in the study of the Scriptures; with Engravings, Maps and Tables. Revised and enlarged Edition. New York: American Tract Society, 150 Nassau Street. 1886. \$2.00.

In offering this revised edition of the deservedly popular Bible Dictionary of the American Tract Society, the editor announces that a great proportion of the articles have been re-written, many new illustrations added, with improved maps; making it in its enlarged form almost a new work. It has made liberal use of the most recent Biblical researches, and especially of the valuable results of the Exploration Companies in Palestine. For its size, handsome binding, beauty of letter-press, and value of contents, it is a marvel of cheapness.

BIBLE STUDIES FROM THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS, covering the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1888. By Geo. F. Pentecost, D. D. 12mo. Paper. Pp. 350. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co. 1887. 50 cts. Cloth \$1.00.

These "studies" will prove most useful to the teachers and older

pupils of the Sabbath-school, and may well form a part of their equipment for the work of the new year. The fervor, earnestness and directness which have made Dr. Pentecost so successful as an evangelist are manifested in this book, and fit him to present the lessons from what may be called the evangelistic rather than the strictly critical or didactic standpoint. This will be practically useful to multitudes of Christian workers and students.

THE PSALMS IN HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY. *By the Rev. John Ker, D. D.* 12 mo. Pp. xvi, 219. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1887. \$1.00

The author's death, just as he was completing this work, adds a tender interest to this volume. His own life was so full of the spirit, as was his ministry with the words of the Psalms, that it appears as if God intended this to be most appropriately the sainted writer's last work. It does not claim to be a commentary, though its comments are sometimes most valuable, but a collection of incidents, arranged with each Psalm, and also provided with a useful cross-index, illustrative of the manner in which the Psalms have made themselves felt in critical moments of action and suffering. Like all who have studied them reverently and observed the Christian life, the author saw how marvelously they pervade human life and how wondrously they are adapted to all forms of human experience and character, and it is his object to show this fact to others. In addition to the collection of incidents and illustrations, there are in the volume a captivating introduction concerning the history connected with the Psalms, and chapters on the Value of the Psalms and Metrical Versions of the Psalms. The volume is rich, a casket of jewels, all precious in themselves and glowing with the light that shines from the excellent glory.

THE STORY OF THE PSALMS. *By Henry Van Dyke, D. D., Pastor of the Brick Church in New York; author of "The Beauty of Religion."* 12 mo. Pp. 259. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1887. \$1.50.

The author disclaims being a commentator, rather dryly suggesting, in a preliminary note, that up to A. D. 1723, there were known six hundred and thirty commentaries on the Psalms. In these pages he gives the "story" of only sixteen Psalms, and with such interest and instruction that we could wish for more. His object is to show how these Psalms come close to the common experience of mankind—how this is the secret of the vitality and power of the Bible throughout—how the Word of God was caused to grow upon the earth out of and into and in connection with the necessities of His people and the development of His purposes of grace. The chapters, under engaging titles, are all beautifully written and are full of striking and suggestive thoughts.

PEOPLE'S LESSON BOOK ON THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW, to aid Sabbath-schools, families and individuals in the study of the Bible. Boards, 18 mo. 224 pp. Single copy, 16cts. Philadelphia: The American Sunday-school Union. 1887.

The little book has seventy-six lessons, covering the entire Gospel of Matthew, and furnishes explanations, questions and applications. A dictionary of terms used in the Gospel, a collection of hymns, orders of service, commandments etc., are appended. The work is prepared by Dr. Edwin W. Rice, assisted by Rev. M. W. Woodworth, of the Synod of Virginia.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. *By George Park Fisher, D. D. Titus Professor of Eccl. History in Yale University.* With Maps. 8vo. Pp. xiii. 701. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1887. \$3.50.

The great gifts of Prof. Fisher were never engaged in a more laudable undertaking than that of seeking to give, within the compass of this one handsome octavo volume, a succinct history of the Christian church which would be adapted to popular use. The vastness of the field which he must traverse, and the variety of facts and beliefs which, as a philosophical historian, he must needs encounter and trace in cause and effect, will naturally cause him to deal tersely with some parts of the subject he treats or to enlarge upon others, when just the opposite course would suit another mind. Hence the volume cannot be expected to satisfy every reader. A noticeable feature of this work is the author's attempt to show the relations of the history of Christianity and of the church to contemporaneous secular history. The book gives an outline of church history up to the very year of publication, together with a chapter on modern missions. In his sketch of Religious Denominations in the United States, he devotes but one line and a half to the Southern Presbyterian Church, simply telling of its separate constitution, and unfortunately missing the proper time, when he gives 1862 instead of 1861 as the date of its organization. The volume is a valuable contribution to the literature of ecclesiastical history, and will be found unusually well adapted to the use of intelligent readers generally. A fuller review of it is reserved for a future number.

THE BEGINNINGS OF CIVILIZATION. *By Charles Woodward Hutson, Professor of Modern Languages and acting-Professor of History in the University of Mississippi.* 16 mo. pp. 242. New York: John B. Alden. 1887. 50cts.

This unpretentious little volume by a Southern writer is declared by him, in its introduction, to be merely tentative, a product of the necessities forced upon him in the class-room. It scarcely needs the modest apology which the author makes, for it is a wonderful compend of learning and research, evincing remarkable familiarity with the literature and progress of his subject. Prof. Hutson states, in his first

chapter, the prevailing theories as to the origin and age of man, but does not express his own opinion. In the succeeding chapters, he brings together a great store of information, gleaned from history, inscriptions, recent explorations and excavations, concerning the early civilized races and nations, the Egyptians, Chaldeans, Hittites, Hebrews, Phœnicians and others. Incidentally he gives many interesting facts concerning the growth of language, and the history of words and idioms, thus adding largely to the value and interest of the little book. The work deserves to be extended and put in handsome form.

THE SCOTTISH PULPIT, FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE PRESENT DAY. *By William M. Taylor, D. D., L.L. D., Minister of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City.* 12 mo. Pp. 287. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1887.

These sketches of great Scottish preachers were originally delivered by Dr. Taylor as "Lyman Beecher Lectures," before the Yale Divinity School. They are striking and happy delineations of character and life by one who felt all the enthusiasm and pride of a fellow countryman, together with the sympathy growing out of a kindred profession and belief. Dr. Taylor's pen pictures of Knox and Melville and Rutherford and Chalmers, and others, are most effective. He depicts each man in his own times and surroundings, and draws many useful lessons from his life and work.

LIGHTS OF TWO CENTURIES. *Edited by Edward Everett Hale.* Illustrated with fifty portraits. 8vo. Pp. 603. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co. 1887. \$1.70.

This is unquestionably one of the most attractive books of the season. The subjects,—the leading spirits in the world's advancement in the past and present century; the writer,—the polished and masterful Edward Everett Hale; and the publishers,—who used the perfection of the printers' and binders' art, have together given a volume that is seldom surpassed for interest and beauty. The editor gives us striking pictures of the life and work of the leading artists and sculptors, prose writers, composers, poets and inventors. The biographies are brief but effective and instructive, and furnish a rich store of information. The book is admirably adapted to use in Reading Circles and Associations.

MY CONFESSION, AND THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST'S TEACHING. *By Count Lyof N. Tolstoi.* Translated from the Russian. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 13 Astor Place. 1887. \$1.00

WHAT TO DO? THOUGHTS EVOKED BY THE CENSUS OF MOSCOW. *By Count Lyof N. Tolstoi.* Translated from the Russian. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 13 Astor Place. 1887. \$1.00

Count Tolstoi's writings are eagerly sought and read for many reasons. Their power and fascination are great; and the author's position in Russia is entirely unique, a statesman and yet one of the people, a man

of vast wealth, and yet a peasant's simplicity in manner of living; and the illustration of Russian life and thought from such a source is so rare, that every reader must come under the writer's spell. To these may be added that greatest of all attractions to the human mind, the fact that the rigid censorship of the Russian Government seeks to suppress much that Count Tolstoi writes. One can scarcely afford at this day to be ignorant of this great man, and hence special thanks are due the publishers for giving these works in such handsome and yet cheap form.

"MY CONFESSION" is the autobiography of one who is seeking by the dim light of reason for the way of life, and is but the recital of what is the experience of myriads of the same class. In young manhood, he discarded belief in what he had been taught in his childhood and youth and came to regard religion as a joke. All the faith that he had at that period was in the possibility of perfection, though how, or what, or whence he could not tell. After more than thirty years of great success in political and literary life, shadowed at times, however, by the question "what shall I do?" until sometimes he even contemplated suicide he still finds no solution for the problem "Why should I live? Why should I wish for anything? Why should I do anything? Is there any meaning in my life which can overcome the inevitable death awaiting me?" Human knowledge, philosophy, companionship with believers and theologians, the study of religions,—nothing satisfied him, until, after placing himself upon the level of the common people, and making himself one of them, he arrived at the conclusion that, while many superstitions were mixed with their religion, there was still in their simple life and belief the only possible solution of the problem of life. Here he found an application of gospel truth that led him to belief in that gospel. The feeling that one has in reading this strange, weird story of Tolstoi is that here was one who was thoroughly under conviction of sin, and whose whole difficulty could have been solved in a moment by a simple acceptance and understanding of the work of the Holy Spirit in applying the redemption purchased for us by Christ. He wandered about helpless and hopeless, and at last became satisfied with a really unsatisfying faith, simply because he did not seem to look for that Comforter who takes the things of Christ and shows them unto us. The second part of the volume under consideration, shows this inadequate conception of the deeper, spiritual meaning of the Word of God. "The Spirit of Christ's Teaching," he understands to be summarized thus: "To understand life is to do good;" "Man in his heart feels love and good to his neighbor to be the only true, free and eternal life."

"WHAT TO DO?" is a discussion of poverty, of social vices and miseries, of labor and luxury, of the significance of science and art, with an address to women. This last chapter is worth the price of the book. The author shows throughout the book the same brilliant power, yet

gloomy views as in his other works, and manifests a painful ignorance of the great fundamental principle of life and means of recuperation from the evil effects of vice—the gift to man of the Holy Ghost.

LIFE NOTES, OR FIFTY YEARS' OUTLOOK. *By William Hague, D. D.* 12 mo. pp. 362. Boston: Lee and Shepard, 10 Milk St. 1888.

The writer was an eminent minister of the Baptist church. This work was the last in a distinguished and useful life. He died just after reading the proof of its last pages. His long service in his church, his work in the great centres of population and wealth, his acquaintance and intimacy with the leading men of his denomination in the past half century peculiarly fitted Dr. Hague to prepare this autobiography, which, after all, is not so much an account of himself as of denominational history and development. His style is very attractive and unaffected, and always fresh and bright. He seemed to have sought and enjoyed the sunshine of life much more than its shadows, and he here shares with us so liberally the brightness and not the cloud, that we could wish he had begun his work earlier and written other volumes of such reminiscences.

JAMES ROBERTSON, OF NEWINGTON. A memorial of his life and work.

With a preface by the late Rev. John Ker, D. D. 12 mo. pp. xxvii; 365. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1887. \$1.75.

This is the biography of an earnest minister of the gospel whose work was a most fruitful and happy one, though characterized throughout by noiselessness and gentle simplicity. As the memoir of such a man, it is both stimulating and helpful to the toilers in the same calling, especially to those who, like James Robertson, find their work in the less ambitious places of the church. As an illustration in life of the power of the gospel to sustain in affliction and labor, it brings us directly to the spring of all power, in the Saviour of men, whose promise it is that He will be with his servants "always, even to the end of the world." The extended preface by the late Dr. Ker is a loving tribute from a life-long friend.

PATRICK HENRY. *By Moses Coit Tyler.* 16 mo. Pp. 398. Cloth, gilt top, \$1.25. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1887.

This is the last issued volume in the publishers' history of American Statesmen, and will, for many reasons, rank as one of the finest contributions to biography ever known. In the first place, the writer went upon practically untrodden ground, there having been no history of Patrick Henry's life written except by Wm. Wirt, and that as long ago as 1817; in the next place, he had access to a store of printed material and manuscript which Wirt never knew; again, the writer had the valued assistance of the descendants of the great orator and statesman, who possess, in large measure, many of the noble traits of their ancestor; and finally, he had one of the richest and most varied histories, in itself, and

one of the grandest figures of the early days of our Republic, to describe. Never has a work been more delightfully executed. Every chapter is fascinating. The author most cleverly removes many of the exaggerated impressions and traditions associated with his subject's name, but by no means lessens the interest in the man and his remarkable career. The account of Patrick Henry's early life is as humorous as it is shrewdly designed to set in more powerful light the subsequent recital of the not more serious but more wisely undertaken relations and duties of life. The chapter proving that the general impression of the illiteracy of Patrick Henry is very erroneous, is full of sound reasoning, which is ably sustained in the succeeding chapters. The account of the great war speech, which is perhaps the master piece of American eloquence, glows almost with the eloquence of Patrick Henry himself. His domestic life, his relations to religious thought and activity, his eloquent pleading against infidelity and irreligion, his going so far even as to have Butler's *Analogy* printed, and to prepare with his own hand an elaborate defence of the Christian religion against the assaults of Tom Paine, are not so well known as they should be, and this volume, in describing them, will add great and enduring lustre to an already illustrious name. The author nowhere in all this fascinating and powerful biography displays more taste or skill than in showing how the end of the great statesman and Christian was in keeping with his life. Having been told by the physician that he must die, perhaps, (and as the event proved), in a few minutes, "he prayed, in clear words, a simple childlike prayer, for his family, for his country, and for his own soul then in the presence of death. Finally . . . he asked the doctor to observe how great a reality and benefit that religion was to a man about to die. And after Patrick Henry had spoken to his beloved physician these few words, in praise of something which, having never failed him in all his life before, did not fail him in his very last need of it, he continued to breathe very softly for some moments; after which they who were looking upon him saw that his life had departed."

PARISH PROBLEMS: HINTS AND HELPS FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE CHURCHES. Edited by Washington Gladden. 8vo. Pp. xii. 479. New York: The Century Co. 1887.

A valuable collection of papers, seventy-eight in number, and from the ablest writers, on just such practical matters as the people in the churches need to see discussed. Among the writers are such well-known and practical men as J. H. Vincent, Lewellyn Pratt, H. M. Scudder, Washington Gladden, H. C. Haydn and Josiah Strong. The general subjects treated are, the pastor's call, parish business, parish buildings, the pastor at home, the pastor at work, helping the pastor, the people at work, the Sunday-school, and worship. The delicate relations between pastor and people, the courtesies and proprieties due in order to the preservation of the tie and making it effective, the right methods of aiding in church work, proper methods of business admin-

istration, and many kindred matters are dealt with in a sensible, practical way that cannot fail to accomplish good wherever this book is read. While the subjects are considered from the standpoint of the pew, rather than of the pulpit, pastors will derive good from it, through the better appreciation and understanding which it will give the people.

LIGHTS AND SHADOWS OF HUMAN LIFE. *By the Rev. John Philip, A. M., Fordoun, Author of "Earth's Care and Heaven's Cure," etc.* 12 mo. Pp. 231. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1887. \$1.00.

This reprint of a Scottish minister's work will be a welcome addition to this class of literature. It is the author's purpose to portray life as it is,—in its source, its burdens, its discipline, its problems, and then to indicate what, by grace, it may become, its sweetness, its compensations, its value, its sequel, its crown. It is a book full of that hopefulness which grace alone can impart, and is characterized throughout by a devout spirit and robust thought.

LETTERS FROM HEAVEN, Translated from the Fourth German Edition. Second Edition. 12 mo. pp. 269. \$1.00. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1887.

A remarkable specimen of imaginative work. The letters are supposed to be written by a mother in heaven to her son on earth. The views given of heaven are materialistic, though by no means as decidedly so as in many other recent publications of the same class. While the picture is overdrawn, the tone is thoroughly evangelical and many passages are calculated to evoke serious thought and turn the mind to the only Saviour of mankind.

PRAYERS FOR THE USE OF FAMILIES. *By Joseph B. Stratton, D. D., Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Natchez, Miss.* Natchez, 1887. Pp. 162. 50cts.

The high commendation of this little book, in our religious papers, is well deserved. The eminently successful and venerable pastor at Natchez has put into its preparation the richness of experience and ripeness of faith which all who know him are happy to acknowledge as his. It is a book of prayers for one month, and prepared at the request of the author's Presbytery. It is designed as a help to those who neglect family worship because of their supposed inability or hesitation to take the duty of prayer upon themselves, but is sent forth with the earnest wish that it may stimulate those who use it to the outpouring of their desires freely by their own tongues, and under the promptings of their own hearts. The book is printed at the writer's own expense and risk, and it is to be hoped that he will find such a demand for it as not only to reimburse him but also call for an enlarged edition. Its happy adaptation to its purpose and remarkable cheapness, and the well known character of Dr. Stratton should soon create this demand.

HOME WORSHIP AND THE USE OF THE BIBLE IN THE HOME. *By Rev. J. P. Thompson, D. D., and Rev. C. H. Spurgeon.* Edited by Rev. James H. Taylor D. D., with special chapters by Bishop Simpson, Rev. John Hall, D. D., Rev. Wm. M. Taylor, D. D., Rev. George D. Boardman, D. D. Illustrated with steel engravings and maps. Quarto. Pp. xxxiv. 920. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. *Sold only by subscription.*

One scarcely knows which most to admire, the elegance of the form of this great family book or the good taste shown in its internal arrangement, or the superb character of its contents. The splendid volume embraces everything needful to adapt it to general use in Christian homes. The running expositions, and notes, the happy adjustment of Old and New Testament passages on kindred themes, the avoidance of detaching passages of Scripture from their proper surroundings, and the constant and successful effort to preserve the unity of the Bible in daily reading, while at the same time suiting the passage to the family circle, the simple, unaffected prayers provided for those who need such help, together with the vast store of information in the Dictionary, Scripture Index, Analytical Index, Atlases, etc., attached to it, make this superb book by far the best ever prepared for the family. The names of the writers and editors, were there no other reason for commending this work, would be a sufficient guarantee of its value and suitableness.

COME YE APART. Daily Morning Readings in the Life of Christ. *By the Rev. J. R. Miller, D. D., author of "Week-Day Religion," "In His Steps," etc.* 12 mo. Pp. 369. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1887. \$1.50.

A book for devotional use, and giving passages from the Gospels for each day of the year, with one page of reading under each passage. The compiler and author has sought to avoid the technically exegetical and expository, and to make these readings practical and devotional. In this he has been successful. The principles of a correct interpretation underlie the readings but do not appear in such a form as to mar their devotional character.

THE "COME" AND "GO" FAMILY TEXT BOOK. Containing "Come" and "Go" texts for every day in the year; also, spaces for births, deaths and marriages. *Compiled by John Strathesk.* Small quarto, gilt edges, pp. 224. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. \$2.00.

A most beautiful register of friends and kindred and of the leading events of each day. The compiler has, with great skill and good taste, woven into the space for each day some passage of Scripture, containing the word "Come," and another containing the word "Go." The extreme beauty and novelty of the book, as well as happy adaptation to its purpose, commend it at once to every one who sees it.

ALDEN'S MANIFOLD CYCLOPEDIA OF KNOWLEDGE AND LANGUAGE. WITH ILLUSTRATIONS. Vol. 3. Artemisia to Baptisia. 12 mo. pp. 631. New York: John B. Alden, Publisher. 1887. Half Morocco, 65cts. Cloth, 50 cts. Postage, 11cts.

To the many who cannot afford a costly and elaborate Encyclopedia, yet who need more than an unabridged Dictionary this Manifold Cyclopaedia will be most acceptable. It undertakes to present a survey of WORDS OR OF THINGS, thus combining the characteristics of both Cyclopaedia and Dictionary without the costliness and bulk of the one or the brevity of the other. It is a marvel of cheapness, and yet in both literary and mechanical make-up is most excellent in quality. The work will be issued in about thirty volumes, appearing monthly. Three of these have now been issued and amply fulfil the publisher's promises. They are wonderfully convenient in form, in clear print, well bound and handsome in appearance.

VICTORIAN POETS. Revised and extended, by a supplementary chapter, to the fiftieth year of the period under review. *By Edmund Clarence Stedman, author of "Poets of America."* Pp. xxiv., 521. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1887. \$2.25.

The rich thought, philosophic and poetic spirit, and pains-taking investigation of the author have deserved the popularity of this delightful book, presented now in enlarged form, in its thirteenth edition. It is an erudite, yet fascinating treatise, by one fitted by talent, temperament and training for his work. It is a book of literary and biographical criticism of British poets of the past fifty years, giving a careful and impartial view of the career and genius of the great leaders, and a comprehensive view of certain minor schools or groups into which the lesser poets may be gathered. The marginal notes present an admirable analysis of the whole work and of each subject's spirit, method and career. As a specimen of literary criticism, from one whose ability and honesty are apparent upon every page, and as a thoroughly philosophical inquiry and analysis, this book will continue to be the highest standard. With the author's "Poets of America," it forms an indispensable handbook of modern English poetry. Its enlargement with the completion of Victoria's fifty years' reign, brings it up to the present and causes it to appear singularly appropriate and complete.

THE FLAG ON THE MILL. *By Mary B. Sleight.* Illustrated. 12mo. Pp. 455. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1887. \$1.50.

The type of fiction generally believed to be popular is of such a degrading and corrupting character that it is a healthy sign when a prudent publisher issues a book like the above. The story is simple, pure and sweet, beautifully illustrating the practical Christian life, and yet sustaining the reader's interest to the end. It is a book which no one need fear to leave within reach of every member of the household.

CROSS CORNERS. *By Anna B. Warner.* 12 mo. Pp. 358. New York : Robert Carter & Brothers. 1887. \$1.50.

A story eminently suitable, because of its sweetness and purity, for the home or the Sabbath-school. It is designed to illustrate in life genuine faith, patience and submission. Each chapter gives wholesome and practical expositions of God's Word. It is an intensely interesting, a delightful book.

TERENCE O'DOWD; OR, ROMANISM TO-DAY. An Irish Story, founded on facts. *By Tom O'Shaughnessy.*

The story is in itself one of great interest. It is well written, in vigorous language, touched with poetic fervor. It carries us right into the heart of Irish Roman Catholic home-life and church-life, and we see in vivid pictures, not over-drawn, yet faithfully portrayed, the actual facts as they are occurring to-day in that strange, sad land. The author, in his introduction, announces his purpose to be to instruct and awaken the people of the Protestant Churches to a clearer conception of nineteenth century Romanism in countries where its power is uncontrolled. Especially does he desire to warn Protestant parents of the danger of sending their children to Romanist schools. The book ought to be widely read. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 16mo. Pp. 350; illustrated. Price, \$1.15.