

PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY

VOLUME 15

1901

2, 15, 20, 1

X  
Per  
P928A  
v. 15

# THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

NO. 55--JANUARY, 1901.

## I. THREE MALIGNED THEOLOGIANS.

Dr. John A. Broadus was fond of telling how his father proved, from the Bible, "there is no God." Calling his son to him and placing his finger over the first line of the 14th Psalm it read, "there is no God." The boy was satisfied, the Bible said it, and that ended it. When his father removed his finger it read, "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God." It has occurred to us that this is not an unfair illustration of the manner of proof offered in the discussion now pending regarding infant salvation. We wish to set this forth particularly in reference to John Calvin, Dr. William Twisse and Jonathan Edwards.

Calvin formulated and left to the world a system of theology; the sweep of this subject should have corrected what was believed by many, owing to the bearing of certain great doctrines of the Bible on infant salvation, independent of their relation to theology as a whole.

We propose to show from Calvin's writings that he states in language as unmistakable as "there is no God," that infants are condemned, and to prove from the context that the declaration is as foreign and untrue to his mind regarding those dying in infancy, as the above declaration is to the mind and context of the Bible.

These men wrote in times of controversy and much of their writing is controversial and the figure of hypothesis is frequently used. In proving the justice of God's decrees, hypothetical sentences are used too severe not to be rep-

pellant. Many such passages are found involving the destiny of infants. The failure of regarding them in this light has given the impression of the harshness of Calvinism that many have who know little of this system.

#### INSTITUTES.

We undertake to show that Calvin states positively that infants are condemned, and that he exempts from condemnation those dying in infancy.

The first writing of consequence Calvin gave the world was his "Institutes;" the last important literary work of his life was the revising of the Institutes. These, then, may be consistently termed the Alpha and Omega of his writings, having revised the Institutes in 1559, just five years before he died. His works are voluminous; many of his essays and sermons remain as he left them, and have never been published in any form. The work that bears his own mark as expressing his final opinions should constitute authority for his beliefs. To these Institutes we appeal for proof of our proposition.

It is easy to see that in Calvin's clear and bald method of stating the distinctive features of his system, he is concerned with the system itself, independent of any consequences that may follow from an honest statement of any of the points confirming the system as a whole. His statements therefore may, and do, fail to take cognizance of any issue save the one in hand. Foreknowledge and Predestination, for instance, are stated by him in such manner as to establish the doctrines as facts, and leave many questions unanswered in consequence of such statement; among the unanswered questions is notably the one of the destiny of infants. We will take Calvin's statements:

"When we attribute foreknowledge to God, we mean that all things have ever been, and perpetually remain, before his eyes, so that to his knowledge nothing is future or past, but all things are present; and present in such manner that he does not merely conceive of them from ideas formed in his mind, as things remembered by us appear present to our mind, but really beholds and sees them as if actually placed before him. And this foreknowledge extends to the whole world, and to all the creatures. Predestination we call the eternal decree of God, by which he has deter -

miued in himself what he would have to become of every individual of mankind. For they are not all created with a similar destiny; but eternal life is foreordained for some, and eternal damnation for others. Every man, therefore, being created for one or the other of these ends, we say he is predestined either to life or death" Book III, Chap. XX.

Here Calvin is zealous for these doctrines alone; the context shows that he was making a statement to oppose those who are attempting to make foreknowledge the cause of predestination. To relieve the doctrines of this, and this alone, he so states them; that there are other difficulties he does not hesitate to declare, for he says "it is involved in many cavils." What we maintain is, that so far as the statement of these doctrines is concerned, there was no room to except infants dying in infancy or any others. The two classes are the predestinated to life and the predestinated to damnation, and the doctrines taken alone include in these classes infants, for he elsewhere shows that they are so predestinated before they are born.

He further states,\* in arguing the doctrine with those opposed to it :

"But as these virulent adversaries are not content with one species of opposition, we will reply to them all as occasion shall require. Foolish mortals enter into many contentions with God, as though they could arraign him to plead their accusations.

"In the first place they inquire by what right the Lord is angry with his creatures who had not provoked him by any previous offence; for that to devote to destruction whom he pleases, is more like the caprice of a tyrant than the lawful sentence of a judge; that men have reason, therefore, to expostulate with God if they are predestinated to eternal death without any demerit of their own, merely by his sovereign will. If such thoughts ever enter the minds of pious men, they will be sufficiently enabled to break their violence by this one consideration—how exceedingly presumptuous it is only to inquire into the causes of the Divine will; which is in fact, and is justly entitled to be, the cause of everything that exists."

Here it is clear that no distinction other than the two classes of the predestinated to life and to death is in his mind. That this statement was meant by Calvin to include infants, we shall presently show. He bases the doctrine on the will of God, and nothing else.†

---

\*Book III, Chap. XXIII.

†Book III, Chap. XXIII.

Discussing the Fall, we find strikingly given Calvin's mind on the consequences to infants :

"But whether they wish it or dread it, predestination exhibits itself in Adam's posterity. For the loss of salvation by the whole race through the guilt of one parent, was an event that did not happen by nature. What prevents their acknowledging concerning one man, what they reluctantly grant concerning the whole species? Why should they lose their labor in sophistical evasion? The Scripture proclaims that all men were, in the person of their father, sentenced to eternal death. This not being attributable to nature, it is evident must have proceeded from the wonderful counsel of God. The perplexity and hesitation discovered at trifles, by these pious defenders of the justice of God, and their facilities in overcoming great difficulties are truly absurd.

"I enquire again, how it came to pass that the fall of Adam, independent of any remedy, should involve so many nations with their *infant children* in eternal death, *but because such was the will of God*. It is an awful decree, I confess; but no one can deny that God foreknew the future final fate of man before he created him, and that he did foreknow it because it was appointed by his own decree. If any one here attacks God's foreknowledge, he rashly and inconsiderately stumbles. For what ground of accusation is there against the Heavenly Judge for not being ignorant of futurity? If there is any just or plausible complaint, it lies against predestination; nor should it be thought absurd to affirm that God not only foresaw the fall of the first man, and the ruin of his posterity in him, but also arranged all by the determination of his own will."

From this it is explicit that Calvin believed the Fall involved man in a literal ruin. It was no fiction of thought, capable of being explained away by after considerations. His statement is that the consequences of the Fall involved the species in death, and its literalness is not to be explained by supposing a remedy. What Calvin does is this: he states the bearing of predestination, on the Fall, in such baldness as to make it impossible for any to escape, infant or adult, and he assigns no reason but the will of God. We argue that it can be proved, not alone from sentences, but from the context, so far as the subject, thus handled extends, that he teaches *infant condemnation*.

We now come to the bearing of this doctrine on justice. We wish to show that in his statement of it, not only his sentences, but his context shows that infants are condemned, and were we left without his words in the discussion of in-

fant regeneration and baptism, we should necessarily be compelled to admit Calvin taught infant condemnation. In his statement he is opposed by those who argue the injustice of God; to which he replies by arguing that the question of justice is not involved. He says:

“Therefore if any one attacks us with such an inquiry as this, why God has from the beginning predestinated some men to death, who, not yet being brought into existence, could not deserve the sentence of death—we reply by asking them in return, what they suppose God owes to man, if he chooses to judge of him from his own nature. As we are all corrupted by sin, we must necessarily be odious to God, and that not from tyrannical cruelty, but in the most equitable estimation of justice. If all whom the Lord predestinates to death are, in their natural condition, liable to the sentence of death, what injustice do they complain of receiving from him?”

We propose to show that Calvin did not believe predestination consigned infants dying in infancy to condemnation; this we shall do from his own words. It must be clear that if predestination and election are concerned with men before they are born, then there must be infants predestined to condemnation and non-elect infants, since all must pass through the infant stage before becoming adults. If it be asked, according to Calvin's writings on predestination and election can it be determined whether infants dying in infancy are saved? The answer is, it cannot; but it can be determined elsewhere in his writings that he did believe all infants dying in infancy were saved, and he so taught.

In arguing the fitness of infants for the sacrament of baptism, we shall find Calvin's words very significant when we remember he is opposing himself to those who did not believe in infant salvation, for the reason that they did not believe in their fitness for baptism. Here, we have the strange picture of a man who is charged with believing in infant condemnation, arguing infant salvation, in overthrowing objections to infant baptism.

Speaking of circumcision and baptism, Calvin says:

“The thing signified in both is one and the same thing, namely, regeneration.” The question then is, can infants, incapable of exercising faith through the hearing of the word, be regenerated?” Calvin answers:

"If it be enquired whether baptism may be rightly administered to infants, shall we not pronounce it an excess of folly, and even madness, in any one who resolves to dwell entirely on the element of water and the external observance, and cannot bear to direct his thoughts to the spiritual mystery? But if they are partakers of the thing signified, why shall they be excluded from the sign? If they obtain the truth why shall they be debarred from the figure? Though the external sign in the sacrament is so connected with the word, as not to be separated from it, yet if it be distinguished, which shall esteem of greater importance? Certainly when we see that the sign is subservient to the word, we shall pronounce it to be inferior to it, and assign it the subordinate place. While the word baptism, then, is directed to infants, why shall the sign, which is an appendix to the word, be prohibited them?"

This is Calvin's argument to show that infants of believers should be baptized, for he says, "It must be evident that the covenant which the Lord made with Abraham continues as much in force with Christians in the present day, as it did formerly with the Jews." He says further :

"For the sign of God, communicated to a child, like the impress of a seal, ratifies and confirms the promise given to the pious parent, declaring that the Lord will be a God, not only to him, but also to his seed, and that he is determined to exercise his goodness and grace, not only towards him, but towards his posterity even to a thousand generations. Nor shall I regard an objection, if it should be urged, that the mere promise of God ought to be sufficient to assure us of the salvation of our children ; since God, who knows our weakness, and has been pleased in this instance to indulge it has decided otherwise. Let those, therefore, who embrace the promise of God that he will perpetuate his mercy to their offspring, consider it their duty to present them to the Church to be signed with the symbol of mercy."

Bearing in mind that Calvin is arguing the regeneration of infants, it is clear he has no doubt about the salvation of at least some of the infants of believers. The covenant made with the Jews passes over to the Gentile nations, and, at least, the children of believers are included. Now let us see if Calvin included others. He says :

"Wherefore the Lord Jesus, to exhibit a specimen from which the world might understand that he was come to *extend* rather than to *limit* the mercy of the Father, kindly received the infants that were presented to him, and embraced them in his arms, chiding the disciples who endeavored to forbid their approach to him because they would keep those, of whom was the kingdom of Heaven, at a distance from him, who is the only way of entrance into it. But some one will object, what resemblance

does the embrace of Christ bear to baptism? for he is not said to have baptised them, but to have received them, taken them into his arms and blessed them; therefore, if we desire to imitate his example, let us assist infants with our prayers, but let us not baptize them. But it is necessary to consider the conduct of Christ with more attention than it receives from persons of this class. For it is not to be passed over as a thing of *little importance*, that Christ commanded infants to be brought to him, and added as a reason for this command, 'For of such is the kingdom of Heaven;' and afterwards gave a practical testimony of his will, when embracing them in his arms he commended them to his Father by his prayers and benedictions. If it be reasonable for infants to be brought to Christ, why is it not allowable to admit them to baptism, the symbol of our communion and fellowship with Christ? If of them is the kingdom of Heaven, why should they be denied the sign, which opens, as it were, an entrance into the church; that being received into it, they may be enrolled among the heirs of the Heavenly kingdom? How unjust shall we be, if we drive away from Christ those whom he invites to him; if we deprive them of the gifts with which he adorns them; if we exclude those whom he freely admits? But if we examine how far what Christ did on that occasion differs from baptism, how much greater importance shall we attach to baptism, by which we testify that infants are included in the covenant of God, than to the reception, the embrace, the imposition of hands and the prayers by which Jesus Christ himself acknowledged them as his, and declared them to be sanctified by him!

"The other cavils by which our opponents endeavor to elude the force of this passage, only betray their ignorance. For they argue that as Christ said, 'Suffer little children to come,' they must have been grown to such an age and stature as to be capable of walking. But they are called by the evangelist *βρεφη* and *παιδια* two words used by the Greeks to signify little infants hanging on the breast. The word 'come,' therefore, is merely used to denote *access*. To such evasions are persons obliged to have recourse who resist the truth. Nor is there any more solidity in the objection that the kingdom of Heaven is not said to belong to infants, but to those who resemble them, because the expression is not 'of them,' but 'of such is the kingdom of Heaven.' For if this be admitted, what kind of reason would it be that Christ assigns, with a view to show that infants in age ought to be prevented from approaching him, when he says, 'Suffer little children to come unto me.' Nothing can be plainer than that he intends those who are in a *state* of real infancy? And to prevent this from being thought unreasonable, he adds, 'of such is the kingdom of Heaven,' and if infants be necessarily comprehended, it is beyond all doubt that the word 'such' designates both infants themselves and those who resemble them."

From this it is certain that Calvin had no doubt about the salvation of those who were known, to the Spirit, to be like



little children. It is absurd to infer that he could believe that one who was in reality in the infant *state*, being taken away, could possibly find a place anywhere but in the kingdom of God. When you establish likeness in things they belong to the same class. He argues that this is a class declared by Christ to be fit for the kingdom of heaven, 'for of such is the kingdom,' then they certainly should be fit for the sacrament of baptism, which is only an outward sign of what they inwardly are.

This distinction is as clear as could be made, marking the classes which are saved. Calvin uses one mark, or characteristic, to distinguish them. The fewer the number of marks, the greater the number of objects included under them, and vice versa. The *state* of actual infancy includes *all* infants dying in infancy; it is therefore impossible, from this statement, for one dying in this *state* to be lost. He here speaks positively that infants dying in infancy are saved.

This class can be known by the ordinary sense of man. The other class certainly saved, is that which is like infants; there is no doubt of their salvation, but who compose this class we cannot affirm, as in the case of the infants. "By their fruits ye shall know them." But men are so limited and so liable to deception that we cannot individualize and say this one is saved, or that one is; but we maintain from Calvin's own words he does say that infants who go out of this world in a *state* of actual infancy are saved. He proceeds in the next place to show how they are saved.

In arguing with those who denied that infants were fit subjects for baptism, and yet did not affirm that they were consequently lost, he shows how infants are regenerated. He says :\*

"They consider themselves as advancing a most powerful argument for excluding infants from baptism when they allege, that by reason of their age they are not yet capable of understanding the mystery signified in it; that is, *spiritual regeneration*, which cannot take place in *early* infancy. Therefore they conclude they are to be considered in no other

---

\*Book IV, Chap. xvi.

view than as children of *Adam*, until they have attained an age which admits of a second birth. But all these things are uniformly contradicted by the truth of God. For if they must be left among the children of *Adam*, they are left in death, for in *Adam* we can only die. On the contrary Christ commands them to be brought to him. Why? Because he is *life*. To give them *life*, therefore, he makes them partakers of himself; while these men, by driving them away from him, adjudge them to death. For if they pretend that infants do not perish, even though they are considered as children of *Adam*, their error is abundantly refuted by the testimony of Scripture. For when it pronounces that 'in *Adam* all die' it follows that there remains no hope of *life* but in Christ. In order to become heirs of life, therefore, it is necessary for us to be partakers of him. So when it is said in other places that we are by nature the children of *wrath*, and conceived in sin, with which condemnation is always connected, it follows that we must depart from our own nature, to have any admission to the kingdom of God. And what can be more explicit than this declaration, that 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God?' Let everything of our own, therefore, be destroyed which will not be effected without *regeneration*, and then we shall see this *possession* of the kingdom.

"Lastly, if Christ speaks the truth when he declares himself to be 'life,' it is necessary for us to be ingrafted into him, that we may be rescued from the bondage of death. But how, it is inquired, are infants regenerated, who have no knowledge of good or evil?"

"We reply, that the work of God is not yet without existence, because it is not *observed or understood* by us. Now it is certain that some infants are saved, and that they are previously regenerated by the Lord is beyond doubt. For if they are born in a state of corruption it is necessary for them to be purified before they are admitted into the kingdom of God, into which "there shall in no wise enter anything that defileth." If they are born sinners, as both David and Paul affirm, either they must remain unacceptable and hateful to God, or it is necessary for them to be justified. And what do we require more, when the Judge himself declares that there is no entrance into the heavenly life except for those who are born again. And to silence all objectors, by sanctifying John the Baptist in his mother's womb, he exhibits an example of what he is able to do for others. Nor can they gain any advantage by their frivolous evasion, that this was only a single case, which does not justify the conclusion that the Lord generally acts in this manner with infants. For we use no such arguments. We only mean to show that they unjustly confine the power of God within those narrow limits to which it does not suffer itself to be restricted.

"Their other subterfuge is equally weak. They allege that according to the usage of the Scriptures, the phrase *from the womb* denotes *from childhood*. But it is easy to see that in the declaration of the the angel to Zacharias, it was used in a different sense, and that John was to be fill-

ed with the Holy Spirit even before he was born. Let us not attempt, therefore, to impose laws upon God, whose power has sustained no diminution, but is able to sanctify whom he pleases, as he sanctified this child."

It is apparent in this argument that Calvin is trying to conform infant salvation to regeneration, and if we may be allowed the expression, finds in the case of infants an *exception* to the ordinary method by which the Holy Spirit regenerates the adult. The adult hears the Word and exercises faith; the infant neither hears the Word nor exercises faith. Regeneration is the same in both cases, the manner is different. In the one case we can understand and explain the method; in the other case we cannot explain how it is done. Here then is one obstacle to infant salvation removed. They are regenerated. The clause "some infants are saved" has been taken to mean that some infants are lost, while nothing could be farther from Calvin's mind. Consider what he is establishing. He is showing that every person who is saved must be regenerated, if not in the ordinary way, then in the exceptional way; and he takes the case of infants whom the Scriptures declare are saved, to show that infants must and can be regenerated.

The conclusion must be, not that some infants are not saved, but that infants dying in an actual *state* of infancy are regenerated and saved. The fair inference is if God regenerated John the Baptist in his mother's womb, who lived to adult age, we have an example of the power of God to regenerate all dying in infancy. And if regeneration, the barrier to the kingdom of God, be removed, no objection should be raised to giving the sign of baptism to that class which certainly are fit for the kingdom of heaven.

We propose to show next, that Calvin was so thoroughly convinced of the salvation of infants dying in infancy, that he accepted the statement "of such is the kingdom of heaven" as satisfactory, independent of any external sign, and argued the case of an adult to prove his claim \* He says:

---

\*Book iv. Chap. xvi.

"It is further evident that their notion ought to be exploded, because it adjudges all unbaptized persons to eternal death. Let us suppose their tenet to be admitted and baptism to be administered to adults alone; what will they say becomes of a youth who is rightly instructed in the first principles of piety, if he desires to be baptized, but 'contrary to the expectation of all around, happens to be snatched away by sudden death? The Lord's promise is clear; "Whosoever believeth on the Son shall not come into condemnation;" but "is passed from death unto life." We are nowhere informed of his having condemned one who had not yet been baptized.

By this I would not be understood as implying that baptism may be despised with impunity; for so far from attempting to excuse such contempt, I affirm it to be a violation of the covenant of the Lord; I only mean that it is not so necessary as that a person, who is deprived of the opportunity of embracing it, must be immediately considered as lost. But if we assent to their notion, we shall condemn all without exception, whom any circumstances whatever prevents from being baptized, whatever faith they may otherwise have, even the faith by which Christ himself is enjoyed. Moreover, they sentence all infants to eternal death by denying them baptism, which according to their own confession is necessary to salvation. Let them see now how well they agree with the language of Christ, which adjudges the kingdom of heaven to little children. But though we should grant them everything they contend for relative to the sense of this passage, still they will gain no advantage from it, unless they first overturn the doctrine which we have already established respecting the *regeneration* of infants."

We find nothing in Calvin's writing that will in any way imply that he thought that any infants in the infant *state* who pass out of the world, are not regenerated. It is clear that no regenerated person, infant or adult, can be lost, so independent of all, but regeneration, Calvin declares, that the adult having this must be saved, and having shown that infants in the infant *state* are regenerated, unless the *regeneration* of infants is set aside, then infants dying in infancy must be saved.

We will take words from Calvin, upon which we make two observations.\*

"But our opponents say, 'Faith cometh by hearing,' of which they (infants) have not yet acquired the use, and they cannot be capable of knowing God; for Moses declares them to "have no knowledge between good and evil." But they do not consider, that when the apostle makes hearing the source of faith he only describes the ordinary economy and dispen-

---

\*Book iv, Chap. xvi.

sation of the Lord, which he generally observed in the calling of his people, but does not prescribe a perpetual rule for him, precluding his employment of any other method, which he has certainly employed in the calling of *many* to whom he has given the knowledge of himself in an internal manner by the illumination of his Spirit, without the intervention of any preaching. But as they think it would be such a great absurdity for any knowledge of God to be given to infants, to whom Moses denies the knowledge of good and evil, I would beg them to inform me what danger can result from our affirming that they already receive some portion of that grace, of which they will ere long enjoy the full abundance. For if the plenitude of life consists in the perfect knowledge of God when *some of them*, whom death removes from the present state in their earliest infancy, pass into eternal life, they are certainly admitted to the immediate contemplation of the presence of God. As the Lord will therefore illuminate them with the full splendor of his countenance in heaven, why may he not also, if such be his pleasure, irradiate them with some faint rays of it in the present life; especially if he does not deliver them from all ignorance before he liberates them from the prison of the body? Not that I would hastily affirm them to be endued with the same faith which we experience in ourselves, or at all to possess a similar knowledge of faith, which I would prefer leaving in suspense."

In this passage Calvin teaches the possible salvation of adults who may never have heard the preached Word, but who are renewed by the Spirit independent of the Word. The language is explicit. This from one so accused of narrowness is indeed surprising. How could the man who believed this believe in infant damnation for lack of the changing power of the Spirit? The clause in this argument, "When *some of them*, whom death removes from the present state in their earliest infancy, pass into eternal life" has been taken to mean that others whom death likewise removes pass into eternal death. Nothing could be further from the point. The contrast is not between infants saved and damned, but between infants dead who are enlightened by God, and infants alive who may be enlightened by him. The "*some*" is inclusive of all dead infants. If they pass into the immediate contemplation of the presence of God, why may not "*some*" who are not taken away in their earliest infancy have some "faint rays" of the knowledge of God in the present life; this construction is apparent to all who do not wish to cavil merely.

In speaking of election,\* Calvin says :

“But what necessity is there for citing the testimony of Bernard, since we hear from the Master’s own mouth, that “No man hath seen the Father save he which is of God,” which implies that all who *are not regenerated* by God, are stupefied with the splendor of his countenance. Faith, indeed, is properly connected with election, provided it occupies the second place. This order is clearly expressed in these words of Christ: ‘This is the Father’s will, that all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing. And this is the will of him that sent me, that that every one which believeth on the Son, may have everlasting life.’ If he willed the salvation of all, he would give them all into the custody of his Son, and unite them all to his body by the sacred bond of faith. Now it is evident that faith is the peculiar pledge of his paternal love, reserved for his adopted children. Therefore Christ says in another place, ‘The sheep follow the shepherd, for they know his voice; and a stranger will they not follow, for they know not the voice of strangers.’ Whence this difference, but because their ears are divinely penetrated? For no man makes himself a sheep, but is created such by Heavenly grace.

“Now, with respect to the reprobate, whom the apostle introduces in the same place; as Jacob, without any merit yet acquired by good works, is made an object of grace, so Esau, while yet unpolluted by any crime, is accounted an object of hatred. If we turn our attention to works, we insult the apostle, as though he saw not that which is clear to us. Now, that he saw none, is evident; because he expressly asserts the one to have been elected and the other rejected, while they had not done any good or evil; in order to prove the foundation of Divine predestination not to be in works.

“Secondly, when he raises the objection whether God is unjust, he never argues, what would have been the most absolute and obvious defence of his justice, that God rewarded Esau according to his wickedness but contents himself with a different solution—that the reprobates are raised up for this purpose, that the glory of God may be displayed by their means.

“Lastly, he subjoins a concluding observation, that, ‘God hath mercy on whom he will mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.’ You see how he attributes faith to the mere will of God. If, therefore, we can assign no reason why he grants mercy to his people but because such is his pleasure, neither shall we find any other cause but his will for the reprobation of others. For when God is said to harden or show mercy to whom he pleases, men are taught by this declaration to seek no cause beside his will.”

In this passage all unregenerated persons are non-elect,

---

\*Book III, Chapter XXIII.

and all regenerated persons are elect. The barrier to infant salvation is *regeneration*. Christ declares that the *state* of infancy is such that those in it can be regenerated; this barrier then goes. The passage also states that some infants are elect, and some non-elect, and a specific instance is given in Jacob and Esau. Now what we maintain is that this passage on election and its bearing on infants, and Calvin's own words on infant regeneration and salvation, cannot be reconciled unless we concede that he believed all infants dying in infancy are elect infants, and are regenerated and saved. Nay, we do not say it must be conceded, but we affirm that it cannot be denied from his writing without making him ridiculous in his reasoning, which we think none will undertake to do; wherefore, we conclude—

From this statement of election and what we have found him to state regarding the regeneration of infants, it is evident that all infants dying in infancy, are considered by Calvin as elect infants. The words "of *such* is the kingdom of Heaven," meant to Calvin that Christ made a statement which relieved the mind of suspense regarding the salvation of children, when he taught that provision for all the limitations of infancy is provided in himself. It is clear that Calvin intended, not to specify any particular infants, but wished to relieve *infancy* of those barriers that theology had, apparently, put in the way of salvation.

To illustrate: it may have been true that one, or some, of the very infants that Christ took in his arms were non-elect infants; if so, it would not in the least affect the truth Christ was inculcating, *viz*: that provision being in himself for infancy as a *state*, we are relieved regarding the salvation of all in that *state* so long as they are in it, for we cannot say what infant will survive the state of infancy, and what one will not; surely, then, should one die in this *state*, it must be saved, because the Lord expressly declares that he has provided for this *state*. Now suppose that one of the identical infants Christ took in his arms survived the state of infancy, and was a non-elect infant, and was finally a lost adult; it could not possibly affect the truth Christ

taught, that against infancy as a *state* there was no barrier to salvation.

The two classes that Calvin says are saved, are infants in the state of infancy, and those like infants; beyond this he could not go, for the word of God goes no further.

How in accord with this are his words against Servetus, who argued for infant damnation:

"I likewise oppose a contrary argument; all those whom Christ blesses are exempted from the curse of Adam and the wrath of God; and as it is known that infants were blessed by him, it follows that they are exempted from death."

Calvin puts infants in the condemnation of death in consequence of the fall of Adam. In Christ the consequence of the Fall is destroyed, unless by actual sin one may incur the consequences. There is left, then, only the corrupt nature, consequent to the Fall, in infants. Having shown in his argument that infants can be regenerate, and regeneration renewed the nature, there stands against this class of infants who are regenerated absolutely nothing from Adam's fall or the wrath of God; consequently, they shall not see death.

Let us ask, what infants compose this class? Those regenerated in the womb, as was John the Baptist, certainly do, and those whom Christ blesses. What infants did he bless? Is it to be inferred that he blessed all infants, or that taking infants in his arms he blessed this *state*? If the latter, then those dying in the *state* of infancy are the "of such is the kingdom of heaven." Or did he bless infants in the sense that against the class, because of his work, the curse of Adam and the wrath of God did not stand? If in this sense, those dying in this *state* are necessarily saved. It is certain that Christ could not have blessed *all* infants in the sense of exempting them from death, since some infants passing beyond the state of infancy, do incur the penalty of death. If this blessing of Christ means regeneration, as Calvin maintains, for only regenerated persons can be exempt from death, and if all infants were blessed by Christ, then he involves himself in the absurdity of saying some whom Christ exempted from death in infancy are in adult



age put back under the penalty of death by actual sin. For he says :

“ All those whom Christ blesses are exempted from the curse of Adam and the wrath of God ; and as it is known that infants were blessed by him, it follows that they are exempted from death. ”

The case of Esau alone shows that all infants are not exempt. What are we left to but to conclude that Christ blessed the *state* of infancy, and assured us that those dying in this *state* are regenerated by the Spirit and saved. With this there is no conflict with anything Calvin elsewhere says, when he states that the predestinating and electing to life or death, is based solely on the will of God. It only shows that here the will of God has been revealed to us regarding the election, at least, of this class.

This leaves it clear that there may be infants predestinated to eternal death ; it only asserts that they do not die in infancy.

The argument so far is concerned with the “ Institutes ” alone.

#### OTHER WORKS.

We have claimed that prior to Calvin and Zwingli theologians did not seem to permit the doctrine of regeneration to be applicable to those who could not hear the Word and exercise faith ; and that when it was conceded that infants could be regenerated, and the Scriptures gave instances of their having been regenerated in their mother’s womb, we would naturally expect from so important a concession a decided change in the theological views of all who so believed and taught.

Dr. George L. Prentiss, a professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York, says :

“ The change from the position generally held by Calvinistic divines at the beginning, or in the middle, of the seventeenth century, to the ground taken by Dr. Charles Hodge in 1871, in his *Systematic Theology*, is simply immense. It amounts to a sort of revolution in theological opinion ; a revolution all the more noteworthy from the quiet, decisive way in which it was at last accomplished, the general acquiescence in it, and also the apparent unconsciousness of its logical consequences ? ”

We are of the opinion that the change from the positive

statement of Augustine, Tertullian and others, that infants were subject to a mild hell (if we may so express it) because they could not be regenerated, to a positive assertion of their regeneration and salvation without the Word or the exercise of faith, is a change indeed immense, and of such importance that we should not be surprised to find the men who brought it about as large in their beliefs regarding the salvation of children as was Dr. Chas. Hodge.

We wish to set forth the clearness with which many of this transition period spoke, at least, regarding the children of believers. The Catechism written by John Calvin in 1556 contains the following :

M. Seeing all this is required in the right using of Baptisme, how is it that little children bee baptised ?

C. I did not meane that faith and repentance ought alwayes to goe before the ministration of this Sacrament ; for that is onely requisite in them that be of age and discretion ; so that it is sufficient, if the little children shew fourth the fruits of Baptisme, when they are come to sufficient age to knowe it.

M. How wilt thou prove that there is no inconvenience in this doing ?

C. For in like manner circuccission was a sacrament of repentance, as Moses and the Prophets doe witness; and also a sacrament of faith, as Saint Paule teacheth; and yet God did not debarre little children from the receiving of the same. Deut. 10, 15 and 30, 6. Jer. 4, 4. Rom. 4. 11.

M. No; but art thou able to prove sufficiently that there is as good reason that they should be received to Baptisme, as that the other should bee circumcised ?

C. Yea; for the same promises which God did make in time past to his people of Israel, are now extended unto all coastes of the worlde.

M. And followeth it, therefore, that we must use also the signe ?

C. Yea, if wee will consider the thing effectually: for Christe hath not made us partakers of that grace, which belonged in time past to the children of Israell, to the intent he woulde in us diminish or obscure it; but rather to shewe fourth his goodnesse more evidently, and in greater abundance.

M. Doest thou count, then, that if we did denie Baptisme to little children, the grace of God should be diminished by the coming of Christ ?

C. Yea, surely: for we should be by that means destitute of the expresse signe of God's bountifull mercie towards our children, the which thing they that were under the Law, had: And in very deede this thing serveth highly to our comfort, and to the stablithing of the promise, which hath bene made unto us from the beginning,

M. Thy mind is then, that forasmuch as it pleased God in old time to declare himself to be the Savior, yea of little children, and that he thought it also good to seale his favourable promises in their bodies by an outward Sacrament, that therefore it is very good reason, that there be no lesse tokens of assurance after Christe's comming, since the selfsame promise continueth still, and is more openly uttered as well by word as deede.

C. Yea: and moreover it seemeth a thing worthy of notable reprehension, if men would doe so much wrong unto children, as to denie them the signe, which is a thing of lesse price, since the vertue and substance of Baptisme belongeth unto them, which is of much higher estimation.

M. For what consideration ought we to baptize little children?

C. In token that they are inheritors of the blessing of God, which is promised to the seede of the faithfull, that when they come to age, they should be instructed what the meaning of Baptisme is, to profite themselves thereby."

The Palatine Catechism published in Edinburgh in 1615, reads:

Q 74. Ought infants also be baptized?

A. Yea truly; for seeing they belong to the Covenant and Church of God, as well as those that be at Years of Discretion: and seeing unto them is promised by the Blood of Christ, Forgiveness of Sins, and the Holy Ghost the Worker of Faith, no less than the other; they ought also by Baptism to be ingrafted into the Church of God, and to be discerned from the children of Infidels, as they were in the Old Testament by Circumcision, in place whereof was ordained Baptism in the New Testament.

Craige's Catechism :

Q. "Howe then may little children receive baptisme ?

A. Even as they received Circumcision under the law.

Q. Upon what ground were they Circumcised ?

A. Upon the ground made to the Fathers, and their feed. Gen. 17. Acts 7, verse 8.

Q. Have we the like promise for us, and our children ?

A. I no doubt, seeing Christ came to accomplish the same to the faithfull.

Q. What if our children die without baptisme ?

A. Yet they are saved by the promise.

Q. Why are they baptised, seeing they are yong and understand not?

A. Because they are of the seed of the faithfull.

Q. What comfort have we by their baptisme ?

A. This, that we rest perswaded, they are inheritours of the kingdom of heaven. "

Q. "Upon whom doth he shew justice ?

A. Upon all the rest of Adams prosperity, which are called the Children of wrath.

Q. When doth he this?

A. When he suffereth them patiently to walk according to their owne corrupt nature.

Q. What followeth upon that walking?

A. Eternall perdition infallibly, according to God's eternall decree."

"And as for us, their posterity, we cannot be better nor they whome of we come, and stock out of the whilk we are hewin. For wha can bring ane clean thing out of filthinesse? and sa, as we say, we haue sin by kinde we cost it not. And David saith, behald, I was born in iniquitie, and in sin did my mother conceave me. And this is that originall sin whairwith the hail rase of mankinde is infected, the rewarde whereof is death; as the power that very natural death hath ower infants that sinne not after the manner of Adam and others, (wha sinnes with knowlege) is a sure argumēt, because being included in sinning with Adam, they are sinners; and meikle mair they and all we gyilty of condemnation, when actual sinne followeth thairupon. Then, as by ane ma<sup>n</sup> sin entered into the world, and death by sinne; so death went over all men, forasmuch as all men haue sinned."

Calvin says :\*

"That in baptism remission of sins, as well as the grace of the Holy Spirit, is offered and exhibited to us, all the pions confess. They also acknowledge that infants have need of it, not as a necessary help to salvation, but as a seal divinely appointed to seal upon them the gift of adoption. For Paul teaches that the children of believers are born holy (1 Cor. vii-14.) And, in deed, baptism would not be at all suitable to them if their salvation were not already included in this promise, 'I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.' For they do not become the sons of God through baptism; but because, in virtue of the promise, they are heirs of adoption, therefore the Church admits them to baptism. And as of old, when the children of the Israelites died before the eighth day, they suffered not by wanting the sacrament of circumcision, so now, provided there is no contumacy or negligence on the part of the parents, the simple promise by which the children of believers are from the womb adopted into the fellowship of the Church suffices for their salvation. For injury is done to Christ if we imagine that the grace of God is impaired by his advent. But God once gave the name of *sons* to all who should be born of Israel, (Ezek. xviii, 4.) Nor do we read that Johu was baptised, though he was the minister of Baptism to others. We ought, therefore, to hold that, as in Abraham, the father of the faithful, the righteousness of faith preceded circumcision, so in the children of the faithful, in the present day, the gift of adoption is prior to baptism. According to the words of the promise, 'I will be a God to thy seed.'

---

\*"Tracts," Vol. I.

(Gen. xvii, 7). Baptism, however, is a confirmation of this gift and a help to our faith."

COMMENTARIES.

"Suffer children. He declares that he wishes to receive *children*; and at length, *taking them in his arms*, he not only embraces, but *blesses* them by the *laying on of hands*; from which we infer that his grace is extended even to those who are of that age. And no wonder; for since the whole race of Adam is shut up under the sentence of death, all from the least even to the greatest must perish, except those who are rescued by the only Redeemer. To exclude from the grace of redemption those who are of that age would be too cruel; and therefore it is not without reason that we employ this passage as a shield against the Anabaptists. They refuse baptism to *infants*, because infants are incapable of understanding that mystery which is denoted by it. We, on the other hand, maintain that, since baptism is the pledge and figure of the forgiveness of sins, and likewise of adoption by God, it ought not to be denied to *infants*, whom God adopts and washes with the blood of His Son. Their objection, that repentance and newness of life are also denoted by it, is easily answered. *Infants* are renewed by the Spirit of God, according to the capacity of their age, till that power which was concealed within them grows by degrees, and becomes fully manifest at the proper time. Again, when they argue that there is no other way in which they are reconciled to God, and become heirs of adoption, than by faith, we admit this as to adults, but, with respect to *infants*, this passage demonstrates it to be false. Certainly, the *laying on of hands* was not a trifling or empty sign, and the prayers of Christ were not idly wasted in air. But he could not present the infants solemnly to God without giving them purity. And for what did he pray for them, but that they might be received into the number of the children of God? Hence it follows, that they were renewed by the Spirit to the hope of salvation. In short, by embracing them, he testified that they were reckoned by Christ among his flock. And if they were partakers of the spiritual gifts, which are represented by Baptism, it is unreasonable that they should be deprived of the outward sign. But it is presumption and sacrilege to drive far from the fold of Christ those whom he cherishes in his bosom, and to shut the door, and exclude as strangers those whom he does not wish to be *forbidden to come to Him*.

"*For of such is the kingdom of heaven.*" Under this term he includes both little children and those who resemble them; for the Anabaptists foolishly exclude children, with whom the subject must have commenced; but at the same time, taking occasion from the present occurrence, he intended to exhort his disciples to lay aside malice and pride, and put on the nature of *children*. Accordingly, it is added by Mark and Luke, that no man can enter into the kingdom of heaven unless he be made to resemble a child." \*

---

\* *Harmony of the Gospel*, Vol. II, pages 390-391.

From this passage we shall first ascertain what proposition the great Reformer is laying down. It is, that the whole race of Adam is shut up under the sentence of death. "All, from the least even to the greatest must perish, except those who are rescued by the "only Redeemer." The exposition of this passage of Scripture is an endeavor to escape from the consequences of this terrible truth as to infants. In doing so, Calvin lays down as a corollary to his proposition, that to cause new-born infants to perish eternally is too cruel a conception to entertain concerning God; therefore he reasons, they are not excluded from the benefits of redemption. For he states, and this statement is worthy of note, "To exclude from the grace of redemption those who are of that age would be too cruel." This sentence determines the interpretation of the exposition Calvin gives of this Scripture.

As a secondary consideration he turns the force of this exposition upon the Anabaptists, regarding infant salvation. Their belief was that all perish since none were capable of the exercise of faith. We have set forth our belief regarding Calvin's interpretation of the *state* of infancy, showing that Christ blest this *state* and taught the world that as long as infants remained in it there should be no apprehension for their safety; and should they die in it, there should be no fear for their eternal salvation. In confirmation of this view, we ask the reader to consider this sentence: "But it is presumption and sacrilege to drive far from the fold of Christ those whom he cherishes in his bosom. and to shut the door and to exclude as strangers those whom he does not wish to be *forbidden to come to him.*"

Dr. Henry Van Dyke indicates, in the following, that he entertains no doubt as to Calvin's position on this great subject :

"He (Calvin) assumes as a premise, which it is 'impossible to deny,' that God by his decree of predestination, and for no other reason than because it seemed meet to him to do so, has involved the infant offspring of many nations in eternal death without remedy. This is what he calls

the camel. He tells his opponents that they have swallowed it; and he tells them the truth, for since the days of Augustine all Christians, except a few heretics, believed in infant damnation. Calvin on this point was only teaching up to the times. And he goes on to reason *a fortiori*, that having swallowed this camel, they ought not to strain at the gnat, viz.: 'The Scripture doctrine that all were in the person of one made liable to eternal death.' As against the opponents with whom he thus reasons, Calvin's argument was *ad hominem* and unanswerable. But the times have changed, and the whole attitude of the argument is changed also. In our day even (Westminster) Calvinists do not swallow the camel. The doctrine that election runs the line of separation between the innumerable multitude upon whom natural death passes before they sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression, predestinating some of them to salvation, and others to eternal death, without remedy, has passed away with other superstitions from the faith of the Protestant world. So far as the Presbyterian Church is concerned, no man has contributed more to indicate and to produce this change than Dr. Charles Hodge. The salvation of all dying infants, with all the consequences it involves, is a characteristic feature of Princeton Theology. Not exclusively so, of course. The same truth is accepted and taught in all our Theological Seminaries. But where is the recognized Calvinistic authority prior to Hodge's Theology, in which it is taught explicitly and without qualification, that 'All who die in infancy are saved.' (Theology, Vol. I, 26.) Lay this parallel with Calvin's horrible decretum, and follow out the Scripture argument by which it is sustained till it culminates and is crowned with the declaration, 'it is more congenial to the nature of God to save than to destroy,' and how wide is the difference, how marked the contrast, in the spirit of their reasoning and in the conclusions they reach, between the Calvinism of Geneva and the Calvinism of Princeton.\*

We are somewhat surprised to find any such interpretation of the language of the great Reformer as Dr. VanDyke has given. He seems to labor at proving what none who read Calvin deny, that God's decree of predestination has involved the offspring of many nations in condemnation without remedy. That infant damnation was believed in to the time of Calvin, we concede, and, so far as we have been able to learn, others concede as much.

The camel swallowed is nothing more than that Adam's sin involved the whole human race in ruin, and the gnat, that anti-Calvinists have strained at, is the "Scripture doctrine that all were made liable to eternal death."

---

\*The Variations of Calvinism, pp. 40, 41.

Dr. VanDyke argues that such changes have taken place in theological thought that Calvinists no longer swallow this camel, from which we beg leave to dissent.

We have already indicated that the change from belief in the damnation of infants, because they could not be regenerated, to the belief of the Scripture doctrine of the regeneration of infants without the hearing of the Word or the exercise of faith is a more remarkable transition than the supposed change from the Westminster divines to the Princeton Theology. In the latter the change is the enlightenment, of the people, concerning the teaching of Calvin and the Westminster fathers, during the last 250 years. There is nothing remarkable in this.

Frequently a writer's opinion on a particular question, may be the better ascertained by studying him on other questions than the one we may be investigating, a kind of indirect testimony. This is true concerning Dr. Charles Hodge on infant salvation. It does not appear that Dr. Hodge considered his views on this subject at all remarkable, nor does it appear, as Dr. Van Dyke indicates, that he sees any difference between his views and those held by all evangelical churches long before pen was put to paper to write his great work on theology.

More than this Dr. Hodge holds to the theory of the immediate imputation while Calvin is a traducionist. We know this distinction had not been made in Calvin's time but if we classify his works they belong in this school. This distinction is very important in considering Dr. Van Dyke's rhetorical expressions in distinguishing the theology of Geneva from that of Princeton. We must confess that to us it appears much kinder for the Supreme Being to tell us that our guilt is due to transmission from our first parent than to tell us that every soul, newly created in this world, is created with a nature liable to become sinful. To the common mind it looks as though our great Father had it in his power to give each one a new chance, or that it was optional whether he would create them holy and confirm them in holiness. If Dr. Van Dyke really wants to advance a more



liberal theological teaching, than the great man at Geneva gave the world, we would suggest that he advance his own beliefs and not ask men to swallow the "camel" Dr. Charles Hodge has given the world. It may be our blindness or ignorance, but we certainly fail to see the advance of Dr. Hodge's teachings on those of John Calvin regarding this vital subject.

If Dr. VanDyke will view original sin from this point it will be awful still, but not so awful as from the point of immediate imputation, and Calvin will not be so inhuman. If Calvin's "*decretum horribile*" is shocking to Dr. VanDyke, we must confess, that if God has decreed to deal with infants after the theory of immediate imputation, this is a "*decretum horribile*" that is repellant beyond expression. Lest we appear extravagant, we bring to bear the words of Dr. Robt. L. Dabney, one of the mightiest minds the Presbyterian Church has had, North or South. He says :

"Turretin states the view of immediate imputation, which has since been defined and asserted in its most rigid sharpness by the Princeton School. It boldly repudiates every sense in which we really or actually sinned in Adam, and admits no other than merely the representative sense of a positive covenant. It says that the guilt of Adam's first sin, which was personally nobody's but Adam's own, is part of the penalty of death, due to Adam's sin, and is visited on Adam's children purely as the penal consequence of the putative guilt they bear. For sin may be the punishment of sin. Very true, after depravity of nature thus becomes personally theirs, it is also an addition of personal guilt, for which they are thenceforward punished, as well as for actual transgressions."

... "This distinction between "mediate" and "immediate" imputation should never have been made. . . . It causelessly aggravates the difficulties of the awful doctrine of original sin, exaggerating needlessly the angles of a subject which is, at best, sufficiently mysterious; that the arguments by which the immediate imputation must be sustained misrepresent the doctrines of the spiritual union and justification; and especially, that it is false to the facts of the case, in a mode the counterpart of Placæus'. It represents the child of Adam as having a separate, undepraved, personal existence, at least for an instant; until from innocent, it becomes depraved by God's act, as a penal consequence of Adam's guilt imputed as *peccatum alienum* solely.'"\*

---

\*Dabney's Theology. Pages 341, 342.

Those who may desire to know more of the feelings of John Calvin on this great question may find the deepest emotions of his heart revealed in his letter to Viret on the death of his only son.

We wish to call special attention to the interpretation Dr. VanDyke gives to this passage :

Iterum quaeno, aeternae morti involeret lapsus Adae absque, remedio, nisi quia. Deo ita visum est? Hic ob mutescere oportet tam dicaces alioqui linguas. Decretum quod idem horribile fateor ; inficiari tamen nemo poterit quin praesciverit Deus, quem exitum esset habiturus homo, antequam ipsum conderet—et ideo praesciveret, quia decreto, sua sic ordinarat. In praescientiam Dei si quis hic iuvehatur, tempere et inconsulte impingit.

The translation of *absque* has led Dr. Van Dyke to indicate that no remedy could ever after be supplied. He has translated *absque* as though equivalent to *sine*, indicating a defect in reality, while *absque* is equivalent to *nisi*, indicating a defect in conception. The translation without remedy indicates that the ruin into which man has fallen is not to be considered a fiction by supposing God had permitted the fall foreseeing the remedy. It is to be looked upon as teaching that all were in the person of one made liable to eternal death.

The 'infant offspring of many nations' is here used as though it were in contrast with the infant offspring of other nations, while the context indicates that it is only a variation of the expression that Adam's transgression involved the race in literal ruin. The statement previous to, and the one immediately following, shows that all Adam's posterity were involved in the ruin of original sin.

We will now consider the following :

" If Pighius holds that original sin is not sufficient to damn men and that the secret counsel of God is not to be admitted, what will he (Pighius) do with children and infants who, before they have reached an age at which they can give any such specimens, (of good or evil works) are snatched from this life? When the conditions of birth and death was alike to infants who died in Sodom and in Jerusalem, and there was no difference in their works, why will Christ at the last day with some standing at his right hand, separate others at his left? Who will not adore the wonderful judgment of God, whereby it comes to pass that

some are born at Jerusalem, whence soon they pass to a better life, while Sodom, the entrance to the lower region, receives others at their birth? Moreover, I by no means deny that Christ awards the meed of righteousness to the elect, so the reprobate will then suffer for their impiety and their crimes. ”\*

This passage is conclusive to those who assert Calvin taught infant damnation. What is the distinct thing Calvin undertakes to do in this passage? It is to show the consequences of Pighius affirming “that original sin is not sufficient to damn men.” How does he do it? By asking two questions. The first question is, What will he (Pighius) do with infant children, who, before they have reached an age at which they can give any such specimens (of good or evil works), are snatched from this life? Since it “is to be held for certain, that all who are destitute of the grace of God are included under the sentence of eternal death; whence it follows that the children of the reprobate, whom the curse of God follows, are subject to the same sentence.” Calvin on Isaiah xiv:21.

The second question is, “Why will Christ, at the last day, separate some to stand at his right hand, others at his left.”

Could anything be plainer than that Calvin is arguing *ad hominem*? He is discussing with one who already believed in the condemnation of infants to eternal death. Why should he be asked any such question unless it be to show the absurdity of their being damned under the doctrine of works?

The injustice of condemning the infants of Sodom, without works, is made apparent by saving the infants of Jerusalem without works. Calvin’s position was that infants are regenerated and saved in an exceptional way. The man who so believed could well ask the question, “Why will Christ separate some on his right hand and others on his left,” knowing no answer could be given?

What is the answer that the question should have received if Pighius was right? That Christ would do so because some infants were judged by good works and others by bad works.

---

\*De æterna Dei Predestinatione. Tom. VIII.

What reply would be made to such an answer? "For inasmuch as the conditions of birth and death were alike to infants who died at Sodom and those who died in Jerusalem; and there was *no difference* in their works!" Then Christ cannot, separate some on his right hand from others on his left, for this cause.

How, then, could infants be involved in eternal death? In consequence of original sin, "for they bear corruption shut up in the soul, so that before God they are damnable."

Why, then, are infants, who die in the infant state, not damned? Because Christ removes from them the curse of Adam and being renewed in nature, by the Spirit, working when and where it to him seemeth good, there is nothing against this class.

From this conclusion there is no escape.

This manner of stating the case would force Pighius to the bald position of declaring that "infants torn from their mother's breast," had been eternally damed for their evil works. The absurdity of the Romish doctrine of infant damnation could not have been thrust with a keener blade. Pighius was an orthodox Roman Catholic priest. He was made provost of the church of St. John at Ulrecht under Pope Paul III, and hoped to get a Cardinal's hat for his attack on Calvin.

To confirm this view we will quote from Calvin in a passage purely sarcastic—continuing his argument against Pighius, he says: "Who will not adore this wonderful judgment of God, whereby it comes to pass that some are born at Jerusalem, whence soon they pass to a better life, while Sodom, the gates of the lower regions, receives others at their birth?" Let the reader answer *who* would "adore this wonderful judgment of God" and he will understand the sublime nature of the man who was hated by the Catholics, by Anglican bishops and divines, by Arminian theologians, by Free Thinkers, by Secular Republicans, by the Sons of Light and Culture, because he opposed them with the *Verbum Dei*.

If we consider that Calvin, on the great doctrines of Pre-

destination, Election and Foreordination, concedes that had God seen fit to have condemned every infant, since Adam was created, His justice would not be involved, since all were worthy of condemnation on account of original sin, and would have been condemned, had not God provided the "only Redeemer," we can understand why it would be patent injustice for God to condemn infants, who died in the destruction of Sodom, and saved infants, who died in the overthrow of Jerusalem, "when the condition of birth and death was alike to infants who died in Sodom and in Jerusalem, and their was no difference in their works."

In the first supposition, the justice or injustice of consigning all dying in infancy to hell, could not be determined by man. He would have nothing to compare it with, and would be left to the conclusion that the Judge of all the earth must do right. In the second supposition, Pighius demands that condemnation must be conditioned on bad works and salvation on good works. Calvin retorts by asking the question, "What will he do with infant children who, before they have reached an age at which they can give such specimens [of good or evil works], are snatched from this life?" Here it is apparent that Calvin means if there is not an atom in the scale, to show a difference between the infants in Jerusalem and those in Sodom, it would be a manifest injustice for God to condemn the one and save the other. Here we can make comparison, and can determine justice from injustice.

Calvin's conclusion is, infants are not under condemnation on account of works but on account of original sin; and since Christ removes all consequences of original sin from infants that, therefore, all infants, dying in infancy, must be saved, not according to divine justice alone but also according to the abundant mercy of God made manifest in Jesus Christ. From this conclusion there is absolutely no getting away.

We think our interpretation of this much-abused passage is further confirmed by Calvin's great pains displayed in showing the relation of works to reprobation. He says :

“Moreover I by no means deny that as Christ awards the meed of righteousness to the elect. so the *reprobate* will then suffer for their impiety and their crimes.” Take the two marks, *impiety* and *crimes*, and tell us if any sane man will affirm that these marks, in any scientific, religious, theological or common-sense manner, describe infants? Blindness shows evil intent as well as a hellish deed.

To confirm this interpretation of the passage still further we will turn to Calvin’s exposition of the Scriptures where the destruction of the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah is related. He says:

“And as it is often asked from this passage, ‘What had infants done to deserve to be swallowed up in the same destruction with their parents?’ The solution of the question is easy; namely, that the human race is in the hands of God, so that he may devote whom he will to destruction, and may follow whom he will with his mercy. Again, whatever we are not able to comprehend by the limited measure of our understanding, ought to be submitted to his secret judgment. Lastly, the whole of that seed was accursed and execrable, so God could not justly have spared even the least.”

In the same volume, in speaking of Lot’s wife, he says: “Although it is not lawful to affirm anything respecting her eternal salvation, it is nevertheless probable that God, having inflicted *temporal* punishment, spared her soul. After stating that the destruction of these cities was intended, by God, to be an example for the benefit of all the ages of the liability of wickedness to *temporal* punishment. He says: “If the severity of the punishment terrifies us, let us remember that they sin, at this day, not less grievously, who, being delivered, not from Sodom but from hell, fix their eyes on some other object than the proposed prize of their high calling.”

We are enlightened in this passage as to the nature of the death that befell the infants in Sodom and Jerusalem. It was temporal death, as a punishment, due to the fault of another, for he says: “As to the infants they seem to perish not by their own fault, but by the fault of another. But there is a double solution. Though sin does not yet appear in them, yet it is latent; for they bear corruption shut up in the soul, so that before God they are damnable.”

Here we have the whole matter, and what are we to conclude? Is it not apparent that when we apply Calvin's argument on the regeneration of infants, we establish the folly of Pighius and others regarding the doctrine of *works* and at the same time relieve Calvin's teaching of every vestige of infant condemnation to eternal death?

Castalio made an attack on Calvin in the following words:

"All laws condemn men after actual sin and on account of actual sin. But this God of Calvin has condemned and reprobated impious men before they exist, even before they are impious and have sinned; and since he has condemned them before their sin, he compels them to sin, forsooth that he may appear to condemn them justly."

To which Calvin made the following reply:

"As to your objection that no one can be justly condemned except on account of actual sin, and after actual sin, there is no dispute between you and me concerning the former; since everywhere I teach that no one will perish unless by the just judgment of God. I may not disguise, however, that there is a hidden venom under your words; for if the comparison which you propose be admitted, God will be unjust who involves the whole race of Abraham in the guilt of original sin. You deny that it is right for God to condemn any mortal except on account of actual sin. Countless mortals are taken from life while yet infants. Now put forth your virulence against God, who hurls innocent new-born babes, torn from their mother's breast, into eternal death. Whosoever will not detest this blasphemy, wherever it is publicly exposed, may revile me as much as he pleases. For I dare not ask to be exempt and free from the insults of those who do not spare God."

Opera, Tom. viii, "De Occulta alei Providentia."

We interpret this passage as follows:

If one denies that God condemns any mortal except for actual sin, he involves himself in the dilemma of either charging God "with hurling innocent new born babes, torn from their mother's breast, into eternal death, since countless mortals are taken from this life while yet infants."

Or else, he must deny condemnation for original sin since infants have no actual sin, and declare all infants born in a state of innocency. This latter was unthinkable to Calvin, and the former was to him the grossest blasphemy.

Calvin's argument plainly is: If one has no more reverence for God's revealed word than to deny a fundamental doctrine, like original sin, it being one of the five points in

his system, and so involve God in so dreadful a thing as condemning innocent infants to eternal death, "then he may revile me as much as he pleases. For I do not ask to be exempt and free from the insults of those who do not spare God."

It will be noted that Calvin transposes Castalio's language—"After actual sin and on account of actual sin." Calvin changes to read "on account of actual sin and after actual sin." This is done to show that Calvin believed that the just judgment of God would only consign to eternal death those who had sinned in act.

For argument we will suppose a process of reasoning for Calvin. While "I teach that no one will *perish* unless by the just judgement of God" when you assert that none can be condemned until "after actual sin," you are not affirming what is in your first proposition, but you are aiming at vilification of the doctrine that in Adam all were made liable to eternal death. The condemnation you speak of in your first clause is what I mean by the eternal perishing of those who sin in act. The condemnation I speak of under original sin, is the liability of all to death before actual sin, and should I admit your comparison I would be denying the doctrine of original sin, which is the first point in my system of doctrine. I may not disguise, therefore, that I see the hidden venom under your words. You think that conceding, as I everywhere do, that it is alone for actual sin that any eternally perish, that therefore, having stated elsewhere that infants, hanging on the breast, are guilty of original sin, "this God of Calvin's has condemned and reprobated impious men before they exist, even before they are impious and have sinned; and since he has condemned them before their sin, he compels them to sin, forsooth that he may appear to condemn them justly."

"You deny that it is right for God to condemn any mortal except on account of actual sin. Countless mortals are taken from life while infants. Now if my doctrine of original sin involves infants in eternal death, "put forth your virulence against God, who hurls innocent new-born babes,



torn from their mothers' breasts, into eternal death." It is a fact that I teach everywhere that original sin involves infants in condemnation, and it is a fact that countless infants are taken from life while yet infants. When the facts are construed by you to mean what you affirm, viz., "that God hurls to eternal death the innocent who are incapable of any actual sin," whosoever will not detest this blasphemy, whenever publicly exposed, may revile me as much as he pleases. For I dare not ask to be exempt and free from the insults of those who do not spare God."

If this interpretation is not true, then, as Dr. Charles W. Shields says: Calvin "premises that no one can be justly damned and perish except for actual sin; if he afterwards maintains that infants are damned and perish without sin, he would be nonsensically saying and unsaying the same thing in the same argument." Or changing Dr. Shields' words a little: "If it is not true, then Calvin has characterized reprobate infants as innocent, he has brutally described them as torn from their mothers breast, and impiously depicted the Almighty as an inhuman monster plunging them into eternal death, he has affirmed the perdition of *all* infants as a class, he has denied what, at first he affirmed that both his premise and the premise of his opponent preclude the perdition of infants. This is a little too much to ask any man to believe Calvin would do.

In his Institutes Calvin has already demonstrated the exemption of infants from the grace of salvation "as an idea not free from execrable blasphemy."

The meaning of the words "condemn" and "actual" as used by Castalio remain to be considered. We shall waive all other considerations except that of common sense and ask: does any one suppose "condemn," to him, did not mean, to eternal death, or that "actual" did not mean sin in act? If Calvin agrees with him, is it possible for Calvin to believe that infants, whom he affirms again and again have no "actual" sin are damned in the sense of eternally perishing? Is it possible for the language, "God who hurls new-born babes torn from their mothers' breasts into eternal death,"

to be the language of Calvin? Is it possible for this passage to mean anything except to deny that the doctrine of original sin involves God so as to make him unjust to innocent babes? Is it possible for it to be less than blasphemy when the holy and just God is charged with condemning eternally those whom his Son declares are "exempt from the curse of Adam and the wrath of God?"

We wish to buttress this interpretation with the following:

"Servetus flatters himself that he has framed an irrefutable syllogism: "Every one who does not believe in the Son of God, remains in the death of Adam and the wrath of God abideth on him; baptised infants do not believe in the Son of God, therefore they remain in the death of Adam. That they cannot believe is plain, because faith comes by hearing." Before I may untie this Gordian knot, I can oppose it with a contrary syllogism: "Whomsoever Christ blesses He exempts from the curse of Adam and the wrath of God; but infants, it is known, were blessed by Him; therefore, they are exempt from the wrath of God." Moreover, the solution of the syllogism is easy; since Christ does not summon infants as accursed to the tribunal of God, but only denounces judgment on the contumacious, who reject the teachings of the Gospel which they have heard."\*

He further states in the same work:

"Meanwhile he adjudges them to death and hell. If one may here reason after the manner of Servetus, will not there be a plausible complaint against God, who pardons the impious and criminal, but in a manner less than human deprives wretched and innocent infants of all remedy? That he is even cruel, who, gratuitously condoning the crimes of His enemies, has not rescued from death His own most innocent images."†

It may be that we are fools; if so, we prefer to be called the worst of fools, than argue, that the man who, further back than 1594, wrote words like the above, could believe in the eternal damnation of those—any of those—whom he carried like lambs in his bosom.

Being charged by Westphal with suspending infant baptism upon secret election, Calvin replies: "I have written much and the Lord has employed me in various kinds of discussion. If out of my lucubrations he can produce a syl-  
lable in which I teach that one ought to begin with predes-

\*"Refutatio Errorum Michaelis Serveti," Opera, Tom. VIII.

†"Refutatio Errorum,"

tionation in seeking assurance of salvation, I am ready to remain dumb."\*

In determining Calvin's meaning, when he speaks of the condemnation of infants, not to be that *all* infants are condemned to eternal death and that *none* dying in infancy are, we assert that the expression "reprobate infants" cannot be found in his writings. If it can be, then we are ready to remain dumb.

The Synod of Dort declared that the infants of believers were exempted from eternal death. Dr. B. B. Warfield says: "No Synod probably ever met which labored under greater temptation to declare that some infants are reprobated, than the Synod of Dort." It is more than probable that the private opinion of some of its members was that there are such infants, but the deliverances show that the Synod declared there were no such infants.

In undertaking to establish the certain salvation of any given class, we must necessarily feel the force of *the single* exception. In the case of believers Calvin mentions Esau. We are confronted with this condition. Calvin's works, the catechisms and deliverances we have cited, assert positively that the believer can rest secure in the certainty of the salvation of his children. And yet the same authorities admit an exception. The paradox is—All children of believers are certainly saved—some children of believers are not saved. We will take the statement of one who lived in the time of the controversy, to show the dilemma.

Leydecker says:

"The faith demanded of parents in the formula of baptism is *indefinite*. This, to wit, that godly persons' infants are sanctified in Christ. And that faith is true, although there should be here and there *an exception*. . . . That divine promise has a *common* truth, though God *reserves to himself*, according to his own power and liberty, *the exclusion of some infants*. Faith. . . . performs its office when it lays hold of the promise *as it is given*, and reverently leaves to God *liberty of application*. The believer is bound. . . . to acquiesce in the promise given. . . . and to trust in it, or, in the judgment of charity, to hope well concerning this infant which is to be baptized—nay, to believe that *this* infant belongs to Christ, *unless* God, by a singular decision, *wills its ex-*

---

\*Second Defence of Sacraments—"Tracts,"

*clusion.* The faith demanded of parents is not vain. . . . though *here and there one* (of the infants) *does not belong to the election.* . . . although there is not an internal baptizing of exactly all infants."

From this we do not see how to escape the conclusion that this writer believed all infants excluded come to years of accountability and are finally condemned for actual sin, or as Dr. Twisse would put it, "willfully committed, contumaciously continued in, by them that come to ripe years." This is much more sensible than to conclude, as some have done, that Calvin would have explained the reprobation of Esau by charging the parents with violating the Covenant, when Jacob, a twin with Esau, was a non-reprobate. The authorities we have cited were designedly giving an answer to parents on the final state of infants dying in infancy. The answer is not uncertain in its sound. It is a word that all can understand. If there is a single exception to it, then it is no answer at all, for a parent, enough concerned to ask the question, would be too deeply concerned to rest satisfied with the possibility of his infant being the excepted one. He could rest satisfied with the assurance that, the baby presented for baptism, if death came upon it in infancy, was certainly saved, but possibly, should it come to years of accountability the adult might not be of the elect.

Dr. Lyman Beecher and Dr. Chas. Hodge said they never knew a Calvinist who held the doctrine of infant reprobation. They could not find it in the works of Calvin nor in the catechisms and standards of the church. Nor can we.

It is by no means conclusive, to some of the very best minds we have had in the Presbyterian Church, that the Westminster Standards teach the possible damnation of infants. Many would be led to believe, from the extravagant statements in the literature we have been discussing, concerning the personnel of the Westminster Assembly, that it was.

Dr. Shedd says:

"As the tenet ('elect infants') was formulated by the Assembly. it has been understood to mean: (a) that all infants dying in infancy are elected as a class, some being saved by covenanted mercy, and some by un-

covenanted mercy; (b) that all infants dying in infancy are elected as a class—all alike, those within the church and those outside of it, being saved by divine mercy, nothing being said of the covenant; (c) that dying infants are elected as individuals, some being elect and some non-elect. Probably each of these opinions had its representatives in the Assembly, and hence the indefinite form of the statement. The writer regards the first-mentioned view as best supported by Scripture and the analogy of faith; but there are many who advocated the second view, and perhaps there may be some who hold the third."

It does not appear that this writer regarded it certain that any of the Westminster divines believed in infant reprobation. It is beyond doubt that the deliverances of this Assembly were never so construed by him.

DR. TWISSE.

We will now consider the views of Dr. William Twisse, the prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly. Dr. Twisse, like Calvin, is arguing with objectors in much of his writing and consequently is forced to use language he would not use were he discussing the matter in hand, independent of the objections. We have claimed that Calvin, when discussing such subjects as Predestination and the justice of God, uses language in answering the objectors that indicates some infants are condemned. He speaks of God's justice in such manner that had he seen fit to have condemned every living soul in the infant state, he would not have involved this attribute since all were justly worthy of eternal death owing to original sin.

In discussing Predestination he finds but two classes: those predestinated to death and those predestinated to life. When the objectors complained that infants were involved he did not exempt them; for this doctrine, independent of God's revealed will on other subjects does not. Under regeneration he does exempt them. Dr. Twisse seems to argue in a similar manner. Dr. Briggs quotes Dr. Twisse as follows: "If many thousands even all the infants of Turks and Sarazens dying in original sin are tormented by him in hell fire, is he to be accounted the father of cruelties for this? And I profess I cannot devise a greater show and appearance of cruelty than in this. Now I be-

seech you consider the spirit that breatheth in this man (Heard, against whom he is here writing); dares he censure God as a father of cruelties for executing eternal death upon those who are guilty of it?"

It must be kept in mind that Dr. Twisse is here arguing against cruelty on the part of God, in a work that bears this title, "Riches of God's Love to Vessels of Mercy Consistent with his Absolute hatred, or Reprobation of Vessels of Wrath." This work was strongly recommended by Dr. Owen. With such a subject the language quoted above is consistent with not believing in infant condemnation. Whatever use Dr. Briggs puts the quotation to some have taken it as expressing his belief that Dr. Twisse taught some infants dying in infancy were damned.

Dr. Henry Van Dyke credits Dr. Twisse with the following: "Many infants depart from this life in original sin, and consequently are condemned to death on account of original sin alone; therefore, from the sole transgression of Adam, condemnation to eternal death has followed upon many infants." The *Independent* of August 30th, 1900, quotes the same sentence as Dr. Twisse's opinion. The *Literary Digest* of September 29th, 1900, does likewise.

Dr. George L. Prentiss says:

"If a single one of the Westminster divines believed that all who die in infancy are elect and consequently saved, he never, so far as in known, avowed such belief."

It would have been better for Dr. Prentiss to have said, "so far as is known to me."

Dr. Briggs says:

"In the seventeenth century orthodox theologians, so far as I have been able to determine, were unanimous in the opinion that the heathen infants were doomed to everlasting fire."

In answer to all the foregoing and in particular to Dr. Prentiss and Dr. Briggs, we submit the following: Dr. Twisse,\* says:

"God doth not ordain any man to condemnation before the consideration of sin. That God of his mere pleasure created all, but of his mere pleasure damneth none, but every one that is damned is damned for his

---

\* "Riches of God's Love."

sin, and that wilfully committed and contumaciously continued in by them that come to ripe years."

In answer to Dr. Briggs we submit the following: Dr. Thomas Ridgley\* says:

"That he (Dr. Twisse) reckons that controversy relating to the order of God's decrees, to be merely '*Apex Logicus*,' as he calls it. 'A Logical Nicety;' and adds that his opinion about it is well known, namely, that 'God doth not ordain any man to damnation before the consideration of sin,' and a few lines after he says, "That God of his mere pleasure created all, but of his mere pleasure damneth none; but every one that is damned is damned for his sin, and that wilfully committed and contumaciously continued in by them that come to ripe years."

From this it is clear at least one man in 1731 thought very differently about Dr. Twisse from Drs. Briggs, Van Dyke and Prentiss. The foregoing quotation is taken from the same volume from which Dr. Briggs quotes. His failure to mention it, if he has not done so, either shows mental dishonesty or unfamiliarity with writings with which he professes to be conversant. Dr. D. C. Marquiss, Professor in McCormick Seminary, said some years ago that Dr. Briggs' chief characteristic was cockishness. Not only he, but all we have named in this controversy seem so cocksure of what they say that with timidity we have been inclined to submit this view. There may be an explanation of what we have written, if so, we await the explanation with interest. Dr. Twisse died in 1646, and Dr. Ridgley gives it as his opinion in 1731 that Dr. Twisse believed all infants dying in infancy were saved. It seems to us that this should have as much weight as Drs. Briggs, Van Dyke and Prentiss, giving their opinion in 1890 that he did not so believe.

The sentence quoted by Dr. Briggs is clearly hypothetical. Dr. Twisse assumed that all were worthy of death, but admits that if God should consign infants to hell fire it would have more the appearance of cruelty than anything he could conceive, yet says this would not convict God of injustice and cruelty, since none would receive less than they merit. He maintains that infants are not exempt

---

\*"Lectures on the Assembly's Larger Catechism."

from eternal death on account of innocency. If this be true there is no conflict between the sentences quoted by Drs. Briggs and Van Dyke and the quotation used by us. If it is not true, then, Dr. Twisse made statements that cannot be reconciled.

Dr. Whitby argues that according to Dr. Twisse men might be perfect and yet they would be damned because God had decreed from all eternity to damn them, independent of good works, and quotes this sentence in proof of his claim:

"That all, besides the elect, God hath ordained to bring them forth into the world in their corrupt mass and to permit them to themselves, to go in their own ways, and so finally to persevere in sin; and, lastly, to damn them for their sin, for the manifestation of the glory of his justice on them."

Dr. Ridgley pointed out the dishonesty on the part of Dr. Whitby in trying to fasten such views on Dr. Twisse by perverting this sentence from the plain teaching of the context of what Dr. Twisse had written, and calls attention to the fact that in the same volume from which Dr. Whitby was quoting a few sentences previous, Dr. Twisse had expressed himself on this matter in language that none could fail to understand. The reference is the quotation we have given. It is needless to state that Dr. Whitby was an Arminian. Jonathan Edwards pays his respects to Dr. Whitby in this language: "Yet this very Dr. Whitby," where Dr. Whitby argues for the "stoics" when they argue with Arminians and against them when they argue with Calvinists. It is very evident that Jonathan Edwards regarded Dr. Whitby unscrupulous in stating proof for his positions. It may be possible that all the Whitbys are not dead.

In 1810 the Cumberland Presbyterian Church was organized. That church has largely been limited to the middle west and south west. It has grown to almost the size of our Southern Presbyterian Church. The name Presbyterian is misleading, for the doctrine of this Church is Arminian, and the average man does not distinguish between government and doctrine; yet it takes advantage of every cavil in the Presbyterian Church to propagate itself on the



ground of being more liberal and reasonable in its doctrines than the Presbyterian Church. In other words it claims to have all the essentials of Calvinism without its faults. We have lived in the section where this Church thrives and know whereof we speak. The overture sent to the General Assembly asking for a revision of the Confession of Faith came from a Presbytery in Texas, and the ministers most in favor of revision are those who encounter the influence of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, which was organized purely on the ground that an educated ministry was not a necessity. This Church has taken advantage of the discussion on infant salvation, and is attempting to show that the Cumberland Presbyterian church at its organization had in view this difficulty, that the Presbyterian church is asked to confront The Rev. J. V. Stephens, D. D., has put forth a small volume of 176 pages which states this as a fact.

After the investigation we have been able to give this subject it appears to us that the discussion followed this trend of thought: First, it was agreed that infants were damned because it was acknowledged that justification must come through hearing the Word and the exercise of faith. Augustin said he believed infants were damned for this reason only. Second, beginning with Calvin, Zwingli and others, it was believed that infants could be regenerated without the hearing of the Word, by the Holy Spirit in a way that men could not understand. Third, those writers who believed in the regeneration of infants we do not think believed in the damnation of infants dying in infancy. This is the way we read the history of the belief in the salvation of all dying in infancy. The Westminster Assembly was confronted with the question, "How are infants saved?" and not "are there non-elect infants dying in infancy?" That As-made answer: "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved."\* The Confession does not need revision, nor does it need any such weak prop as a "foot-

---

\*Confession of Faith, Chap. x : 3.

note." The Confession needs nothing. The people need to be taught what the framers of the Confession meant and that they stated what they meant and nothing more.

We submit these views in the face of the fact it is generally conceded Dr. Biggs has a more complete library on the Westminster divines and knows more about their opinions than any living man. But we submit them in the belief that Dr. Briggs has succeeded in giving himself this reputation, and do not believe that he really knows more about them than other mortals

JONATHAN EDWARDS.

It is a singular fact that many people have come to regard the Apostle Paul, John Calvin and Jonathan Edwards as severe and harsh men, without being able to give a reason for so regarding them. It is undeniable that if we will search for traits of tenderness as many will be found in these men as are in any others. Paul mentions more friends and expresses appreciation of kindnesses oftener than any writer of the New Testament. Calvin's letters show a heart that ached for suffering humanity; Jonathan Edwards' works reveal a man as tender as an infant on its mother's bosom—yet it hangs in the air—that Calvin, or Edwards, or some of their disciples said "Hell was paved with infants' skulls."

In his little booklet, "Elect Infants," the Rev. J. V. Stephens, D. D., a Cumberland Presbyterian, has this from Jonathan Edwards :

"President Jonathan Edwards (1703-1753) teaches very plainly that some infants dying in infancy are lost. In his 'Doctrine of Original Sin Defended' he more than once strongly implies the doctrine of infant damnation. He says: 'We may well argue from these things, that infants are not looked upon by God as sinless, but they are by nature the children of wrath, seeing this terrible evil comes so heavily on mankind in infancy. But besides these things, which are observable concerning the mortality of infants in general, there are some particular cases of the death of infants, which the Scripture sets before us that are attended with circumstances, in a peculiar manner giving evidences of the sinfulness of such, and their just exposedness to divine wrath.' He then cites the destruction of the infants in Sodom, the destruction of the infants of the Midianites by the 'command of Moses,' and the destruction of

the infants in Jerusalem under the New Testament dispensation. On these instances he observes : ' And here it must be remembered, that these very destructions of that city and land are spoken of in those places forementioned, as clear evidences of God's wrath, to all nations which shall behold them. And if so, they were evidences of God's wrath towards infants ; who, equally with the rest, were the subjects of the destruction. If a particular kind or rank of persons, which made a very considerable part of the inhabitants, were from time to time partakers of the overthrow, without any distinction made in divine providence, and yet this was no evidence at all of God's displeasure with any of them ; then a being the subject of such a calamity could not be an evidence of God's wrath against any of the inhabitants, to the reason of *all nations*, or any nation, or so much as one person. ' The reasoning of President Edwards appears to be as follows : since infants frequently suffer physical pain and death because of sin, therefore some of them at least suffer eternal death for the same reason."

Again, he says :

"To think of poor little *infants* bearing such torments for Adam's sin as they sometimes do in *this* world, and these torments ending in death and annihilation (as some claim), may sit easier on the imagination, than to conceive of their suffering eternal misery for it. But it does not at all relieve one's *reason*.' *President Edwards, as many others of his time, followed a certain method of 'reason' to the unreasonable extent of consigning 'non-elect' infants to eternal misery!*"

Dr. Stephens says "the reasoning of President Edwards appears as follows: "Since infants frequently suffer physical pain and death because of sin, therefore some of them at least suffer eternal death for the same reason." At this piece of profundity we pause. Dr. Stephens is a professor in a Cumberland Presbyterian Seminary, and as professors profess to know things, the common people generally take what they say as true. For the truly learned, what we say here is not intended to enlighten.

In the passages quoted, President Edwards was writing on original sin and its consequences to the race. We shall try to come to the *therefore* by the way that Jonathan Edwards traveled. We have his views clearly stated in the following:

"And God either thus deals with mankind, because he looks upon them as *one* with their first father and so treats them as *sinful* and *guilty* by his apostacy; or (which will not mend the matter) he, *without* viewing them as at all concerned in that affair, but as in every respect perfectly *innocent*, subjects them nevertheless to this infinitely dreadful calamity.

Adam by his sin was exposed to the *calamities and sorrows of this life, to temporal death and eternal ruin*; as is confessed. And it is also in effect confessed, that all his posterity come into the world in such a state, as that the certain consequence is their being *exposed*, and *justly so*, to the *sorrows of this life, to temporal death and eternal ruin*, unless saved by grace. So that we see, God *in fact* deals with them together, or as *one*. If God orders the consequences of Adam's sin, with regard to his posterity's welfare—even in those things which are most important, and which in the highest degree concern their eternal interest—to be the same with the consequences to Adam himself, then he treats Adam and his posterity as *one* in that affair. Hence, however the matter be attended with difficulty, fact obliges us to get over it, either by finding out some solution, or by shutting our mouths and acknowledging the weakness and scantiness of our understandings; as we must in other innumerable cases, where apparent and undeniable *fact*, in God's works of creation and providence, is attended with events and circumstances, the *manner* and *reason* of which are difficult to our understandings.

"On the whole, if any do not like the philosophy, or the meta-physics (as some perhaps may choose to call it) made use of in the foregoing reasonings; yet I cannot doubt, but that a proper consideration of what is apparent and undeniable in fact, with the respect to the dependence of the state and course of things in the universe on the sovereign constitutions of the supreme Author and Lord of all—who 'gives account to none of any of his matters, and whose ways are past finding out'—will be sufficient, with modesty and sobriety, to stop their mouths from making peremptory decisions against the *justice* of God, respecting what is so plainly and fully taught in his holy word, concerning the derivation of depravity and guilt from Adam to his posterity."

In the next place he says :

"By reason of the established *union* between Adam and his posterity, the case is far otherwise between him and them, than it is between distinct parts of individuals of Adam's race betwixt whom is no such constituted *union*: As between children and other ancestors. Concerning whom is apparently to be understood that place, Ezek. xviii, 1-20. where God reproves the Jews for the use they made of that proverb, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge"; and tells them, that hereafter they shall no more have an occasion to use this proverb; and that if a *son* sees the wickedness of his *father*, and sincerely *disapproves* it and *avoids* it, and he himself is righteous, 'he shall not die for the iniquity of his father; that all souls, both the soul of the father and the son are his, and that therefore the son shall not bear the iniquity of his father, nor the father bear the iniquity of the son; but the soul that sinneth it shall die; that the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked

shall be upon him.' The thing *denied* is communion in the guilt and punishment of the sins of others, that are distinct parts of Adam's race; and expressly in that case, where there is no consent and concurrence, but a sincere disapprobation of the wickedness of ancestors. It is declared that *children* who are *adult* and come to act for themselves, who are righteous, and do not approve of, but sincerely condemn the wickedness of their *fathers*, shall not be punished for their disapproved and avoided iniquities. The occasion of what is here said, as well as the design and plain sense, shows, that nothing is intended in the least degree inconsistent with what has been supposed concerning Adam's posterity sinning and falling into apostacy."

From the following we shall see that President Edwards reasoned very strongly for the salvation of infants under the covenant made with Noah :

"There is good evidence that the benedictions God pronounced on Noah and his posterity, were granted on a new foundation; a dispensation diverse from any grant, promise or revelation which God gave to Adam, antecedently to his fall; even on the foundation of the *covenant of grace established in Jesus Christ*; a dispensation, the design of which is to deliver men from the *curse* that came upon them by *Adam's sin*, and to bring them to *greater* blessing than ever *he* had. These blessings were pronounced on Noah and his seed, on the same foundation whereon afterwards the blessing was pronounced on Abraham and his seed, which included both spiritual and temporal benefits. Noah had his name prophetically given him by his father Lameck, because by him and his seed deliverance should be obtained from the curse which came by Adam's fall. Gen. v. 29. "And he called his name Noah, (i. e. REST) saying, This same shall comfort us concerning our work, and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed."

"In what is said here, there is a special respect to the gospel dispensation; as is greatly confirmed by comparing this place with Jer xxxi, 29-31. Under which dispensation the righteousness of God's dealings with mankind would be more fully manifested, in the clear revelation then to be made of the method of God's *judgment*, by which the *final state* of the wicked men is determined; which is not according to the sin of *his own* wicked heart, or sinful nature and practice. The affair of derivation of the natural corruption of mankind in general, and of their consent *to*, and participation *of*, the primitive and common apostacy, is not in the least intermeddled with, by anything meant in the true scope and design of this place in Ezekiel."

"But that Noah's posterity have such blessings given them

through the great Redeemer, who suspends and removes the *curse* which came through Adam's sin, surely is no argument that they originally, as in their natural state, are not under the *curse*. That men have blessings *through grace* is no evidence of their being not justly exposed to the curse *by nature*; but it rather argues the contrary. For if they did not deserve the curse, they would not depend on *grace and redemption* for the removal of it, and for bringing them into a state of favor with God."

Here it is clear that President Edwards exempts infants dying in infancy from Adam's sin, the only cause of condemnation against them, and makes the exemption an argument for the certainty of their guilt under original sin. Only guilty parties stand in need of the benefits of grace, and what benefit of grace could belong to an infant except the deliverance from the curse of Adam's sin, and a renovated nature?

We wish to set forth yet further the clearness of proof that Edwards did believe in the salvation of all dying in infancy:

"There are two things with regard to which men will be tried and openly distinguished by the perfect judgment of God at the last day, according to the twofold *real distinction* subsisting among mankind, viz: (1) The difference of *STATE*, that *primary* and grand distinction whereby all mankind are divided into two sorts, the righteous and the wicked. (2) That *secondary distinction* whereby both sorts differ from others in the *same* general state, in degrees of *additional fruits of righteousness and wickedness*. Now the Judge, in order to manifest both these, will judge men according to their personal *works*. But to inquire at the day of judgment whether Adam sinned or not, or whether men are to be looked upon as one with him and so partakers of his sin, is what in no respect tends to manifest either of these distinctions.

"1. The *first* thing to be manifested will be the *state* that each man is in with respect to the *grand distinction* of the whole world of mankind into *righteous* and *wicked*; or in metaphorical language, *wheat* and *tares*; or, the *children of the kingdom of Christ* and the *children of the wicked one*; the latter, the head of the apostacy; but the former, the head of the restoration and recovery. The Judge, in manifesting this, will prove men's hearts by their *works* in such as have had opportunity to perform any works in the body. The *evil works* of the children of the *wicked one* will be the proper manifestation and evidence or proof of whatever belongs to the general

state of such; and particularly they will prove that they belong to the kingdom of the great deceiver and head of the apostacy, as they will demonstrate the exceeding corruption of their nature and full consent of their hearts to the common apostacy; and also that their hearts never relinquished the apostacy by a cordial adherence to Christ, the great Restorer. The Judge will also make use of the *good works* of the *righteous* to show their interest in the redemption of Christ; as thereby will be manifested the sincerity of their hearts in their acceptance of, and adherence to the Redeemer and his righteousness. And in thus proving the state of men's hearts by their actions, the *circumstances* of those actions must necessarily come into consideration to manifest the true *quality* of their actions as each one's talents, opportunities, advantages, light, motives, etc."

Here he describes God's judgment of men. To this judgment infants would not be summoned since the ground of judgment is works. All turns on the *state* men are in. We made much of Calvin's *state* of infancy. Edwards makes more of it. Infants can only be in an infant *state*. Against this state there is the curse of Adam's sin. Remove this, as Edwards does, by the work of Christ, and there is absolutely nothing against this *state*. He says: "But the proper evidence of the wickedness of men's hearts (the true seat of all wickedness) both as to corruption of nature, and additional pollution *and guilt*, are men's works."

The two causes of condemnation are corrupt nature and bad works. The corrupt nature he removes by the perfect work of Christ, there are no bad works to infants, therefore infants must be saved if they die in infancy, according to Jonathan Edwards. If we agree that Christ removes the curse of Adam's sin from infants, as infants, then these words are proof positive that Edwards believed all infants dying in infancy were saved.

"And so I say with respect to the imputation of Adam's sin. The thing meant by the word *impute*, may be as plainly and certainly expressed by using other words, as if *that* were expressly used; and more certainly, because the words used instead of it, may amount to an explanation of this word. And this, I think, is the very case here. Though the word *impute* is not used with respect to Adam's sin, yet it is said, *all have sinned*; which, *respecting infants, can be true only of their sinning by his sin.*"

In these quotations we have Jonathan Edwards' complete argument on original sin and its effects on the race; and Christ's redemptive work and its effects on the race. It appears clear to us that if Jonathan Edwards had been asked the direct question, "are all infants dying in infancy saved?" he would have answered unhesitatingly, "Yes."

It impresses us that the old writings and the decisions of church courts concerning the certain salvation of all the infant children of believing parents, and especially the clear statement of Calvin, that parents need give themselves concern only to keep the covenant, gives the strongest presumption that the salvation of all dying in infancy was at least held by those from whom we have quoted. This view is strengthened when we remember that Calvin teaches thus regarding the children—all children—of believers who do not die in infancy, but come to man's estate and endure the temptations of a sinful world. Further, that he teaches thus whether these children have been baptised or not. It is still strengthened when we consider that he was not called upon to give any encouragement to those outside the covenant. His positive statement to believers appears to come from having previously settled upon the opinion that all infants dying in infancy were saved. When a mind like John Calvin's teaches believing parents an indifference on the subject of their *dead infants*, it *must* be due to a belief in the salvation of all dying in infancy.

If we have succeeded in creating the presumption that possibly some of the distinctive men who have moulded the world's ideas on Calvinism believed in the salvation of all dying in infancy: and have succeeded in showing that not a single standard of Calvinism positively states that there are reprobate infants, we would like to ask the question—'Why is the Presbyterian church singled out as holding a *decretum horribile*? Calvinism is the only system of theology that can with logical consistency declare the salvation of all dying in infancy. It is taught that James Arminius so believed. A study of his life and times reveals the fact that he got no further than the denial of an *absolute* predes-



tinuation. Arminius died in 1609. The doctrine of works, in the Arminian system, makes it logically absurd to believe in infant salvation. It is a fact that Arminians believe it, but they believe it in the face of logic, i. e. They do not go to the logical conclusion from their premise. This may be done and not imply untruth in intent but fault in doctrine. We believe that John Wesley's writings will show that he believed in the salvation of all infants; but the following creates a suspicion stronger than anything in John Calvin's writing, to the contrary:

Wesley says :\*

" If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are the proper subjects of baptism, seeing in the ordinary way they cannot be saved unless this be washed away by baptism. It has been already proved that this original stain cleaves to every child of man, and that they thereby are children of wrath and liable to eternal damnation. "

Why is it that in New York, where the Episcopal Church is strong, and into which men like Dr. Briggs have gone, it is not singled out when in its standards it is so plainly taught that infants, not baptized, are damned, that the fool who runs may read, is not molested? Its doctrine is stated as follows :

" The Protestant advocates of Baptismal Regeneration, without committing themselves to the Romish theory, of an *opus operatum*, hold that by baptism the guilt of original sin is removed. Every infant is regenerated when baptized. If he dies in infancy the seed is actualized in paradise. If he lives to adult age, its result depends upon the use of it. "

Why is it that a Reformed Episcopal Church, organized to repudiate baptismal regeneration, does not call attention to the fact that the Episcopal Church has not, and does not now believe in the salvation of any but infants baptized in *the Church* ?

What is to be inferred from Dr. Briggs and others leaving the Presbyterian Church for teaching *uncertainly* the eternal destruction of *some* infants, and going into a Church that teaches the *certain* eternal destruction of *all* unbaptized infants, of both believers and unbelievers? We give as an answer the following from Dr. Horatius Bonar :

---

\* Treatise on Baptism, 1756.

† Blunt's Diet of Theology.

“To attack human catechisms and confessions is fairly within our province; to attack them on the plea that they are at variance with Scripture, is but the discharge of a plain duty; but to attack them with arguments which tell equally against the Bible, and which, as used by some, are really meant to do so, is not only to adopt a deceptive line of argument, but it is to give currency to a rationalism, the issue of which can only be the belief of everything or the belief of nothing.

“They are in the right in naming the modish innovations, and opposition to creeds and confessions, *Theologia indifferentifica*. We have an old Scots phrase that sometimes I cannot help applying to them—they love elbow-room. And this is certainly at the bottom of their eagerness against forms of sound words.”

Dr. Schaff says, “The term ‘*elect infants*’ in Chapter x:3 of the Confession plainly implies, in the Calvinistic system, non-elect, or reprobate infants.”

As to Dr. Schaff’s contention, there is less in it than some have supposed. Elect does imply non-elect—a correct use of language demands it, and so does a correct understanding of the Calvinistic system. But when it is understood that the Westminster divines were giving an answer to a world that once believed that infants must be eternally lost because there was no satisfactory answer to the question, “how are they saved?” The answer, “Elect infants dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved,” does not imply that there are non-elect infants (*dying in infancy*.) The inference is that non-elect infants do not die in the infant state. In confirmation we quote from William Carter, an Independent, and take the same passage that Dr. Briggs uses to prove that the Westminster divines believed in infant damnation. He says:

“Therefore I say, this is one thing which makes this difference between the children of beleevers and unbelievers, that they are holy, and these common or unclean, because they are under such a word of blessing which these are not; yea though we cannot with certainty affirm of this or that infant of a beleever that it is inherently holy, yet holy as thus separated and differenced, from those who are common by the word of blessing from God, under which they are. As we cannot upon certainty affirm of any particular person in the Church that he is inherently holy, because he may make a lye in his confession, yet of every such person we can say he is in that sense holy, namely, as separated unto God in that re-

lation, and thereby differenced from those who are common or unclean."

From this passage it appears that the supposed silence of the Scriptures on this great subject make this writer at least hesitate to declare more positively his belief that all infants dying were saved. We think this is apparent to any fair mind. Many men of this time expressed themselves in a similar way. The quotation we have given from Dr. William Twisse put in ordinary men's language, of to-day, would be, "when speaking on the decrees of God it is difficult to give a clear answer to the question of infant salvation, but if you wish to know my opinion, here it is: I believe that God damneth none except those who wilfully commit sin, contumaciously continue it, until they come to ripe years." Zwingli declared positively this to be his belief; if he believed it, why not others of his time? Dr. Hodge's statement of which Dr. Prentiss makes so much, is no clearer than Zwingli's. One was made in the 16th and the other in the 19th century.

Calvin developed the doctrine of infant salvation beyond the point many consider scriptural at this day. He laid the basis of the belief in the universal salvation of all dying in infancy. When we find works on the development of the doctrine of infant salvation, since his time, let us be on our guard lest we forget the great transition brought about by Calvin in opposing infant *damnation* with infant *regeneration*.

It would be very difficult to conceive a clearer statement than this:

"Christ does not there [John III, 36] speak of the general guilt in which all the posterity of Adam are involved, but only threatens the despisers of the gospel, who proudly and contumaciously spurn the grace which is offered to them. But this has nothing to do with infants. Every one whom Christ blesses is exempted from the curse of Adam and the wrath of God. Therefore, seeing it is certain that infants are blessed by Him, it follows that they are freed from death."\*

\*"Institutes." Book IV.

This is the third citation we have made in this article showing the positive assertion of Calvin (a) that original

sin involved the race in eternal death and that the condemnation of those who wilfully despise the Gospel is eternal death. (b) That the curse of Adam and the wrath of God, because of the work of Christ, is no longer a reason for the eternal condemnation of infants. Therefore infants shall not see death. Now what kind of death? The baby that died yesterday in your home or in your friends' home, proves that it is not physical death. The hope that is given from Calvin's writing on the freedom of infants from the "curse of Adam and the wrath of God," proves that they are exempted from eternal death. Show us a statement by Dr. Charles Hodge, or any modern theologian, upon which the doctrine of infant salvation can rest more securely than this. If we are not much mistaken, he who, undertakes to do so, will search in vain.

There is a hybrid-type of Calvinism attractive to some young men of the South. They seem to be under such a spell as was the Queen of Sheba when she went from the South to hear of the wisdom of Solomon. Our observations lead us to place these men in two classes, (a) men who are strong in mind and feel the need of wider learning; (b) men with no strength of mind and feel the need of something that will shock the world into hearing them. The first class are among our best and strongest preachers. The testimony here given from one of their number indicates the impression made. "Had Prof. ——— *ad nauseam* before I was through the seminary. I could see his ear-marks in every article on the foot-note that reflected on the founders of the type of theology we received on this vital point." The second class either do not return or are dissatisfied when they do, and afterwards partake themselves to some other denomination, or give up the ministry, or else make some complete change from Calvinism. It is beyond controversy that whatever they may finally settle upon, their hatred of Calvinism is established.

The doctrine of the Sadducees on the resurrection was probably due to the teachings of some professors that there could not be rewards and punishments in another world.

Danger is more apt to come from the disciples of an unsound man, whom his pupils do not thoroughly understand, than the unsound man himself. The disciples of some modern theologians have misrepresented them more than their opponents. The utter worthlessness of the disciple has brought contempt upon his somewhat worthy instructor.

We believe God's way of bringing Calvinism to the consideration of the world is by abuse. When we consider he shows given in the pulpit, the superficial men who have paraded in the public press and the substitutes for the Gospel, in the last twenty years, we are reminded of the reply made by a rather hardened sinner, who, when converted, was approached by some rather gushy ladies with "of course you will join the ——— church," to which he replied, "No, I'll join the Presbyterian Church; it takes a strong harness for an old horse."

Men will ridicule and abuse Calvinism when they "have little faith in the supernatural in the very degree that they have lost faith in God; but in days when men are possessed by faith in an all-sufficient Reason that knows all and never can be deceived, in an all-sufficient Will that guides all and never can be defeated or surprised, then the theology that holds them will be the theology that makes God most real to the intellect and most authoritative to the conscience."

Calvin has been maligned for the death of Servetus, and Calvinism has been abused before popular audiences, on this account more than any other.

That this matter may appear in a different light from that in which the late Bob Ingersoll left it, we quote from Henry B. Stebbing :

" But I must ask of all the opponents of Calvin, whether, when they find Servetus perpetually pouring out his blasphemies, they would become responsible for these deviltries before God? or whether they would not rather join with Calvin and his age in taking up the stone against him? I take it up. "

Let us take a few sentences from Servetus, that we may know the manner of man we are told, by some, was a saint;

“ If the Word had become flesh, as woman, then they would have called the Word itself the Son of God, and the woman herself the daughter of man. Hence the Son of God would have been of two sexes. If the angels, in like manner, were to take asses’ bodies, you must allow that then they would be asses, and they would die in their asses-skins ; they would be four-footed animals, and would have long ears. So too you must allow, that were you right, God himself might be an ass ; the Holy Spirit a mule ; and that He would die as the mule died. O the wondrously altered animal. ”

This article goes to the world for what it is worth. We believe the hostility to Calvinism is due, in large part, to the study of the vituperations of such writers as Pighius, Castalio, Servetus, and others like them, rather than a searching for the true interpretation of the great Calvin’s writings.

JNO. W. STAGG.

The Editor of the Quarterly was sick while this article was being put to press. The proof reading devolved upon me. I wish to call attention to some mistakes which I regard as serious—other errors I leave for the reader to correct.

Further, in tenth line from bottom of page 12, should be, farther, traducionist, in fourteenth line from bottom of page 23 should be traducianist, tempere, in next to last line of Latin quotations on page 25 should be temere, alei on page 30 should be Dei. Following *the Church*, on page 48 the sentence should end, or, at least, those who have been baptized.

J. W. S.

## II. THE AIM OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The aim or object of foreign missions should be clearly distinguished from its motive. There may be no confusion to the student mind on this point, but we are satisfied that there is such confusion to the public mind. The motive is general, the aim particular. There is nothing that differentiates the motive for foreign missions from the motive of domestic missions, or, indeed, from that of all Christian work. The motive is always and everywhere the same. The motive of the hunter, which takes him out into the fields and woods, is entirely general, no matter what the game may be which he desires to pursue. It is love for sport or adventure. But his aim is particular. He does not point his gun in general at the tree or brush, or field, but he aims at some definite, some particular object. So with foreign missions. The motive is the influence of the Holy Spirit on the minds and hearts of God's children. The love of God is "shed abroad in their hearts" and that "Love of Christ constrains them."

Says Dr. Lawrence, in his excellent book, "Modern Missions in the East:" "There are motives that look Godward and motives that look manward. Godward motives are gratitude for his saving grace, obedience to his command, loyalty to his purpose, love for his person, sympathy with his plan, zeal for his glory. Manward motives are gratitude for the conversion of our ancestors by missions, compassion for the condition of the heathen, educational and philanthropic zeal, and brotherly love for them as individuals and classes." Many little wires may enter into the construction of the massive cables of a suspension bridge, yet all these thin wires together form only one cable; so many motives may enter into the work of Foreign Missions, such as the general improvement and elevation of mankind, their relief from poverty, ignorance, suffering, superstition and oppression—all this is greatly to be desired, and while they invariably proceed from mission work, and constantly rein-

force the mission motive, they do not constitute that motive. Strictly speaking, the source of missions is not any motive at all, "but in a motor, in Christ himself as author, operator and energizer of all divine vitalities and activities. Christ is the one motive power. He moves within us and moves us. He draws us into his life and bears us forth in the outflowings of his heart. 'I have but one passion,' said Count Zinzendorf, the head of the Moravian church; "I have but one passion, and that is He, only He!" Just as Paul, the missionary, had said before him, "For me to live is Christ."

"The love of Christ constraineth us" is the one motive, even as Christ himself is the one motor.

And both motor or motive lie back of all truly Christian activity, in the family, in society, the state and the church, both at home and abroad,

Having thus spoken about the "why," we shall now consider the "what" of Foreign Missions. What is our aim? What should we try to accomplish?

A general and therefore vague answer might be given, which does not make a clear impression upon our minds. Thus Dr. James S. Dennis in his "Foreign Missions After a Century:" "As regards the object of missions, it is to give the Gospel to those who need it. . . . The object of missions is simply the extension among all men of the manifold benefits of the Gospel." This is excellent so far as it goes, but it is too general.

Others say the aim is the conversion of sinners. That again is most true, but this is the aim of the church at home as well as abroad. The conversion of sinners is aimed at by every true believer, and it ought to be the aim of every evangelist, and every city missionary. Hence, the conversion of sinners can not be the characteristic mark of Foreign Missions.

Nor will it do to say that the aim is the conversion of the world. For that is too vague an expression. Says Dr. Lawrence, "It says at once too much and too little. The mission must not stop with the conversion of heathen. It



must seek their edification and sanctification. It must not stop with individuals. It must build them up into a Christian society."

Neither the conversion of sinners in particular, nor that of the world in general, will suffice as the aim of foreign missions. Many evils can be traced to a misconception of the mission aim. The conversion of sinners aims at atoms, while we ought to aim at families, and large groups of men.

This misconception gives rise to such questions as the following:

What is the annual number of converts?

What is the annual average cost of a convert?

Why is not a soul at home as valuable as a soul abroad?

This leads to competition between the home and the foreign work, and leads men to say, Why should we send men and money to the heathen while there are so many unsaved souls around us? And if it comes to the simple conversion of sinners there is certainly work enough at home.

This also leads to discouragement. How can a handful of missionaries do all this work? So few missionaries for so many souls. How can *they* convert the world? We have actually heard it said by intelligent men, that there are more heathen today than at the beginning of the century; that the heathen are multiplying faster than Christians, as if this fact had any bearing on the question!

The same may be said about the assertion that the aim of foreign missions is the "evangelization of the world within the present generation." Far be it from us to minimize the work of the Student Volunteer Movement, which has adopted this as its watchword. And the watchword has had its uses. Says the *Sundry School Times* of Oct. 6, 1900, "It has been helpful through its terse and stirring formulation of an inspiring ideal of achievement, and in its suggestion of an important and urgent duty, causing many to realize more clearly their possible relation to the greatest need of the age."

It is not clear just how this motto is to be interpreted. What does it mean to evangelize the world?

Some answer, that it simply means that the Gospel is to be preached to a few representatives in each country and community. That carries the principle of representation too far into the kingdom of God.

Others construe it as meaning that it is to be a mere proclamation. Like that of Nebuchadnezzar and Ahasuerus. Hudson Taylor, the head of the China Inland Mission estimates that in China one evangelist could reach fifty families a day. Then one thousand evangelists in 1000 days could reach 50,000,000 families, or the whole population of 250,000,000. Allowing two years for learning the language, sixty days a year for rest, and setting aside the present force on the ground for emergencies, all could be done in five years by 1000 new volunteers. This implies that we have all responsibility for proclamation of the Gospel in this superficial sense.

Besides this, it will take more than a generation to make the heathen capable to understand the Gospel message.

It is the Moravian maxim that you must teach men to count three before you can tell them of the Trinity. And Bishop Patterson said, "It is very hard so to speak of the Gospel as to give the heathen man a fair chance to accept what you say . . . there are no words which convey the ideas of repentance, sin, heartfelt confession of faith, etc. Yet somehow the language is to be made the exponent of such ideas." We are aware that Mr. John R. Mott, in his recent publication, "The Evangelization of the World in this Generation" defines his position. He defines the watchword to mean, "to give all men an adequate opportunity to know Jesus Christ as their Savior, and to become his real disciples." By an adequate opportunity he understands the preaching of the Gospel in such a manner as will constitute an intelligent and intelligible presentation of the message. He claims it does not mean the "conversion of the world within the generation," nor does it contemplate an hasty or superficial preaching of the Gospel without regard to its real effectiveness. It does not signify even the permeation of the world by Christian ideas and standards, nor does it demand any definite result.

"It is the assertion of a responsibility which Christendom ought to assume, not a prediction of what shall take place. It looks forward to the adoption and persistent and regular use of all forms of missionary activity—educational, literary, medical, evangelistic, with undue emphasis upon none."—See *Sunday School Times*, Oct. 6, 1900.

We have no fault to find with the motto as thus explained, for it has been shorn of its principal fallacy.

The true and real aim of Foreign Missions, as we conceive of it, is the planting of the church in all lands. We do, indeed, aim at the conversion of sinners. Not for so many separate individual converts, but for the purpose of forming them into a Christian community, to organize them into a church. God's great agency for the spread of his kingdom is the church. It is "the pillar and ground of the truth." "Missions exist for the church. They have their source and their aim in the church. They take their rise in the church and they flow back into the church."

"Every church should work out into a mission, and every mission should work out into a church. The conversion of souls is a necessary part of this. The *primary* aim of missions is to preach the Gospel in all lands, but the *ultimate* aim is to plant the church in all lands. When missions have done that, their work is accomplished. Then the church of each land thus planted must win its own people to Christ. The converts must convert. The new church must evangelize and Christianize. India, China, Japan, are each to be turned to Christ not by missions, but by the Indian, the Chinese, the Japanese churches, when these churches shall have been securely planted by missions."

"Missions are but a step, though the first, and it may be the longest single step in the conversion of the world. The main part of the task devolves upon the native church in each land. *Our* part is to organize individuals whom we may convert into an indigenous, independent, and expansive church, which shall be the type of a native and reproductive Christianity. We are to found this church on Christ

and the apostles, to train it from the start in the principles of self-reliance, self-control and self-propagation. We are to develop its ministry, found its institutions, organize its work. From that point the attitude of the mission to the church, and of the missionary to the native pastor, is to be that of John the Baptist to Jesus, "He must increase, but I must decrease."

The true spirit, therefore, of both mission and missionary is that of self-effacement. They must recognize from the start that their own part of the work is as surely transitory as it is necessary. This temporary or scaffolding character of foreign missionary work forms perhaps its most radical distinction from all work of the pastorate at home. And in this connection with the church proper, we would urge the persistent and regular use of educational, literary, medical, and philanthropic agencies. In short, our idea is that foreign missions aim at the planting of a well-equipped Christian community in the midst of heathenism.

This seems to us to be the Biblical ideal. "The kingdom of God is like leaven"—and the whole lump was leavened not by adding more, but by the leaven already deposited. "Paul might plant, and Apollos might water," but God would give the increase, the larger, the permanent increase, through the Corinthian church.

This aim and method will account for the rapid, the phenomenal spread of the church during the apostolic age. No age has been so little understood as that first age of the Christian church. Men have looked upon that Roman Empire as a mass of corruption, as in a state of dissolution and putrefaction—and that is correct from one point of view. But we neglect another and no less important phase of the truth, when we infer, that since the church grew so rapidly in that first century, it ought to spread as rapidly in the 19th century as the church comes in conflict with the heathenism of to-day. There were factors at work in the apostolic age which are not at work in the present age.

First of all, Israel as a nation was placed in a central position, in the land of Palestine; and although it is true that

the nation as a whole was not true to Jehovah, nevertheless there was always an "Israel in Israel," which was loyal to the Lord. Thus the heathen world of that day always had an object lesson before it, showing that the man "whose God is the Lord is indeed happy."

Again, we must take into consideration the dispersion of the Jews at different times. They were dispersed not as individuals, but as families and communities, thus forming local centers of light. At times, notably during the days of Solomon, and by the deliverance of Daniel and his companions at Babylon, and of the Jews under Esther and Mordecai at Shusha, the name of the Lord was proclaimed to all peoples.

Further, there was the translation of the Old Testament Scriptures into the Greek language. The Septuagint was complete, in its present form, as early as 150 B. C., and possibly earlier. Many of the heathen would thus be led to read the Old Testament.

Add to this, the almost uniform language of the Roman empire, and we can readily understand how the apostles, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit could accomplish so great a work in so short a time. The Roman Empire, in so far as it came under the influence of the church, during the first few centuries, was literally honey-combed with Jewish communities which worshipped the true and only living God. The work was not done by the apostles, nor by the evangelists, nor by missionaries, but by the churches found in different parts of the realm.

The Christian church connects itself historically with Judaism. The synagogue was the first center of influence. Hence also there were so many proselytes.

At Thessalonica "of the chief women not a few" believed, and at Beræa. "Also of the Greek women of honorable estate, and of the men, now a few" followed Paul.

The church at Jerusalem lighted the lamp at Antioch, then Antioch became the center for missionary activity. Dr. G. P. Fisher, in his "Beginnings of Christianity" says, "Visitors to Jerusalem at the Festivals, mechanics who

changed their abode from place to place, and commercial travelers, might carry to their homes the faith which they had elsewhere received, and form the nucleus of new Christian communities. The Gospel doctrine was transported from place to place, as seeds are blown from the trees and wafted abroad." The same may be said of the Christianizing of all Europe. As the Gospel spread northward and westward, and later eastward through the different countries of Europe, the bulk of the work was done by the native church. In confirmation of this thought we quote only a single sentence from Mrs. W. W. Scudder's book, "Nineteen centuries of Missions." Referring to the spread of the Gospel in ancient Britain, she says, "This early period of military occupation of Britain was a time when every Christian was a missionary."

This aim of missions was stated in a tract published by the American Board in 1856 and the Rev. Henry Venn, a former secretary of the Christian Missionary Society expressed it in this form. The object of missions, he says, is "the development of native churches with a view to their ultimate settlement upon a self-supporting, self-governing, and self-extending system. When this settlement has been effected the mission will have attained its purpose, and the missionary and all missionary agency can be transferred to 'the regions beyond.'"

How soon the native church is to be self-supporting is an entirely different question. That can best be settled by the men and women on the foreign field. And since this belongs to missionary methods, not to the aim of missions, we may dismiss it here. Well may we exclaim with Dr. Dennis, "How difficult must it be to plant the church in the atmosphere of these foreign lands, and in that new and strange and alien environment, to apply wisely, tenderly and effectively the great fundamental truths of the Gospel, and the vital principles of Christian morality, and the essentials of church polity, and the governing regulations of church life, and the obligations of missionary service, to the Christianity of missionary lands, in such a spirit and

method as to secure native co-operation, purity of church life, high moral standards, and a true conception of the supreme and exclusive place of Christianity among the religions of the earth. Let us ask for divine wisdom that these great problems of His kingdom, as it advances among the nations, may all be finally solved in a spirit of wisdom and love, to the glory of His name, and to the honor and exaltation of His church."

With the correct idea of the aim of missions, i. e. *Foreign Missions*, there is no occasion for pessimistic views, but every reason for encouragement.

If the number of converts for one year, or series of years, is not so large as we might hope, we reflect that great good may have been done in purifying and strengthening the native church, thus preparing that native church for her future task.

Moreover it is not so much the number of converts as the quality. What kind of men are converted? What will be their influence upon the native church? Will they be ordinary men, or extraordinary men, whose true worth can not be measured till in after years, possibly in after ages?

And verily a great work has been done. Thousands have been saved. Some of these have joined the "spirits of just men made perfect," but some are yet alive, and are letting their light shine before men.

Then think of the amazing amount of work that has been done in reducing these heathen languages to writing, in the production of grammars, and lexicons, and, above all, in the translation of the Scriptures into almost every known tongue.

If our view as to the aim of Foreign Missions be correct, it is readily seen that the amount of work that has already been accomplished is really immense.

With love of Christ, and zeal for his glory as our motive, our aim should be to plant the church in all lands, to watch it, and guard it, and strengthen it as long as necessary, but always realizing that our work is of a temporary, scaffolding character, and that God will give the permanent increase,

not through the missions, but through the native church, and the native converts, who have been trained how to handle the "sword of the Spirit, the Word of God," in their own language. Thus shall the "fulness of the Gentiles come in," and our precious Saviour, the righteous servant of the Lord, shall see of the "travail of his soul, and be satisfied."

"When shall the voice of singing  
Flow joyfully along,  
When hill and valley, ringing  
With one triumphant song,  
Proclaim the contest ended,  
And him who once was slain,  
Again to earth descended,  
In righteousness to reign?"

"Break forth in hymns of gladness ;  
O waste Jerusalem,  
Let songs, instead of sadness,  
Thy jubilee proclaim ;  
The Lord, in strength victorious,  
Upon thy foes hath trod ;  
Behold, O earth, the glorious  
Salvation of our God."

Holland, Mich.

G. H. DUBBINK.



### III. THE CREED-PRINCIPLE IN RELIGION.

II Tim. I : 13. "Hold fast the form of sound words."

There are three great principles in religion—the Church-principle, the Creed-principle and the Life-principle.

Advantages inhere in each. The Church-principle compels propriety, decorum, uniformity of worship. The Life-principle compels evangelization, revival. Neither is safe without the third, the Creed-principle. This *determines* everything. Why?

1. Because religion is based on a Book.
2. Because that Book contains a complete and perfect revelation.
3. Because the author of the Book cannot lie—deny Himself, contradict Himself—change.
4. Because the Book contains principles which, therefore, stand forever.
5. Because we are born again out of the Book—made to believe and conform to certain principles. And because, apart from these principles, however decorous and impressive our worship, however intense our enthusiasm, our religion is vain.

No doubt a man may get to know these principles theoretically and be unaffected by them, but no man can know, receive and love them in his *heart* without being saved. It is this which makes the Creed-principle—the Doctrinal principle—the strongest and most respected form of Religion on the face of the earth. Whether it be Paul, Augustine—the Waldensian and Bohemian martyrs—Scotch Covenanters, or Dutch Calvinists who preach, there is no form so pure as that which is built on a definite, inspired and God-given Creed.

The axiom we lay down is that "Truth is in order to holiness." That men are saved by knowledge—the knowledge—the knowledge of God. That they are lost through ignorance. That the church is, first of all a teacher, that her ministers, the prophets of the Lord, in all ages, stand

in her pulpits with the Bible in their hands to declare those facts on which eternity is to be builded. That men are enlightened by the truth, Ps. 43 : 3—made free by the truth, John 8 : 32—begotten again by the Word of truth, Jas. 1 : 18—chosen unto salvation through belief of the truth, II Thess. 2 : 13—sanctified by the truth, John 17 : 17, and preserved by it, Col. 1 : 23. On the other hand that men are lost if they do not receive the love of the truth, II Thess. 2 : 10—if they do not come to the knowledge of it, I Tim. 2 : 4—if they do not believe it, II Thess. 2 : 12—if they resist it, II Tim. 4 : 4—if they do not obey it, Rom. 2 : 8. The Creed, therefore, is everything.

“As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he.” As a church thinketh, so is *she*. Change a man's principles and you change his character. Change a church's Creed and you have destroyed her. She may keep the old name; she is not the old church. She cannot be relied upon any more. She does not make the men she did. Her atmosphere is not the same. She does not have the same influence. The world knows this even better than she does.

A church to be respected must respect herself. To respect herself she must have a conviction—she must be positive. Men cannot respect what shifts and changes—what teaches one thing in one century and another thing in another—one thing to one generation and another thing to another. This makes imperative the Divine injunction, “Hold fast the Form of sound words.”

Consider,

- I. God's words are sound words.
- II. They have a Form.
- III. This Form of sound words we are to hold fast.

I. God's words are sound words.

They *claim* this, “The words of the Lord are pure words,” Ps. 12:6. Thirty times this same word, *pure*, is spoken of the gold of the tabernacle. The ark was to be overlaid with pure gold—the Mercy Seat was to be overlaid with pure gold—nothing mixed. In God's words is nothing doubtful, ambiguous, weak, unreliable. “Every word of

God is pure," Prov. 30:5. The word here is צְרוּפָה, "stands fire as if in a furnace." Thy word is very pure," מֵאֹר—pure even to vehemence—*over* exceedingly. In this last expression the Hebrew exhausts itself. No question that the words are sound, as sound as God is—as absolute in their last meaning as are the elements in God.

God's words are sound, for they claim it. God's words are sound, for they are *His* words. It is distinctly asserted that the "word of the Lord" came to such and such a writer. Not that the Spirit came, which is true enough, but that the word came. Not that the thought, the suggestion, came for the man to clothe and express as he pleased; but the word which expressed it came—the Dabar Jehovah. And it is said Hayo, Haya Dabar, that it substantially came, exactly came—the word *itself* came. "Is not *My* word like as a fire? saith the Lord"—"*words*" which the Holy Ghost teacheth—the *words*.

God's words are sound, for they are God himself. A *man's* word is his *manifestation*. If the man be false his words, however plausible, are false. If the man be true, his words are true. God's words are God Himself in expression.

God's words are sound words—*all* of them sound words, one less than sound annihilates them all. But, if the words are sound, then what they say is sound, i. e., the statements. God does not give the words and leave men to manipulate them, nor does He use sound and pure words to cover and disguise His thoughts. He sets the words in order. The Hebrew דָּבַר means not only to speak but to marshal in sentences. God does not fling out pure words in a confused medley like one insane. He uses words to state facts, propositions—facts and propositions which have a certain, fixed, personal, eternal bearing. "My words shall surely stand," Jer. 44:29. "Heaven and earth shall pass away but My word shall not pass away," Mark 13:31. "He that receiveth not my words hath One that judgeth him. The word that I have spoken shall judge him in the last day," John 12:48.

God's words are sound words. *All* God's words are

sound words. No other words but God's are sound words. In all nature, in all philosophy, in all science, there is not one word that will stand the test of soundness which is not an echo of the words of God. Not one human utterance but is fallible. Not one that can stand scrutiny. "Add not to His words lest thou be found a liar," Prov. 30:6. Put anything you please of man's fabric under a microscope; it goes to pieces; it reveals its coarseness. Put any work of God—a fly's wing, for instance, under a microscope, and the higher the power, the more exquisite, the more delicate the tissues, until it attenuates almost to the silken and gossamer filaments of a seraph's. So it is with the words of God. They alone are sound, are pure. They repel any attempt to wrest, vitiate, clip, splinter, cleave or gloss them. "Forever, O Lord, Thy word is settled in heaven." More fixed than the fixed stars, than Pleiades—than Orion. Go up into heaven, God's words do not alter. They will all be found written there.

## II. There is a *Form* of sound words.

The words contain statements. The statements can be put into Form. We cannot get away from the Form.

The Form must be the consensus of the statements—their harmonious agreement arrived at by a comparison of spiritual things with spiritual.

The Form can never contradict itself; or declare that to be true at one time which may be proved to be false at another. For instance, it cannot say for 300 years "Hell is eternal," and then at the end of that time say "Hell is a second probation." A plain, categorical statement will have to stand in the form. It is there, if there at all, to stay forever.

If Arithmetic says twice 2 make 4, then twice 2 make 4 everywhere. You cannot come later and say "Yes, twice 2 made 4 in the year 1600, but it makes 634 to-day or 10,000 to-day." Twice 2 make 4 binds. Those who deal with figures find that it binds. The cashier who in keeping his books mistakes in that matter finds his mistake represented as crime. You cannot play fast and loose with Arithme-

tic, and neither can you with religion. A proposition taken from the word of God binds to eternity.

Take Arithmetic again. The true notion is that however high one may go in mathematics, Geometry, Trigonometry, the Parabola, Conic Sections, always the four fundamental rules, Addition, Subtraction, Multiplication and Division, remain the same. This is the notion of Orthodox Theology—of an unchangeable Creed. It is not that there are no degrees and no advances in the knowledge of truth, but only that there are none which vitiate and destroy already-laid-down Divine propositions. Old Orthodoxy says: "You cannot get a complete line of rail by pulling up rails already laid down, or by letting every man lay rails for himself without any regard to the Chief who has the enterprise in hand—the Engineer—the Projector." The contention of the men who stand by the Creed is, that fundamental Doctrines taken from the word of God and stated in it, like the four principles of Arithmetic rule everywhere—that whatever discoveries men may make in Science, or in the Bible they never can discover anything which does not involve and go to confirm what has already been found to be basal and axiomatic in Scripture. If Depravity has been a fact, it is now a fact. If election was true in Paul's day and in Eph. 1:3, then it is true this moment that "God hath chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world, having predestined us unto the adoption of children."

Now the higher critics contend that twice 2 do not any longer make 4, that they may make 6, 10, 25, anything—that the time has come for a new Arithmetic adapted to a newer and larger Geometry, Trigonometry, Conic Sections and Measurement of the Universe. That "twice 2 make 4" is narrow, antiquated—the ghost of old Calvin is in twice 2 make 4. *Wir brauchen jetzt ein neues dogma*—we want a new Arithmetic, up to date, adapted to the enlarged knowledge and the wider outlook of the twentieth century.

Some of us are fools enough to stick to it that twice 2 still make 4, that there are some things which even the twentieth century—wise as it is beyond all former wisdom

—cannot change, that are eternal because God is eternal, immutable because facts are self-consistent.

For my part I am glad that there are some things—the bottom things—the things which one wants upon a dying bed, that do not change. “If the foundation be destroyed what can the righteous do”?

If twice 2 make 4 then this is true everywhere. That makes the Creed. Depravity, the fall, is in the word of God. In it once, in it everywhere; in the Creed, therefore it must be everywhere. So with Election, the Redemption of the Church, her Calling and Preservation.

Here is a five-pointed star! To be perfect, we say all the lines and angles must correspond—must be equal. You may enlarge the star, you may expand its proportions and discover a thousand things inside its lines, but the outlines, project them how you please, cannot alter, the proportions cannot change.

The Higher Critics, the Creed Changers, say they can alter. They say, “You can shorten Election, make it conditional or leave it out altogether, and not distort the star.” They say, you can reduce the angle of Depravity and still keep exact and right proportions.

We say “The sides of the angle may be extended, but the angle itself cannot change, or you have changed the star.”

There is, then, a Form of Sound words, a form which would have to come back again if every Synod on earth should vote it out of existence—a Form which would stand if every Book of Divinity in the world should be burned up—a Form which would emerge and come to be recognized by evangelized pagans who had never yet heard of a Creed. In other words, there is a System of Doctrine in the Bible—fundamental, coherent, self-consistent—the intellectual belief in which constitutes speculative Christianity, the cordial reception of which constitutes spiritual Christianity—but the rejection of which is heresy. The Creed is nothing more nor less than the systematic ordering of the facts and doctrines of Divine Revelation. The facts and doctrines,

being revealed, cannot change. The Creed, therefore, never can change.

Does this elevate the Creed to a level with Scripture? Do we, as the Remonstrants in old time charged upon the Church of Holland, hold the Creed to be a "Little Bible?"

Nothing of the sort. The Creed is but a short Compendium of Bible teaching—a series of statements drawn from the Word of God, defining true doctrine. Something essential it is and of the last importance, since men the world over assert and strongly assert that they believe the Bible who know very little about the Bible and who cherish and defend opinions flatly opposed to the teachings of the Bible. Unitarians pretend to receive the Bible, Christian Scientists to receive the Bible, Arminians to receive the Bible, Romanists to receive the Bible. It has even impiously been held by some that you can prove anything out of the Bible—and so, in a certain way, you can. By taking a single word or sentence by itself, apart from the connection—men can prove Christ to be a *mere* man because he is called "the Son of *man*." They can prove that all men will be saved because it says he is "the Saviour of all men," and again, that "he tasted death for every" (*man*.) They can prove that men can convert themselves and that they have a free-will because it says "Turn ye—turn ye, for why will ye die?" They can prove that a man is saved by his works because St. James says: "Was not Abraham justified by works?" They can prove that there is no Trinity because the word is not in the Bible and because the Bible says: "The Lord our God is *one* Lord."

You take any document, or any man's speech or sermon and treat it that way and you can twist it like a nose of wax.

The Creed means a painstaking putting together of just what the Bible teaches, viz: The putting of "Son of God" along with "Son of man." It finishes the sentence "He is the Savior of all men" by adding, "especially of them that believe," and by putting the full connection "He tasted death for every one of them," (the word man is not in the Greek) "He tasted death for every one of them that *in*

*bringing many sons to glory, He might make the Captain of their Salvation perfect through suffering.*" It supplements the words "Turn ye, turn ye" by the words, "Surely after that I *was* turned I repented," "Turn us unto Thee, Oh Lord, and we shall be turned."

The Creed is not intended to take the place of the Most Holy Scripture, for which earthly frail and dying man should cherish that reverence, and that trembling fear which becomes a guilty and condemned creature, for that word of the God of Heaven and Earth which alone reveals to him a way of deliverance out of an unspeakably miserable and lost condition into a state of blessed eternal salvation. The point was well stated by Hadrian Saravia in his letter to Utenbogaart. "No one who has placed his hand to such a work, has ever thought to publish a Canon of Faith but only to *prove* his faith out of the Canon."

The *importance* of the Creed lies in *this*—that we have in it instruction, preservation,—a bond of unity of unity and defense. Taught by it, we advance on right lines steadily, surely. Its contents hold and transmit the truth of God to our children. Bound together by the Creed we are a solidarity. Its statements form a compact and logical defense of the faith against the attacks of its foes.

The Doctrine of the *Trinity* was thus built up in the efforts of the early Church to prove from Scripture that Christ—God-man in two natures, is the Eternal Son of God.

The doctrine of Depravity was thus defined in opposition to Pelagius and others, who denied the fall, and taught that man by nature is sinless and innocent.

The doctrine of Sovereign Grace was thus emphasized by men who—in opposition to those who contended that men can save themselves or help to save themselves by works and merits and the action of their independent wills—taught that "if it be of works it is no more of grace"—"so then it is *not* of him that willeth or of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy."

The Creed is the building up, upon the sure foundations of the Word of God, of bulwarks which are the bastions and



the Redan of the Gospel. The Creed is not the Church ; it fixes and instructs the Church. The Creed is not the life; any more than an eggshell is the chick, but, break the eggshell, and the life is gone.

From all of which, it is clear, then, that we hold the Creed because the Creed explains and states the Bible. This is the position of the Reformed, and of every Creed church. A man who joins it accepts the Creed. If he is a minister he binds himself to teach and defend it. If he does the *opposite* thing, inside a Creed church, he is a self-contradiction. His only manly and open course, if he has misunderstood the Creed, or changed his sentiments, is to leave the church which holds it. He has no right to eat his bread while contending against its principles.

The position we take is that, as a man and a citizen, a man has a right to believe and say what he pleases, but not as representing a church to whose constitution he has subscribed. It was once said to a person suspended from our ministry, "Dr. ——, you are at liberty to write down the Pentateuch and, with it, the Doctrines of Grace, but not as a minister of the Dutch Reformed church—to oppose her doctrines you must go outside."

The point thus made is that the reason for the existence of a Creed church is gone the moment she gives up her Creed. It makes no difference what she becomes denominationally after that,—her distinctive testimony as a witness has ended. She has renounced her commission.

God's words are *sound* words; they have a *form*. That brings us

III. To the Apostolic injunction—*Hold fast the form of sound words.*"

I. We are to hold it because it has been proved to be *safe*. No harm has ever come by holding the Doctrines of Grace as taught in Calvinistic Confessions.

I well recollect when at Andover, the distress of a fellow-student, an intimate friend. The Professor had been teaching and insisting that Christ is not the *eternal* son of God, but that "Son" is an official or circumstantial title.

“He is called Son because declared to be the Son of God with power by His resurrection from the dead. He is called Son because Divinely born of the Virgin, and because He was to be so born.”

My friend came rushing into my room soon after the lecture and said: “You know I am going along with professors Stuart and Park in this thing. I am going to give up the Doctrine of an Eternal Sonship.”

“Joseph,” was my reply, “the Bible says God sent His Son. He must have had a Son to send before He sent Him. For more than 1800 years the church has held and believed that Christ is Son of God by nature—out of the very essence of the Father—equal to the Father. That makes a Father and a Son and that makes a Trinity. Now no harm has ever come of holding that. On the contrary, almost every heresy ever broached in the world has begun in a denial of Eternal Sonship. From Arius down, ruin has come from any other view of it than that Christ is the Son of the Father—begotten of the Father—essentially—and in every sense of the word. In spite of every teaching I shall hold to it.”

Three days my friend spent alone in fasting, prayer and study of the Scriptures. At the end of that time he came to me and said “I am with you! I have been studying the Second Psalm, ‘Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee.’ ‘This day,’ means Eternity.”

It is safe to hold fast the Form of Sound Words.

But again: and growing out of this, it is *essential*. Men who go wrong, go wrong as fish go bad, first, in the head. Cain contended the Doctrine of a Vicarious Sacrifice—the Lamb as a Substitute. Out of that contention came enmity and out of that came murder. Men deteriorate in proportion as they lose their principles. “According to all that I can understand of modern liberalism,” says one, “religion is mere matter of opinion and no opinion is of sufficient importance to be worth contending for. The martyrs might have saved themselves a world of loss and pain if they had been of this school, and the Reformers might have spared

the world all their din about Popery and Protestantism. I deplore the spread of this infidel spirit; it will eat as doth a canker. Where is the strength of a Church when its faith is held in such low esteem? Where is conscience? Where is common honesty? No! No! Let us be sure our Lord Jesus never gave countenance to the base born charity which teaches that it is no injury to a man's nature to believe a lie. Let us be firm—steadfast—positive. There are certain things which are true and which stay true; let us find them out and grapple them as with hooks of steel. Let us buy the truth at any price and sell it at no price. Hold fast the form of sound words ”

We are to hold it finally because what is needed is not a new religion, but new *power*.

God will not bless error as He blesses truth.

God knows the difference between truth and error and His eyes are on the truth. God will not bless error as he blesses truth, and let men pray on both sides as did Baal's priests and Elijah at Carmel. The Doctrines of Grace held in the power of the Holy Ghost and by men of spiritual lives are the mightiest force at work on this planet.

It is a great thing for men, when they kneel down to pray, to feel that they are praying on right lines and for the working of eternal truths which God will bless.

No revivals have ever been known like those which have sprung from the preaching of those doctrines which root in the Sovereignty of Grace. For depth, for permanency, solidity and breadth of influence there is nothing like them, when accompanied by earnest, heartfelt and believing prayer. The Spirit of God delights to honor these Doctrines, for Divinity is in them. The soul converted under them bears an impression of genuineness borne by none other. The church built upon them is one against which the gates of hell itself cannot prevail.

What is needed is not a new locomotive, but steam in a locomotive where the fire has died low.\* What is needed is not a new track, but *time* on the old one—that trains should run as if for life—at lightning speed.

It is not a new mould, but liquid white-hot iron to be poured into a mould where iron now lies cold and rusty. May God awaken us to the necessity of calling down His power in connection with the preaching of the Gospel. Then shall we behold the marvellous increase and vigor of the Church. Then shall conversions be multiplied, affections kindled and the kingdom of God brought in.

Orange, N. J.

GEORGE F. BISHOP, D. D.

---

\*The reports of conversions, for the last year, in what may be called the Puritan denominations diminish precisely in the ratio in which they have relaxed or thrown suspicion on their Creeds.

#### IV. BAPTISM.

In I Cor. 12:13 we read, "For also with one Spirit were we all baptized into one body." Every one agrees that here the translation should be *into* rather than *unto*, and that here *baptize* signifies a putting into. It is true that that into which this baptism introduces is not water, but that it does introduce into something is undeniable. Calling this idea of putting into *intuspositio*, we may lay down the formula, Baptism signifies intusposition. It is equally plain that there is here no taking out after the putting in, but the persons thus put into one body were put in to stay. *Baptism, therefore, signifies permanent intusposition.* Further, that into which baptism puts to stay is expressed in Greek by the object of the proposition, *eis*.

Bearing in mind that this baptism puts into one body of Christ and his people, therein to remain, we are not surprised to read in Gal. 3:27, "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ, put Christ on." Here baptism means permanent intusposition into Christ, not into water.

If, now, we read in Rom. 6:3, "Or do ye fail to know that as many of us as were baptized into Christ Jesus, were baptized into his death?" we again see baptism putting men into Christ Jesus instead of into water, and putting them into Him to stay instead of dipping them. It is permanent intusposition into Jesus Christ.

The same Greek words in the same construction must bear the same meaning in I Cor. 10:2, "For they were all baptized into Moses with the cloud and with the sea." It was a baptism that symbolized permanent union with Moses, just as the baptism of Gal. 3:27 effected permanent union with Christ. Here, too, it is *baptize into* instead of *unto*, but it is not *baptize into* water.

If we turn back in this Epistle to 1:13-15, we shall see that, as by the name of Paul he could not have meant much different from Paul, so '*eis* the name of Paul' can hardly mean either *unto* or *in* the name of Paul, while '*eis* Moses'

means *into* Moses. "Hath Christ been divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were ye baptized into the name of Paul? I give thanks to God that I baptized none of you except Crispus and Gaius, lest some one should say that ye were baptized into my name." "Into the name of Paul" stands in contrast with "into the name of the Lord Jesus." Compare Acts 8:16, where it says of the Samaritan converts, that "they had been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus." This cannot mean "in the name," which is expressed by "en" the name, not by "eis." If any of Paul's converts were baptized by his command, it would have been easy to say that they were baptiz<sup>d</sup> *in his name*, that is by his authority, but *into the name* has a much deeper meaning. Baptism into one's name must mean no less than permanent intusposition into *him as revealed*. Such baptism puts into indissoluble union with. Paul did not take the place of Christ, not even in the sense in which Moses was a type of Christ. For the Israelites were baptized into Moses typically, as the true Israelites are baptized into Christ really; but in no sense will Paul admit that the Corinthian saints were baptized into his own name. Again it is to be noted, that here is permanent intusposition into a person, and not dipping in water.

With this light we come to Mat. 28:19. Shall we render "Baptizing into the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit," or shall we depart from this plain consistency by rendering "Baptizing in the name?" The arguments against *in* are as follows: First, it gives to *eis* a strange meaning, and to *baptize in eis* is a meaning that it will not bear elsewhere. Secondly, it imposes upon this Greek a meaning so difficult when no other Greek would express *into* and when *en* would have immediately expressed *in*. And third, the erroneous rendering *in* proceeds upon the erroneous assumption that here is a formula prescribed for use in the ceremony of baptism, whereas there is no evidence that this form of words was so used until after the age of the Apostles. But our Lord really meant such thorough indoctrination in the revealed truth of the Trinity

as can be properly called a baptism into the Three as revealed. He means something more than a ceremony; he means a teaching, a teaching so thorough as to transpose all the nations into a new world of thought and belief, a putting of them permanently into the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. It is well to use these words in the ceremony, since they help to direct attention constantly to the great organic principle of the Christian system, the Trinity; but we should never forget that the mission of the Church is not to administer ceremonies, but to baptize into truth.

Let us now return to Rom. 6:3, 4: "Or do ye fail to know that as many of us as were baptised into Christ Jesus, were baptised into his death? Therefore by the baptism into death we were buried with him." This baptism into Christ was identical with the baptism into Christ of Gal. 3:27. This baptism into Christ was baptism into his death, not into water. The death of Christ was his severance or release from sin; and as many as are baptised into Christ are permanently united with him in his severance or release from sin. We are transposed into a new world of freedom. But the baptism is permanent intusposition into this death, this divorce from sin, and not dipping in water.

It was the Paul who wrote 1 Cor. 12:13; Gal. 3:27, and Rom. 6:3, 4, not to mention 1 Cor. 1:13, 15, and 10:2, that also asked the twelve disciples at Ephesus, "Into what, then, were ye baptised?" and got from them the answer, "Into John's baptism." See Acts 19:3. "John's baptism" meant a certain body of doctrine (compare 18:25); and to be baptised into that doctrine meant to be initiated into it fully and permanently. "Unto," if we think upon it, would be meaningless here.

Let us now come to Acts 2:38: "Change your mind, and let each of you be, in [or upon] the name of Jesus Christ, baptised into forgiveness of your sins, and ye will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

If we read "in (*en*) the name of Jesus Christ," we must interpret 'by his authority'; but if we read "upon (*epi*) the name," we must interpret by 'resting upon him as revealed.'

There is no evidence for reading "into (*eis*) the name" here. But we do and certainly should read "*eis* forgiveness" Shall we translate it *unto*, which would be meaningless here, or *for*, which changes the consistent meaning of the Greek to make a proof-text for the error of baptismal justification, or consistently *into*? Let us remember that, if Peter wished to say *into*, he had to use *eis*; but, if he wished to say *for* or *unto*, he had at his service Greek that would have unmistakably meant *for* or *unto*. To be baptized into forgiveness means to be fully and permanently brought into this truth.

Accordingly Mk. 1:4 and Lk. 3:3 should not be translated "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins," but "change-of mind baptism into the remission of sins." It was a baptism professing change of mind, and is rightly called a baptism professing change of mind, or a change-of-mind baptism. And it was a baptism into remission. It was the symbol of introduction into forgiveness. Here again is a putting in to stay, not a dipping; and it is a putting into a truth, not into water.

Similar is Mat. 3:11, "I baptize you with water into repentance." This baptism with water is a symbol of baptism into repentance, that is permanent intusposition into this truth. Not a dipping, but a putting into to stay; not a putting into water, but into truth.

Nor is Mk. 1:9 an instance of baptism into water, since *eis* belongs, not to the verb *baptize*, but to the preceding verb of motion—a frequent construction in Greek. The feeling of the original would be expressed by the following: "Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee unto the Jordan, and was baptized therein" (or thereat).

This rapid review of every passage in which *baptizein eis* or *baptisma eis* occurs in the New Testament discovers, that baptize or baptism, in all these cases means putting into to stay, and never dipping, always permanent intusposition, and never temporary intusposition. It is a matter of course that New Testament baptism is never said to be *eis* water (into water), which would necessarily involve drowning. *The New Testament knows nothing of baptism into water.*



Nor does it know anything of baptism into that of which water is the symbol. Water is the symbol of Spirit; but there is no baptism into Spirit, in the New Testament. The New Testament speaks of baptism into one body; of baptism into persons, as Christ, Christ Jesus, Moses; of baptism into the name of Paul, of the Lord Jesus, of the Father and Son and of the Holy Spirit; and of baptism into truths, as death to sin, John's baptism, the forgiveness of sins, and change of mind; but never of baptism into Spirit or baptism into water.

On the other hand, it is always baptism WITH water or Spirit. Matt. 3:11, "I indeed baptize you with water into repentance; but He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear—He will baptize you with Holy Spirit and fire." Here *with* is expressed according to the Hellenic idiom, by *en* and the Dative. Mk. 1:8, "I baptize you with water, but He will baptize you with Holy Spirit." Here *with* is expressed by the *en* (in connection with water, if not Spirit), which makes *with* unmistakably the meaning. Luke 3:16, "I indeed baptize you with water (the Dative without *en*) . . . . He will baptize you with Holy Spirit and fire." Jno. 1:26, "I baptize with water." V. 31, "I came baptizing with water." And v. 33, "He that sent me to baptize with water, he said to me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and abiding upon him, this is he that is baptized with Holy Spirit." Acts 1:5, "John indeed baptized with water [Dative without *en*], but ye shall be baptized with Holy Spirit not many days hence." 1 Cor. 10:2, "And were all baptized into Moses with the cloud and with the sea." Eph. 12:13, "For also with one Spirit we were all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink one Spirit." Real baptism is always baptism with Spirit, and ceremonial baptism is always baptism with water. Real baptism is permanent in-tusposition into Christ, or the one body of which he is the head, into the name of the Trinity, or into forgiveness of sins or death to sin; and ceremonial baptism is always a

symbol of this real baptism. In real baptism the Spirit is sent upon the person baptized and brings him into Christ; in symbolic baptism the water should be put upon the person. The fundamental truth of Calvinism, that the Holy Spirit and not the sinner initiates and effects the sinner's union with Christ, forbids a symbol in which the sinner comes as able to move to water as to what lies dead; it requires rather that water as vivifying come upon the sinner as dead. The correlative truth, once in Christ forever in him, will not allow the symbol of baptism into him to be a putting in and taking out. Dipping in water, if done for the sake of putting into water and taking out again, is contrary to the New Testament. Baptism into water is an invention of men; baptism into Christ is the teaching of God.

Only he fully knows the truth who knows how others miss it. How is it that so many men of piety and learning believe that only dipping in water is the true symbolic baptism? Is it not due to the fact that baptism does have in it the idea of putting into? Shall we in protesting against dipping deny this? Not thus shall we ever convince them; for thus we show ourselves in error. Their mistake lies in making the intusposition of baptism intusposition into water instead of into Christ.

The truth reconciles. The errors which are fragments of truth come into harmony in a whole truth. That baptism signifies a putting into, and that baptism signifies a modelless influencing, stand harmonious, into one body with one Spirit.

And any truth is harmonious with all truth. Man's utter dependence on the Divine Spirit; the performance of union with Christ; the Trinitarian system, these are some of the doctrines which stand in manifest harmony with baptism with Spirit into Christ.

But it would not be just to the relative importance of points and principles, if this brief paper stopped without insisting on the importance of that special truth which receives its emphatic assertion in baptism, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, The Sabbath, commemorating God's creation

of all things out of nothing and his raising of Jesus Christ from the dead, is a reiterative witness for the honor of God the Father. The Lord's supper commemorating the death of Jesus Christ, by which he made propitiation for sins and became himself receivable as life and sustenance, is a dumb but eloquent witness for the honor of God the Son. And Baptism, the third of the three observances of the Christian religion, commemorating the outpouring of the Holy Spirit as the Giver and Director of life and power, is the beautiful and persuasive witness for the honor of God the Holy Spirit. Immeasurably more important than correctness in the ceremony is appreciation of the Spirit. And we must let no aberrations of some who study the doctrine of the Holy Spirit frighten us from the investigation. Some fail where many succeed. The importance of the subject will excuse our search ; and the wealth to be gained will reward us. The truth of baptism gives to the Holy Spirit his place ; the Holy Spirit must have his place in any symmetrical doctrine of the Trinity ; and the symmetry of the Trinity is the beauty and the proof of the Christian system.

Oxford, Ala.

F. P. RAMSAY.

## V. TURN OR BURN!

The master move in that devilish strategy which accomplished the Fall, was when Satan succeeded in casting a doubt on the certainty of future punishment. And since that woeful hour, "Ye shall not surely die," has been the favorite tenet of all who are under the dominion of the god of this world. It is not to be expected, therefore, that the doctrine of eternal punishment will ever be popular among men. On the contrary, every preacher who faithfully confronts his hearers with that stern alternative which forms the heading of this article, may count on receiving his full share of this world's reproach and scorn.

"Your preachers are all too old and plain,  
Says the gay world, with a sneer ;  
They frighten my children with dreadful tales  
Which I do not like them to hear ;  
They talk of damnation, fire and pain,  
And the horrors of endless night ;  
They speak of a place that should not be  
Mentioned to ears polite.  
You must give us some of a different stamp,  
Brilliant, and gay and fast,  
Who will teach us how men may live as they list  
And yet go to heaven at last."

We may well suppose that the devil, working hand in hand with the bitter revolt of the carnal mind against this doctrine, would long ago have banished it from the faith of mankind, were it not for one thing ; and that is, that there is no way to silence the unequivocal testimony of the Scriptures upon this subject. No man, for example, can read with unbiased mind the latter part of Luke 16, the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, without drawing two necessary inferences : first, that the souls of the ungodly do at their death, pass into a state of penal suffering ; second, that this state is without mitigation or end. And the authority of Jesus Christ, as a divine teacher, stands committed to these two points of doctrine. And this is only one of many sim-

ilar passages, in which the dreadful character and endless duration of future punishment are explicitly stated.

And not only is there this immovable foundation for this doctrine in the express language of God's Word, but it may be said further, that the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the finally impenitent is so related to the whole fabric of Christianity, that the entire Christian system stands or falls with it. The doom of him who dies in his sins is not simply the background of the gospel, it is the very canvas on which the gospel is set forth. Take away this truth, and the gospel itself is gone. Examine in this light another familiar passage of Scripture: Luke 19: 10: "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." Come to save what? "That which was lost." How? To these questions there is no adequate answer but such as is seen in the lurid gleam of penal fires. There is no *modus deo vindice dignus*, apart from the wrath which is to come. A sufficient illustration of this line of thought is found in the notorious fact that those who make Christianity a mere scheme of social amelioration, are the same that empty it of every supernatural element—its divine Christ, its regenerating Spirit, as well as its threat of endless retribution.

Our purpose, however, in this article is not the proof of this doctrine. If what has just been said is true, then to those who accept Inspiration, and embrace in its integrity the system of doctrine contained in the Holy Scriptures, further proof of this particular doctrine is needless. But this does not preclude every effort to meet popular objections, and to clear away as far as possible difficulties which beset this dread truth even in the minds of those who reverently accept it. It becomes us to recognize the horror of great darkness which hangs over this subject, and the obligation to handle it with all tenderness towards our fellow sinners, while we show all fidelity to the truth of God. And this will we do if God permit.

At the very outset, we would frankly admit that we find here difficulties which cannot be fully cleared up. Some of the mystery inherent to this subject is what always con-

fronts us, whenever the purposes and dealings of the infinite God are made the subject of investigation by a finite mind. Especially do we find ourselves immediately confronted with that *crux philosophorum et theologorum*, the origin of evil. Many of the questions concerning the eternal punishment of sin, run back into the larger question of the origin of sin. And in the face of this larger question we are helpless. When it is asked, how did evil enter the universe, how is rebellion against his authority compatible with the government of the Almighty, or how can the existence of suffering be harmonized with the benevolence of one who was wise enough to foresee it and powerful enough to prevent it? In the face of such questions, we are in the position of all who have gone before us—we can return no adequate answer. It is true that there is something in the relations of God to moral agents, very different from relations to the material universe. Such a thing as an infraction of the laws of physics or chemistry, for example—except the miraculous suspension of these laws by God himself, is unknown and ever inconceivable. But the Government of God over free agents is in a totally different sphere. Now while we are far from endorsing such a *theodicy*, as seeks to relieve the divine perfections by asserting the existence of evil as a necessary complement to the existence of good; while we would by no means say that the creation of free and mutable beings rendered it inevitable that they would eventually fall into sin; yet, as said, we feel that the mystery of the origin of sin is in some way bound up in the mystery of free agency. This much is plain, that on the day that any being was created a free agent, at that time the door opened by which sin and misery entered. But this, as is evident, only pushes the question further back. Why did a God of infinite prescience and benevolence ever thus open the door by which evil could enter? And to this we find but one answer, that given by our Lord in regard to a similar mystery, "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight."

But this confession of ignorance is a different thing from

consenting to any arraignment of the justice or goodness of God, because of the existence of sin and suffering. Our position is simply this: We know that evil is in the world; we know that God rules the world, and that his rule is holy, just and good; but how to make this knowledge harmonize we do not now see. And yet, while we thus confess our ignorance, our position is an impregnable one; it can only be assailed by denying its existence on the one hand; or, on the other, by denying the existence or limiting the perfections of God. To take the first alternative is to become a follower of Mrs. Eddy, to take the second is atheism. It is also evident that our attitude towards the punishment of sin is the same as towards the origin of sin; they are only different branches of the same insoluble problem. With regard to all these "secret things of the Lord our God," we await the clearer light of that promised day, when "we shall know, even as also we are known"

Contenting ourselves with thus postponing until the light of a clearer day, the solution of the most serious difficulty which besets our subject, when we turn to meet the popular attacks upon the doctrine of eternal punishment our task becomes much simpler.

We notice, first, what is perhaps the most common form of objection, that based upon the popular tenet of the New Theology, the Fatherhood of God. This is taken as forbidding the very idea of eternal punishment. It is argued, and the argument is pressed with the assurance of one enunciating an axiom, "Would you send *your* child to the flames of torment; and do you think our Father in Heaven is less merciful and loving than you are?"

"The Father is merciful, great and good,  
Loving and tender and kind,  
Do you think he would take one child to heaven,  
And leave the rest behind?"

You will notice the ingenious approximation here to our Saviour's tender words, "If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children." It is doubtful if in all his career as a deceiver of souls, the father of lies ever devised anything better calculated to blind the minds of them

that believe not than this. And yet the loose thread in this web of half-truth, sentiment and sophistry, is not hard to get hold of. It is true that mankind, by virtue of creation, sustains to God the relation of children to a father; for every one of us may trace his lineage—back to that illustrious point where we can say—“which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God.” But waiving the question as to how far this filial relation was forfeited when our progenitor ate the forbidden fruit—is the relation of children to a father the only one which men sustain to God? If so, what mean the Scriptures, “the Judge of all the earth,” “God, the righteous judge,” “who will render to every man according to his deeds?” The moment you introduce this judicial element into the relations between the creature and his Creator, the whole aspect of the subject is changed. You have no longer to deal with a blind sentiment, the instinct which binds a lioness to her cubs, as well as a mother to her child, but you enter the domain of moral government with laws and penalties, rewards and punishments. And in this domain, once admitting the sinfulness of sin, you must proceed by an inexorable logic to the punishment of sin, as revealed in God’s Word.

We may pause right here to say that many orthodox writers, and more frequently popular preachers from orthodox pulpits, abandon the high ground which they ought to take in handling this question. Let the reader study carefully the following quotation from a popular writer in the *Sunday School Times*, and see upon what ground the author of it undertakes to “justify the ways of God to men.”

“So shall also my heavenly Father do unto you (v 35). The shoe will be on the other foot some time. Jesus did not say this in vindictiveness. He simply stated a fact. There is no law more certain in its operations than the one he announced in these words. Every hard-hearted man will, sooner or later, find himself in as tight a place as the man he squeezed. You smile sardonically, and say, “I can take care of myself.” You will see. The traits of character you are forming will force you as resistlessly as a movement of a



glacier into some situation where you will have to throw up your hands and beg for mercy. It will come when you stand before the great bar on the last day, if never before. Do you think that Justice will permit you to evade your just retribution? It is as necessary to restrain the cruelty of some of these monsters as for people to shoot lions and tigers. Human hearts at last become ice and adamant. It is only by flinging them square against a calm and terrible justice that they perceive the devilish coldness of their own hearts. God does not enjoy doing it, *but the protection of society demands it.*"

Note particularly the last words, which we have italicized and see to what a lame and impotent conclusion our author conducts us. He ought to have said, "God does not enjoy doing it, *but his own inflexible justice demands it.*" Instead of taking this high ground, which the preceding sentences might lead you to expect, he comes down to the low plane of governmental expediency, and says, "the protection of society demands it."

In like manner, we have heard preachers seek to evade the universalist argument from the Fatherhood of God, by supposing the case of an earthly parent with an incorrigible son; who, for the sake of his other children, disowns his incurably vicious child, and even turns him over to the strong arm of the law. We may have used this analogical argument ourselves in our past sermonizing; if so, we promise never to do it again. It is a distinct surrender to the objector of the great principle at issue. The ground of a sinner's condemnation is naked justice; that foundation is adamantine and all sufficient, and needs no supplement from expediency.

But coming back to our main line of argument, the Scriptural representatin of the great Jehovah in his relations to his sinful creatures, is that of one with the *feelings* of a father, and the *principles* of a just judge. His feelings are expressed in such pathetic utterances as these: "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked." "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim, how shall I deliver

thee, O Israel? how shall I make thee as Admah? how shall I set thee as Zeboim?" [two of the doomed cities of the plain.] "Who is longsuffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." The principles of the divine government, however, are thus expressed: "Our God is a consuming fire;" "who will render to every man according to his deeds \* \* \* indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil." "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."

We have known from our earliest recollections an earthly parent, who is to us a far more fitting exemplification of the "All-Father" than any fancy sketches our liberal theologians have devised. He is one whom the Church has honored with the highest offices in her gift; at the same time the State has for years retained him upon the judicial bench.

If by any fault of our own, it were possible for us to be brought before his court for trial upon a capital charge, we know very well what would take place. If the charge was sustained by the evidence, and the verdict of guilty brought in, we know that the extreme sentence of the law would be pronounced, with unfaltering lips and with a broken heart! This is to our mind a far-away picture of Him whom His word describes as "the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgressions and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty."

Those, then, who represent the Fatherhood of God as incompatible with the idea of an eternal hell, have to go somewhere else than to the Scriptures for their picture of the divine character. In fact, the only thing in the Bible which corresponds with the notion of the divine fatherhood, is the character of "good old Eli," "whose sons made themselves vile, and he restrained them not." We commend this case in all of its bearings, to our liberal friends, as well worthy of their serious study.

But often the objector shifts his ground, and says that

not in the name of mercy only, but in the name of justice, he protests against the doctrine of eternal punishment. Here the objection is not so much to punishment itself, as to its endless duration. It is said that it is unjust to inflict on finite beings, a practically infinite punishment. Eternal torment is disproportioned to offences, brief in duration, and often trivial in character. And so rhetoric has been exhausted to bring out this alleged injustice. No stronger statement of this objection could be given than that framed by the high-priest of American infidelity, the late R. G. Ingersoll. Mr. Ingersoll imagines a bird winging its way through illimitable space from this earth to the remotest fixed star, and bearing in its mouth one grain of sand. The bird comes back, after an almost immeasurable lapse of time, for another grain, and repeats his journey back and forth, until he has removed this solid earth, grain by grain—"And then," says Mr. Ingersoll, with startling climax, "it will not yet be day-break in Hell!"

We grant that the mind staggers under this tremendous conception, but that does not abate one particle of our confidence in its truth. We would solemnly match this awful thought with that which is its counterpart, the enormity, the immeasurable ill-desert of sin. If we could compass in one view all the sin which has ever been committed on this earth, the vile idolatries, the sorceries, the blasphemies, the disobedience to parents, the lies, the thefts, the adulteries, rapes, and incests, if we could hear the shrieks of the tortured, and see the blood of the slain; and then remember that every single sin, however small, contains in itself that germ of rebellion against God, from which this world-wide and age-long mass of iniquity has sprung; and that every single sinner, if divine and human restraints had been removed, could have committed all the sins of every other sinner; with such a view of sin before us, there would rise in our minds a sense of righteous indignation, which only the Scripture conception of punishment could satisfy.

We would commend to the present generation of New England theologians who sit in Edwards' seat, Edwards'

argument right here. In his sermon on the justice of God in the damnation of sinners, Edwards argues substantially as follows: It is not unjust in God to inflict on sin that punishment which it deserves. The ill-desert of any action is measured by the contrary obligation of which it is the transgression: see such terms as *dishonesty*, *disobedience*, *untruthfulness*, *unchastity*, etc. Now our obligation to love, adore, and serve God is an infinite obligation. This can only be disproved by saying that God is not infinitely adorable and lovely. Then sin, which violates our obligation to love and serve God, is the transgression of an infinite obligation. The ill desert of sin, therefore, is infinite, and to award the sinner with a punishment, which is, as to duration, infinite, is no more than his iniquities deserve. So when the objector seeks to gather into one appalling picture the ages upon ages of illimitable torment stretching out forever before the damned soul, we simply turn the stream of his objection against the rock wall of Edwards' inexorable logic. Any protest against the endless punishment of sin is met and matched by any fair statement of the enormous evil of sin.

But the objection is met with equal conclusiveness from another point of view. It is not to be forgotten that infinite duration of punishment, in the case of finite creatures, is made up of an endless series of finite periods. If it is granted that God is just in inflicting upon the sinner the first period, however brief, of this series, then every succeeding period follows like the revolving links of an endless chain. For there is nothing remedial in punishment. On the contrary, suffering, when not sanctified by grace, only hardens and embitters. The sinner will not cease to sin when he enters hell; on the contrary, every analogy of this present life, and all the light of Scripture, lead us to believe that the wickedness of this world will be continued and intensified as the ages of that other world roll on. The last time that the curtain is lifted by the hand of revelation disclosing that place of torment shows us the lost "blaspheming the God of Heaven because of their pains and their sores, and repenting not of their deeds." For if men continue to sin, they

must continue to reap the due reward of their sin. And so "hell is thick darkness, waxing blacker and blacker forever." The only escape from this argument is to assert some sort of operation of divine grace in the abode of despair, and of this the Word of God affords not the slightest evidence. There is, on the other hand, the most express assertion of the fixed moral state of those who go out of this world unsaved. "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still."

In that lone land of dark despair,  
No Sabbath's heavenly light shall rise ;  
No God regard your bitter prayer,  
Nor Saviour call you to the skies.

Therefore, instead of justice militating against the endlessness of the sinner's doom, it is justice which not only sends him to hell, but must forever keep him there.

But we must bring this discussion to a close.

As was said in the beginning, we deeply feel the gloom and sadness inexpressible, which overhangs our subject; and we frankly admit lines of difficulty running through it, which carry us back into that deeper darkness which shrouds the origin of evil. At the same time, in most of the popular attacks upon this truth, we see nothing but unfounded assaults upon the goodness or justice of God, which fail to recognize him as the judge of all the earth, which belittles the infinite evil of sin, and leaves out of sight the persistent impenitency of the ungodly in the world to come.

If space permitted, we might notice the discussion of some of the words which present the Bible doctrine of future retribution, especially some things which have recently come under our eye as to the meaning of  $\chi\alpha\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  in the Hebrew,  $\alphaἰδης$  and  $\alphaἰώνιος$  in the Greek. We will only say that the Scriptural doctrine does not depend upon the meaning of any one term, but is set forth in passages so numerous and expressive, so varied and explicit, as to leave no room for doubt in the mind of any fair interpreter, that the Word of God discloses a state of penal suffering awaiting the ungodly

in the other world which is terrible and never-ending. And all discussions to the contrary, which involve the language of Scripture, impress us as "strifes about words," "perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds," which are "unprofitable and vain."

We would far rather take time to dwell upon that blessed theodicy which brings this dark subject into bright relief, viz: The sacrifice of the Son of God upon the accursed tree to provide a way of escape from the wrath which is to come. Gladly do we echo the invitation:

Come let us gather 'round the cross  
That knowledge to obtain,  
Not by the soul's eternal loss,  
But everlasting gain

One thing, however, we must notice in closing. Our conviction, is, that the bitterness and persistency of the popular opposition to this truth, is a matter of the heart far more than of the head, and is due at last to the revolt of the stubborn will of the flesh against the divine *ultimatum* suggested by our title—turn or burn! We feel sure that it is not so much the nature or duration of final retribution to which mankind object; it is rather the necessity which is upon them, either to give up sin or face eternal damnation. "Let the wicked forsake his way;" "Turn ye, for why will ye die;" "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish"—of all the contents of God's Word, there is nothing so galling to the unregenerate heart as these. If there could be some compromise effected, by which sin could be retained and yet the sinner escape the damnation of hell, mankind would regard the doctrine of eternal punishment with amiable complacency. It is a notable fact, that all man-made religions display this convenient feature. They all offer some scheme by which a substitute for repentance is proposed. The sinner may continue in his sins, provided he goes through with certain costly ceremonies, offers a libation to the gods, does penance, gives money to the priest, or makes provision in his will for masses which shall liberate his soul from purgatory. Only revealed religion confronts the guilty conscience with the uncompromising

demand: "Repent or perish, turn or burn!" But inasmuch as few, even the most hardened, have the face to question the propriety of the call to repentance, they turn their hostility against the second member of the obnoxious alternative, and deny the reality of the threatened doom of the impenitent. It is evident, therefore that when a disbelief in doom eternal gains ground, the call to repentance loses force proportionately. It is only the certain prospect of irretrievable perdition which imparts urgency to the call, "Repent ye, and believe the gospel." Hence is manifest the conscience—hardening, soul-destroying, God defying influence of universalism, annihilationism, restorationism, and all so-called liberal views.

In the Rev. W. Haslam's book, *From Death into Life*, there is an account of a very striking dream, of a man who was subsequently converted under his ministry. The man said: "I dreamt that I was walking along a broad smooth road, where everything was lovely. The road was crowded, and the people all seemed as if they were out for a holiday. Seeing a working man in a field close by, I called to him, and asked, 'Where does this road lead?' He answered, 'To hell, straight on; you cannot miss!' 'Hell!' I was surprised; 'Hell,' I said to myself. 'This is very different from what I thought. Is the way to hell as pleasant as this? and are people so unconcerned about it?' I was amazed, yet I did not stop nor turn back, but went on and on, seemingly as pleased as the others were. However it did not continue like this long, for soon I came to a rough post, where the atmosphere was thick and sulphury and it was almost dark. Seeing some people in the distance I went near to ask them the way out. They were busy with long rakes raking cinders about on the dry ground and would not answer my urgent inquiries. As I approached them, I saw that every now and then fire appeared from under the ground, over which they raked cinders to keep it out of sight. Just then the ground became so hot that I began to run, in my despair I knew not whither. As I passed along in haste, I came to cracks in the ground full of fire;

I stepped over them one after another, and ran, ran on till I came to such a large chasm that I could not jump over it. I turned and went in another direction, leaping and running in a state of terror, till at last I came upon a glowing sheet of fire, into which I fell. Then I awoke." The application of this is obvious. Many in our day and time are at this cruel business of raking cinders over the fire; few there are like faithful Richard Baxter, who was wont to compress the warnings of God's Word into one solemn, urgent appeal, saying, "Sinner, turn or burn! turn or burn!"

R. A. LAPSLEY.

Greenville, Va.



## VI. THE HARD DOCTRINES AND THE WORDS OF ETERNAL LIFE.

### I.

Jesus preached a sermon one day on the Bread of Life. In it he very plainly taught the doctrine of the Atonement. Many of his disciples, when they heard it, said, "This is an hard saying; who can hear it?" From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him. Then Jesus said to the twelve, "Will ye also go away?" Peter, always spokesman, answered for them, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God."

The congregations to which Jesus preached are very much like the congregations to which the Word of God is preached to-day. There are to-day as then the hostile hearers, who are always looking for something in the Bible to justify their unbelief. Then there is another class like those who for a while heard him gladly, but afterward walked no more with him. There are some things in the Bible that they like very much. Things easy to understand, things pleasant to their feelings, things that do not shock their prejudices, for a while they hear gladly. They are eager for the words of eternal life. They like sermons on the love of God, the joy of the Christian life, and the hopes of heaven. But when they read or hear those things in the Bible which perplex the understanding, which are inconsistent with their prejudices, they say, "This is an hard saying, who can hear it?" Some of them, like those disciples, go back and walk no more with Jesus. They become skeptics. Others, who do not wish to lose the words of eternal life, which the Bible contains, simply reject or ignore its hard doctrines. They expurgate the Bible. They believe what they wish to believe. If they can they will explain away the plain meaning of the Bible, and deceive themselves into thinking that they have got rid

of its mysteries. If they cannot do this, they will simply ignore or forget them. They organize themselves into churches and frame creeds from which all the hard doctrines of the Bible are carefully expunged. We may concede that some of this feeling is due to unnecessarily harsh and disproportionate statements of Bible doctrines in human creeds and sermons, but the real objection of many is, not to the creed statements of the doctrines, but to the doctrines themselves. If it be true that our creeds do not correctly express the teachings of God's Word, then by all means, let them be changed. But let the reviewers or framers of new creeds be sure they are right; let them take heed lest, in expunging the hard things in the creeds they expunge the hard sayings of Christ.

But there is another class of readers and hearers like Peter and the disciples. Some of these sayings of Christ, some of these doctrines of the Bible are just as hard to them as they are to others; but they have settled this point once for all, that they believe and are sure that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, that he alone has the words of Eternal Life, and that the Bible is his Word. They believe that he speaks through that word with the voice of authority; they know that if they believe him in one thing they must believe him in all; that if they would hear his smooth sayings, they must hear his hard ones too; that they cannot reject his hard doctrines without rejecting his words of eternal life.

So they submit their minds and wills to his. They believe whatever he teaches, whether they like it or not.

Only in such submission to the mind and will of God can rest be found. But this state of mind is often not attained without severe conflict. Such conflict is not necessary, and some of God's people never know it. But the mysteries of the Bible sometimes perplex the most sincere and humble students of it. What the agony of this mental and spiritual struggle is, only those who have felt it know. The writer speaks from the sympathy of personal experience. While

a student of theology in the seminary, little trouble was felt on this score. The sinner was an abstract notion, and his eternal destiny could be reasoned out by a process as purely intellectual as that of finding the value of an unknown quantity in an algebraic equation. The Calvinistic system was logical, and that was enough. But when to that pastor the sinner became his own loved friend, or was bound to the best of his people by the closest ties, it was a very different matter. The eternal loss of a soul was a thing too awful to contemplate. The burden of the cross was too great for human strength to bear. Then came the doubts and the prolonged agony of conflict. First came the questioning of single doctrines, and the effort to find relief from them in the Bible. The appeal was made from the creed to the Bible. But in the main the higher court sustained the lower. Except by a process of special pleading and forced interpretation which intellectual honesty would not permit, the Bible could not be expurgated of its hard doctrines. Then came the appeal from other inspired writers to the Great Teacher himself. The appeal was made from Paul to Jesus. Again the appeal was not sustained. Christ taught the hard doctrines even more plainly than his disciples. Then the appeal was made from the Bible to Nature. But the case only grew worse. Through the dark mystery of sin in the Bible shone the light of the glorious mystery of Redemption, but in the night of Nature gleamed not one ray of light. Nature's sentence was, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Conscience would not permit the escape of denying the essential reality of sin by calling it an imperfect stage in man's evolution. From a theory which in effect ascribed all sin to God as its creator, the soul shrank in horror. Nature taught all the dark mysteries of sin, but nothing of redemption. The mysteries of providence were harder than the mysteries of revelation. No relief in Arminianism, none in Liberalism, none in Rationalism, none in Agnosticism. Then, as by a lightning flash which left the darkness deeper than before, the soul saw itself standing upon the brink

of the precipice of Atheism. Outwardly it was a beautiful scene. Far beneath lay a placid river, but God was not in the stream; in the distance were the blue mountains, but God was not in the hills; in the valleys between spread the waving fields of grain, but God was not in the harvest; a soft breeze stirred the foliage, but God was not in the wind; the sky above was blue, flecked with white clouds, but God was not in the firmament; over all shone the bright sun of June, but God was not in the light. For one brief awful moment the world was empty, without God. Then in an instant, into that great empty cavern of the soul, with its insatiable yearning for God, there came rushing as a mighty wind to fill its void, the lost sense of God's presence. O, how the whole earth and sky changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye! The gladness came back to the song of the birds, the sunlight danced with joy upon the ripples of the stream, the breeze was laden with the murmur of prayer, and the whole earth beamed with ineffable peace. Then was understood as never before, "In him we live and move and have our being." And with faith in God came back faith in his Word. The lesson had been taught, that between faith in God's Word and the abyss of atheism, a bottomless pit of despair, there was no logical stopping-place. There came the memory of the words of the Great Teacher, "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter." The hard doctrines were not explained. They were mysteries still, they are mysteries now, mysteries they will be until that time comes when we shall know as we are known, when we shall no longer see through a glass darkly, but face to face. But the soul learned to say with the Master, "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." Whatever God says must be true, because God is truth; whatever God does must be right, because God is just; whatever God does or says must be wise, because God is wisdom; whatever God does must, in its consummation, be merciful, because God is love.

This essay is an attempt to set forth the process by which one soul became established in the orthodox interpretation

of God's Word. It is not written for the learned, but for those who may be perplexed by the same difficulties, especially for younger ministers. There is nothing new in the argument. But the theological unrest of today is not wholly, nor perhaps chiefly, due to new difficulties. There are new problems, arising from the advancement of modern science; these must be met by competent men in their place and time. But a large part of the discussion is centred on the old moral and philosophical objections. Since these are revived, and published in reviews and periodicals, no apology is needed for reviving old answers and publishing them where they have some chance of being read by the new generation.

It will save us a great deal of unnecessary trouble, if, at the very outset, we make up our minds that we can never expect to understand all the mysteries of Revelation. We might just as well settle this point now as later on, that some things must be received by simple faith in God's Word. It shall be my first object then to show the reasonableness of this.

There are three things to be taken into consideration; first, there is Man, who receives the revelation; second, there is God, who gives the revelation; third, there is the subject matter of revelation, Sin and Redemption.

Now from the very nature of any one of these three, any revelation must contain mysteries, hard to understand, hard to believe. I mean this, that a revelation without hard doctrines was impossible. The demands of the Bible upon faith are not arbitrary, nor are they peculiar to the Bible. Faith is necessary to all knowledge, not only in religion and theology, but in science.

First, then, let us consider the difficulties which arise from the nature of Man who receives the Revelation.

Man is of finite intelligence. That is only to say that there is an infinite range of truth beyond the grasp of his reason. Mysteries surround us, mysteries above us, mysteries beneath us, mysteries within us. There are mysteries of matter, mysteries of force, mysteries of life, mysteries of

spirit. There is not a force in nature which is understood even by the most learned scientist. He can only observe its effects, and learn some of its laws. Who can tell us why the earth is held in her place, through the centuries, by the sun? Do we understand any better than we did when we were children how the earth rests upon nothing? What is that force which makes every star in space dependent upon every other star? Gravity, answers the scientist. What is gravity? It is a force. And we are left where we began. The chemist puts two entirely different substances together; they combine and form a third substance unlike both. What is the cause of this? you ask him. Chemical affinity, he answers. What is chemical affinity? Force. A scientist has recently discovered a force whose rays will cast a shadow through opaque substances. He calls these rays "X" rays"; that is, unknown rays. But do the words light, heat, electricity tell us any more about those forces than the term X does of this new force?

Then there are the mysteries of life. What is that force which we call life? We know no more now than was known a thousand years ago. Before the mysteries of birth, decay and death we stand in awe, overwhelmed with wonder. The smallest animalcule that inhabits a globule of water is a world of mystery to us. What then must be the mysteries of the mental and spiritual world? What can the human intellect grasp of the mysteries of soul, of feeling, of knowledge, of will? Is not the saying of the old philosopher true to-day? "Then I beheld all the work of God, that a man cannot find out the work that is done under the sun; because though a man labor to seek it out, yet shall he not be able to find it; yea, further, though a wise man think to know it, yet shall he not be able to find it."

The mysteries of which we have spoken arise merely from the fact that man is a being of finite intelligence. Even if man had never sinned he must have found mysteries in Nature, mysteries in himself, mysteries in God. But these mysteries would not have been hard in the sense of being repugnant to his feelings. His knowledge would have been

limited, but it would have been correct. Upon the foundations of faith, reason might have erected a temple of knowledge which would have been, not indeed infinite, but perfect and complete.

But this is not the worst of it. As it is, man's intelligence is not merely finite, but every faculty of his soul has been corrupted and disabled by sin. For this reason man cannot even interpret nature correctly. Reason cannot correctly build even a finite temple of knowledge. She does not clear her foundations properly. She often mistakes prejudices for intuitions. She errs in the selection of the facts of experience which constitute the material of her edifice of knowledge. Crumbling stones are used as the keystone of many a grand arch, or the base of many a lofty column. Her architectural design is faulty. The result is often a building resting upon a rotten foundation, false in design, and composed of worthless materials. Thus it happens that much that is called philosophy proves to be mere speculation.

If then sin makes reason err in her interpretation of nature, is it any wonder that it also causes error in her interpretation of the Bible? Is it not perfectly reasonable 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?"

But the intellectual difficulties in the Bible are not the only nor chief ones. Many of the doctrines of the Bible are hard, not because man cannot understand them, but because he does not like them.

It is not that he cannot believe, but that he will not believe. This is especially true of every doctrine in the Bible about the nature, extent and guilt of sin; and of every doctrine about God which has any relation to sin. This arises from the fact that sin has not merely weakened man's reason, but has corrupted his heart. As a result of sin, the natural mind is enmity against God. It is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. The whole corrupt nature of man rises in rebellion against the claim of sov-

ereignty on the part of his Creator. Self is enthroned in the heart instead of God. Therefore any revelation which demands an unconditional surrender of self must be repugnant to the natural feelings. But this must be taught in any revelation God might make. God is supreme, and can be limited by nothing save his own perfections.

Besides this, sin sears the conscience. It impairs man's sense of justice. It is one of the natural consequences of sin that the sinner loses his sense of the enormity of sin. He is therefore in no condition to judge of his own desert. For this reason the doctrine of the justice of God becomes hateful to him. As the criminal considers the law under which he suffers his natural enemy and hates it, as the fallen woman resents the shame which is the reward of her vice, and hates virtue, so the sinner hates justice. Every doctrine of the Bible which is based upon the justice of God must be hateful to him.

When we in our viciousness grow hard,  
 O misery on't—the wise gods seal our eyes;  
 In our own filth drop our clear judgments; make us  
 Adore our errors; laugh at's while we strut  
 To our confusion.

Thus it is that so many doctrines of the Bible are not only hard to a finite intelligence, but hard to a wayward heart, hard to a seared conscience, hard to a stubborn will.

Such are the difficulties which arise from the finite nature and fallen condition of man, who receives the revelation. The conclusion is strengthened when we come to consider the Giver of revelation. If man finds mysteries in the natural world, mysteries in himself, what must he find in God! If reason cannot comprehend matter, how shall it comprehend spirit? If man cannot understand his own finite spirit, how can he expect to understand the infinite essence of God? God is infinite, but man can think only within the sphere of the finite. God is absolute, but thought is possible to man only under conditions. God is eternal, but man's thought is conditioned by time. Man may believe in, but he cannot grasp the idea of his own immortality; how then shall he comprehend a Being who



exists through all eternity? God is immutable; his knowledge and purposes are the same throughout all eternity, incapable of change. But change is one of the conditions of human thought—thought itself involves change. These attributes of God cannot even be correctly expressed in human language. We say God is infinite, but the term is only negative. It denies limitations to God, but conveys no idea of the vast realm of his nature which lies beyond those limits. We speak of God's foreknowledge, but the term is inexact, because God's knowledge may be an eternal present. We speak of his foreordination, but this too is inexact, because all his purposes are eternal. There can be no order of time in his decrees.

But it is in the exercise of God's attributes toward man that we find the hardest doctrines. God is omnipotent, therefore the Creator and Governor of all things. But God is also holy, therefore he cannot be the author of sin. In vain does speculation try to solve this mystery. It tends on the one hand either to make God the author of sin, or to deny the reality of sin; or on the other hand to limit the power and sovereignty of God. God is infinitely just, therefore he cannot allow sin to go unpunished. But he is also infinitely merciful, and takes no pleasure in the death of the sinner. Here is another insoluble mystery. Some in attempting to solve it have represented God as hard, stern, unloving, unmerciful; others have made him out to be weak, indulgent, unjust and unholy. The Bible says that God subsists in one essence and three persons. Efforts to comprehend this mystery have resulted either in making three Gods of Father, Son and Holy Spirit; or else in denying the divinity of the Son and the personality of the Spirit.

Passing on now to the subject matter of revelation, we find the mystery growing, not more stupendous, but deeper. There are the mysteries of Sin and Redemption.

Sin is the mystery of all mysteries. It is mysterious in its nature, defying analysis or definition; mysterious in its existence, irreconcilable by human reason with the perfec-

tions of God; mysterious in its origin, a dark and strange river which has never been traced to its source; mysterious in its future, emptying at the precipice of death into a bottomless pit of despair. This is the sphinx who seizes upon the traveller in the ways of philosophy, propounds her dark enigma, and when he fails to answer, dashes him upon the rock. Said Dean Mansel, "Against this immovable barrier of evil, the waves of philosophy have dashed themselves since the birthday of human thought, and have retired broken and powerless, without displacing one fragment of that stubborn rock, or without softening one feature of that dark and rugged surface."

So when we come to the Bible we may expect to find hard doctrines about sin, and we do find them. Thousands of volumes have been written about them, grand intellects have been consumed in their study, controversies have been waged about them; but hard and strange they are still, hard and strange they will be until God chooses to explain them. Sometimes, no doubt, they have been disproportionately emphasized, sometimes harshly stated, but all attempts to make them easy or pleasant have failed.

Passing this dark phase of our subject, we reach a region of light, but of mystery still. Redemption is as great though not so dark a mystery as sin. The problem of the origin of sin is not more difficult than that of its removal. Man can no more find an answer to the question, How can God pardon sin? than to the question, How could God permit sin? The question, How can a sinful soul become sinless? is just as hard to answer as the question, How could a sinless soul become sinful? The fall, original sin, total depravity, are mysteries deep and dark; election, atonement, regeneration, sanctification, are mysteries sublime and dazzling.

We have seen now that we must expect to find mysteries in the Bible. They arise from the very nature of God, from the nature of man, from the nature of sin and redemption. No revelation could have been made from God to man on the subject of sin and redemption without such mysteries.

There must be hard doctrines—hard, not only to the mind, but hard to the natural heart. They are not mere speculative difficulties which baffle the reason, but great moral problems. The sayings of Jesus were hard, not only to those who went back, and walked no more with him, but hard to his disciples. Some of these doctrines are hard not only to the enemies of Christ, but to his friends; not only to scoffers, but to believers; not only to heretics, but to the orthodox. They were hard to Peter, hard to Paul, hard to Augustine, hard to Calvin.

Now the Bible does not attempt to explain these mysteries. That is not its purpose. It is not intended to “justify the ways of God to men.” You will not find anywhere in the Bible any apology for anything God does or says. It deals with facts, not with explanations. It teaches all that is necessary for man to know about God’s attributes and relations to man, but does not attempt to explain seeming contradictions. It affirms God’s sovereignty and man’s free agency, but does not try to reconcile them to human reason. It affirms the fact of sin, but does not explain how a holy God could permit sin, nor how a sinless creature could fall. It affirms man’s total inability to save himself from sin, and at the same time his moral responsibility for his sin, but does not explain their reconciliation. It teaches that Christ was perfect God and perfect man, but does not explain the union of the two natures. It teaches vicarious atonement, but does not seek to explain how one could suffer for the sins of all. It affirms the power of the Holy Spirit to renew man’s will, and to enable him to accept of Christ, yet affirms that man is free in his acceptance or rejection of the Gospel, giving no explanation.

Is it not plain that the Bible is designedly devoid of all effort to bring these things within the compass of human reason? Indeed, it is expressly affirmed. “The secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but the things that are revealed unto us and to our children forever.” Deut. xxxix : 29.

Is there not then a purpose in these very mysteries? May not the very hardness of some of the doctrines of the Bible serve a beneficent design? This is not far to seek. It is to teach us absolute submission to the mind and will of God. Without this submission, man could not be saved. The very essence of sin consists in self-assertion against God. The head and front of man's offending consisted in his asserting his mind and will against that of God. Sin began this way. The first temptation began with the question, "Yea, hath God said?" The first sin was the doubt of God's wisdom, love and justice in the command not to touch the forbidden fruit. To cure sin selfishness must be destroyed. Self must be conquered in every point—self-righteousness, self-love, self-wisdom, self-will. The whole scheme of salvation is adapted to this end. Man's guilt must be atoned for by a righteousness which is not his own; his will must be renewed by a power which is not his own; he must be saved by a plan of salvation which his own wisdom could not have devised, and which when revealed, he must accept on simple faith in God. The same design runs through his providential dealings with us. Many of his providences are mysteries, and must remain mysteries until the day of the revelation of all things. But if we required God to explain all his dealings with us, could we ever learn to say, "Thy will be done"? Would the Bible be in harmony with this design if it did not contain mysteries? Even if a revelation which contained nothing beyond the compass of human reason, and nothing but what is pleasant to man's natural heart, could have been given, it would have been powerless to save; because it would have left man in his self-assertion against the mind and will of God. As we must learn to submit to the providences of God whether we understand them or not, whether we like them or not; so we must learn to believe whatever God says whether we understand and like it or not. But this is just what the natural man will not do. The first and last impulse of the natural heart is rebellion against such absolute authority. Therefore the natural man receiveth not the things of God, for they are foolishness unto him.

What then? Shall we say to Jesus, "These are hard sayings; who can hear them?" Shall we go back and walk no more with him? This is the alternative which some have accepted. Finding the Bible full of things hard to understand, and harder still to like, they have turned away, to seek in some other religion, or in some system of human philosophy, a faith that is free from the mysteries of the Bible. Failing to seek aid and light where alone they can be found, in the guidance of the Spirit, they stumble along in the darkness until they are lost in the wilderness of unbelief. Sometimes they never return. Sometimes they do return, after a long and weary wandering. But even when this is the issue, such wandering is needless. It is a dangerous notion that a man must first doubt in order that his faith may be established. I think that every man who has passed through such an experience, and who, by the grace of God, has been brought back to faith, will testify that his wandering was the result of his own folly and self-conceit.

But those who turn away from the Bible because of its mysteries, will find no relief in human religions or philosophies. These mysteries or hard doctrines are not peculiar to the Bible. They belong to the very nature of the subject. Any religion or religious philosophy must deal with the subject of God and man and the relations between them, and with sin and redemption. The same reasons hold good. If God could not give a revelation free from mysteries, how much less can man frame a religion of his own which is free from them? It might be shown that for every mystery in the Bible you will find a corresponding mystery in human philosophy, but such a task would require a book.

For the sake of example and illustration, we may mention two or three of these difficult subjects, and see how they have been dealt with by human religions and philosophies.

Take first, the subject of God. What sort of gods have men made for themselves? The day of idolatry is not past.

Men no longer worship the images of their hands, but they do worship the idols of their imaginations. They do not fashion gods out of wood or stone, but they fashion gods out of dreams and speculations.

There is the pantheistic conception of God,—the All-god. The god who is not merely immanent in all things, in whom all things live and move and have their existence, but who is everything; the god who is the only substance, of whom all things are but forms of manifestation. According to this conception there is no distinction of substance or personality or identity between God and his creatures. Every person is but a fraction of the personality of God, and the sum of all creature persons is the only divine personality. It denies all distinction between right and wrong, and not only makes God the author of sin, but identifies him with sin, makes sin one of his manifestations. For, according to this view, the malice in the heart of the murderer, the lust in the heart of the adulterer, are as truly forms of God's manifestation of himself, as the sympathy in the heart of the philanthropist, or the love in the heart of the mother, or the longing for righteousness in the heart of the saint. This is a prevalent theory of God in the philosophies of to-day, which have grown out of the attempt to apply the theory of evolution to religion. Is this theory less difficult to the understanding, or less revolting to the feelings than the Bible conception of a personal God, who has created all things, who is immanent in all his works, in whom all live and move and have their being, yet who is distinct from all his creatures? And if such be the case with the more refined conception of the pantheist, what shall we say of the gross conception of the materialist, whose only God is a blind force inhering in eternal matter?

There is another fruitful source of mystery and objection to the Bible in the impossibility of reconciling to human reason the doctrine of the divine sovereignty and human responsibility. But this is not a difficulty that is peculiar to the Bible. Every religion and every philosophy has grappled with this great problem in vain. It is just as dif-

ficult to understand how the freedom of the will is consistent with the laws of thought, emotion and will, as to understand how it is consistent with the sovereignty. It is just as impossible to explain satisfactorily how a man, determined by the motives of self-interest or love of family, may yet freely sow the seed that brings him bread, as it is to explain how it is that he may freely make the choice which determines his eternal destiny. Precisely the same logic, which in theology, leads to a denial, either of divine sovereignty, or human responsibility, would, in philosophy lead to a corresponding denial either of the laws of motive and choice, or the fact of the freedom of the will. Yet the latter pair of truths are facts of consciousness, as the former are deliverances of revelation, and both must be accepted on authority from which there is no appeal. He who revolts from the authority of the Bible in this matter, must revolt from the authority of consciousness, and must surrender himself into the clutches of a remorseless fatalism.

No Christian attempts to explain it, because the Bible does not pretend to furnish any explanation of it. He believes it is a fact, because the Bible states it as a fact. Of all others, this perhaps is the most fruitful source of objection to the Bible on account of its hard doctrines. Nothing, perhaps, so staggers the faith of weak Christians as this. But have human religions or philosophies ever proposed any theory of the origin of sin less objectionable? Sin is a fact. Every religion or philosophy must deal with it. No theory can be ever entertained which denies its existence. That would indeed be a delightful solution of this terrible problem. If the human race could only awaken some bright day and find that the whole conception of sin was only a long and terrible nightmare! If we could think sin out of existence! There is a prevalent craze that disease of the human body is only the result of a condition of the mind, that to cure it it is only necessary to think that it does not exist. Of course it is absurd, yet men who would laugh at the idea of a mind-cure for disease, fondly imagine that they can cure sin by that process! But like the poor

fool who tries to think his aches away, and finds them racking him still, so the poor sinner who tries to deceive himself by imagining sin away, finds it there still, terrible, guilty, vile as ever.

There is the theory of the materialist, that sin is only one of the phenomena of matter. Now mark, this theory does not deny the fact of that which we call original sin. It admits, nay, teaches, that all men are born in sin, but attempts to rob this fact of its terrible meaning by denying that sin is sin. The distinction between right and wrong is no more than the distinction between the beautiful and the ugly, between cleanliness and filth. The flowers which delight the sense of the beautiful are the phenomena of matter; so is the virtue which wins the approbation of conscience. The filth which disgusts the sense of sight and smell is a mere condition of matter; so is the vice which shocks every moral sense. The murderer or the seducer are as much the victims of a physical organization as the blind or the cripple. The feeling with which we regard moral baseness is of the same nature as that with which we look upon physical deformity. These theories have only to be stated in their concrete form to arouse the indignation which they deserve.

Then there is that very prevalent and growing theory that sin is a mere stage in the process of evolution, from which man will one day be delivered by a process of natural law. Now notice again, this theory does not deny the fact of that which we call original sin. On the contrary it teaches it. But they call it heredity, and heredity does not sound as ugly as original sin. It, too, attempts to rob the fact of sin of its terrible significance by denying its nature. God created sin. He brought man into existence in a sinful condition and left him to work himself upward by natural laws. This theory, too, destroys all distinction between virtue and vice. The only difference between them is that virtue is a more advanced stage of evolution than vice. This theory, like the other, needs only to be stated to arouse such an indignant protest of the moral nature as its sufficient answer. The effect of the spread of



these theories would be to give free reign to vice of every description. I say, "would be," I should have said, "has been," for the prevalent materialistic and pantheistic philosophy of the intelligent and cultivated classes of today has already borne its legitimate fruit. It has percolated through society by means of popular philosophical and scientific treatises, the lecture, the religious novel, the current reviews and magazines, and all kinds of cheap literature, carrying its deadly poison to all classes of men. It has increased adultery and murder, not only among the ignorant and degraded, but among the wealthiest and educated classes; it has sown dissension in families, and increased divorce; it has accumulated vast fortunes acquired by the disregard of all the principles of honesty—in short it has corrupted society, the nation, the church, and the family, besides ruining thousands of individual souls. Are these theories of sin more satisfactory to the intellect, more pleasant to man's right feelings, than the Bible doctrines of sin?

Enough has been said to show that a man will find no relief from mysteries in human substitutes for the religion of the Bible. Forsake the God of the Bible, whom we must regard with awe, and find a god in a blind, un pitying force, which we must regard with horror; forsake the Bible because of its doctrine of predestination, and we are driven to fatalism; forsake it because of its teachings about sin, and we are driven to theories which shock every moral sense, and turn loose upon earth all the passions of hell.

If then the mysteries of the Bible are due to the very nature of Revelation; to the transcendental character of the subjects with which it deals; to the finite capacity of the human intellect; to the further corruption of man's moral judgments by sin; if further all human philosophies and ethical systems contain either the same hard doctrines or substitutes harder still; then it follows that the hard sayings can be no good reason for turning away from Christ, if we find that he has the words of eternal life. To show this is our next task.

## II.

When the murmuring disciples had gone back, Jesus said to the twelve, Will ye also go away? Peter answered, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."

Is there not sense in this reasoning? May we not use it ourselves? Here is a teacher who tells us how we may be saved; here is a Book which professes to be God's message. If Christ be not the Redeemer, then there is no redeemer, if the Bible be not God's revelation, there is no revelation. If Jesus has not the words of eternal life, then no one else has them. Shall we forsake Christ then because of his hard sayings, when he alone has the words of eternal life?

"If a man die shall he live again?" This is the question of the ages. It was asked thousands of years ago. It is recorded in what may be the first of all books extant. It has been asked with increasing earnestness by every generation since. From Job to Socrates and from Socrates till the present time, the problem of the immortality of the soul has been the study of philosophers. It is a theme of surpassing interest to the unlearned as well as the wise. Savage peoples have asked this question, and have longed for an answer. This instinctive longing for immortality is co-extensive with our race.

"'Tis Immortality, 'tis that alone,  
Amid life's pains, abasement, emptiness,  
The soul can comfort, elevate, and fill."

The religion which does not satisfy this longing is worthless as a religion. Men want a religion which will not only teach them how to live in this present time, but to look for that blessed hope of a life of eternal happiness beyond the grave.

Now where is the answer to this question to be found? Who has the words of eternal life? Who can assure us that there is a life beyond the grave? And if there be a life beyond, who can tell us whether, and upon what conditions, that life may be free from the ills of this life? Let us first

see if there is any answer to this question outside of the message of Christ, and whether the answer, if there is any, satisfies all the conditions.

I do not mean to say that nature is silent upon the subject of the immortality of the soul. On the contrary, it may be conceded that, apart from revelation, there is a presumption of the immortality of the soul. To see what that presumption is worth, upon what it is grounded, and wherein it is lacking, let us examine it somewhat in detail.

At first sight the testimony of the book of nature seems to be adverse to all our hopes. For the first thing that arrests our attention is the universal reign of death. There is no exception. From the lowest form of vegetable life up to man, nothing is exempt from the universal doom. Leaving the Bible aside for the present, there is not one single recorded exception. No intelligence, no virtue, no wealth, no power, no rank, makes any difference. Beside every city of the living lies a city of the dead, to which all alike must go at last. The brightest eye must be quenched, the sweetest voice be hushed in death. No voice comes back from beyond the grave to tell us whether the soul still lives. To the shallow thinker this universal reign of death, this utter, unbroken silence, would seem to be conclusive against the immortality of the soul.

But think again. This universal law of death proves absolutely nothing as to the immortality of the soul. For this testimony of physical nature is purely negative. It proves the death of the body, but proves nothing as to the soul. To make it proof of the death of the soul, it must be proved that the soul and body are identical, or that the soul is the product of the body. It does not even prove that the body may not live again, still less does it prove that the soul dies. Death, so far as we can observe its effects, merely destroys the channel of communication between soul and soul. In our present state of existence there is no means of communication between one soul and another, except through the body. If there be any other, it has not yet been clearly established. But that body, how-

ever highly and sensitively organized, is a merely material body. It is subject to all the laws of matter. Its dissolution is a purely physical process. The sight, the hearing, the voice, the touch, are the functions of material organs. The eye, the ear, the voice organs are instruments, composed of atoms of matter, just as truly as the telegraph, the telephone or any other of the wonderful inventions of modern science. The same physical laws which destroy the one may dissolve the other. When these are destroyed all communication between soul and soul must cease, unless other means of communication, of which we know nothing, be discovered. But is it valid to argue that because all communication is cut off, therefore the soul has ceased to exist? Suppose that all the cables between the eastern and western hemispheres were to be cut, would the inhabitants of one be justified in reasoning that the inhabitants of the other had ceased to exist? Before the discovery of America here were two continents full of human beings, neither of which had any idea of the other's existence, because there was no means of communication between them.

Is it unreasonable to suppose there may be a vast world of spiritual beings of which we do not know, simply because we have no means of communicating with them? Suppose that when Columbus had landed on the shores of the western continent his ships had been burned and his means of return and communication thereby cut off. Would not his friends in Spain have supposed that he and all his company had perished? Yet they would have been still living, though supposed dead. Are we justified in reasoning that those who have passed beyond the horizon of this life are not in existence still in some spiritual realm? More than that, we know that all the functions of the body may be completely suspended, all means of communication cut off for a time as completely as by death. There are well attested instances of men who have lain in a trance for days which was mistaken for death, and yet have returned to consciousness. Are we justified in reasoning that their souls had ceased to exist during that interval? And if the soul may

still exist when the body is, so to speak, temporarily dead, may it not exist when the body has been dissolved? In the one case, as in the other, the testimony as to the existence of the soul is merely negative. It is only a question of a means of communication. You have of course heard of the cases of Laura Bridgman and of Helen Keller who were deaf, dumb and blind. Who suspected the intelligence that dwelt behind those sightless eyes until a means of communication had been established? But when that means was established, it was seen that there were minds and hearts as perfect as our own, and capable of high degree of cultivation. Did not they exist before, though unsuspected even by their own parents? Suppose that they had been paralyzed in the sense of touch, thus cutting off all communication, would we have the right to presume that those souls with all their gifts did not exist?

The death of the body then, creates absolutely no presumption as to the death of the soul. It simply means that so long as we are restricted to the senses of the body we can have no communication with disembodied spirits. It may well be that they know us far better than we knew them when in the body. It may well be that it is our limitations to the faculties of sense that cuts them off from communication with us.

If it could be proved that the soul was identical with the body, that intelligence and feeling and conscience and will were mere functions of the brain; in other words if it could be proved that there is no such thing as a soul, then the death of the body would at least create a strong presumption against immortality. But from the very nature of the case, this can never be proved by physical demonstration. But it is the testimony of consciousness that the soul is a distinct entity from the body. That, then, which seemed at first sight so discouraging to our hopes of immortality, proves to be no presumption at all against it. Having settled this we are at liberty to inquire further whether nature gives us any positive testimony as to the existence of the soul after death.

There are some beautiful analogies in the physical world, which do not indeed prove the immortality of the soul, but serve to illustrate it. Take the case of the caterpillar and the butterfly. We know that the poor grub, which crawls upon its belly all its life, at a certain time crawls into the earth, and seems to die. But from that chrysalis, a new and beautiful winged creature, as unlike the worm as can be, emerges, leaving the dead shell of its old form behind. Now suppose the worm to be endowed with reason, and a longing for a life beyond. The same facts would confront him, as confront us—the apparent universal reign of death. He sees his companions crawl into the earth and die. How can he suspect that beautiful creature, flitting from flower to flower, is a creature like himself, translated into a new existence? Would he not have the same reason to argue that there is no life for the poor worm beyond the chrysalis, that we have to argue that there may be a life beyond as new and strange to us as that of the butterfly is to the caterpillar? May not God have put these things into the book of nature, to suggest to man that there may be a new and higher state of existence for him? But it is not in the physical world that man finds the strongest intimations of a future existence. It is within himself, in the structure of the mind and soul, that he finds his strongest presumption of immortality. However unlike to the superficial observer the caterpillar and the butterfly may be, the scientist finds in the anatomy of the worm the rudiments of the organs of the butterfly. So to the philosopher the soul of man contains intimations of a higher existence.

There is the instinct of immortality itself. Does the longing for immortality itself prove nothing? This argument from instinctive longing must be cautiously used, but when so used it is valid. There is a correspondence between man's constitution and his environment. For every appetite of the body, there is something external in the world of nature to gratify it; for every sense there is an object; for every taste there is a beauty or harmony; for every affection there is a relation of life which calls it into exer-

cise ; for every power of the intellect there is an object of study. Does it not seem to point to a law by which we may reason from every universal and necessary instinct of the human soul to some reality somewhere which is objective to it? If we may reason from the instinct of worship to God, the object of it, may we not reason from the instinct of immortality to immortality itself? It is a universal instinct. It is not confined to civilized races, nor to people who have been brought under the influence of the Bible. It is recorded in tablets and inscriptions long before the greater part of the Bible was written. It is found in the mummies of Egypt, in the tablets of Babylon. The masterly reasoning of Plato, which contains the germ of the whole argument, was written before Christ was born. It was found among the Indians and Aztecs of America, the missionaries found it among the Chinese, it is found to-day even among the degraded tribes of Africa. What does it mean, if there be no reality to satisfy it?

"It must be so, Plato—thou reasonest well—  
Else whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,  
This longing after immortality?  
Or whence this secret dread, and inward horror  
Of falling into nought? Why shrinks the soul  
Back on herself, and startles at destruction?  
'Tis the divinity that stirs within us ;  
'Tis heaven itself that points out an hereafter,  
And intimates eternity to man."

But paradoxical as it may seem, there is a dread of immortality, co-existing with the longing for it, which constitutes equally as strong an argument. The great poet of human nature has expressed this in the oft quoted soliloquy of Hamlet :

"To die, to sleep ;  
To sleep ; perchance to dream ; Aye there's the rub ;  
For in that sleep of death what dreams may come  
When we have shuffled off this mortal coil,  
Must give us pause : \* \* \*  
\* \* \* the dread of something after death,  
The undiscovered country from whose bourne  
No traveler returns, puzzles the will,  
And makes us rather bear those ills we have,  
Than fly to others that we know not of."

And in the great Christian epic fallen man is represented as saying :

“ How gladly would I meet  
Mortality my sentence, and be earth  
Insensible ! How glad would lay me down  
As in my mother's lap ! There I should rest  
And sleep secure ; His dreadful voice no more  
Would thunder in my ears ; no fears of worse  
To me or to my offspring would torment me  
With cruel expectation. Yet one doubt  
Pursues me still, lest all I cannot die ;  
Lest that pure breath of life, the spirit of man  
Which God inspired, cannot together perish  
With this corporeal clod : then in the grave  
Or in some other dismal place, who knows  
But I shall die a living death ? ”

Thus “conscience doth make cowards of us all ” and while man longs for immortality as a sinner he dreads it. It is for this reason that some are anxious to prove that there is no hereafter, as others are to prove that the soul is immortal. They would surrender their hopes of immortality and accept annihilation for the sake of immunity from the just punishment of their sins. I say this dread of immortality is as strong, if not stronger proof, than the longing for it, because it springs from that faculty of the soul which is nearest to infallibility in its utterances, the conscience. Conscience demands a future life for the punishment of those sins which go unwhipt of justice in this life. It is one of the infallible dicta of conscience that all sin deserves punishment. Even in this life there is enough evidence of connection between sin and its punishment to prove that there is a moral government in the world and a just God in heaven. But it is equally evident that this moral government is not complete in this life. Nothing is more patent to observation than that some of the worst of crimes go unwhipt of justice. The fallen woman becomes an outcast from society, and drinks to its bitter dregs the cup of the punishment of her sins, but her seducer, the vile scoundrel who has taken advantage of her ignorance or her love for him, lives often in the enjoyment of wealth and the adu'a-



tion of society, and dies peacefully in his bed. The rich man who has amassed a vast fortune by robbing the poor under the sanction of human law, lives in luxury and dies in the enjoyment of his wealth, while his victims starve, or are driven to crime and shame. The murderer escapes the penalty of human law. Is there no hereafter for such as these?

Is there no tribunal to which the wronged may come and demand justice upon their oppressors? Is there no judgment day when all that is left unequal in this life may be made even? Was the exile of Napoleon at St. Helena a sufficient atonement for the lives which he sacrificed to his selfish ambition, for the wives whom he made widows, for the children whom he made orphans? Does not the blood of ten thousand martyrs cry out for vengeance upon their persecutors? Is there no hereafter where such foul wrongs may be redressed? Ah, yes, unless justice be a mockery, and conscience a delusion, there is a life beyond the grave, and well may the sinner dread it!

We find then in the book of nature at least a strong presumption of a future state of existence. It may be that there are still stronger proofs there which we have not yet been able to decipher. With judgment warped by sin we cannot read all that God has written there. But at best the argument from nature does not satisfy us. It fails in that it does not give the assurance which the soul craves. It creates a hope, but not a settled conviction. That was a pathetic confession of one of Cicero's pupils when Cicero said to him, "Study Plato's book that treats of the soul and you will find there all you can want." He replied, "I have indeed done that, and often; but somehow, though I am convinced by it while reading it, yet when I lay down the book and begin to reflect for myself upon the immortality of the soul, my conviction is shaken, and my doubts return." It is not a conviction that will stand the test of affliction and bereavement. It will not support a man in his dying hour. Nature does not speak with the voice of comfort and assurance because it does not speak with the voice of author-

ity. When in bitter grief we stand at the graves of our beloved, looking into the shadows of the future, wondering if we shall ever look again upon the dear faces in life, no promises of eternal life which rests only upon our reason or our wishes, can give rest from agonizing doubt. The priest of natural religion cannot say to his people, "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not even as others, which have no hope. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." When we ourselves are called upon to pass through the valley of the shadow of death, and the cold waves of its dark river are lapping at our feet, no voice from reason can cheer the soul, and enable it to shout, "Oh grave, where is thy victory; O death, where is thy sting?" Only the voice of God himself, speaking from the other side of that veil which hangs between us and the spirit world can give the assurance, It shall be well with thy soul.

The book of Nature fails again in that it cannot answer the question, "How shall man be just with God?" It is not merely the fact of a future life of which the soul craves assurance, but that it will be a life of happiness. The sinner's instinctive dread of immortality must be overcome before his instinctive longing for it can be satisfied. The question, "What must I do to be saved?" is prompted not merely by dread of annihilation and longing for immortality, but by the fear of a just and holy God. The longing for immortality cannot be satisfied except by the satisfaction of the longing for peace with God. The answer of nature here is not a merely negative answer. For upon the pages of Nature's book as well as upon those of Revelation, it is written, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Upon the tables of conscience it is written with the finger of God, "The wages of sin is death." This law of nature is inexorable, and without exception. For the violation of her laws, whether within the physical or spiritual sphere, Nature shows no mercy. In the body, in the soul, in the social order, sin works out its own woe in its inevitable, necessary, natural consequences. If there be an im-

mortal life, then, by the law of continuity, sin must continue to work out its consequences and its just desert throughout eternity. If reason could find in nature absolute proof of an eternal life beyond the grave, that life to the sinner could only be a prolongation of this, with all its sins and with all its miseries. Eternal life would be a living death.

I am aware that the natural religion of to-day has assumed a broader scope than in the old controversies, as the term "Nature" has acquired a wider meaning. Revelation is purely a natural process of development. Christianity, denuded of its miraculous element and supernatural sanctions, is the highest development of Natural Religion. The life and teachings of Jesus Christ constitute an extraordinary, but not a supernatural epoch in a process of purely Natural Revelation—if we may thus unite words usually contrasted. Nature thus broadly interpreted is the source, and the only source of the science of theology. There is no authoritative source. From Nature may be drawn an adequate sanction of morals, and sufficient rule of conduct; from Nature may be derived an answer to man's longings for immortality; from Nature alone may be deduced a Gospel of Redemption. Nature herself is man's redeemer. There never has been any Fall of Man, but there is a continual Ascent of Man. There is no need of reconciliation between God and man, because there has never been any estrangement. Man has been evolved from the brute, not only in the body, but in the mind and soul. Sin is only the mark of an imperfect stage in this evolution. That evolution is incomplete, therefore sin still exists, But in some far off day it will be complete, and sin will thus have been eliminated by a purely natural process. The theory of evolution is the Gospel of Redemption.

But this new Natural Religion, supported as it is by the wide spread and growing influence of the evolutionary philosophy, can, no more than the old, satisfy our longings for immortality and redemption from sin.

For its answer to the first is still inconclusive. The presumptive evidence may be stronger and more clearly stated

than in Plato's day, but it still lacks authority. It cannot plead the historical fact of the reappearance of Christ after death, as some of its advocates have illogically done; for the admission of Christ's resurrection logically involves not only the admission of the scheme of the supernaturalists, but also the peculiar mission and distinct authority of Jesus.

The immortality of the modern evolutionary school, the Gospel of the "survival of the fittest" is merely a race immortality.

Somewhere the story is told of a general, who in storming a fortress filled the trenches with the bodies of his foremost soldiers, that the rear ranks might pass over them to victory. So the elect generations who are to attain this immortality must pass over the bodies of countless millions of luckless ancestors. We are told that in some of the convents of Europe the pillars and arches of their vaults are formed of human skulls and bones. So this future race will build the temple of their immortality upon the bones of their forefathers. But the immortality for which the soul of man longs, is personal, conscious, individual existence.

Still less can the new Natural Religion satisfy us with its new Plan of Salvation from Sin. For its fundamental postulate is a denial of the fact of Sin in any real sense. There is, in this theory, no eternal and necessary distinction between Right and Wrong. Sin is a part of Nature as God created it. No just conception of ill-desert can be attached to sin if this be true. Sin is not man's fault, it is his misfortune,—nay, it is more, it is a wrong which God has done to man, and no future redemption of an elect generation could ever atone for the woes of the countless millions who have writhed under it. The sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, so far from atoning to God for man's sin, would only add to the sum of misery for which man would call his creator to account. It is a blasphemous theory of sin. If suffered to govern the conduct of men it would make virtue impossible. One might imagine that the old prophet was referring to the preachers of this gospel when he said, "Woe unto them that put light for darkness, and darkness for light; that call evil good, and good evil?"

But such a gospel can never meet with any general acceptance, because it violates the most profound intuitions of man's moral nature. It does not, cannot "commend itself to every man's Conscience in the sight of God." However seductive it may be to the sinful heart, conscience will reject it, and plunge man into deep despair of hearing any Good News of redemption from Nature's book. Natural religion knows no miracle, but if there be no miracle there is no salvation.

But we can make the words of Peter our own, "Thou hast the words of eternal life." What all the sages of ancient and modern times have failed to do, Jesus, the lowly Nazarene has done, he has "brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel." In the first place, the Gospel strengthens and clarifies every argument which may be drawn from nature as to the future existence of the soul. It affirms what consciousness had already taught us to believe, that the soul has a separate existence from the body. The body is but the temporary abode of the soul, and if it perish, never to be brought to life again, the soul would still live, in a personal conscious state of existence. It affirms the moral argument. It corroborates what reason taught us, that the moral government of God is not complete in this life; that there is a day of judgment when wrongs shall be righted, when those who have escaped the judgment of the wicked deeds of this life shall be sentenced; that there is a future state of existence, when those crimes which have gone unwhipt of justice here shall be expiated to the utmost. It reaffirms the argument from the purpose of man's existence. It shows that the end cannot be fulfilled here; that there is an eternal life in which all the faculties of the soul may attain their highest development and accomplish their purpose in the glory of God and the enjoyment of him. But the Gospel does more than this, it gives us a demonstration of a future state of existence which reason could not give. It speaks to us from the other side of the river of death. It brings us back a message from the grave. Jesus Christ is the only one of our mortal race who has

passed that river of death, and has returned to speak to our mortal ears and to be seen with our mortal eyes.

The resurrection of Christ is the great proof of the immortality of the soul. That resurrection is the great event of the world's history. And there is no event in the history of the world more clearly proved. Even unbelievers confess that the testimony which we have of the resurrection of Christ would be sufficient to prove beyond the possibility of doubt any event less extraordinary. All efforts to overthrow this testimony have only resulted in strengthening it. Romanes, writing while in a stage of transition from unbelief to faith says, "The outcome of the great textual battle is impartially considered a signal victory for Christianity." "There is so much to be said in objective evidence for Christianity that were the central doctrines thus testified to anything short of miraculous, no one would doubt. But we are not competent judges *a priori* of what a revelation should be." The honesty and sincerity of the witnesses have been established beyond cavil. The theory of imposture and fraud is no longer urged. The genuineness of the principal documents have been established by hostile criticism. Paul's testimony alone would stand in any court of law. It would be a greater problem how to account for the evidence now if false than to account for the fact. For the validity of the proof of existence after death it is not necessary to contend for any particular theory of the resurrection. It matters not whether Christ appeared after his crucifixion in the same body which was crucified, or in a sublimated body, or in the appearance of the body, or in the spirit. It is enough that he appeared after his death, and that to a number of witnesses. No clearer evidence of the immortality of the soul could be furnished unless Christ were to repeat the miracle of his resurrection to each generation and to each individual of the race. But even then, the same spirit of unbelief which rejects the evidence of the Gospel would reject the evidence of the senses.

But in a still higher sense Christ alone has the words of eternal life. He alone has answered that question, "How

shall man be just with God?" He alone teaches upon what condition that life beyond the grave may be a happy life free from the sins and woes of this life. "O death, where is thy sting? The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law." But Christ has satisfied the law. Christ has paid the penalty of sin. Through death he hath destroyed him that hath the power of death that he might deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. He has taken away from the sinner who believes in him the dread of immortality, and has satisfied the longing for it. He hath begotten us again to an immortal hope by his resurrection from the dead. The very death which he died has conquered death; the same resurrection which proves the fact of a life beyond the grave gives us a right to its blessedness. When we were dead in trespass and sins we were quickened together with Christ, we were raised up with him, we are made to sit together with him in heavenly places. Our life is now hid with Christ in God. Our citizenship is now in heaven. There we may lay up our treasures, knowing that moth and rust will not corrupt them. There we have an inheritance, incorruptible, undefiled and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us, while we are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation. There we have a mansion in the Father's house, prepared by Christ himself. There we shall meet again and know the loved ones who have gone before. There we shall be satisfied when we awake in his likeness.

Now mark the way in which this question is answered—by the suffering of the Son of God. Here is the lighthouse on the reef of mystery, which shines through the fog and darkness, backward through the ages past, onward through the ages yet to come. The tempests of centuries have beaten against it in vain. It stands upon the very reef where lies the danger of faith, upon which beat the breakers of doubt—on this reef of the mystery of sin. Sin and the suffering which ensue from it, are the great mystery; but here we see God himself suffering for sin. Here we see

that whatever the origin of sin, it was not God's work. Here we see that whatever be the future of the sinner, he does not meet his doom because God takes any pleasure in his death. Here we see that, terrible as are the consequences of sin, God has involved himself in them. "For God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him might not perish, but have eternal life."

The question now arises, May we not accept the words of eternal life, while we reject the hard sayings?

But these hard sayings are inseparably joined with the words of eternal life, so that the acceptance or the rejection of one logically involves the same treatment of the other. This may be shown in two ways: First, the hard sayings and the words of eternal life rest upon the same authority; if this authority be valid in one, it is valid in the other; if false in one, it is false in the other; faith in one will lead to faith in the other. Secondly, the hard sayings and words of eternal life are parts of one complete logical system, and the acceptance or the rejection of any part of it logically involves the acceptance or the rejection of the whole system.

First then, both rest upon the same authority. This was the reasoning of Peter. "We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the Living God." We have settled that point once for all. From that confession we will never recede. We are prepared to follow wherever that admission leads. If then, thou art the Christ, we must accept whatever thou teachest—thy hard sayings, as well as thy words of eternal life; things we do not like, as well as things that are pleasant to us; things we do not understand as well as those we do understand.

This reasoning is sound. We must be prepared to follow our admissions to their logical results. Now we have settled it that the words of eternal life, to satisfy the soul, must rest upon infallible authority. They must speak with the voice of authority when they tell us that there is a life beyond the grave. They must speak with the voice of authority when they tell us upon what conditions that life



may be a happy life, not a mere prolongation of this life, with its sins and its consequent miseries. God alone can forgive sins, God alone can publish conditions of pardon. The essential doctrines of redemption could not have been conceived by human reason, much less proved and proclaimed as a sure ground of hope. The Gospel of salvation must from its very nature be a Gospel of authority. If then, Christ speaks the words of eternal life at all, he speaks with divine authority. We have admitted that his resurrection is at once our surest ground of hope of immortality and of the pardon of sin. But that resurrection is also incontestable proof of his Divine mission and infallible authority. But if Christ speaks with authority in one thing, he must speak with authority in all things. If he is either God or God's inspired messenger, then he cannot err. If we believe him in one thing, we must believe him in all. If we believe his words of eternal life, we must believe his hard sayings; if we reject his hard sayings, we must forfeit his words of eternal life. If his authority be successfully impeached in his hard sayings, then his words of eternal life become worthless.

But the authority of Christ implies the authority of the Bible. The two things are not the same, but they are logically inseparable. Christ, not the Bible, is the object of saving faith, but faith in Christ will lead to faith in the Bible. It is possible that a man may have a saving faith in Christ, who has not a perfect intellectual faith in the Bible. But if he will follow his admission of Christ's claims to its logical consequence, it will compel him to acknowledge the inspiration and authority of the Bible. This is because Christ himself has borne such clear and unequivocal testimony to the divinity and authority of the Scriptures as to stake his own claim upon that of the Scriptures. The effort of critics to distinguish between the authority of Christ and the authority of the Scriptures, to impeach the one and yet conserve the other, has failed. Christ himself has made the issue. If then we accept Christ's words of eternal life we must acknowledge his divine mission and authority, but if

we acknowledge the authority of Christ, we must acknowledge the authority of his Word.

When once reason has accepted the credentials of a divine revelation, it must abandon its seat as the judge of its contents and bow with absolute submission to its authority. The law rests upon the same authority as the Gospel; there is the same authority for the doctrine of original sin as for the doctrine of regeneration; the same Gospel which promises eternal life to the penitent and believing threatens eternal death to the impenitent and unbelieving; the same authority upon which rests the free and universal proclamation of the Gospel, attests also God's sovereignty in the dispensation of his grace. Almost every doctrine of the Word of God has two faces, the one dark with the mystery of sin, the other dazzling with the mystery of grace; both alike transcend reason, both alike rest upon God's authority. Therefore we cannot reject one without logically rejecting the other.

Not only do both the hard sayings and the words of eternal life rest upon the same authority, but the attitude of our faith toward the one is affected by our attitude toward the other. An implicit belief in the words of eternal life will subdue murmurings against the hard sayings; distrust of the hard sayings will impair confidence in the words of eternal life. If we heed not the warnings of the Bible in the time of prosperity, we shall find its promises fail us in the time of adversity. This is the reason why so many Christians seem to get no comfort from the Bible in the hour of their affliction. They permit themselves to fall into the habit of questioning this or that doctrine of the Bible, and of trying to explain away its plain meaning. Thus insensibly to themselves they have impaired their own confidence in its authority. But the time of affliction or temptation, or the approach of death reveals the disease of his faith. A man may insensibly undermine his constitution by bad habits, and when disease attacks him he is unable to resist it. So many Christians come to the Bible in the time of need only to find that it has lost to them that which gives

it power for strength and consolation—the pledge of God's authority. But authority implies submission. If then we would have the comfort of Christ's words of life we must listen without murmur to his hard sayings.

In the second place, the hard sayings and the words of eternal life not only rest upon the same authority, but they are also parts of a complete logical system, and the acceptance or the rejection of any part of the system logically leads to the acceptance or the rejection of the whole system.

When we first begin the study of the Bible, we may see no connection between its facts and doctrines, except that they are contents of the same book, and rest upon the same authority. But when we compare them with one another, we find that there is another connection. We find that they are related to each other upon eternal and necessary principles, so that they form a complete system of truth. Our system of doctrine then becomes, in a certain sense, a self-supporting structure. True, its materials could never have been obtained in any other way than by revelation, and human reason could never have combined them into a system without the illumination of the same Spirit who inspired them. Yet when thus complete it will stand by its own stability and proportion. Its symmetry and unity of design become in turn a reflex evidence of the divine origin of the Book which reveals it. Now we find that these so-called hard doctrines are necessary parts of this system. If you begin to take away from this system any of its parts, you will mar its symmetry, and may cause the whole structure to fall a crumbling ruin. If you take away some of these hard doctrines, it would be like removing a cornerstone or the keystone of an arch. To show this in detail has been the work of centuries, and has filled libraries, but it is beyond the scope of this essay.

But this argument applies only to those doctrines which are taught by the Word of God. It does not apply to those doctrines which an orthodox rationalism has put into the Word of God. For there is an orthodox as well as a het-

erodox rationalism. It must be remembered that after all our creeds and treatises on systematic theology are the work of uninspired men. We have seen the liability to error when reasoning on transcendental problems. When we leave the express teachings of God's Word, our "good and necessary inferences" are in danger of being far-fetched. In order to a good and necessary inference both premises must be taken from the Word itself. When one of the premises is the product of our own wisdom, all the sources of error are open. And when we take these inferences and make them premises in their turn we are getting dangerously far away from the original source of authority. We must be as careful not to burden faith with the hard sayings of men as we must be not to reject the hard sayings of Christ.

Again, I have said that rejection of parts of the system *logically* lead to the rejection of the system. But we must guard against a very common mistake. We must not impute to others beliefs which we regard as logical consequence of their avowed opinions. This is a mistake too common in all controversy, but especially religious controversy. We have the right, if we can, to prove that these are the logical consequences of our opponents' views, but not to charge them with holding and teaching what they expressly repudiate. Men do not always follow their opinions to their logical conclusions. It is essential to charity and liberality to remember that men may sincerely inconsistent. All truth indeed is one, and absolutely speaking, any error will ultimately lead to a denial of all truth. An error in mathematics, if followed out rigidly to its conclusions, would lead to a denial of the existence of God. But there is a happy inconsistency by which men may be wrong in minor matters, but right in the essentials. Because a man may deny something which I believe to be a plain teaching of God's Word, I dare not charge him with unbelief in the Bible. Even though he may hold what I regard as a loose and dangerous view of inspiration, I dare not call him an unbeliever in the essentials of the Gospel. Though a man denies the

doctrines of election I do not charge him with rejecting the atonement, though I may believe that one logically involves the other.

Then too we must not always judge men's hearts by their heads. These are more often inconsistent with each other than the head with itself. A better man than oneself may hold less correct opinions. Even so severely logical a thinker as John Owen said, "I am very slow to judge of men's acceptance with God by the comprehension of their understandings."

While all truth is strictly speaking essential, and all error vital in its consequences; yet the limitations of human understanding compel us to distinguish between essential and non-essential doctrines. Men may sometimes question important truths without wholly departing from the faith.

But who knows where the line may be crossed? Who knows how near the knife may come to the heart without destroying the life? Who knows but the arrow of heresy may be tipped with the poison of unbelief, which will corrupt the life blood of faith? Look at your watch. All of its parts are not of the same importance, but all are essential to its completeness. You may take away the second hand without injuring it for ordinary purposes. You may even take away the minute hand, and you can still tell the time within twelve minutes. Now open it and look at the works. You may remove a screw here or there without breaking it; but in your ignorance of mechanism you may touch some seemingly unimportant part, and you have ruined your watch. So with the doctrines of the Bible. In your concessions to rationalism you may remove this or that without seeming to destroy the Gospel. But before you are aware of it, in seeking to remove the offence of the cross you may destroy its power to save. Attempt to make the Gospel the wisdom of men, and you may make it foolishness with God,

Furthermore, there is a historical development of error. Though an individual may recoil, by a happy inconsistency, from the logical consequences of his errors, his school will

certainly develop his views after him. All pure thought is according to fixed laws. Though their operation in the case of one man may be arrested by conditions of prejudice, feeling or education, the minds of many men will show their ultimate effect.

Any important doctrine, be it true or false, will sooner or later group about itself other related doctrines and will crystalize them into a system. All the great schools which have controlled the thinking of the world, have been to a greater or less extent, logical systems. All great leaders of thought have been men of logical minds. Eccentric thinkers and inconsistent systems can have no lasting influence. Error or truth, to gain a permanent influence, must shape itself into some kind of a logical system. There is a passage in Ephesians which, when properly translated, forcibly brings out this fact: "That ye be no more children, tossed like waves, and driven about by every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, by craftiness, tending to a deliberate system of error." The history of the church is full of examples of this truth. Seemingly slight mistakes in the interpretation of Scripture have developed into vital heresies. Seemingly trivial innovations in the worship of the church have destroyed its purity. Seemingly unimportant encroachments upon the Church's liberties have led to the enthronement of Anti-Christ. Pious men have sowed the seeds of doctrines from which they would have recoiled in indignation. Therefore, while according charity to others, as well as asking it for ourselves, let us beware of the first approaches of error.

Beside this historical development of error there is also the development of principle into practice. Here again we must not impute to men all the consequences of their beliefs. A man may hold views which are subversive of all distinction between right and wrong, and yet be, so far as his own conduct is concerned, a moral man. But every man must give account for the influence which he exerts. It is as certain that error in principle will produce error in morals as that seed will bring forth fruit after its kind. In the long

run heresy begets infidelity, infidelity begets atheism, atheism begets sin and crime.

Now to resume, these hard doctrines must be expected in the Word of God. They arise from the limitations of the human mind, from its corruption by sin, from the stupendous nature of the subjects involved. They are not peculiar to the Bible, and there is no relief from them in human systems, while in the Bible alone are the words of eternal life. These sayings of Christ cannot be separated from his words of eternal life; they rest upon the same authority, and are integral parts of a system of truth which logically must be accepted or rejected as a whole. It is the tendency of error to perpetuate and systematize itself. System can be met and overthrown only by system; the final conflict must be between armies that are organized and disciplined. The careful student of the history of thought will see that, just as, with advancing civilization, petty tribes and kingdoms have tended to unite and form great nations, and wars have increased in extent and magnitude, so there has been an ever-growing tendency of the many schools and sects to group themselves into large systems, while controversies have increased in magnitude and importance of the principles involved. The time is coming, and perhaps may not be very far off, when there will be but two great logical systems opposed to each other to fight the battle involving every fundamental principle, which will determine forever the issue. These two systems will be materialism and orthodoxy. I say these two systems are logical. Materialism is logical when you have admitted a single premise, viz., that the five senses are the source of all knowledge. Admit this monstrous assumption, which involves a flat contradiction of the first principles of all knowledge, and which is self-destructive, and the materialist builds upon it an edifice of deceit, whose faultless proportions and logical symmetry must command even our admiration. The worst enemy of Calvinism never denied that it is logical. Froude is quoted as saying, "when the foundations of religious belief are upturned, in the agitations

of the ages, the Calvinistic doctrine is the only thing that will stand." Spurgeon said something like this: "As when two giant icebergs meet, all smaller floes are crushed to pieces, so between the shock of Atheism and Calvinism all intermediate systems of thought will be destroyed." They are like two great armies between whose lines there can be no neutrality. Sooner or later all must betake themselves for refuge to one or the other, and abide the issue of the battle. Calvinism may be compared to the citadel within the walls. When all other systems have surrendered to the batteries of Atheism, to these impregnable walls the defenders of the faith may betake themselves and defy the assaults of unbelief.

"The Inevitable Surrender of Orthodoxy" is the boastful prophecy of the liberalists. When orthodoxy surrenders, the cause of Christianity is lost; and when Christianity surrenders, the cause of religion is lost; and when religion is conquered, the cause of righteousness and truth is lost, and evil is forever triumphant. But built as it is upon the foundation which God hath laid, under the direction of his Spirit of truth, it has withstood the assaults of error through ages past, and will withstand through all the conflicts of the future. For the truth of God we fear not, but we do fear all who venture outside its safe walls in the perilous times of unbelief, lest they they may be taken captive by the prince of error.

Therefore, when perplexed and troubled by the mysteries of God's providence and the hard sayings of his Word, let us not go away saying, "This is a hard saying, who can hear it?" Neither let us make a timid and impossible compromise with error, but, holding fast the truth in its integrity, let us answer as Peter: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." Let us answer as Paul:

"O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been his counselor? Or



who hath given to him and it shall be recompensed to him again? For of him and through him and to him are all things: to whom be glory forever. Amen."

JAMES R. HOWERTON.

NOTE—This article consists of three sermons. The writer did not see the proof, except of the last few pages. Attention is called to one important omission, p. 110, l. 19: Before the words, "No Christian attempts to explain it," prefix the sentence, "Another source of difficulty is the Bible doctrine of the nature and origin of sin."

## NOTES.

### THE ENDOWMENT OF COLLEGES FOR WOMEN.

The age in which we live demands a very high standard of education. The time was when only the favored few enjoyed the privilege of a liberal education and when the advantages offered this class were very limited. Now the door of the temple of knowledge has been thrown open to thousands and the facilities for acquiring knowledge have been wonderfully increased. The number of educated people has become much larger and the departments in which men may be trained have been greatly multiplied. Indeed so many and so extensive are the courses of study provided by the universities that students cannot possibly pursue them all, must select special subjects and apply themselves with the utmost diligence in order to master them. Ours is an age of specialties, an age in which, to become a teacher in any department, a person must be able to show that attention sufficient has been given to that subject, under competent instructors, to render the student thoroughly familiar with it. In certain sections of our country the very best of advantages have been provided, especially for men ; but for the women of the South, there has never yet been furnished any thing like an adequate opportunity to pursue the highest branches of learning nor to enjoy the best facilities for perfecting themselves in special lines of study. There are many excellent institutions, where good advantages can be had, but most of these do not claim to have the equipment of the wealthier institutions for boys. Some of our State universities have opened their doors to young ladies, but there are but few real colleges for women in our Southland. Our daughters must go North or to State and co-educational institutions in order to study special and higher branches of learning. This should not continue to be true. We should build and equip colleges and seminaries in which our daughters may enjoy advantages equal to those provided for our sons.

1. To furnish the best advantages these institutions must be endowed. To erect suitable buildings, to supply proper apparatus, and to employ competent teachers will require large sums of money. The statement is made that one of our best schools for girls, that its buildings and grounds cost over a hundred thousand dollars. Its teaching force for a single year required an outlay of nearly fifteen thousand dollars. One of the few endowed colleges for women in the South owns a property that cost two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. The sanitary arrangement of this College cost over six thousand dollars, its heating system eight thousand dollars, its lights, water, gymnasium, infirmary and library thousands more. Its faculty, of about thirty university trained teachers must require a sum far in excess of all tuition fees. It is evident, therefore, that to furnish the best educational advantages to our young ladies, our schools must be provided with more money than can be collected from the students. This is the more necessary since the State is offering better and better advantages and at a nominal cost. If the Church is to keep under her own care and direction the training of her daughters she must spend large amounts of money in the establishment of colleges in which she can offer the very best training in the special branches which may be desired, she must endow such institutions.

2. This must be done to furnish such advantages to that class which is most influential in the education of the young.

There can be no question but that the mother exerts a greater influence in the training of the child than the father. "The hand that rocks the cradle rules the world" is an adage old but true. It was well said of France, in the days of her decline, that what that country needed most was mothers. The mother has the advantage of beginning the education of the child and of continuing it through the formative period of life. She is the first being whom the child learns to love and the person to whom it looks for guidance during the season of first, deepest and most lasting impressions. How important that she, who is to be the

child's teacher in early life, be herself well trained and possessed of high ideals. It has been said, "No great man ever had a fool for his mother." Many men who have attained distinction have gratefully acknowledged their indebtedness to their mothers but they are often stimulated by them to use and improve the gifts with which God has endowed them. Mothers not teach their children but awaken in their hearts a desire for more knowledge. The Spartan boy learned courage at his mother's knee and was led to long to know how best to fight for his country's battles. The poet inherited his love of the beautiful from his mother and by her had awakened in his soul a desire to express in verse the elevated thoughts of his soul; and the man of literary taste acquired his fondness for books in the days of his boyhood, while his mother read to him from her favorite authors. How essential that they who are to guide and direct the young be thoroughly equipped before they occupy such positions of influence and responsibility. How imperative the duty of establishing schools where our daughters may enjoy the best preparation for the duties to which they may be called. It is evident that our schools for girls should offer the best possible advantages to those who are to be most influential in giving shape and direction to the education of the young.

3. Endowment is necessary to give these advantages to the largest number of this most influential class.

There might be a sufficient number of well equipped institutions to train all who could pay the fees, and yet hundreds of bright girls could not avail themselves of these advantages for the lack of means. Hence the necessity of so endowing such colleges as to put the cost of liberal education within the reach of those in moderate circumstances. This has been done, in some degree, by the State but only to a very limited extent by the Church. Something has been done in this direction for boys but almost nothing for girls. In a college for men the entire tuition for all branches is frequently less than that charged for a single study in a school for girls; while the number of extras runs

the cost of educating a girl up to two or three times that of educating a boy.

This inequality ought not to exist. We should give the girls a fair and equal chance. We should make the course for them just as thorough and just as cheap as that offered the boys.

Our schools should be endowed that their privileges may be extended to a much larger number of those who, when trained, will be capable of exerting so great an influence for good in the home and in the school.

4. We should endow such institutions as one of the most effective means of counteracting the materialistic tendencies of our age.

To the thoughtful observer there are not wanting many evidencies that men are seeking and cultivating the material rather than the spiritual, the temporal rather than the eternal. The greed for gain, the desire for power, the demands of fashion, and the claims of the world have all made such an assault upon men that few have been able to resist its force. Many have come to worship and serve Mammon, to court the favor of the world and to center their minds and hearts upon "things that are seen" to such an extent as to lead them to neglect the higher interests of the mind and heart. Many fathers and mothers have little or no interest in those studies which do not directly fit their children to earn bread, make money and "get on well in the world." Many more have so limited their vision as to lose sight of the world to come and live as though this world were to be their only possession and the present time the extent of their existence. Hence the sad neglect of the study of that which is best suited to develop and improve the heart and soul.

The establishment of Christian institutions of learning would do much to correct this evil; (a) by encouraging and requiring the cultivation of the higher, spiritual part of our nature, and by sending forth those who have been trained under such influences. The more culture, intelligence and true refinement are given to women, the more they will be

prized, and the more will they esteem those who possess these gifts and attainments. Thus there will arise an aristocracy of culture and learning rather than one of wealth. The question will not be "how much money?", but "what character, what culture, what attainments?" It will then be seen that "knowledge is power", and that culture and character weigh more than gold and silver. (b) Woman excels man in her power to love. In her, heart predominates. Hence there is less danger of her overlooking, as man is prone to do, that which refines the taste and elevates the affections of the heart to that which is noble and good. She is less exposed to intellectual doubt and to materialistic infidelity. Properly educated she will prove a help and safe-guard to man. She will teach the young to love and adore the Author of all good and to seek and pursue the highest forms of truth and beauty. By precept and example she will do much to lift the thoughts and desires of men above the world and direct them to that which is "eternal in the heavens." (c) Then too the endowment of our schools and colleges will the more certainly insure the possession of Christian character as an essential element in education. The education which has not for its object the development of Christian character is partial and incomplete, and in great danger of leading to infidelity. The tendency of the natural heart is to sin and error and hence the necessity for positive and wisely directed efforts to establish in the heart principles of sound morality and true religion. State institutions cannot exert that effective influence in this direction that is properly expected from our Church schools. If the moral and spiritual training of the young be neglected in the home and in the school the result must prove fatal. If, however, we furnish, by means of our schools, well trained, cultured, Christian mothers for the home, and intelligent, Christian teachers for the school, we will not only provide a means of counteracting the evil tendencies of our age, but will do much for the highest refinement, the truest culture, and best education.

Let us endow our schools and colleges for women. Let

there be at least one such college in each State, that the blessings of the highest Christian education may be brought near the homes of all of our daughters. Let loyal and liberal fathers and sons in our church found and endow such institutions and thus confer upon others the highest benefit, and erect for themselves monuments more beautiful than marble and more enduring than brass.

W. C. CLARK.

---

### A BIT OF SCOTCH PHILOSOPHY.

The conflict, or rather the supposed conflict, between faith and reason, has, for a long time, provoked earnest discussion among thinking men. Some contend, with an air of infallible knowingness, that they have reasoned faith out of the universe; only that, they say, which can be verified by scientific methods, only that which conforms to known law, can be accepted as true and worthy of a place among the facts of human knowledge. In the view of these dogmatists, all else is but the dream of superstition, the shadowy result of tradition, which in the light of modern research, is no longer tenable. The time has come, they believe, to drop faith from our working vocabulary; as the Greek and Roman lost faith in their gods, so we, having outgrown our ancestral ideas, ought to abandon faith as an exploded superstition, and as being altogether contrary to reason.

On the other hand there are those who without laying any claim whatsoever to omniscience, yet as confidently maintain, that faith not only is not the mere child of superstition, but holds a basal place and serves a primal function in our mental constitution: whilst its foundations, being divine, instead of having been demolished, are just as sure and impregnable as ever they were. It is no more unreasonable, they contend, to believe in the supernatural than to believe in the natural, to believe in the reign of moral law than to believe in the operation of physical law, to believe in God's word than to believe in his works.

From this statement of the case it will be seen that the

difference between rationalists and believers (we use the term in its widest sense) is radical. This does not mean, however, that those who give faith a place among our intellectual powers, deny the existence of reason, as those who deify reason deny the existence of faith, or that faith and reason are supposed to come into conflict in any sense whatsoever. They believe, on the contrary, that a careful analysis of human consciousness will show, in place of any conflict existing between the two, that faith if not a part, certainly conditions reason.

It has commonly been thought by Christian apologists that the interests of faith were such as to call for its complete separation from reason, as if the only way to reconcile them were to keep them apart. Now while it may save us from giving any countenance to Rationalism to affirm that faith has solely to do with divine knowledge and that secular knowledge, so called, belongs solely to the province of reason, it does not keep us also from giving countenance to Ritschlianism, a school which practically rules reason out of court in matters of faith and which in order to be consistent with itself, has no explanation to give of Christ as a divine person (more than that he has for us the value of God); has no place for his vicarious death, and altogether ignores the fact of his resurrection. If this is not a case of jumping out of the frying pan into the fire, it looks very much like jumping out of the fire into the frying pan. The truth is, any attempt to divorce these two ancillary powers, however commendable in its intentions, must prove a failure; for though it secures its desired end, it leaves us with Rationalism intact and as ready for the "fray" as ever, besides also having wedded its advocates, however unwillingly, to a new if not to a more dangerous form of error.

The simplest way of showing the true relation in which faith stands to reason lies in our seeing clearly the essential oneness of the mind in its various activities. The mind does not consist of so many compartments—reason being supposed to occupy one, faith another, love another and so



on—but is one inseparable whole, one individual unity. The importance of seeing the mind to be all of a piece, is no less than determinative in its effects. For it follows that if the mind is one in its several activities, the faculties by which we acquire secular knowledge cannot be different from those by which we acquire spiritual knowledge, and hence faith must form the ultimate basis, not only of religious knowledge but of all knowledge.

The proof of this important deduction is ready to hand. Until we believe something we are at a standstill. We have no foundation upon which to build the temple of truth, no point of departure from which to conduct our inquiry after truth. We have to believe something before we can know anything. It matters not what we call those primary truths from which we start our investigations—first principles, axioms, or what not—when we stand face to face with them, reason we find, can afford no demonstration of them; all we have to do, and all we can do is simply to accept them by means of faith. In their last analysis, we repeat, all our science and all our reasonings, so often colored with conceit and arrogance, rest upon these fundamental self-evident truths, which we have to believe and beyond which we cannot go. Therefore we conclude, that if faith thus lies at the foundation of all knowledge, and constitutes the basis of reason, there is and can be, no conflict between faith and reason.

We know not in what new form, nor under what new guise rationalism may appear in the future, but this we do know, that whatever name it may bear, it will prove to be as inconsistent and unphilosophic as it has proved to be in the past. There is nothing, however, to be feared from truth, for the revelation given us in nature and in the world, proceeding as they do from the same mind, must be in harmony.

## EDITORIAL.

### THE CALVINISTIC CENTURY.

The first issue of the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY in the new century indicates the strong reaction toward the old theology, which is one of the signs of the times. Dr. Stagg's article on "Three Maligned Theologians" is a demonstration in our judgment of the fact that Dr. Twisse, the prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly, affirmed positively the salvation of all infants dying in infancy. Dr. Stagg is entitled to the merit of discovering for our generation this fact with regard to the man who was considered the most extreme Calvinist of the famous Assembly. About ten years ago, when the Revision Controversy was on in the Northern Church, Dr. Briggs, of Union Seminary and those who had access to his superb library of the Westminster literature, published abroad the supposed opinion of the Westminster divines on the subject of infant salvation. These quotations have been current ever since and it is more than a historical question what these opinions really were. So far as we know there has been no authoritative correction of these quotations. It is doubtless true that some of the less noted Calvinistic divines were led into extreme expressions with regard to the fate of infants dying in infancy. It is a great relief, therefore, to know that the one most frequently quoted as a certain believer in the damnation of some infants is so abundantly acquitted.

The proof as to Calvin's belief will be even more valuable, though we must not forget to distinguish between Calvin's opinion and the system called Calvinism. There are many expressions in Calvin's writings which at first blush indicate a belief that some infants were lost. It is almost impossible to suppose that Calvin involved himself in a flat contradiction on this subject. While we do not think that Dr. Stagg has made his proof of Calvin's position as clear as he did in the case of Dr. Twisse, he has raised such a strong presumption as to his innocence of the doctrine so frequently

ascribed to him that there will be a strong feeling among Calvinists that Calvin should be given the benefit of the doubt. For example, the single citation, "Since Christ does not summon infants as accursed to the tribunal of God, but only denounces judgment on the contumacious who reject the teachings of the Gospel which they have heard," is harder to explain on the theory of the belief so universally ascribed to Calvin than other passages are, on the other theory. We should suspend judgment and wait for more light.

The position of Jonathan Edwards on the same subject in the same article is made clear so far as the quotations given from his writings by Dr. J. V. Stephens, a Professor of Cumberland Presbyterian theology. In this connection we desire to say that Calvinism, generally, owes a lasting debt to Dr. F. R. Beattie, of Louisville, who inaugurated the movement looking to the celebration of the 250th anniversary of the Westminster Assembly, observed first by the Southern and then by the Northern Presbyterian Church. We are convinced that the study of Westminster theology has brought about a reaction in the Northern Church in spite of the apparent desire to revise the Confession.

Dr. Howerton's article on "The Hard Doctrines" is supplemented by Rev. R. A. Lapsley's presentation of the subject of Eternal Punishment. They help to show that the old theology is to be the theology of the Twentieth Century.

We are living in a transition period. The evangelization of America is by no means complete. The more spiritual a church is, and the more its creed concerns itself with essentials, the more profound is the conviction that denominational differences ought to be suppressed in the face of heathenism, both at home and abroad. But with churches established in every corner of this continent, say in the next fifty years, what then? With education widely diffused and a high average of intelligence attained, with the prejudices of the past losing hold of minds that are being strengthened by the truth, can any one suppose that the churches, just as they are to-day, will still compete on

equal terms? Nay, verily. To him that hath shall more be given and from him that hath not shall be taken away, even that which he hath; an exposition of the great law of the survival of the fittest that is nineteen centuries older than Darwin's.

The stench of Catholic administration in Cuba and the Philippines has been brought very near to American nostrils, and the hollow religion that has dominated Spain and the Spanish possessions has been thrust upon the American conscience. More than Spanish ships went down in Manila and Santiago Bays. To-day the message comes that a Romish Bishop is boasting of having brought on the crisis in China. Through his representation of the murder of two Catholic missionaries, made to the Emperor of Germany in person, the warships were ordered to China, Kiaochau was seized and \$169,000 collected as indemnity. This was the beginning of the trouble whose end no man may yet see. A Catholic dignitary is planning the political organization of all American Catholics to secure such ends as the appropriation of government money to Catholic schools. These are but straws flying before the wind. Abraham Lincoln said that this republic could not exist half-slave and half-free. This nation cannot exist half-Protestant and half-Catholic. And we have never been pessimistic enough to suppose that the surviving half, after the battle, was going to be Catholic. It looks to us inevitable, that the revolt against all that Catholicism stands for will be more and more widespread with the general education of the people and that Catholicism will be more and more confined to the ranks of ignorance and low morality. That will be the beginning of the end of Catholicism in America, if popular indignation at its political machinations does not hasten the crisis.

Supposing that Protestantism is forced to unite in the conflict, or supposing that, with a waning Catholicism, the different branches of Protestantism contend for the best right to existence, what changes will the century bring?

The checking of the tide of immigration will lead to the

extinction of the national churches as such. The Dutch Reformed Church has already dropped its national name. Others will follow suit. German ancestry is the chief reason for the existence of the Lutheran Church in America. Episcopacy is more or less closely allied with England, and often calls itself Anglicanism. Unless they develop something distinctive from Protestantism or Catholicism, as the case may be, these will be absorbed by the nearest faith to their own, or may be reckoned out of the running. The same cause, the decrease of immigration, will cripple Italian and Irish Catholicism.

Next we shall see a change in those churches whose reasons for existence are trivial. It is too late to build up a church on psalm-singing as a distinctive doctrine. Nor has the size of the church anything to do with the question when once the area of intelligence and spirituality is broad enough. The idea that the mode of performing an external religious rite should separate men into church-members and non-church-members, should give some the right to the Lord's Table and deny that right to others, will be unthinkable to our good Baptist brethren of the end of the twentieth century. Congregationalism already sees how little reason it has for separate existence and is longing for something distinctive, even though it be Unitarianism. With its espousal of liberalism it is rapidly sawing off the limb on which it sits. Its government is organized disintegration and its liberal doctrines are making men indifferent instead of attracting them.

Remain in Protestantism Calvinism and Arminianism as to doctrine, and the Republic and the Empire as to Church government.

Calvinism is truth, Arminianism, a half truth. Calvinism affirms, Arminianism denies. The positive has a natural advantage over the negative faith. As a matter of fact the Methodist church is the only conspicuous example of aggressive Arminianism in history, and we all understand that it was the truth of its evangelism that caused its triumphs rather than its denial of the Divine Sovereignty.

So far as teaching the world the necessity of evangelistic efforts, Methodism has fulfilled its mission.

In the century's alignment as to doctrine, the Methodist church, and its mother, which it has so much outgrown, and half the Congregational churches, will be found on the side of Arminianism. Most of these forces are associated with one man power in ecclesiastical government, and here is another disadvantage in this free republic. The recent history of both Methodism and Episcopacy in America shows the tendency of revolt against a monarchical government. The old Roman empire by force of its example changed the early Christian Republic into a form of government like unto itself. The American republic is irresistibly changing both the Methodist monarchy and the Baptist democracy into the republican, representative form of government. Year by year the power of the bishop decreases and the power of the convention over churches, theoretically independent, increases. Both are approaching from opposite directions the middle ground of Presbyterian government. In fact, an open communion Baptist, with his Calvinism, his adherence to the Scriptures as the infallible rule of faith and practice, his presbyterial ordination and his evolving representative government is a pretty good Presbyterian, whatever he calls himself.

The Presbyterian and Baptist hosts will be found standing shoulder to shoulder in advocacy of Calvinistic doctrine, simplicity of worship, and the supremacy of the Word of God. Setting toward Calvinism is the whole current of modern philosophy and science. When the harmony is discovered the skepticism of modern thought will disappear. We may rest assured that it will never accept anything less logical and symmetrical than Calvinism. The age of faith will demand the system that exalts God.

So that the triumph of Calvinism in the century that has dawned upon us is as certain as anything in the future can be. It is the leading influence against Modernism. The blue banner waves over the front rank and Calvinism goes westward with the course of empire. Its work has been

but half accomplished in giving truth and freedom to the world. Now it can set about the task of teaching duty, with the prejudices that its former battle for the truth of freedom and the freedom of truth made, disappearing like the mists at the sunrising.

There is going to be, almost certainly, a consolidation of true Protestantism in the years to come but it is not going to be by way of surrender of vital truth for the sake of a false peace. It will come by the manful stand of every man for what he believes to be truth, and the final sifting out of falsehood through the innate force of truth upon the general mind.

Calvinism is to be the real force in the establishment of Christ's kingdom in the near future, in the century upon which we have entered. The world is already weary of the irresponsible appeals that have been made to it from a thousand sources. Fads and isms have had their little day. Regularity is going to be as much desired as it is desirable.

We hope to see the Calvinistic host leading the Lord's army at home as it does abroad, inaugurating the revival of the twentieth century, effecting the Reformation of Duty as it did the Reformation of Belief; the reformation that shall lead men, through simplicity of life, through separation from the world, through self-denial and heroism and martyrdom if need be, through devoted service of Christ, to the evangelization of the nations and the world-wide triumphs of Christ's Kingdom.

---

## RECORD AND REVIEW.

### PRESBYTERIAN (SOUTHERN.)

The death of Dr. J. N. Craig, Secretary of Assembly's Home Missions, while addressing the Synod of Virginia, was the answer to his prayer that he might be permitted to die in harness. He was just closing his address when he said, "I must stop," put his hand to his heart and sank unconsciously into the arms of the minister who was in the pulpit with him. He belonged to the older generation of

ministers, now a pathetically thinning band, who had seen service in the Confederate army. He was born in the Valley of Virginia, served a group of churches in South Carolina, was pastor for some years at Holly Springs, Miss., and had been Secretary of Home Missions since 1883. The Assembly's Committee has acted most wisely in appointing one of their number as Secretary *pro tem.* until the meeting of the Assembly, not attempting to forestall the election of a Secretary by the Assembly itself.

The Home Mission work of the Southern Church needs unification. The churches contribute to three Home Mission causes, Presbyterial, Synodical and Assembly's Missions. There is rivalry between the claims of each cause, though perhaps this is not altogether harmful. However it is a comparatively small amount that goes past the guard set by the Presbyterial and Synodical Committees and gets into the Assembly's fund. Moreover, the claims of Florida, Arkansas and Texas, the three Synods now receiving aid from the common fund, fall upon comparatively deaf ears when a Synod has equally destitute fields of its own to look after. For a work embracing the whole church a general, representative committee from the Synods is needed, instead of a local committee, while an appeal to the whole church for the needs of the whole church would be much more effective than the appeal to one Synod to aid another. Perhaps the Presbyteries should be left to do their own local work. But a man of grasp and energy in the Secretaryship would probably bring about the merging of the different Synodical Committees into one, collecting from all the Synods and disbursing in all, wherever the need appeared greatest to the general representative committee. May the Assembly be guided to the selection of the right man for this most responsible and important position.

#### PRESBYTERIAN (NORTHERN)

The Northern Church has been considering in its Presbyteries the confessional changes which were proposed in a series of questions by the last Assembly. The committee appointed to ascertain the wishes of the Presbyteries, con-



sisting of S. J. Nichols, J. B. Parsons, D. R. Noyes, G. B. Stewart, E. W. C. Humphrey, W. McKibben, W. H. Roberts, R. A. Frazer, W. R. Crabbe, D. W. Fisher, Henry Van Dyke, S. S. Sprechev, ex-President Benjamin Harrison, C. A. Dickey, Herrick Johnson, S. W. Dana and Justice Harlan, met in Washington December 8, and Dr. Roberts, the Secretary of the Committee, was authorized to make the following statement for publication:

I. That the returns plainly indicate that the Church desires some changes in its credal statements.

II. These returns indicate plainly that no change is desired which would in any way impair the integrity of the system of doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith.

III. These returns also indicate that a large plurality desires that changes should be made by some new statement of present doctrines rather than by revision.

IV. The returns also indicate a desire on the part of many Presbyteries for some revision of the present Confession.

Therefore, it was unanimously agreed by the committee to recommend to the General Assembly that some revision or change be made in our Confessional statements. Substantial, but not final, agreement was reached as to the method of preparing changes embodying both revision and supplemental statement, but the determining of the whole matter was deferred to a subsequent meeting.

In the meantime a new movement has been started in a Northwestern Presbytery to refer the question of revision or of any credal change to a representative body from all the Calvinistic Churches, such as the Pan-Presbyterian Assembly. It is called to the attention of the Northern Church that it is not the only church that has the Westminster Confession as a symbol. This has heretofore been a bond of union between these bodies and at least a promise of closer union. It will be inevitable that the different churches when they come in competition will magnify the differences in their credal statements, in case the revision movement should triumph, however small those changes may be. This will tend to discord rather than to union. It will be doubly hard to bring together the forces of our common Presbyterianism where separated by different creeds. But it should be easy to make a creed that would be a bond of union of

Pan-Presbyterianism, formed out of the old creeds by representatives of all the churches. The Westminster Confession was a representative creed. Anything in the way of serious change should be considered by more than one church. We should not be surprised to see this movement gain headway and postpone the question of revision for a while.

#### SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIANISM.

On the last day of October the Free Church and the United Church met as distinct bodies for the last time, marched to the appointed place of meeting in one body and became the United Free Church of Scotland. The attending ceremonies were thrilling in their interest. The United Presbyterian Church withdrew from the Church of Scotland in 1733. The Free Church, in 1843, and an heroic act it was, for its ministers gave up their manses and their livings for the sake of the principle of a Free Church, untrammelled by ties with the State.

Now the United Free Church has half a million members, nearly as many as the Presbyterian "Church of Scotland" (600,000). There are two other Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, "The Synod of the United Original Seceders" with 4,000 members and "The Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland" of 1,000 members. The world has forgotten just what these two noble bands stand for, but the smaller they grow the more firmly they will stand.

#### UNITARIAN AND UNIVERSALIST.

The movement to combine these two churches in one still continues, though the Unitarian Church seems much the more anxious of the two.

Dr. Edward Everett Hale thus sums up the reason for the union: "It does seem too absurd to build two churches side by side, in some village, with two congregations supporting two ministers, two choirs, and two missionary societies, when the object of each is exactly the same as the object of the other."

But this Jeremiad, which is really a confession that the bond of union is the weakness of both, is met with a stern

repulse by Dr. Edward C. Sweetser. The Universalist Church has always stood for the divine Sonship of Jesus Christ as revealed in the New Testament. The Unitarian Church, on the contrary, has gone so far from the teachings of Channing, even, that its National Conference in 1894 amended its constitution so as to avoid all recognition of the Christ-hood of Jesus, striking out all such expressions as the "gospel of Jesus Christ," "the followers of Christ," the "cause of Christian faith." The Universalist Church, while its theory of the inspiration of the Scriptures undoubtedly tends to infidelity, and its creed is suicidal, is far from Unitarianism, according to Dr. Sweetser. He says :

"It is the difference between those who believe in the Christ of the New Testament and those who do not ; between those who believe in him as an historical personage, identical with the Babe of Bethlehem and with Jesus of Nazareth, and those who regard that belief as a superstitious vagary unworthy of acceptance by intelligent men. How can two such bodies ' walk together ' ?"

#### EPISCOPAL.

American Episcopacy has been exercised lately by two new departures. The Committee of Twelve appointed by the Convention of two years ago has unanimously adopted the following proposed Canon on divorce for the consideration of the next Convention :

"Section 4.—No minister shall solemnize marriage between any two persons unless, nor until, by inquiry he shall have satisfied himself that neither person has been, or is, the husband or the wife of any person living, unless the former marriage was annulled by decree of some court of competent jurisdiction for cause existing before such former marriage."

That is the hybrid product of Romanism and Protestantism. It is neither. Rome denies the right of divorce for any cause. (There are exceptions made by his Holiness for large pecuniary or political reasons). Protestantism denies the right of divorce except for the one cause, the principle expounded by Christ. It allows the remarriage of the innocent party, as Christ also taught. To allow such scandalous divorces as have been granted to certain rich

members of the Episcopal Church, and to deny any remarriage by an Episcopal minister, while the Episcopal Church declines to discipline legalized adultery within its pale, is confusing to the uninitiated.

The other incident referred to is what the *Churchman* calls "ritual anarchy." The revision movement seems to have pervaded the Northwestern Episcopal circles, and the service of the Prayer-Book was subtracted from and added to without authority, in the consecrating of "the Ven." Reginald Heber Weller as Bishop-Coadjutor of the Diocese of Fond du Lac. This service was printed in a little pamphlet in rubrical colors and type and paragraph marks after the manner of the Prayer-Book. We quote from the new ritual :

" ¶ Then shall follow the anointing and the conferring of the Episcopal Ring and the Pectoral Cross.

" ¶ Then the Consecrator shall give the Kiss of Peace to the new Bishop, who shall give the same to the Co-Consecrators.

" ¶ After the Blessing the Consecrator shall place the Mitre upon the Head of the new Bishop, and then shall conduct him to his Throne.

" ¶ Then the Consecrator shall return to the Altar, and the Co-Consecrators shall lead the new Bishop around the Church. "

" NOTE—The people should kneel to receive the new Bishop's Blessing as he passes. "

The Presbyterian Church is often criticised for its contentions. At least it is contending about truth, however insignificant its principles may appear to an outsider. But it has heretofore refused to occupy itself with such questions of ecclesiastical millinery and jewelry as are described above, and their lawfulness, and it will be a long time before it debates the right of exclusively masculine osculation in a church service.

## CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

**THE EAGLE'S HEART.** By Hamlin Garland. Pp 369. Price \$1 50. D. Appleton & Co. New York.

This is a story of a wayward son of a preacher, who is lawless from the boy to manhood, and who has no redeeming trait except courage and a strong will.

The redeeming feature of the book is the accurate and vivid description of life on a cattle ranch and the recreations of a cow boy.

The book itself is a disappointment, and it will do no boy good to read it.

**NORTH CAROLINA SKETCHES.** By Mary Nelson Carter. Price, \$1.00. Pp. 313. A. C. McClurg & Co. Chicago.

We noticed recently a series of sketches of the people of Northern Georgia. This may be intended to be something of the same kind, but in many respects it is different, owing no doubt partly to the fact that the subjects of the sketches are essentially different, and partly that the style of each writer is different.

The writer is a Northern lady who mingles with the natives of the mountains of Western North Carolina, and gives pen and ink sketches of those she meets. Those who have mingled with these people will readily recognize the faithfulness of the writer and will also recognize many of the stories she tells.

As a true picture of mountain life and folk it is to be commended, and from them you will learn that beneath the rough exterior there are pure hearts and high thoughts, and that nature's noble men do not always dress according to the latest style, nor use the purest English.

**A WHITE GUARD TO SATAN.** By Alice Maud Ewell. Pp. 187. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. New York.

The title of this book is enough to condemn it, but barring the title, it is a sweet story, written in quaint old English, which is well sustained throughout.

It is a story of Virginia in the time of Nathanael Bacon, and purports to be founded upon a tradition that he seized a number of ladies who were compelled to stand in front while he and his men threw up entrenchments behind them.

It is not a story to make one forget the dinner bell, yet it is one that the purest girl may read with safety.

**EBEN HOLDEN.** By Irving Bacheller. Pp. 432. Lothrop Publishing Co. Boston.

As the reviewer of the publications of to-day one has to read many books, and a weary time he has in doing so, and, therefore, when he strikes a nugget he enjoys it fully.

This one is long, over four hundred pages, but it is a book far too short, and the reader puts it down wishing that it had been longer.

No words can describe the story or the quaint character of Uncle Eb, or the freshness of the scenery. In less than three months after its first appearance its sales reached fifty thousand copies, and still they go on.

It has been compared with David Harum, but in the language of the prize ring, they are not in the same class. Eben Holden is by far the freshest and most invigorating story of the day, and we envy the man who has not yet read it, for he has before him a feast that seldom comes to a reader.

**THREE COLONIAL MAIDS.** By Julia McNair Wright. Pp. 291. \$1 25. Pilgrim Press. Chicago.

Stories about colonial days are always popular, and while we would deprecate arousing any antagonism to England, we still think that each generation would be better if they knew of what stuff the revolution heroes were made of.

Mrs. Wright is a Northern lady, living in Missouri, who is well known in Presbyterian circles by her contributions to the religious press.

In this work she appears in a new role, and her literary reputation will not suffer from her venture. The three colonial maids are very charming girls, and under their varied experiences camp and field among the Indians and "Continental" they rapidly develop till one almost wishes that he had been a "Continental" to enter the field for their favor.

The story is full of life and history, and is withal pure and wholesome, which may seem scant praise, yet it is more than can be said of many of the publications of the day.

**THE SPIRIT OF GOD.** By G. Campbell Morgan. Pp. 246. Price, \$1.25. Fleming H. Revell Co. Chicago.

Rev. G. Campbell Morgan, the author of this new work on the Holy Spirit is well known in America as an Englishman belonging, we believe, to the Keswick school, who has assisted Mr. Moody in the Northfield work, and who has recently been elected to take Mr. Moody's place in Northfield.

First establishing the personality of the Spirit and His relation to the Trinity, he proceeds to show His work in creation and His relation to unfallen man, and also His work in the world from the fall to the coming of Christ and during His life.

In four chapters he gives us the teachings of Christ concerning the Spirit, His coming, His character His mission, and the results of the Spirit's coming. He next presents Him at Pentecost, and then in the Church and in the world. When he deals with the Spirit as found in the individual, we have the Baptism of the Spirit, the filling of the Spirit and the power of the Spirit.

He holds that baptism of the Spirit is identical with conversion, and only takes place once, while the filling of the Spirit may take place fre-

quently, and is generally though not necessarily subsequent to conversion.

We have no doubt but that there will be critics with a keen scent for heresy, who will find in this book some verbal unsoundness, though we will venture to say that none of the critics will be able to show in their life the sweetness and power of the Spirit's presence as does the author of this book.

We heartily recommend it to those who wish to know just what the Keswick school holds concerning the doctrine of the Holy Ghost.

**EVE AND HER DAUGHTERS, OR HEROINES AT HOME.** By Rev. T. M. McConnell, D. D. Price 75c. Pp. 295. Westminster Press. Philadelphia.

This is a series of sermons preached by the author to his people in Greenville, South Carolina, on the Women of the Bible.

Those who know Dr. McConnell as a successful pastor and preacher will not be surprised at the excellence of these sermons. The plan is an admirable one, as is shown by one glance at the table of contents: Eve, the Ideal Woman; Sarah, the Wife; Rebecca, the Mother; Miriam, the Sister; Jephthah's Daughter; Anna, the Old Woman; Ruth, the Woman Converted; Jezebel, the Woman in Sin; Lydia, the Woman Under Grace; Esther, the Woman in Society; Martha, the Woman in the Home; Phebe, the Woman in the Church.

Taking these as texts, Dr. McConnell embodies some striking thoughts and much needed lessons. The worth of the book as well as its cheapness ought to insure it a place in every family library, especially where girls are to be trained.

**VISITING THE SIN.** By Emma Rayner. Pp. 448. Price \$1 50. Small, Maynard & Co. Boston.

This is a tale of mountain life in Kentucky and Tennessee. The writer is a Northern lady, but one who has evidently lived among the mountain people. The story begins in Kentucky, but shifts to Tennessee, yet through it all it is a story of mountain life, with its native humor, its peculiar dialects and its strange superstitions.

Love and hate, compassion and revenge are displayed in different characters in a striking and ingenious manner. It is a book of much power and of intense interest, though at times too full in its details.

We have read no book for a long time of greater force in some respects, or one that draws more faithfully the peculiar character and superstitions of the mountain people.

In a few years that type of life will disappear, as schools and churches are rapidly forcing their way into these recesses, and it is in view of such a future that books of this class have their value.

**THE CHEVALIER DE ST. DENIS.** By Alice I. Jones. Pp. 317. Price \$1.25. A. C. McClurg & Co. Chicago.

We are glad to see that some one is writing about the Southwest, after

the many books about Colonial life in New England and Virginia. This story deals with life at the French Court of Louis XIV, with its intrigues and battles, and then shifts to Louisiana and Mexico, giving us true pictures of the life of that period.

St. Denis goes to France, fights in the Spanish War, and then lands in Louisiana, whence he is sent to Mexico to arrange a commercial treaty.

Of course there is a beautiful *Senorita*, a weak, weak *Senor* and a tricky *Senora*.

The story is not a strong one, but the historical setting makes it well worth one's reading.

**THE OLD GENTLEMAN OF THE BLACK STOCK.** By Thomas Nelson Page. 12 mo. \$1.50. Chas. Scribner's Sons. New York. Illustrated in colors by Howard Chandler Christy.

It would be difficult to find a more beautiful book than this, whether you consider the binding, the paper, the type, the illustrations, or the charming story.

Mr. Page possesses a style that touches the softest places in one's nature, and whoever reads his sketches must be a better man or woman.

Those of us who lived in the days succeeding the war can recall more than one old gentleman of the black stock, with his quaint and original ideas of men and books, and his courtly ways, while those of us who are married imagine that we have not only seen the original of Elizabeth Dale, but we have her in our possession.

In "The Old Gentleman of the Blackstock," Mr. Page fully sustains his reputation as the author of "Meh Lady," and as being one of the most charming writers of our day.

**THE KINCAID VENTURE.** By Kate W. Hamilton. Pp. 293. \$1.25. Pilgrim Press, Chicago.

We recently disapproved one of the publications of the Pilgrim Press on the ground that it was unfit for the Sabbath school library or for young people.

This book we endorse without qualification as having in it just what a book for the young ought to have.

It is the story of a family of young people reduced to poverty by the death of their father, together with business complications. They go West and begin the struggle for bread.

They have a garden, raise chickens, run a mill, teach a school and work in a store, each contributing to the general fund.

Running through the book there is a strong temperance lesson with none of the intemperance of such lessons, while the spiritual growth of each one is along natural lines, and devoid of experiences such as are found only in books.

**NORTHERN GEORGIA SKETCHES.** By Will N. Harben. Price, \$1. Pp. 305. A. G. McClurg & Co., Chicago.

These are simple stories about the humble people who live in North



Georgia. They have no plot, neither does the writer indulge in descriptions of the mountains or skies, after the manner of Charles Egbert Craddock, and lesser imitators.

He gives us short sketches of their home life, just such stories as one can hear in a country store, but with a local coloring that no native, unless he be a genius, can give.

We have read for a long time nothing purer in style or sweeter in sentiment than these sketches, and we venture the prediction that the author will yet be one of the South's sons of whom she will be proud. "The Sale of Uncle Rastus," in pathos and power, is equal to some of Page's work.

These sketches have already appeared in the magazines, but for the first time they appear in book form.

THE REIGN OF LAW. By James Lane Allen.

This is intended to be a story of one man's loss of faith. David was the son of poor parents. He lives in the hemp-raising section of Kentucky. His early advantages are few. He gets but a slender start in education. His days are made up of the hard labor of the hemp fields. His father and his mother are ignorant people, but deeply religious. The book opens with a description on hemp culture that is interesting and instructive. It then presents us with the excommunication of David's great-grandfather from his church because he did not believe as they did and was liberal in his views. His great-grandfather builds a church and school of his own. Anybody who wished preached in his church and the children of the neighborhood were taught in the school. Here David got his early training both in books and religion. At the time the story begins he is a young man of deeply religious nature, connected with the church and believing her doctrines and her Bible.

By and by a movement is made to build a great University in Lexington, and in connection therewith a Bible College. An agent, a professor of the college, visits David's neighborhood and preaches in the church and advocates his institution. David decides that he will go to college and study for the ministry. He is too poor to do so at once. But he works and saves for two years until he has sufficient funds, and then he enters the Bible College to prepare to preach the Gospel.

It is not long after he enters college that the process of doubt begins. It is started by the pastor of his church in town. He preaches a series of sermons on the errors of other denominations of Christians. These sermons were delivered on Sabbath mornings, and David regularly went in the evening to the church that was attacked. He did this frequently until he came to the conclusion that here were men and women who were evidently just as sincere in their beliefs, and were pursuing their way without any fear or doubt. He found each claiming to be the only representative of true religion in the world, or thought that he did, and he concluded that maybe they were all false. He studied the matter very

closely, we are told. He once ventured into the study of his pastor, seeking aid in his doubt. But this man showed no sympathy with him, and talked to him in such an uncharitable, such a dogmatic and bigoted way that he was driven further away from all religion. A little sympathy, a little of the milk of human kindness here would have saved the boy. Had that preacher been broad-minded enough to show him "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth" instead of the concentrated selfishness and bigotry of his denomination, David would have been saved from trouble thereby. But the pastor gave him to understand that he thought all the rest of the world, except those who believed like himself, were lost, and there was no hope for them.

After this, when his opinions became known, he was remonstrated with, and avoided by professors, and slighted by his fellow-students. By and by he gets a hold of Darwin's works and others which teach the Evolution doctrine. He reads them with avidity. He accepts the hypothesis of Evolution, and by it tries to explain everything in nature. He applies it to Religion, and comes to the conclusion that it is only one of the many forms of faith, which has arisen in the evolution of man, destined to give way in time, to something else. In this way he sets aside the Bible, the Church, Christianity.

One day he is expelled from College and Church, and comes back to his father's home. When his parents know the cause of his home coming, they give him scant welcome. He is made to feel that he has disgraced them. They had high hopes for him and had stunted themselves to help him, and this was the end of it. The father scarcely spoke to him. The mother chafed under their increased poverty and secretly egged her husband on. They showed plainly that they did not love him. Though afterward in his sickness they softened their hearts.

It is needless to pursue the story further—to tell how he toiled on the farm, how a young woman from Lexington, one of the results of the Revolution which the Civil War created, came into his neighborhood and taught schools; deeply pious, a member of the Episcopal Church how they fell in love with each other, expected to marry, notwithstanding the great difference in their religious beliefs. He devoting his life to the study of nature.

It does not require very close reading to see that David originally, David's pastor in town, and the Bible College in Lexington all belong to the so-called "Christian" or Campbellite Church. I do not wish to accuse Mr. Allen of premeditatedly pilloring this sect of the church, who are unequalled for sectarian zeal and theological bigotry. But maybe this is just the thing he intended to do. And he may have intended to represent that one of the logical results of the attitude of this church toward all the others is just that sort of infidelity which David grew into, or worse.

It is an extreme case. I do not believe that church as a whole stands for such narrowness. I know of some who freely acknowledge the

Christian character of other communions, but do not accept their theological views. The narrowness, the bigotry, that anathematizes all other denominations is found in the uneducated ministry and an unenlightened people. Those who know more have better sense.

The soil in which this infidelity grew was most propitious. David's parents were certainly a very inferior pair. They were poor, which of itself is no crime, but a certain part of their poverty resulted from lack of spirit and judgment. They were ignorant, and of naturally little mind. David had few advantages as he grew up. He was a kind of exotic in the family, a case of heredity, which leaped his immediate progenitors. His parents were of that class in which a superstitious faith naturally springs up—without breadth of vision enough to be charitable—a faith that is credulity. When there comes an awakening to this credulity it is easy to run to the other extreme and think that all has fallen, when it is only a false conception of the truth that has been blown away.

I submit that it is unfair to the thousands of men and women who remain true to the Bible and Christianity, notwithstanding they come to look with new eyes upon some things in the world which seemed in earlier days to be the bulwarks of faith. There are many people who have read Darwin, and the whole school of Evolution teachers, who have not lost their faith either in God or the Bible. If Mr. Allen wants to write of the loss of any man's faith, why does he not choose a better subject, and why does he not let us see something more of the grounds of his doubt than a few general statements? The chief ground of this man's doubt of the Bible and Christianity seems to be that the Bible teaches that everything in this universe was made for man. He represents that the Old Testament certainly teaches this view, and it is "imposed" upon Christianity. But the statement that the Bible teaches this view is debatable, to say the least. For the scriptures teach us in unmistakable terms the littleness of man compared with the universe. But the scriptures are intended for the guidance of man, as a citizen of this planet, and there certainly can be no doubt that man is the highest and noblest form of life that exists on the planet. I know of no scholar who denies it. The Bible was not intended to teach everything. It purports to be a revelation of God to man, and principally teaches what we are to believe concerning God and what duties God requires of us.

The controlling principle of David's ambition was the doctrine of Evolution as promulgated by Darwin, a doctrine which in David's thought rules God out of his universe. Indeed it has no need of God at all, and is usually Atheistic, though not absolutely so in David's case. It seems to be a foolish thing that a man will lose all faith in religion because of a mere guess, and such certainly Evolution is. It is a mere hypothesis. It has not been established and cannot be established. There are leaps in nature too great to be bridged by so slender a theory. It never has been explained how mere matter can evolve out of itself; physical life, thought, conscience, spirit; and while the hero of this book prates about

the bigotry of the churches, it is not one whit greater than the assurance with which the skeptic announces his opinions, and pities the poor devotee of faith because he does not fall down and accept him as a deliverer from the bondage of superstition. A certain religious paper expressed the truth very vividly when it said: "The skeptic stands on his head and says: 'See me hold up the world.'"

Even granting that Evolution is a fact, a method by which creation is continued, there is no necessary reason why religious skepticism should follow. Darwin himself maintained throughout his whole life that his doctrine was not inconsistent with the Christian faith. An advocate of the theory is authority for the following statements that "the fact of Evolution implies nothing in respect to causation; there is no assumption of inherent forces, or necessary activities, or eternal matter; there is no implication concerning the nature or origin of mind; we are at full liberty to trace intelligence in the methods of the inorganic world, or to affirm that the all embracing method of Evolution is itself the highest possible manifestation of intelligence and unity: we may also maintain that the method of the world and the collocations of the world imply determination and motive; in brief the full acceptance of the doctrine does not conflict with any fundamental conception of Christian theology." We cannot dwell upon the reasons for these statements of the logical limitations of the theory, but Evolutionists themselves being the judges, when a man transgresses these limitations and begins to rule God out of his universe, and all evidence of design, and the place of a true and authentic revelation of himself; to stay the cherished hopes and faiths of millions, he is plainly out of his sphere. He may be entitled to a hearing in the realm of physics, but in the realm of theology he is entitled to no more credit; not even as much as other men who have devoted themselves to the study of it, and when a writer undertakes to paint us a fiction which exhibits this speculation he deserves the condemnation for his superficial views, and his glaring *non sequiturs*. Likewise when a man is led to discard all religious faith because he happens to find that there is an organic development in creation, he is narrow-visioned and superficial, that is all, and is more to be pitied than sympathized with.

An evidence of David's halting logic is to be found in his amusing declaration of love to Galnilla. He beats about the bush for considerable time, trying to show that there is no design in nature, nothing was made for man; man had taken certain things by force and used them. But he winds up by saying that there was one thing that was made for man, and that was woman, and he thought she was made for him. This was a pardonable lapse of logic, but it is fatal to his philosophy.

In David's enthusiasm for his "Masters," as the author calls the books that David read, he assures Galnilla that "the time is coming when the churches will be deserted by all thinking men, unless they cease trying to uphold, as the teachings of God, mere creeds of their ecclesiastical founders."

For glaring assumption, and unparalleled assurance, and for wholesale condemnation, this speech is hard to beat. It declares that the thousands of men who teach and preach in our churches, not one of them rises to the dignity of "thinking men." Shades of the mighty dead! such egotism!

The world never saw so many scholarly adherents to the cause of Christ. It is not an age of weaklings by any means. In this speech there is a part of the senseless clamor of the day: simply because they happen to be written. The Campbellite Church of today has just as rigid a creed as the Westminster Confession; one is written and the other is oral. The Evolutionist has just as exacting a creed as any church in Christendom; one in the realm of nature, the other in the realm of religion. Why set so much store by an unwritten creed and discard a written one? It is a part of that bigotry which the "Reign of Law" is trying to exhibit, which says, "What I believe is all right, what you believe is all wrong." Heterodoxy is the other man's doxy.

But it is well to bear in mind what some people easily forget, that the creeds of the churches are the human interpretations of the Scriptures, and should never be allowed to take the place of the Word of God and the instances in which they are allowed to do so, I am persuaded, are few.

But the believer need not fear that the Evolutionist is going to destroy his Bible and his faith. There never was a time when true science contributed more to the support of the Holy Book than now. It "liveth and abideth forever."

The major part of David's troubles arose from the circumstances of his life, but a very large part came from the sectarianism and bigotry of his pastor and his teachers. His pastor failed utterly to show the spirit of the Master. He ought to have helped him to solve his doubts, but instead he denounces him and assists in expelling him from college and church. His professors and his father and mother were no better; the utter absence of Christian love and sympathy is fearful to contemplate.

If Mr. Allen means all this to be a picture of the Church of Christ today, it is miserably drawn. There is many a place where religious narrowness and selfishness cripples the cause of the Christ, but the spirit of Christian unity has been growing from year to year. And the world has never seen such wide unity among Christian denominations as is to be seen to-day—upon the great fundamentals of faith. The largeness of Christian charity witnesses to the truth of our holy religion. The fault of narrowness and bigotry is traceable to the imperfection of human nature, not to the falsity of all religion.

The vividness and beauty of Mr. Allen's descriptions of nature, especially of the hemp fields is acknowledged. But beauty may be seductive, as it is in this case. If a man cannot propose something better than the Bible and Christian religion he is cruel to tear that down and leave poor, helpless humanity without any beacon, but the will-o-

the-wisp of speculative evolutionists. He can build no enduring fame, who writes books which try to tear down the bulwarks of faith. Mrs. Humphrey Ward got little desirable reputation from Robert Elsmere, Margaret Deland got less from John Ward Preacher, and James Lane Allen has soiled his fair name by "The Reign of Law."

JOHN P. HERNDON.

DISCUSSION OF PHILOSOPHICAL SUBJECTS. By J. L. Girardeau, D. D., LL. D. pp. 515. Price \$2.00. Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va.

This is the first volume of Dr. Girardeau's works that his pupils and friends propose to publish, the other two being Theological Discussions and His Life and Sermons.

Our Committee in the mechanical work has fully sustained its good reputation in the binding, type and paper.

Among the articles we find the following: The End of Philosophy; Consciousness with Special Reference to Sir Wm. Hamilton's Views; The Authority of Consciousness; Cosmothetic Idealism; Berkeley's Idealism; Objective Idealism, etc.

Only trained minds will find pleasure in these discussions, for they are the thoughts of a profound scholar, but the trained mind will find ample compensation for any effort it may put forth. It is a book that ought to be in the library of every minister, and we are glad to welcome all such publications.

CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THEOLOGY. By Frank Hugh Foster, Ph.D., D. D. Pp. 268. Price \$1.50. Fleming H. Revell Company, Chicago.

These are the Stone Lectures for 1900 delivered at Princeton Theological Seminary, which in itself ought to introduce the book into every minister's study, because some of the best contributions to theology have come to us from this source.

Dr. Foster seeks to show what contribution has been made to the system of evangelical doctrine by Christian experience. Yet in doing so he wishes it understood that he does not advocate experience as a substitute for the scriptures as a source of Christian doctrine. His aim is rather to promote the actual study of Christian experience.

At no distant day we hope to be able to give this book the notice its worth deserves, but for the present we must content ourselves with introducing it to the attention of our readers as a book well worth their time and money.

LOUISVILLE  
**PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY**

105 EAST BROADWAY,

LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY.

---

Under the Control of the Synods of Kentucky and Missouri, and  
Subject to the Supervision of the General Assembly.

---

REV. J. G. HUNTER, D. D.....President of the Board of Directors  
REV. J. S. LYONS, D. D.....Secretary  
W. T. GRANT, Esq.....Treasurer

---

**FACULTY:**

W. HOGE MARQUESS, D. D., Chairman of the Faculty, Old Testa-  
ment and English Bible.  
CHARLES R. HEMPHILL, D. D., LL. D., New Testament.  
FRANCIS R. BEATTIE, B. D., D. D., Ph. D., Systematic Theology and  
Apologetics.  
THOMAS M. HAWES, D. D., Elocution and Rhetoric.  
EDWIN MULLER, D. D., Clerk of Faculty, Church History and Polity.

---

The course of study is broad, thorough and flexible. It is also made practical by means of various forms of city mission work. Instruction in music is given by a competent teacher.

---

Good comfortable rooms, well furnished, are provided free of cost to the students. Board, fuel, light and attendance cost three dollars a week. For rooms apply to Professor Beattie.

---

One day each month is devoted to the special study of Missionary themes. The liberality of a number of friends enables the Faculty to give students remuneration for Mission work during the session. The Faculty has in view the founding of certain scholarships to be awarded on examination.

---

☞ For Catalogue and further information, address any of the Professors. Sessions begin the first Wednesday of October, and continue seven months.



# FISHBURNE SCHOOL,

## Waynesboro, Va.

---

English, Classical and Scientific Courses  
with Military Training.

---


A Christian School for boys and young men, preparatory for higher classes of College and University, or for practical life.

The mental, the moral and the physical man carefully looked after.

The Westminster Catechisms and Standards made a part of the Bible Course.

No vulgar, profane, or vicious boy received or allowed to remain.

---

 Write for catalogue, giving full particulars.

JAMES A. FISHBURNE, A. B.,

PRINCIPAL.





**SOUTHWESTERN**

**PRESBYTERIAN UNIVERSITY,**

**CLARKSVILLE, TENNESSEE.**

THE ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT has nine professors, and its Schools and Degree courses offer unusual and improved combination of study, along with flexibility of detail.

FIVE DEGREE COURSES, as follows: (1), Master of Arts; (2), Bachelor of Arts; (3), Bachelor of Science; (4), Doctor of Philosophy (three years residential course).

Every student is taught the English Bible, as a necessary part of a Christian Education, and is rewarded for faithful work in this as is in other studies.

THE DIVINITY DEPARTMENT has six instructors. The complete course leads to the degree of Bachelor of Divinity.

Board, including furnished room, fuel, lights and attendance, from \$2.00 per week to \$4.00 per week.

The location is healthful, the community excellent, and the moral and religious tone unrivalled.

The whole time of a Physical Director is given to the new and completely equipped Gymnasium.

Free tuition to ministers' sons and candidates for the ministry.

In the Academic Department, one hundred and eighty-four dollars will pay for tuition, incidental and library fees, room, furniture, board, fuel and lights.

Send for a Catalogue; or, better still, write for full particulars to

GEORGE SUMMEY, Chancellor,  
CLARKSVILLE, TENN.

APRIL, 1901.



# THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

VOL. XV.	CONTENTS:	No. 2
I.	CALVIN'S TRADUCERS, WHO THEY WERE AND WHAT THEY THOUGHT. Rev. Jno. W. Stagg, D. D. . . . .	167-203
II.	THE IMPORTANCE OF DOCTRINAL SOUNDNESS IN TEACHING. Rev. Nicholas M. Steffens, D. D. . . . .	204-221
III.	THE LIFE AND THEOLOGY OF JONATHAN EDWARDS. . . . .	222-237
IV.	CHRIST, THE MODEL PREACHER. Rev. T. W. Hooper, D. D., . . . . .	238-349
V.	PERFECTION. Rev. W. T. Hall, D. D. . . . .	250-260
VI.	PROOFS OF GOD'S EXISTENCE AND CHARACTER. Rev. J. A. Quarles, D. D. . . . .	261-273
VII.	CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS. Frazer Hood, W. W. Elwang, James A. Quarles, J. R. Bridges, S. C. Byrd. . . . .	274-305
VIII.	EDITORIAL: THE FIVE GREAT SYSTEMS, THE CHINESE MISSIONARIES, RECORD AND REVIEW. . . . .	306-315

---

CHARLOTTE, N. C.

PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

---

\$3.00 A YEAR, - - 75 CENTS A COPY.

IN ADVANCE.

Address all communications to A. J. MCKELWAY, Editor, Charlotte, N. C.

# THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY

---

A Theological, Philosophical and Literary Review, conducted by an Association composed of the following Ministers :

W. M. McPHEETERS, D. D.	W. W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D.
D. J. BRIMM, D. D.	B. M. PALMER, D. D., LL. D.
JOHN F. CANNON, D. D.	ROBERT PRICE, D. D.
WM. C. CLARK, D. D.	J. B. SHEARER, D. D.
J. N. CRAIG, D. D.	SAMUEL M. SMITH, D. D.
A. R. CURRY, D. D.	R. K. SMOOT, D. D., LL. D.
C. R. HEMPHILL, D. D., LL. D.	C. C. HEERSMAN, D. D., LL. D.
T. W. HOOPER, D. D.	ROBERT A. WEBB, D. D.
C. W. HUMPHREYS, D. D.	

---

A. J. MCKELWAY, EDITOR.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS : G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D., GEO. SUMMEY, D. D.;  
F. R. BEATTIE, D. D.; S. C. BYRD, A. M.

---

CHARLOTTE, N. C.:

THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

\$3.00 Per Annum.

75 Cents Per Single Number.

---

Address all communications and make all remittances to

A. J. MCKELWAY, Charlotte, N. C.

Subscriptions are discontinued only upon written request of subscribers and settlement of account to date.

---

## The Presbyterian Publishing Co., Charlotte, N. C.

Prints the Presbyterian Standard, the mechanical work on which is unexcelled in any Southern paper, and the Presbyterian Quarterly, the largest magazine published in the South.

Its printing office is fully equipped for all kinds of Job Printing, and it makes a specialty of the Minutes of Synods and Presbyteries, College Catalogues and Magazines, Church Registers and Envelopes. Save trouble by patronizing a Presbyterian office for Presbyterian work.

*LOW PRICES. FAIR DEALING. GOOD WORK.*

THE  
Presbyterian Quarterly.

NO. 55--APRIL, 1901.

I. CALVIN'S TRADUCERS—WHO THEY WERE  
AND WHAT THEY THOUGHT.

To understand a man should be the honest purpose of all who undertake to write about him. It is acknowledged by those not too friendly to the system known as Calvinistic, that John Calvin is the worst understood of all the men of history, and the best hated. Fairbairn says: "He is one of the best hated men in history; round his name fierce controversies have raged, and still rage. \* \* There is something imposing in the multitude and variety of aversions that converge on Calvin."

Calvin's doctrine of Election, which he describes as a profound mystery and which must not be curiously examined, but nevertheless is a profitable doctrine, calculated to destroy the very roots of pride and presumption, is the initial cause of the intense hatred of his name. In his system of theology, under this doctrine, occurs the startling statement, that God, for the glory of his righteousness, consigns some to damnation; and the expression, brought against him, "A terror-moving decree." "This celebrated place; *Decretum quidem horribile fateor*, which does honor to his feelings, has also served as the foundation of abuse." (Ancillon, *Melanges Critiques*, p. 37. People accuse Calvin, says that writer, of describing God's decrees as horrible, whereas he simply meant that we ought to tremble at contemplating this mystery; as he himself expresses it in the French version of the "Institutes." Rivett, III, in his treat-

ise "Apologeticus," says the same thing."

The system of theology formulated by Calvin is recognized as exalting God and humbling man. He says: "If that term be diabolical, which exalts man in his own opinion, let us not admit it, unless we wish to take the counsel of an enemy. It is pleasant, indeed, to have so much innate strength as to confide in and be satisfied with ourselves. But from being allured into this vain confidence, let us be deterred by the many awful sentences which severely humble us to the dust." *Institutes*, Book II, Chap. II. The majesty of God was so clearly apprehended by him in all the work of redemption that he reckoned those vain and supercilious who were bold enough to attack the doctrines which he believed with all his being. Humility was his mark for the elect.

"I have always, indeed, been exceedingly pleased with this observation of Chrysostom, that humility is the foundation of our philosophy; but still more with this of Augustine: 'As a rhetorician,' says he, on being interrogated what was the first thing in the rules of eloquence, replied, 'Pronunciation;' and on being separately interrogated what was the second and what was the third, gave the same reply; so should any one interrogate me concerning the rules of the Christian religion, the first, second and third, I would always reply, 'humility.'" *Institutes*, Book II, Chap. II.

Nothing is better calculated to engender hatred for a man than a constant placing of his finger upon the pride and arrogance of his opponents.

Another prolific cause of the contempt heaped upon Calvin was his doctrine of the Will. This subject is fully discussed in the second book of the *Institutes*. He maintained that there was no such thing as free-will in an absolute sense. "This being admitted will place it beyond all doubt, that man is not possessed of free will for good works, unless he be assisted by grace; and that special grace which is bestowed on the elect alone in regeneration. For

I stop not to notice those fanatics, who pretend that grace is offered equally and promiscuously to all. But it does not yet appear, whether he is deprived of power to do good, or whether he yet possesses some power, though small and feeble; which of itself can do nothing, but by the assistance of grace does also perform its part. Lombard, in order to establish this notion, informs us that two sorts of grace are necessary to qualify us for the performance of good works. One he calls operative, by which we efficaciously will what is good; the other co-operative, which attends as auxiliary to a good will. This division I dislike, because, while he attributes an efficacious desire of what is good to the grace of God, he insinuates that man has of his own nature antecedent, though ineffectual, desires after what is good; as Bernard asserts that a good will is the work of God, but yet allows that man is self-impelled to desire such a good. But this is very remote from the meaning of Augustine, from whom, however, Lombard would be thought to have borrowed this division. The second part of it offends me by its ambiguity, which has produced a very erroneous interpretation. For they have supposed that we co-operate with the second sort of Divine grace, because we have it in our power either to frustrate the first sort by rejecting it, or to confirm it by our obedience to it. The author of the treatise 'On the Vocation of the Gentiles' expresses it thus—that those who have the use of reason and judgment are at liberty to depart from grace, that they may be rewarded for not having departed, and that what is impossible without the co-operation of the Spirit, may be imputed to their merits, by whose will it might have been prevented. These two things I have thought proper to notice as I proceed, that the reader may perceive how much I dissent from the sounder schoolmen. For I differ considerably more from the later sophists, as they have departed much further from the judgments of antiquity. However, we understand from this division, in what sense they have ascribed free will to man. For Lombard at length pronounces, that we are not therefore, possessed of free will, because we have an equal

power to do or to think either good or evil, but only because we are free from constraint. And this liberty is not diminished, although we are corrupt and the slaves of sin, and capable of doing nothing but sin."

Then man will be said to possess free will in this sense, not that he has an equally free election of good and evil, but because he does evil voluntarily, and not by constraint. That, indeed, is very true; but what end could it answer to decorate a thing so diminutive with a title so superb? Egregious liberty indeed, if man be not compelled to serve sin, but yet is such a willing slave, that his will is held in bondage by the fetters of sin. I really abominate contentions about words, which disturb the Church without producing any good effect; but I think that we ought religiously to avoid words which signify an absurdity, particularly when they lead to a pernicious error. How few are there, pray, who, when they hear free will attributed to man, do not immediately conceive, that he has the sovereignty over his own mind and will, and is able by his innate power to incline himself to whatever he pleases? But it will be said, all danger from these expressions will be removed, if the people are carefully apprized of their signification. But, on the contrary, the human mind is naturally so prone to falsehood, that it will sooner imbibe error from one single expression, than truth from a prolix oration; of which we have a more certain experiment than could be wished in this very word. For neglecting that explanation of the fathers, almost all their successors have been drawn into a fatal self-confidence, by adhering to the original and proper signification of the word." Institutes, Book II, Chap. II, Par. VI and VII.

There is no such thing as free-will and Calvin, who was followed by Jonathan Edwards, was as far along on the doctrine of the will as the psychologist who writes in the year 1901. Dr. R. L. Dabney was carrying out Calvin's suggestion when he used free-agent as a substitute for free-will as ordinarily interpreted by ordinary men.

"In respect of the exercise of volition there are two

opposed doctrines, that of liberty and that of necessity, with modifications of each. Strict necessity is fatalism. This extreme doctrine philosophers of the necessitarian school generally reject. Some would prefer that their doctrine should be called determinism. They do not wholly deny freedom, but they give it a special definition. They say the will is free when acting according to its nature, and that it is in its nature to be determined by desires. Every scheme of necessity or determinism represents desires as controlling the will, and voluntary acts as effects which follow from their mental causes as certainly and invariably as physical effects follow physical causes." Davis, p. 318.

"We are free-agents; that is to say, wherever action is our own, we ourselves determine our volitions. Consciousness so clearly evinces this, that it is almost a truism. I know intuitively that my spirit is free—in other words—self-determined in every intelligent volition. To deny this is virtually to deny that the action is my own. As Cousin well declares, no pretended argument to prove that my volitions are fated or compulsory are valid; because the premise of such argument, be it what it may, cannot be as certain to me as my intuitive consciousness of free agency. We infer our freedom again from our conscious responsibility. Conscience assures us that we are responsible for our intelligent volitions; but the reason also declares that our responsibility could not be just if we were not free agents." Dabney's Practical Philosophy. P. 143.

These quotations are given simply to show how the doctrine of the will must powerfully affect even philosophers in their opinions of the merit or demerit of philosophical writings. When we recall that here, perhaps more than anywhere else, theology receives its deepest coloring, and that Calvinism and Arminianism are more distinctive from the place given the will in either system than possibly from the combination of all other points of divergence, it is readily understood. The two systems are the antipodes of each other, and the poles are found by going in opposite directions from this common point in dispute. It is here that



predestination looks its ugliest. To affirm that there is an all-sufficient Will that guides all and never can be defeated or surprised; that controls every human will so that all which is willed is in accord with a fixed pre-arrangement, is to antagonize all who are of a contrary mind. Calvin felt to the last that it was his duty to contend for his doctrine. He expressed his indignation that men hated the system out of hatred to him.

Having given, as we believe, some of the causes of the intense hatred of Calvin and his system, let us ascertain who were the more prominent individuals opposed to him, and what was their manner of thought. There is quite a list of names of greater or lesser prominence: Bolsec, Caroli, Castalio, Servetus, Gentilis, Georgii, Gribaldi, Gruet, Krell, Loyola, Menno, Motte, Perrini, Pighius Sadolet, Siculus, Socinus, Stancaras, Troillet, Welsius, Westphal. Many others could be added to this list, but these suffice to show that antagonism to Calvin was something imposing. His opponents were discordant in many ways; they were, however, concordant in their hatred of Calvin.

In the limited space assigned this article it is not practicable to fully ascertain the beliefs and teachings of all we have named as opposed to Calvin. It shall be our purpose to get the opinions of those who were the more conspicuous and whose views are more generally known. We will confine our investigation to Caroli, Bolsec, Servetus, Castalio and Westphal.

In 1536 Calvin writes of Caroli: "Scarcely were four months passed when we were assailed, on the one side by the Anabaptists, and on the other by a scandalous apostate, who, secretly supported by some person of rank, gave us much to do." He, with Farel and Viret, was obliged to defend his orthodoxy against Caroli. "This dangerous, vain, and insufferable man would have been unworthy of notice had he not had the honor to excite Calvin's indignation. Full of hypocrisy he read and preached the Word of God in Paris, where Farel was well acquainted with his immoral life. Being accused as a heretic, because he in

some measure taught the truth, he recanted and persecuted the reformed. Again attaching himself to the Protestants he came to Geneva. In Basel he played the part of a hypocrite. At Neufchatel he married, and being subsequently appointed pastor at Lausanne, he used his utmost efforts to weaken the influence of Farel and Viret, who accused him of immorality. In his sermons he upheld the doctrine of purgatory, and the practice of praying for the dead."

"Caroli was deprived of his office and banished. He made his peace with the evangelical party while Calvin was in Strasburg, but again separated himself. At last he went to Rome, and was re-admitted into the Roman Catholic Church." Henry, Vol. I.

Calvin had been much disturbed by the charge of Arianism and Sabellianism brought against him by Caroli. He refuted the charge by citing his teachings "*Conscriptus aliquanto ante catechismus a nobis fuerat Gallice etiam editus, ubi sub una essentia nos Patrem, Filium et Spiritum Sanctum complecti testabamur.*" Of his banishment Calvin wrote, "That sycophant has been banished by a decree of the Senate, and now we are acquitted not only of all guilt but of all suspicion. Although, therefore, he is now boasting of the name of Athanasius, as if he were suffering for the defence of the truth, the world is in no danger of finding an Athanasius in this church-robber, whoremonger and murderer, dripping as he is with the blood of many saints. While I thus describe him, I say nothing but what I should be able to prove through competent witnesses." Letter to Grynæus from Bern.

#### BOLSEC.

The following is sufficient to give the reader a very correct idea of Bolsec and his relation to the reformation :

"Jerome Bolsec was born in Paris, and became a Carmelite monk. Having cast aside his cowl, he was obliged to flee into Italy, dreading the consequence of having spoken too freely respecting the Catholic Church. The Duchess of Ferrara had received him with her accustomed kindness, as a clergyman. But he became a physician, married and,

went to Geneva. There he became acquainted with many persons of distinction, among others, with DeBourgogne, who had settled in that city at the earnest request of Calvin. Bolsec was, to all appearance, a good Christian, and there are good reasons to believe that he employed himself at one time in compiling materials for the life of Calvin; traces of such a collection being found at the beginning of his libel, published at a later period. Not by any means vicious or despicable at first, this man sank by degrees into the lowest depths of error, and became the declared enemy of truth. He commenced by discussing vehemently, in the different circles at Geneva, the abstruse doctrine of election. Calvin admitted him to a conference, and explained to him the nature of the subject, so difficult and profound, but without effect. Bolsec was called into the consistory, and he was desired to consider the inconsistency of his opinion; but he refused to listen. But such an opposition could not be tolerated in the midst of the reformation. It was the well-known custom at Geneva for a minister, whether of the city or country, to preach every Friday, according to his turn, in the cathedral, the other ministers examining and deciding upon the merits of the discourse. Any individual also might at that time go up to the preacher, even in the church, and make such observations as he pleased. This was allowed in order to accustom the people to contend firmly for all points connected with the reformation.

On the 16th of October the minister of St. Andrew's preached to a crowded congregation, on St. John, Chap. viii, Ver. 47. "He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." All those who are not of God resist him to the end, because God affords the grace of obedience to his elect alone. As the preacher uttered this remark, a man suddenly started up from the midst of the congregation, and combated with unbecoming vehemence the doctrine which had been thus advanced. All were silent. "How," he said, can you believe that God has determined the lot of a man before his

birth, destining this one to sin and punishment, and that one to virtue and eternal reward? It is a false and impious notion, which Laurentius Valla has started, namely, that the will of God is the cause of all things, and that therefore the origin of all the evils and all the sins which exist must be ascribed to him, as the old poets feign with regard to Jupiter. Would you make of God, the eternal and righteous one, a senseless tyrant? Would you rob virtue of its glory, free vice from its disgrace, and the wicked from the terrors of conscience?"

He who spoke thus was the physician Bolsec. The fathers of the church were cited in his speech, and he concluded by exhorting the people, in the most seditious and abusive language, not to allow themselves to be deceived by the clergy. He was probably induced to adopt this course by some of Calvin's enemies.

A curious scene now took place. Bolsec had ventured to act as he had done, because Calvin was not then present; but just as he was in the midst of his speech, the reformer entered the church. He was concealed by the mass of the people, and listened, in secret, but with astonishment to the attack made upon his grand doctrine. Scarcely had Bolsec ended, when he pressed through the crowd, hastened up to his opponent, and without preparation proved at once his prodigious powers of argument. He thundered against the antagonist with so many and such opposite quotations from Scripture, and with so many passages from Augustine—he so assailed him with arguments, that all who were present, it is said, blushed for the defeated monk. He himself, however, appears to have felt no shame."

"Bolsec returned to Thonon, where he began again to dogmatize. He was then silent for a time; he soon recommenced the strife, and was at last banished as an insufferable disputant, even by the Bernese, who would fain have kept him quiet. The worst part of his character now showed itself; he proceeded to Paris, and spoke of repentance, in the hope of obtaining a position as a reformed pas-

tor. A conference with the ministers was allowed him. They represented to him his errors and wicked course, and referred his case to the Synod, which was to meet at Orleans, that he might there solemnly renounce his errors. He appeared, exhibited the signs of deep contrition, promised to subscribe the orthodox confession, and to give satisfaction to the churches of Bern and Geneva. But when he saw the reformed church in more danger than ever of a fearful persecution, he fell back into his old state of wretched doubt, and sank deeper and deeper. He again sought Switzerland. We find him some time after in Lausanne, practicing as a physician. He was admitted to the rights of a citizen, under the condition that he should adopt the Bernese confession of faith. But he did not remain long there. Beza wrote against him to the faithful of Lausanne. He was once more received by the Bernese, but Haller being full of zeal for purity of doctrine, he was told to remove. His next place of abode was Mompelgard: he there found Tossanus, who was opposed to Calvin, and in the end re-joined the Catholics. Such was the hatred of this man against the reformer, that twelve years after the death of the latter he wrote a libel upon him, which has been the source of all the detestable slanders current in later times." Henry, Vol. II.

#### SERVETUS.

Servetus is ranked as a person of importance by many because of the extravagances of Mosheim in his writings about this unfortunate man. Mosheim estimates his mental qualities high; he even places them on a level with Calvin's. We have been impressed with two marks of the intellect of Servetus: the one is, that he furnished the material, which every infidel, since his time, down to Bradlaw, in England, and Bob Ingersoll, in America, have worked with; the other is, that his troubles with the Bible seem to be identically those of the extreme higher critics at the present time. If some modern writers had been sufficiently acquainted with Servetus, they need never have put pen to

paper, for he has conveyed their views to the world equally as well, if not better than, they have done.

Trechsel gives his estimate of the man thus: "He had a certain penetrating acuteness of mind, which was subsequently increased by the study of law—a powerful fancy, which held the understanding in abeyance. He was skilled in analyzing, and could annihilate by his critical acumen the notions of others, but he could not bridle his own imaginations, or reduce his thoughts to a tranquil and logical development. By his natural wit he could everywhere discover types, similes, analogies, allegories, but could not perceive the eccentricity and perverseness of his own opinions."

#### HISTORY OF SERVETUS.

"The history of Servetus may be divided into three periods: 1. That during which he was developing his system, and when he first appeared, a period extending to the year 1532, when he left Basel and Strasburg. 2. That from 1532 to 1553, during which he lived in various parts of France, and printed his great work. And 3. The period of his trial and death." Henry, Vol. II.

#### THE MAN.

"That man must indeed have been remarkable whom Catholics and Protestants equally hate; whom both parties condemn with horror; and who when found guilty by the whole world, could venture to call upon God and Christ with fervent supplications, and in words which had an edifying sound, as if, indeed, the Spirit of truth dwelt with the culprit. The smoke which arose from Champel long darkened the pure, gladsome air of the Geneva Lake. But now, after three centuries, when we only desire the truth, independent of party interests, the history of Calvin lies clear before us. Public opinion has fixed a brand upon his name. The world has done this because it has no proper understanding either of Servetus or of the character of his age. I shall relate the events of which we are speaking as fully, and yet as succinctly, as possible, and adduce all that can

be advanced from Servetus, filling up what may still appear wanting in the evidence on his behalf. The remarkable life of this man ; his genial nature ; his end ; his system, so imperfectly comprehended, even by himself, and which Calvin examined only from the point of view, which the church afforded—these have all tended infinitely to increase the difficulty of the subject." Henry, Vol. II.

His work, "De Trinitatis Erroribus," caused consternation among Catholics as well as Protestants. Of this work we will quote from Henry, Vol. II :

"The plan of the work consists mainly in an endeavor to prove the great mystery of the Trinity through the man, the historical Christ. Thus the author seeks, in the first place, to show that this man is Jesus Christ ; that he is the Son of God ; and lastly, that he is God himself.

"No sooner had the work made its appearance than the clamor against it became universal. It was felt that the seeming belief of the writer did, in reality, tread the holy creed of true Christians in the dust. People could scarcely understand how Servetus had dared to conceive such extraordinary errors in respect to a doctrine which had been so long free from attack. It was even fabled that he had made a journey into Africa and had gathered his notions from the Koran ; this idea seemed justified by the fact, that he had employed arguments from that book to illustrate his reasoning.

Servetus exhibited in this, his first work, the pride and bitterness which never left him. His principles are very apparent, and it naturally excites surprise, that in the one-and-twentieth year of his age he could undertake to attempt the reformation of religion and philosophy with such a show of knowledge. His doctrine was original. The anti-trinitarians before him were of little account. He professed that the Holy Scriptures were the source of all his knowledge ; in the same manner he asserted that they had both a literal and a mystical, or spiritual signification ; the former depended upon history, the latter upon Christ. True Christianity, according to him, had been darkened through the

Aristotelian philosophy, and a want of the knowledge of Hebrew. Paul of Samosata, he said, who represented Christ as man, had originally a perception of the truth. The doctrine of the Trinity was framed in opposition to the heretics who existed at the time when the Pope assumed the sovereignty of the church. It was then that we lost Christ. The two principles on which Servetus found his reasonings are the incommunicability of the divine essence; for God is one, and therefore the modifications in God can only be variations or forms, and not persons. God is incomprehensible without a revelation. To make himself known he sent forth two forms or manifestations, the Son and Spirit. He desires, therefore, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost to be acknowledged; but only in the sense in which the Latins use the word *persona*, as representing an outward form. The operation, which is called 'the Word,' became flesh; God, that is, united himself in this manner with man; Christ, therefore, is God, and must be adored. The Holy Ghost is a divine energy; an angel. This Trinity is not eternal, but, like the world, is eternal, according to the divine idea; ideal as Logos; real only in the world.

"This new system of ideas would have had even an attractive appearance, had not Servetus heaped terrific abuse upon the ancient faith of the Church, calling the persons of the Godhead inventions of the devil, and the triune deity a hell-hound. So much that was new was here thrust upon the world that Catholics and Protestants agreed in their expression of indignation. Quintana, offended beyond measure that a Spaniard was the author of such a work, obtained immediately an imperial order that the book should be everywhere suppressed. The Protestants were in still greater excitement. Servetus was in communion with them, and they might be accused of agreeing with him in opinion. It happened that about this time Melancthon wrote in the strongest terms respecting him to Camerarius: 'Good God! what tragedies will not the questions, whether the Logos and the Holy Ghost be persons, create for future times?' To Brentius he complains especially, that the



Logos should be represented only as the thinking Father, or as his voice. He calls Servetus a fanatic."

Considerable correspondence was had with Calvin between 1540 and 1548, during which time Servetus wrote: "I labor incessantly for the quickening of the church, and you are indignant with me because I take part in the conflict of Michael, and wish all pious men to follow my example. Consider well the passage, and you will see that there are men thus struggling who are ready to sacrifice their lives, in blood and in the testimony of Christ. That they are called angels is according to the use of Scripture. The new birth from above makes us like the angels. See you not that the subject here spoken of is the revivifying of the ruined church?"

Claiming to be a reformer, it was necessary for Servetus to measure his strength with the most powerful spirit of the Protestant party; consequently he wrote to Calvin for answers to the following questions: "Is the crucified man, Jesus, the Son of God, and on what account is he so? Is the kingdom of God in men, when they go into this kingdom—when they are born again? Must the baptism of Christ take place in faith, as the Lord's Supper; and why did he institute baptism and the Supper?"

In answer Calvin showed earnestness but disclaims either anger or hatred. He said: "I neither hate you nor despise you, nor do I wish to persecute you, but I would be hard as iron when I behold you insulting sound doctrine with such audacity." *Refut. Error Serv.*

That Calvin regarded Servetus as insincere and believed he wished to involve him in a controversy that thereby he might gain some point of advantage, is apparent in what Calvin afterwards wrote: "When he was at Lyons he sent me three questions to answer. He thought to entrap me. That my answer did not satisfy him I am not surprised." *Calvin's Tracts.*

In this correspondence between Calvin and Servetus occurs one sentence from Calvin that is worthy of all remembrance, by those who insist that Calvin taught the reprobation

tion of infants. In his defense of the baptism of children, Calvin says : " Should God take them out of the world before they could be spiritually circumcised, we must leave them to the secret dispensation of divine grace."

If ever a man had the occasion to say he believed in the reprobation of infants Calvin had it here. Servetus was ridiculing his system because it allowed of the baptism of children on the same conditions and at the age that circumcision was allowed ; now when Servetus pushes the inquiry about the final state of children beyond the age at which they could be spiritually circumcised ; that this attempt at the *reductio ad absurdum* should have been answered as in the above, puts it beyond controversy, that whether Calvin ever declared his belief in the salvation of all dying in infancy, or not, he positively refused to declare his belief in the reprobation of any in the infant state.

The following is an extract from a letter to Frelon which gives Calvin's estimate of Servetus at the time he was in correspondence with him : " Herr Johann ! I would fain satisfy your wish ; not that I have much hope to effect anything with such a man, but because I am anxious to try whether any means exist to bring him to a right understanding, or whether God may have wrought in him any change. He has written to me in a very haughty spirit, and I have desired to humble him a little ; hence I have spoken to him rather more severely than is my wont. This is all I could do ; and I assure you, that nothing is more necessary for him than a lecture on humility. True it is, he can only acquire that grace through the Spirit of God ; but we must lend him what help we can. If God be so gracious to him and to us as to render this answer profitable to him, I shall have cause to rejoice ; but if, on the other hand, he continue to pursue his present course, you will lose your time in urging me to labor for him. I have other occupations of a more pressing nature, and I shall make it a matter of conscience not to concern myself any longer about him, for I have little doubt that he is a Satan whose end it is to divert me from other and profitable studies. I entreat you, there-

fore, remain content with what has been already done, if there be no change."—Mosheim.

After this letter it may be seen from Calvin's writings that he entertained a hope that the Holy Spirit might effect the conversion of Servetus. We have space for only a few extracts from Servetus, showing his blasphemy, the charge upon which he came to his tragic end.

Calvin, in the examination of Servetus to show his blasphemy, had said: "We do not doubt, but that God upholds all things by his power, but it does not follow from this position, that there is an essential Deity in all things; still less can it be argued that the floor on which we tread is a part of the god-head, and that all the devils are full of the divine essence."

In reply Servetus said: "That is all one. Thou hast heard from Irenaeus and others, that 'being' or 'substance' is that which supports us. By moving thy foot, thou deniest that it is moved in God. Thus thou wouldst move in Satan. We, on the contrary, assert that we move in God, in whom we live; and thou, though a devil, must also move in him."

He further said: "I would fain make a list of thine errors. He who is not Simon Magus is, according to Calvin, a Pelagian. The whole body of Christians, consequently are condemned by him; even the apostles, and the disciples of the apostles, and the doctors of the church; for none of them rejected free-will, as this sorcerer has done. Thou liest, thou liest, thou liest, thou most wicked, wretched monster."

We give now the closing scenes of the life of Servetus with the part that Calvin took in them: "The proceedings had now reached their last stage. It was not lawful for the lesser council to pronounce sentence of death, without having previously conferred with that of 'The Sixty,' and obtained a majority of votes. The discussions of the council lasted three days. Opinions were greatly divided. Some of the members advocated perpetual banishment; others perpetual imprisonment; but the greater number were in

favor of capital punishment. But of what kind? The majority determined upon that by fire, according to the old law, unless the prisoner should recant."

"As soon as Calvin heard that the assembly, in its zeal, had gone too far, he called the ministers together: and they, with one voice, besought the council to soften the mode of execution. Another color, in fact, had been given to the whole proceeding, by dooming the culprit to the flames. Calvin had already said to Farel, 'I think he will be condemned to die; but I wish that what is horrible in the punishment may be spared him.'"

"We find that it was his blasphemy, his rash jesting with holy things—the insult with which he treated the majesty of God, which weighed heaviest upon him. The judges passed over everything else; such as his supposed pantheism, his rejecting the prophecies of Isaiah, and his doubts respecting the spirituality of the soul. Instead of insisting on these things, they confined their attention to that which he had said on the person of Christ without plunging into the depths of speculation. That, however, which all regarded with the greatest horror was his blasphemy; his insult of the majesty of God was viewed alike by all. Calvin in his admonition, and Farel in his address, at the place of execution, and also in his letter to Blaer, insist on this; and here the offender still remained unbending as iron. He could not be induced to ask forgiveness, or to retract his infamous expressions. Hence it was that he could not die tranquilly; and that all future generations will lift up the stone against him." Henry, Vol. II.

"Farel, who was intent upon leading his soul to the true faith, began again to speak of his errors, and then passed to the subject of Christian love. He besought him to 'repent of his sins, and to confess the God who had thrice revealed himself.' But the unhappy man persevered in his original statement, and required that it should be proved to him from Scripture, that Christ was called the Son of God before he became man. Farel answered him, but he could not be convinced of his error; he had nothing to reply, but remained

impenetrable and obstinate. The struggle was long continued, and the hour of execution drew near. Farel, therefore, and some ministers from the country who were then present, warned him, that if he would die as a Christian, he must be reconciled to Calvin, whom he had treated so unjustly. Servetus consented. Calvin was sent for, and appeared accompanied by two members of the council, probably on the supposition that the prisoner might still retract.

“Servetus received Calvin tranquilly. The solemnity of the hour of death had sharpened his conscience, and tamed his pride and wrath. Calvin himself has described these last moments: ‘When one of the members of the council asked him what he wished with me, he answered that he desired to ask my forgiveness. I readily answered, and it was strictly the truth, that I had never sought to resent any personal affront received from him. I also tenderly reminded him, that sixteen years before, I had diligently sought, at the hourly peril of my own life, to win him to the Lord; that it was not my fault that all pious people had not extended the hand of friendship toward him, and that this would have been the case had he but shown some degree of judgment; that although he had taken to flight, I had still continued to correspond freely with him; that, in a word, no duty of kindness had been neglected on my part, till, embittered by my free and candid warnings, he had resigned himself not merely to a feeling of anger, but to absolute wrath against me. Turning, however, from that which concerned myself, I prayed him to implore the forgiveness of God, whom he had so awfully blasphemed, seeking to annihilate the three-fold personality, and calling it a three-headed hell-hound, whenever mention was made of a distinction between Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. I besought him to seek the pardon of the Son of God, whom he had dishonored by his heresies, denying that Christ, by the human nature which he had taken, had become like us; and destroying the band of brotherly union between us and the Saviour, and our only hope of deliverance.’ But Servetus

gave him no answer. Calvin continues: 'When I found that I could effect nothing by arguments and persuasions, I would not attempt to be wiser than the precept of the Master. I withdrew from the presence of a man who had sinned as a heretic, and was condemned of himself.' Titus III. 10, 11. And thus Calvin and Servetus parted."

## CASTALIO.

Castalio was a free-thinker, a man of much learning, and by his ultra liberal spirit was calculated to put Calvin in a worse light than any opponent he encountered during his stormy life.

Calvin became acquainted with Castalio at the University of Strasburg in 1539-'50. He lived for some time in the same house with him, and endeavored to obtain the diligent young man, the ingenious student of antiquity, for Geneva, it always being the wish of the great reformer to secure for his church a scientific cultivation. But Castalio was determined to be a theologian also. Beza described him according to his own style, by the Greek term, *ιδιογνώμων*, self-opinionated. His residence at Geneva, as principal tutor in the Gymnasium, lasted about three years. He did not receive any appointment as a preacher, but he now began to put forth some singular exegetical opinions on Scriptural subjects. Thus he declared the Canticles to be a mere obscene song, especially the seventh chapter. It was written, he said, by Solomon in his youth, and ought to be struck out of the canon. He never considered the difficulty of setting bounds to such experiments and to what end they would lead where the Catholics were concerned. His perverseness was even still more apparent in his denial of the descent of Christ into hell, in his refusal to receive Calvin's intelligent and cautious exposition of the subject, or to consider the vast importance of a reference to the sentiments of the early believers.

Calvin was obliged to declare aloud his disapprobation of this conduct. He spared him, from the great regard which he entertained for him, as much as he could; but Castalio,

deeply offended, wished to enter into an open discussion with him on the point in dispute. The council refused its consent, and thereby evinced its discretion ; but for the sake of truth, and not to limit the freedom of opinion, the discussion was allowed to take place in the presence of the assembled preachers. It was continued a long while, but without any good result. Castalio was now so embittered that he openly abused the ministers in a sort of congregation, in which every one was allowed to bring forward his complaints. He then took his departure, but without being obliged to leave Geneva in a degrading manner, as Beza falsely reports." Henry, Vol. II, p. 33; 34.

Calvin wrote to Farel, May 30th, 1544: "I now again see what it is to live in Geneva. I lie among thorns. There have been terrible quarrels among my colleagues during the last two months. Our Castalio, on the other hand, raves against us with the fury of despair. About sixty hearers were present at the meeting yesterday, when the Scriptures were expounded. The following passages were proposed : ' Let us prove ourselves the servants of God in all long-suffering ' Castalio now raised a constant opposition, in order to create between us and Christ's servants the greatest possible dissension. Thus he played with the words in this manner : ' Paul was a servant of God, we serve only ourselves ; he was the most patient of men, we are impatience itself ; he watched the night through for the edifying of the church, we watch to amuse ourselves ; he was modest and temperate, we have a drunken boldness ; he was persecuted by the rebellious, we excite them ; he was chaste, we are licentious ; he was himself cast into prison, we cast others in, if they but utter a word against us ; he looked to the power of God, we to the strength of others ; he was oppressed, but we oppress, and that the innocent.' What more is necessary ? It was in short a cruel, exciting speech throughout. I was silent for the moment, lest a greater dispute might be kindled in the presence of our numerous friends, but I complained to the syndics. Such a conduct marks the beginning of all schis-

matics. I am induced to oppose myself to his rage, not so much on account of the perverseness of his conduct and the rashness of his abuse, as because of the perfect groundlessness of his accusations."

The character of the man may be understood from the following :

"Castalio published a paper on the doctrine of predestination and justification, as founded on the ninth chapter of Romans. It was directed against Calvin's principles. The essay on toleration is also generally, and rightly, ascribed to him. It appears after the trial of Servetus, under the assumed name of Martin Bellius, and with the following title: '*Haeretici, an sint persequendi, mul'or, sententiae.*' Calvin answered this work. Beza also wrote a very strong reply to it, at Lausanne, under the title of '*De Haereticis a magistratu gladio puniendis.*' He supported his views with great talent, painted Servetus in the darkest colors, and undertook the defence of his friend against all assailants. But Castalio was not yet silenced. An anonymous writing, the author of which Calvin and Beza could easily guess, appeared at Paris, under the title of '*Extracts from the Latin and French Works of Calvin.*' In this publication the fundamental doctrine of election, that which supplied all deficiencies, was trodden under foot with biting wit and the keen logic which might have been looked for from a Voltaire. Beza and Calvin, however, exhibited far greater ability in the answer, and again trod the adversary in the dust. Worth and dignity were on their side, and it can not be denied that Castalio would have done better to have been silent. It is not so much a matter of surprise, therefore, that they should have spoken severely of him in the preface to their translation of the New Testament, and warned every Christian to beware of a man 'who had been chosen by Satan to deceive the thoughtless and indifferent.' Castalio indeed, in his '*Apology,*' published in 1558, complains of Calvin's fierceness against him, and declares that he had never seen the two works which Calvin ascribed to him. But who can doubt that they were his,



when they breathe so entirely his spirit ?” Henry, Vol. II.

#### WESTPHAL.

We give a brief account of Calvin's controversy with Westphal, because it serves a double purpose. It reveals the intensity of the opposition the great reformer encountered, and it reveals the greatness of the man in acknowledging his weakness :

“ The controversy with Westphal seems to have exercised a favorable influence on Calvin's character. He had in this case to do with a man of violent passions, who had inflicted an injustice on him. All the failings peculiar to Calvin were exaggerated, so that the latter had occasion to consider the hatefulness of such defects, and to reflect on the nature of anger and impatience. He repeatedly confessed his failings in this controversy, though not yet overcoming them ; and it is probable that he attained, in this manner, to a higher degree of self-knowledge, confessing, as he did upon his death-bed, and with sincere repentance, his too great impetuosity.

“ He also freely confessed that he was often carried too far, and that against his will ; observing, as is worthy of remark, that a man's indiscretion will frequently urge him on in spite of his will. He can not, as it were, do otherwise ; he is driven forward by a tempestuous wind. Partial judges, however, would not impute to Calvin the failings, to the force of which he apparently yielded against his will. But so little conscious was he, in many cases, of his impetuosity and arrogance, and we might also say his insolence, that he could observe, ‘ It is easy for Master Joachim to object to me, that my language is seasoned with a black salt of vain and tasteless pleasantry, and with the biting asperity of a calumniator. If I ought to be called a slanderer, because I have afforded Master Joachim, so blinded by his vices, a mirror, by the help of which he may at length begin to know his own shame, he must address his complaints to the prophets, to the apostles, and to Christ himself, who did not scruple sharply to reprove the adver-

saries of holy doctrine, when they were seen to be proud and obstinate.'

'We are quite agreed,' he adds, 'that injurious expressions, and foolish pleasantries, are little becoming of Christians. But since even the prophets did not refrain altogether from the use of reproaches, and Christ employed very sharp expressions in rebuking deceivers and false teachers, and as the Holy Spirit continually assails such persons, crying against them without ceasing, so it is a foolish and thoughtless thing to question whether it be lawful to reprove, sternly, boldly, and with a good heart, those who have justly exposed themselves to blame and infamy.'" Henry, Vol I.

"The agreement in doctrine established between the Swiss and the Genevese extended their influence to France, England, Scotland and Holland. In the same manner, the union between Melancthon and Calvin on the subject of the sacrament, secured the peace of the Protestant church; and there was every reason to expect its continuance, till Westphal, Hesshuss, and some others, designedly created a breach, and thus aroused the holy indignation of Calvin."

"That which was so calculated to excite Calvin's anxiety was evidently the prospect of the indescribably evils which threatened the church through these proceedings in Germany. In the case of a man like Luther, he could forgive anything, even when he most fiercely assailed the doctrine of Zwingli, and rent the church. But Westphal manifestly awakened the strife from an ignorant love of disputation; and Calvin, in order to bridle him, threatened him with the fire, but of an altogether different kind from that which consumed Servetus. Calvin's main effort had ever been to establish concord between the two great parties in the church. He had placed himself in the midst that he might bind them together." Henry, Vol. II.

"This first work, however, against Westphal was published in French, November 28, 1554, that the people might be made acquainted with the nature of the controversy. In the preliminary address to the Swiss ministers,

Calvin expresses his utter unwillingness to engage in controversy with a set of men indulging in absurdities. He would write against one of them only; and to show his contempt even for him, he would not mention his name. In his last epistle, however, to Westphal, he intimates that it was from tenderness to him that he refrained from naming him.

'This vain and foolish doctor,' he says in his French dedication, 'who has published a wretched work against the Sacramentarians, although we know better than he how to defend the sacraments, speaks also against our 'Consensus,' as if we contemplated in that document, not the sacrament, but an empty sign.' The Latin text is the more correct. We meet with the following reproachful expressions: 'This calf afterwards cites our own words, in which we openly confess, that the body of Christ is actually communicated to the faithful. He answers, that we speak only of a spiritual eating. What then? He would like, I suppose, to make it appear that the flesh of Jesus Christ may be eaten like the flesh of the oxen on his farm. Christ has a real natural body, as it was once offered upon the cross; and this is daily presented to us in the sacrament.'

"Calvin complained that Westphal had perverted the expressions employed in the 'Consensus.' 'Is he not like a foolish dog, which bites at every stone that lies in his way? This confusion-counsellor pretends that we are guilty of trickery; that we deceive the simple, by speaking of a spiritual eating. In the same manner this fine champion shows that we are all at variance with each other in our views. He has thereby done us a service; for nothing can more plainly prove that we are agreed, since all our views tend to the same end, namely that the mystery is figuratively exhibited. Even the apostles differ in their words, but this man supposes that we differ in sense. Some may indeed, seem to contradict each other; but the church-fathers and the apostles express themselves in various ways on the mystery of the sacrament.'

"'You see,' he continues, 'what grounds this brainless

man has for fabricating thunderbolts in his chamber to set, if possible, all Europe in a blaze. In one place he asserts, that the words of Christ are perfectly clear and need no commentary, when he says that the bread is his body ; but that he said this figuratively, which yet does not lessen the truth. that the bread is indeed the body of Christ.'

"Lastly, Calvin objects to him his unholy desire to involve the church in schism, whereas Zwingli, Ecolampadius, and especially Bucer had agreed to the 'Consensus.' 'I will confine my answer to three words: It is the property of Satan to slander, to darken the light ; and as the father of contention, to destroy peace and break the unity of the faith. Such being the characteristics of this babblers, nothing remains for us but to designate him a child of the devil.'" Henry, Vol. II.

We leave for the reader to decide what word, if any, shall be spoken against Calvin, as we have watched him encounter his traducers. If their characters do not justify every word and act of Calvin's, judged by putting ourselves in his place, we are at a loss to say what would. It is worth much to know why a man is hated and by whom hated. It may be a badge of honor and a sign of loyalty to truth and to God to be hated.

Against the idea of the reformation the old institutions, both secular and ecclesiastic, brought all the weight of historic continuity and papal order. "Kings, with faith in their own divine rights, grew grave ; where the old ecclesiastic only troubled, the new reform threatened to overturn.'" Rome argued that having ruled the world well, she should continue to rule by historic right. She asked the question: "If Protestantism, which produced these lawless and leveling sects, be allowed to exist and conquer, what will become of our rights, properties, civilization ?" Kings joined with Rome and "marshalled armies and fought battles to end what was to them less a pestilent heresy than a disorganizing and destructive political movement."

"Under Elizabeth, Calvinism was dominant ; the Thirty-nine Articles are in their doctrine higher than the old *Con-*

*fessio Seoticana*; the Bishop's Bible, as sanctioned by Elizabeth's bishops, contains the true Genevan doctrine; Parker and Grindal, Whitgift and Bancroft, were quite as Calvinistic as Goodman or Jewel, Cartwright or Perkins; the Lambeth Articles are as high as the Genevan Catechism; Hooker thinks Calvin "incomparably the wisest man that ever the French Church did enjoy," and though he opposed the Genevan discipline, he had nothing to say against the theology. But under Charles, the Anglican tendency was Arminian, the milder theology and the high polity going hand in hand. The significance of the change does not so much lie in the new theology as in the more elastic political doctrine it allowed. Laud was not an Arminian simply because he was able the better to resist the Puritans by contradicting their theology, but because his theory of the Divine right of kings and bishops had free scope and could have a more justived existence under a conditional theology, than under one which so magnified the divine sovereignty as to have no place for any absolute sovereignty of man over the people of God. And Laud did not stand alone; the Anglicans, like Jeremy Taylor, Bull, Sancroft, Barrow, became the severest critics of Calvinism; and never again do we see, as under Elizabeth and James, the highest offices of the Church, held by Calvinists and representative theologians sent as delegates to help a Calvinistic synod to formulate a high, aggressive, and uncompromising Calvinism."

We slip along the line of history scarcely one hundred years, and in England the questions asked by kings and bishops are the same as those asked by kings and popes in the life time of Calvin and Luther. Archbishop Laud, as we have indicated, was opposing the reformation idea in his efforts in behalf of divine rights for kings and bishops. The public conscience answered with a stroke of the axe on January 10th, 1645. The coming to the front of that much abused, because much misunderstood man, Oliver Cromwell, was because kings insisted on having the old order, though acknowledged to be bad, restored. The ground of

hatred for Cromwell is similar, if not identical to the ground of the hatred of Calvin. The one stood solitary and alone, and brought order out of disorder in one of the wickedest cities of Europe, by means of banishment and fire; the other, backed by an army selected on belief in, and fear of, the one living and true God, brought liberty and religious toleration from the merciless grasp of kings, by a stroke of the sword, in 1649, on the ground that the right could be conserved in no other way. It has been aptly put; that with Cromwell and Charles it was, "Your head or mine." Let the reader retrace his steps to the year 1576, and study the famous union of Utrecht, which formed the basis of the Dutch republic, and when he understands why Philip offered 25,000 crowns and a patent of nobility for the assassination of William of Orange, he will understand why timid men, who always see double when singleness of eye is most needed, cannot help the world when human rights are being trod under foot. The world calls for its Calvins, Luthers, Williams, Cromwells, because it cannot maintain the value of every unit and guarantee the right of every human soul without them.

There is a rigidness about Calvinism that provokes all manner of opposition, and invites a variety of hypotheses to explain what Calvinism asserts as fact. What Calvinism insists on most is the sovereignty of God and the reality of the Fall. Many theological distinctions have been advanced in the hope of escaping difficulties, and rendering these facts less obnoxious. Supra-lapsarianism has been denominated the highest form of speculative Calvinism, and has been described as a philosophy advocating a theory of the divine will, which claims that that will is conditioned on the divine nature and nothing else. This theory, it is claimed, precludes anything in the creature from being capable of moving the Creator. This makes God's will the only efficient will in the universe, and consequently the only ultimate cause. Thus the history of man, with all its anomalies as regards evil and good was to be explained. It eliminates "Chance" from the universe and compels a reading of all

events through the all-ordering will. Supra-lapsarianism placed the decrees of God before the Fall instead of after it. This shifted the place occupied by the divine will in the universe without destroying its efficiency. It changed the way of looking at the origin of evil, without in the slightest changing the effects of evil in the soul. It raised the question of divine injustice without giving the answer to the question, "How is God unjust in punishing the sinner?" So far as these distinctions in theology are concerned they leave the facts, as believed by all true Calvinists, much as Calvin stated them. Calvinism will never make friends by planing down its rough lines to suit those who do not like hard doctrines and the flint side of truth. When we undertake to make Calvinism fawn, we make it a weakling among the systems of theological thought. Dr. Henry Van Dyke has tried it in his *Gospel for an Age of Doubt*. The only perfect antithesis to Calvinism is Romanism. The nearest approach to that in Protestantism is Arminianism. Arminianism rests on two main ideas, viz., equity and man. It insists that God is compelled to save somebody. Calvinism insists that God is under necessity to save nobody. In Arminianism moral principles and laws are made the condition of the divine will for equity's sake, and physical limits are set to the divine action for man's sake. Calvinism bases justice on the supremacy and rights of God, and places the rights of man over against God's rights. There is no middle ground between these points, one or the other is true. To attempt a go-between is to be involved in ridicule. We remember having heard two theological students in debate when one was trying to show the middle ground between these antagonistic systems, his opponent answered him by saying: "There are two systems of theology, Calvinism and Arminianism: there is a crack between them, and you are following the crack."

The most perfect embodiment of Calvinism is to be found in the Westminster Confession of Faith, consequently that work excites as many enemies as Calvin. Its enemies are confined to no class; they are found among non-professing

believers and infidels, as well as among professing believers, and all denominations, including Presbyterians. Such dislike, it would seem, argues for the truth of the Confession of Faith and Calvinism. Coming to our own day, what an array of names marks this dislike! To begin with, there are Dr. David Swing, Dr. Chas. Briggs, Dr. Henry Preserved Smith, B. Fay Mills, Dr. George L. Prentiss, Dr. McGiffert, Dr. Chas. H. Parkhurst, Dr. Dwight Hillis, Dr. Lyman Abbott, and many others. Each has some complaint against John Calvin, the Confession of Faith, or the Bible. Truly it is true, "there is something imposing in the aversion heaped on Calvin."

We do not know how many people there are who are as ignorant as we are, but we confess that the literature of the last decade led us to look upon Calvin as an inhuman monster, and Calvinism as anything but lovable. This article is written to undeceive others if possible. When we have revised, or foot-noted, or amended the old Confession—if it is ever done—we will find that the "elect infant clause," and the "preterition clause," after they are stricken out will leave the facts of the sovereignty of God, the Fall, and Christ the only redeemer, as much realities as ever.

We shall attempt, in the words of others, to put John Calvin in contrast with his immediate traducers, and we shall leave for the reader to infer, it may not be possible that some in our own time still misjudge Calvin and do injustice to the system of theology that bears his name.

Later than 1835 Paul Henry wrote: "The genius and solid merits of this great reformer have rarely been estimated according to their value. It is only of late years that attention has been drawn to his talent as a commentator. We may also mention it as a singular fact, that while the world is so ready to censure the ignorance of former times, it should still have so generally retained its prejudice against Calvin. While this is shown by particular criticisms directed against him, it is equally evident from the circumstance that not a single complete biography of this remarkable man has appeared. The life of Calvin by the Genevese, Senebier,



and translated into German by Ziegenbein, and that by Tischer, are simple biographical notices, and contain even less than that by Beza, which is itself but a mere outline. Bretschneider's excellent and solid, though short memoir, in the "Reformations-Almanach," on the genius and character of Calvin, combines a knowledge of the man with that of his history. The earlier works about him are either filled with abuse, or are mere panegyrics. It was impossible, perhaps, that Calvin should have been regarded at a former period in a historical point of view. As a polemic, he could only be treated with a one-sided prejudice. Assailed with passionate violence by his opponents, a sort of church-patriotism taught his friends to represent him as infallible and immaculate. Thus he shared the fate of many other great men, namely, to be fanatically hated or loved extravagantly. But during the reign of apostasy and indifference he was forgotten or despised. Now, however, when it has ceased to be the fashion to magnify, in a spirit of controversy, the failings of the great teachers of the church or to lessen and conceal them; and when it is seen that evangelical churches rest upon a very different foundation to that laid by the mere virtues of the reformers, it becomes possible to form an unprejudiced opinion of this man, and to expect it from all religious parties, even from evangelically-minded Roman Catholics. We may now also look for justice to be done to the greatness of his genius.

"The old prejudice against him has even prevailed in reformed France, and such has been the indifference respecting him, that till now, amid all the variety of books, good and bad, proceeding from the press, no one has thought of writing the history of this great theologian. It has been no better in Switzerland. In England only has some love for the forgotten Calvin been displayed."

"May the world then, perverted as it has been by French example, listen to the fact, that at no remote period there existed in France a moral tribunal; that a sublime experiment was made there to preserve the Christian church, by a moral power and strength, pure from the contagion of a

miserable heathenism ; that the unworthy were excommunicated, whilst the church offered up its supplications for those who were thus separated from its communion—all of which may sound as a wonder in the ears of the present sensual age. Here too we might speak of the martyrs of that country, who afforded examples of fortitude not excelled in the primitive church. France will never, we believe, arrive at a proper knowledge of herself till she learn to know and to love the great reformer sent her by God. He was given to her as a bitter medicine, but she must take it. The stone which the builders rejected is become a corner-stone, He may be one of stumbling to many, but he will be also for the rising of many. In a word, Calvin is as a source of living faith, hitherto despised, but to which we now direct attention : he is also as an armory, whence weapons may be drawn for every Christian in his good fight against all the powers of Antichrist."

"We are not likely, however, to yield ourselves to the influence of this great man, unless we be first made acquainted with the task imposed upon him by God, and with the force by which he overcame its difficulties. We must live and pray with him, and see how his strength armed itself more and more for the conflict, and how the Holy Spirit led, supported and comforted him throughout his life. The only thing to be advanced against him is, that he was not in every respect superior to his age ; and that, like all other men, he had to strive with human infirmities. And if Providence should grant the church another such teacher, how would he in the present day, and after an experience of three hundred years, speak to us in the new circumstances of the world ? What judgment would he pass upon our creed, upon our systems of doctrine, and dogmatics ? How would he assail the infidel ? Would he endeavor to impart holiness to the church of Christ ? What methods would he employ to secure the church in its rightful position against Catholic despotism and Protestant anarchy ? To establish its proper relation to the State ? To restore and preserve its unity ?"

It may appear extravagant to some who read these pages, but it is nevertheless true, that Calvin was the mildest, most evenly poised of all the spirits of the reformation, not excepting the gentle Philip Melancthon.

"Calvin's life has been rarely understood, because it exhibits almost incomprehensible extremes, in the same manner as his system, which appears on the one side the unpractical of systems, through the doctrine of election, and on the other the most practical, through the sternness of its morality. These contrasts in his life are partly the cause why he had such bitter enemies and such enthusiastic friends; and why no man in the world has been so variously judged, as people have directed their attention to the one or the other extreme of his character. But this renders a familiar acquaintance with his history so much the more interesting, and there is a greater charm in diligently separating the true from the false. They only can know this who are capable of feeling that the sublimest element in his doctrine, as well as in his intellect, was the deep religious feeling of which we have spoken, and that it was with this, and not from thought or speculation, that he began his career. The main source of all the false opinions passed upon this great man may be traced to the notion, that he was a mere dialectician, passionately engaged in unfolding one idea. His life in God, his love of truth and purity of conscience are overlooked, while it was these alone which determined his conduct, and exercised a commanding influence on his practice, and on his zeal for the unity of the church." Henry's Preface.

"His holy zeal was a righteous one, and it is our drowsiness only which has provoked his Christian indignation, his tumultuous and stormy feeling of duty. And what remains for the Christian if he will not use the sword? It is not by soft remedies that he could heal the wounds of Zion. He would not have gained his end, and it would have been objected to him, "If you are not yourself convinced in your whole soul, why do you disturb the existing order of things?" Morus,

"The ordinary rule by which we measure common men and circumstances, is not available in the case of great men, whose course is more eccentric." Bretschneider.

A historian of Switzerland, predisposed to the Roman Catholic Church, says : "John Calvin had the spirit of an old lawgiver ; he had the genius and qualities which endowed him on the one side with indisputable excellences, and he had failings which were only those virtues in excess, by which he completed and carried out his work. Like the other reformers, he exhibited an unwearied diligence in the firm pursuit of a single object, an inflexible firmness in principle and duty. and both in his life and death the earnestness and dignity of an old Roman censor. He very greatly promoted the freedom of Geneva, his influence often giving harmony to the otherwise discordant element of its government. Through his position and discourse he aided the progress of the human mind far more than he himself supposed. Among the Genevese, and in France, the principles of free discussion, upon which he was at first obliged to depend, and which he afterwards sought in vain to limit, produced much more important consequences than in other nations less inquisitive than the Genevese, and not so bold as the French. Hence, by degrees, were evolved these philosophical ideas, which, although not sufficiently free from the passions and designs of their authors, were sufficient to banish a mighty host of dark and shameful prejudices, and to open for the future a brighter prospect, the hope of happiness, founded on the genuine wisdom of social life."

Another writes : "Calvin was not only a profound theologian, but also an able legislator. The part which he took in framing the civil and religious laws, which have been the happiness of Geneva for so many centuries, gives him perhaps a higher title to glory than his theological works ; and that republic, celebrated notwithstanding its smallness, which has united morality to knowledge, riches to simplicity, simplicity to taste, liberty to order, and which has been a nursery for talent and virtue, has well proved how deeply

acquainted Calvin was with the nature of man, and the art of government."

Calvin's death revealed more than his life how deeply he was loved and revered by all good men. Beza thus writes of his end: "The day on which he died, May 27th, he seemed to suffer less, and even to speak with greater ease; but this was the last effort of nature. In the evening, about eight o'clock, the sure signs of death became suddenly apparent. As soon as this was made known to me, and to one of the brethren, by the servants, I hastened to the bedside, and found him just as he quietly expired, neither feet nor hands were convulsed; he had not even breathed hard. He had retained his consciousness and reason to the end. Even his voice was preserved till his last breath, and he looked rather like one sleeping than one dead. Thus on this day, with the setting sun, the brightest light in the world, and he who had been the strength of the church, was taken back to heaven."

"During the night, and on the following day, great was the mourning throughout the city. The entire state wept for the prophet of the Lord; the Church lamented the departure of its faithful pastor; the academy the loss of so great a teacher; all exclaimed in their grief, that they had lost a father, who, after God, was their truest friend and comforter. Many inhabitants of the city desired to see him after he was dead, and could hardly be induced to leave his remains."

"Some of those also, who had come from distant places to make his acquaintance and to hear him, among whom was a very distinguished man, the ambassador of the Queen of England to France, were particularly anxious to behold his countenance, even in death. At first, all who wished, were admitted; but as they were merely influenced by curiosity, it seemed advisable to his friends, in order to prevent the misrepresentation of adversaries, to put him early the next day, which was Sunday, in a shroud, and then inclose him as usual in a wooden coffin. At two o'clock in the afternoon, he was carried to the city church-yard, called the

*Plain-Palais.* All the patricians of the city followed ; they were accompanied by the clergy, the professors of the high-school, and by almost the whole city ; not without many tears."

"He was buried without the slightest pomp ; this was according to his own expressed desire. Beza, however, wrote an epitaph on him. He had lived fifty-four years, ten months, seventeen days ; and the half of this time he had consecrated to the service of the Gospel. Respecting his last will, the Genevese neither raised a monument to his memory, nor marked his grave with a stone. Thus, in the church-yard which is so decorated with the tombs of others, the grave of Calvin is unmarked and unknown. It will be shown at the last day. A beautiful brass medal has been lately cast in honor of his name. But his writings, and the example of his firm faith, have a durability greater than that of marble and brass ; and certain it is, that wherever a church is praying, or a martyr is struggling for the faith, there Calvin is also present with his power of faith and prayer."

"In proportion to the grief experienced in the reformed church, was the joy of the Roman Catholics. The Pope expected that he might again win Geneva to his side, and even named seven missionaries for this especial work ; but the council venerated the majesty of Calvin's character, and held firm to the truth, as if it had still the invisible before its eyes." Henry, Vol. II.

As we read these words of Beza and Dr. Henry, we recall the closing time of another life. A life lived in an age and in a land that had been benefitted by the powerful influence of Calvin : "It was in the dining-room at Abbotsford that Sir Walter died. Here, at the age of sixty-one, and attended by all his children, his gentle spirit passed away from earth ; and while his family knelt around his bed, his eldest son kissed and closed his eyes."

"A wonderful procession was that which followed Scott's body to the grave. Mourners had come from every part of Scotland. The line of carriages alone, was more than a

mile in length Hundreds of yeomanry followed on horse-back In every village on the way, the entire population stood before their doorways, clothed in black. The heavens, too, were hung with clouds, as if in lamentation for the poet's death."

These two men, so unlike in life, in work, in environment, were alike in child-like faith in God and in the adoration of the people. We say Scott was so loved because he was lovable. Shall we say less, when from Geneva we hear the sound of lamentation where he, whom the people loved and adored, lies dead?

It is certainly impressive that the man who has done more for the world than any uninspired man who ever lived, should be so maligned, and that his system of thought should be so misrepresented. One is possessed with the feeling that action so violent must one day cause a reaction equally as violent. There are certain things true about Calvinism, and such results have been attained because of it, that the honesty and good sense of the world will save them from calumny and falsehood, and put them where the people shall recognize their benefactor and the sources from whence come their liberties.

Clear visioned, the world is learning through each upward struggling year, that he is prince whose life is noblest. Nobility of nature, goodness in life, and suffering for humankind the world will not suffer to be lost. We conclude this article in the words of Rufus Choate, which link Calvin's influence and every important event of history from his work in Geneva to the birth time of our own Republic.

"In the reign of Mary (of England), a thousand learned artisans fled from the stake, and home to the happier States of Continental Protestantism. Of these a great number, I know not how many, came to Geneva. I ascribe to that five years in Geneva, an influence which has changed the history of the world. I seem to myself to trace to it, as an influence on the English character, the opening of another era of time and liberty. I seem to myself to trace to it the great civil war in England; the Republican constitution

framed in the Mayflower ; the theology of Jonathan Edwards, the battle of Bunker Hill, the Independence of America."

JNO. W. STAGG.

Charlotte, N. C.

This article is intended to be simply a compilation and arrangement of materials easily accessible to any who may wish to investigate further.



## II.—THE IMPORTANCE OF DOCTRINAL SOUNDNESS IN TEACHING.

Why is it deemed necessary that our young men who prepare themselves for the ministry of the Word, have to give a considerable part of their time and energy during their seminary life, to the study of Dogmatic theology? In our anti-Dogmatical times this question is often brought before the public. It is conceded that Dogmatic is the corner-stone of theology as a science, but our moderns are unable to see why students, who do not study theology for its own sake, but desire to enter the practical service of the church, should—as they call it—waste precious time over abstruse Dogmatical questions. It seems to them a work of supererogation, a vexation of spirit, to occupy one's mind with all the hair-splitting distinctions and disputations which confront the scholar who attempts to study dogmatic theology, while thorough, energetical work would be sufficient and far more profitable. The aim of practical men, they argue, is not to teach Dogmatic, but to win souls for Christ and to lead the church into the paths of life.

There is a grain of truth in all this. There is a twofold study of theology. As e.g. the Semitic languages are studied by a philologist in a different manner and with a different purpose than by an historian, so also theology is studied in a different manner and with a different purpose by a professional theologian than by a minister of the Word. In debates, carried on now and then in reviews and newspapers, the ground is generally taken that the seminary is an institution with practical purposes, a training school, as it were, for the aspirant ministers of the Word. If this is so, it might be reasonably asked, why then not relegate the study of Dogmatic to the university, where theology is studied for its own sake? And they might point to the new departure in the Netherlands, where since A. D. 1876, all the practical branches of theology have been excluded from the curricula of the univer-

sities. The recent introduction into Presbyterian seminaries of the study of the English Bible is an elegant reproof of a system which neglects the practical aspect of the work. A young man in the seminary ought to learn how to handle his tools before he enters the lists in the great fight for Christ and the church. Instead of loading his cart with a great deal of learned rubbish of a rabbinical nature, which he feels inclined to drop at the first dumping ground he meets, he ought to be instructed how to carry away treasures, which make him rich as a minister of the Word, and enable him to become a workman who need not be ashamed.

However true this may be to a certain extent—and as a criticism of wrong methods we welcome such objections—it is after all a superficial view of the Word, which prompts such thoughts. In every department of professional studies we find men who apply themselves to their profession scientifically, while others prepare themselves by their studies, for practical work. Are the latter dispensed from pursuing a scientific course? Are they perhaps mechanically trained for a life of routine? How about the preparation of our aspirant practical lawyers? It is required of them to study jurisprudence scientifically. And certainly this does not hinder them afterwards in drawing up a contract or in filling in blanks of any description correctly. The drudgery of the work may be done by a man who never has enjoyed a thorough education in his special department, but what does a practical knowledge of the law amount to without a thorough preparation in painstaking study? And how about our practical physicians and surgeons? We call them quacks, and justly so, if they lack a careful preparation for their work under the guidance of competent masters of medical science. That, which is acknowledged by all as a necessary equipment of our physicians and jurists, is in a still higher degree necessary for the ministers of the Word. All who belong to the learned professions—and although the ministry of the Word is much more than this, it also is and ought to remain a learned profession—have to

study, as it were, the Dogmatic of their science. All ought to be dogmatically sound in their different spheres.

Certainly, preachers of the Word are not called upon to give dogmatical lectures to their parishoners, but they are in duty bound to be teachers when they preach. Preaching may be more than mere teaching, but the teaching element must never be absent from the sermons of our preachers. The oratorical element must never predominate. We do not wish to minimize the importance of other qualifications in a preacher, but we have the word of Paul for it, when we emphasize their duty to teach. This duty is of paramount importance. A bishop must be apt to teach. "He may be a married man, or glory in celibacy; he may shine as an orator, or lack the splendor of eloquence; he may be a man of genius, or in the possession of ordinary gifts; but he must be apt to teach." He has to be a teacher everywhere and always in all his ministrations, but especially when he mounts the pulpit in order to preach the Word as an ambassador of Christ. He has to teach divine truth. Alexander Vinet is certainly<sup>s</sup> right when he maintains that a preacher is engaged in a battle when he addresses his people, but we must not forget that the weapons of our warfare are spiritual, taken from the arsenal of the Holy Scriptures. Instead of presenting to his parishoners the chaff of his own dreams and speculations, he has to give them bread prepared of the wheat of God's revelation. We all agree that the Holy Scriptures are full of doctrines. Eliminate the doctrinal part from the Bible, and little remains. The doctrinal treasures of the Bible are inexhaustible. The minister's glory is to be an interpreter and expositor of God's Word. Faithful adherence to the expressed will and thoughts of God as transmitted to us in the Holy Scriptures, as well as soundness in the presentation of them, is his bounden duty. Doctrinal soundness is an absolute condition of a ministry, acceptable to God, what ever men may say to the contrary. To find the unity in the multiplicity of doctrines, to have a sound *regula fidei*, is an absolute necessity for a preacher. Without it, his hearers will soon

find him out and call him unreliable and wavering in his pulpit ministrations.

Doctrinal soundness is first of all a vigorous presentation of the truth. Sound men, in a bodily sense, are healthy and vigorous. They have strength in all the members of their body, and they use them all vigorously in the execution of their work. Doctrinal soundness is impossible without a vigorous declaration of the whole truth without questionable alloy. The trumpet may not give an uncertain sound. Milk and water preaching lacks soundness, because it lacks vigor. A man who exhorts without teaching, or who tells stories to amuse his hearers, may make a great deal of noise like a Capuchian friar, but the impression he makes will be weak. A man, who always apologizes for the truth he preaches, who envelopes it in the swaddling clothes and sugar-coats the bitter pills he has to administer, and who is always dreadfully afraid of the pews, is sickly in his preaching and will do no real good.

Doctrinal soundness also requires a presentation of the whole truth, as it is in Jesus. Some preachers have a stunted Bible. There are among them those who never, or seldom, take a text from the Old Testament. They have no use for that part of the Bible. They have shelved it as antiquated. In the new Bible, advocated by some, it ought to be added to the New Testament as an appendix, as was formerly done with the apocryphal books of the Old Testament. Others confine themselves to the gospels, or as they are accustomed to say, the words of the Lord, spoken by himself and recorded in the three synoptical gospels. Their view of the Holy Scriptures allows them to use the pen-knife freely and cut out obnoxious portions, which they do not like to present to the people. Such preachers may be eloquent and fervently religious after a fashion; they may please their audiences immensely and win a great deal of applause; but they lack the one thing needful in a Christian preacher, viz: Doctrinal soundness; the *conditio sine qua non* of a ministry, acceptable to the Lord.

Others again, whom we have to put in the same category,

although they take their texts from both the Old and New Testaments, preach a certain set of doctrines, which they favor themselves or are favored by them who hear them. Some delight in preaching on the total depravity of man and neglect to press upon their hearers their responsibility; others speak on the sovereignty of God, but neglect to give a full and universal invitation of the gospel; some speak eloquently on the character of Christ, but put his cross in the back-ground; others again speak on the glories of heaven, but ignore the calling of God's people in this world. *Ex ungue leonem.* We are not called upon to withhold from saints and sinners a part of the truth, which God in his wisdom has deemed necessary to reveal to us. God nowhere gives his servants, who are his ambassadors, liberty to select some truths for their pulpit ministrations and to leave the rest untouched. We are ministers and not masters of the Word. We have to apply the truths to all the needs of the people, wisely choosing from time to time what is necessary, but we may not neglect any aspect of the truth, however disagreeable it may appear to them to whom it is preached. We are lacking in doctrinal soundness if we pursue such a course.

Sometimes we are told: Such and such doctrines are no longer fit for our age. They are not, as they think, scientifically sound. Scientific soundness versus doctrinal soundness, history versus dogma is the burning question of to-day. Natural science under the thumb of the philosophy of evolution reigns supreme. If the preacher submits himself to this yoke it is impossible for him to be doctrinally sound. Suppose we ask our naturalistic age: What may be preached in our pulpits with the consent of natural science? What will the answer be? May a preacher of the Word tell his people that God has created heaven and earth? There is no doubt about it, the holy Scriptures, both in the Old and New Testaments, teach that God the Father Almighty is the creator of heaven and earth. He has brought forth all things visible and invisible by the word of His power out of nothing. The universe is not eternal. May this old-

fashioned doctrine be preached? The answer of modern naturalists to this question will be: Go and tell your people, that protoplasm is the faithful womb of all the phenomena that have been evolved. May I bow to the dictatorship of natural science? If I desire to remain doctrinally sound, I may not. The interrelation between natural science and God's revelation is of a delicate nature, and we certainly ought to be modest in our position, as far as debatable questions are concerned, for we owe a debt of gratitude to modern investigation, but if doctrinal soundness should suffer from our concessions we have the courage to say with Pope Pius IX: *Non possumus*.

May I preach, I ask again, that the holy Scriptures are inspired, inspired in the old sense of the word? Has the Holy Spirit given us by inspiration an infallible and inerrant rule for our faith and life? Nonsense, we are told, we find in the noble collection of the Hebrew and Hellenistic writings, traditionally called the Word of God, the record of the evolution of the religious genius of the Hebrews, which culminated in the foundation and development of the Christian religion. It is true, we are told by honest men among modern theologians, that the prophets, Christ himself, and the apostles, believed in the inspiration of the holy Scriptures, but we are no longer bound by their views, which are antiquated. The doctrine of inspiration in all its forms, they claim, is solved for good. Theopneustists—this term was first used, if I am not mistaken, by Eugene Menejoz, the head of the Fideists in France—are representatives of an age gone by and never to return again.

May I speak, I ask again, on the Divinity of Christ and on the atonement by the blood of the lamb; may I follow Paul in his determination to know nothing save Jesus Christ and him crucified? The doctrine of the Divinity of Christ is ruled out as metaphysical and the atonement by blood is looked upon as a remnant of heathenism, which thinks it necessary to appease the wrath of the gods by bloody victims. We are saved, they tell us, by the life and character of the historical Christ and by his noble and invigorating

example.

May I declare, I ask our moderns, who are infatuated with the charm of evolution, that without regeneration it is impossible to see the kingdom of God? No, I am emphatically told, for we have ruled out the supernatural from the life of man; we have found it necessary to extinguish the boundary line between the sacred and the secular, because we find everything, which is worth keeping, in the "gospel" of Darwin and Spencer. Evolution excludes regeneration. The modern man is evolved, he is not regenerated. It is an affront to nature, to believe, that a man has to receive anything in addition to what he already has. We do not believe in the descent but in the ascent of man. The fall is a myth, a true story but lacking reality, as some say, original sin, except in the form of heredity, a superstition, evolution is everything.

How little remains, if we try to keep our preaching in harmony with the dictates of modern naturalism. Haeckel triumphantly predicts the downfall of Christianity within a short time and he only allows the ethical maxims of Jesus to survive. In the conflict now upon us the pulpit ought to be strong and uncompromising. Preachers must not cede an inch to the invasion of modern thought into the pulpit, sound doctrinal preaching is an utter necessity, a true mark of loyalty to Christ and his cause. If we have to suffer opprobrium, if we are looked upon as fossils or fanatics, because we remember our ordination vows, we have simply to endure this hardship, as good soldiers of Jesus Christ. Our enemies must learn that they have to deal with men of unflinching courage and firm determination, who desire to make their office as ministers of the Word glorious. Weak apology and compromises born of fear are to be shunned, a war to the bitter end for our Master and Lord is the only honorable position we can and may take.

In our efforts to be sound in our pulpit ministrations we are of course not bound to preach everything which is coined orthodox by fallible men. Every system of doctrine has its strong and weak points. We are in harmony with the

public confessions of our churches, but we do not subscribe to everything that has been said by all who have written on dogmatical subjects. We have to preach the whole truth and nothing but the truth of God, if we desire to be doctrinally sound in our preaching. As Napoleon Roussell said : Not what men say, but what the Word of God testifies, is our rule.

Many things, which are found in dogmatical treatises on account of their speculative value in theology as a science, are debarred from the pulpit. We do not preach e. g. about the origin of the soul, the different views of the imputation of Adam's sin to his descendants, the difference between infra and supralapsarianism, the Christological questions in their bearing upon the person of Christ. All these subjects interest us very much, but they are not food for the church of God. It is to be confessed, that the orthodox pulpit of former times has done too much in this line of unfruitful preaching. How paradoxical it may sound, but it has to be admitted, that such orthodox preaching was doctrinally unsound. We have to feed our people with bread, well baked and presented in a suitable form, hence we have to abstain from bringing our scientific foods into our pulpits. We may be orthodox to the core in our statements, but our people will sleep over it without taking into consideration what we tell them. We may be orthodox, I repeat, but we are not doctrinally sound if we convert an assembly of believers into a school of theological amateurs.

In order to be sound in preaching, we have to present the doctrines, contained in the Bible, in their interrelation. I have already intimated above, that the truths revealed in the holy Scriptures are not only a series following each other in succession, but also a congress, connected and interrelated as members of a well regulated body. All truths are important, but some doctrines are of a more vital importance than others. We must be able to value the single truths as parts of the whole and to give them their correct place, not only in our system of theology, but also in our pulpit ministrations. Hobbies in the pulpit are entirely out



of place. To harp away at some important truths, while others, which we perhaps do not deem as important as the rest, are rejected or ignored, is entirely wrong and has a detrimental effect upon our parishioners. The harmonious development of their Christian character will suffer, if their spiritual instruction is one-sided. Doctrinal soundness in preaching means the harmonious, well poised, setting forth of all the truths in their interrelation.

Soundness in doctrinal preaching, however, means more than a sound presentation of the doctrines of the holy Scriptures. To be sure, doctrinal sermons have to be preached. It is the *pièce de résistance* of our spiritual fare. There is an outcry against this kind of preaching in some circles, and timid souls are forced into submission and present to the flock of Christ water and milk as their only food. You see it in the weak condition of those churches which have to live on such a fare. We are not so easily frightened by such a clamor of anti-dogmatical men, be they never so influential in the churches as at present. We are convinced that no preacher can come before his people without some kind of dogmatics. Even the bare assertion of anti-dogmatism must have, if it desires to have a respectful hearing, a doctrinal basis. The anti-dogmatical preachers may not be in love with the five points of Dordt or with the Westminster Confession, they have a system of their own, who is able to trace a man's basic point in his manifold utterances. If the anti-dogmatical preacher is an educated man, he will be logical and systematical, hence he is dogmatical. Do you not detect in the rationalistic sermons of the eighteenth century the systems of natural religion and the rejection of the theology of blood? It is a very difficult thing to prove from the writings of Theodore Parker that he was a Unitarian barker of the most pronounced type? Does the lovely character of William E. Channing hide from view his Christological errors? The idea of preaching sermons without a doctrinal basis! It is absurd, because it is impossible, and it is impossible, because it is absurd. Moderns desire to drive the old reformation theology out of the pul-

pit, and they do it, not by preaching no doctrines at all, which is impossible, but by substituting their own doctrines for the old approved ones. Their outcry against doctrinal preaching is only a stratagem of war. We are not willing to deliver the bulwark of the doctrinal foundation of our preaching in the reformation theology into the hands of the enemy.

In the Reformed Church in America it is incumbent upon the ministers to explain the Heidelberg Catechism. Formerly this exposition had to be finished within each year; at present the time of limitation is set at the end of four years. The extension of the time limit is a concession to the anti-dogmatical tendency in the churches. We know, that even now in its moderate application, this law is not popular in many churches. It is prejudice which sets people against such a wholesome arrangement. They do not know what they do. I am sure that expositions of the Heidelberg Catechism or of that gem of logical statement of truth, the Assembly's Shorter Catechism, in the evening services, would do a great deal more of good than the musical-religious entertainments now in vogue. It is the lack of doctrinal instruction which make people say, when they have listened to a sermon full of the marrow of the Word of God: Doctor Dry as Dust has effectually tried to lull us to sleep. They pronounce judgment against themselves in their innocent unconsciousness. People who have given up the doctrines of the Bible as indigestible, are too weak to follow the lines of thought in any sermon which deserves the name, and which requires a little more of them than a scanty knowledge of contemporaneous literature and science. The latest novel will not help a man to understand a sermon on justification by faith.

But as we have said, soundness in doctrinal preaching means more than a sound presentation of the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures. Preaching and doctrinal preaching are not identical. That is, what we say, our evangelistic brethren will be ready to chime in. The gospel has to be preached. We do not say it. The gospel has to be preached

to sinners. The way of salvation has to be made plain. The gospel music must never cease. Preaching of the gospel, however, in its restricted evangelistic sense, is far from being the full burden of Christ's ambassadors to the church. Churches are, ideally considered, associations of believers. It is true there are, in our congregations, people who still are under the dominion of sin, far from Christ; but when we assemble in the house of God for the purpose of public worship, we assemble as God people. We do not follow Schliermacher, who taught that a preacher had to address his people as Christians, true believers in Christ, for in reality they are not all in a saved condition; but we do not forget that the church is present, where they assemble in God's presence. Preaching of the gospel however necessary it is, is not the whole of preaching. We are not doctrinally sound, if we are too exclusively evangelistic.

The old title of a minister is V. D. M. This exactly expresses his work in the pulpit, and, for that matter, also his work outside of it. But we confine ourselves here to his work as a preacher. He who wants to be doctrinally sound in preaching, has to be so in every aspect of his glorious work. Many and various subjects are given to him in his work as a preacher. In all these subjects, and not only in his doctrinal sermons, he has to be doctrinally sound.

Take e. g. historical subjects. How easy it is to allow these to degenerate into eulogies, into glorification of man. May this be done? It never serves the purpose. In our own time it is especially dangerous to indulge in such rhapsodies, which do not edify, because they do not glorify God. Spreadeagleism in the pulpit is not only in bad taste, but dangerous in the extreme. It is easily understood, when one listens to many orations at funerals or on days of remembrance, why it is that the fathers of the reformation of the sixteenth century did not encourage funeral sermons or addresses of a similar kind. Sermons on Abraham and David, on Peter and Paul, etc., must be doctrinally sound in order to do good. If we are not guided in presenting Biblical characters or narratives by the fundamental doc-

trines of the Bible, the pictures we draw will be caricatures and the influence of such preaching will be very bad indeed.

Think also of the parables. They seem so simple, and yet how difficult is their true interpretation. Young ministers have often burned their fingers in trying to handle them. They are so difficult, because they are so simple. We need the clearest light in order to see their beauty and their exact meaning. And this light is the truth, which God has revealed in the holy Scriptures. The historical school abhors dogmatic interpretation, but we do not care about the beauty of the parables as gems of poetry, if we are not allowed to interpret them in the light of God's truth. If this is called allegorical interpretation, let us have as much of it as possible. But the allegorizing method of former times we do countenance for a moment. Trench was a fine interpreter of the parables, and yet sometimes, when he was found napping, he left the field of revealed truth and indulged in allegorical interpretation of what really is the embellishment of the narrative. We do not approve of this. It leads to positions, doctrinally unsound.

Ethical sermons are in great demand nowadays. They are undoubtedly necessary, on condition that they are doctrinally sound. But as a reaction against doctrinal preaching they are of little value. One of the most valid objections against the doctrinal preaching of the Eighteenth Century was the lack of moral tone and quality in the sermons of those times. The people were fed—exceptions excepted—on the husks of dry dogmatics, presented in a popular form. Christianity suffered immensely in the days of neo-scholastic theology, which paved the way for pietism on the one and rationalism on the other side. We have not one word of commendation for such a kind of preaching, which is no preaching in the true sense of the word. Doctrinal preaching was overdone; it ignored the claims of ethic entirely, and thereby became doctrinally unsound. But there is a danger on the other side, a danger apparent to all who make a study of the modern pulpit. Ethic con-

siders our relation to our followers. We have to "love our neighbor as ourselves" is an epitome of every truly ethical system. Our actions must manifest this love; but actions, considered in the abstract, can not lay claim to an ethical character. Is it possible to separate faith from action, the Credenda and the agenda? The French are responsible for what they call independent morals, and although this idea was born in the days of the French Encyclopedists, at the end of the eighteenth century, it has been taken hold of with great zeal by many of our contemporaries. Even theologians speak of the ethical character of Christianity and set aside the doctrinal part as no longer in harmony with the scientific character of the age. Ethical preaching based upon such a view of our religion is not at all in harmony with the true character of Christianity. Henry Drummond in his eulogy of love in his little book, *The Greatest Thing in the World*, may use his influence to make, as the phrase goes, Christianity practical; it is nevertheless an axiom, if I mistake not, that love must be guided by doctrinal soundness, if it indeed shall be the greatest, i. e., the most profitable thing in the world.

History tells us that ethical preaching, unless it rests upon the foundation of sound doctrine, is barren of results and even leads to an immoral condition of things. In the beginning of the nineteenth century e. g. the moral condition of the Scotch people was bad indeed. The majority of the ministers who flourished in the later part of the eighteenth century, had been of the opinion that doctrinal preaching would finally lead to the swamps and bogs of immorality. They began to preach morals. They were called Moderates, because they were very, very moderate in the amount of doctrinal preaching. They emphasized on the other hand moral conduct. What was the result of such a change of preaching? The sad condition of Scotland in the beginning of the nineteenth century, morally considered, tells the tale. This condition grew worse and worse, until at last God sent them a herald of a better gospel in the person of Dr. Chalmers, who was followed by a large host of spiritually mind-

ed men, who were not afraid to present to the people the full counsel of God.

Let us beware of separating the ethical part of Christianity from the bed rock of doctrine. Why are men by nature enemies of their neighbors? Because they hate God. In our day the cry is often heard: Back to Christ! We are glad to hear this little cry, when the true Christ is meant and the true way which leads back to him. But we are inclined to call the people back to God, in order that the Christ of the Scriptures may become precious to them. When men learn to reverence God, to fear and to love Him on account of His great gift, the gift of his power, wisdom and love, then and then only will ethical preaching have a good effect, for the service of God on earth as manifested in our love to our neighbor is profitable indeed, if it is a service of gratitude "We love, because He has loved us." Such ethical preaching is in full harmony with the doctrines of the holy Scriptures; it is the natural flow of water bursting forth from the fountain.

But is it not better, some have asked, to require of ministers to preach Christ, and will the natural result not be, if they adhere to this theme exclusively, that they will be doctrinally sound and a blessing to the Church and the world? This question, it seems, includes the correct answer. All Christians believe that Christ is the center of God's revelation and the source of salvation. He includes all things necessary and desirable to know. Let the minister of the Word by all means present Christ, and if he does it, as it ought to be done, he certainly be doctrinally sound. For Christ indeed is the dogma *κατ'ἐξοχήν* of Christianity. But it must be the true Christ, whom God has sent us from on high, and who has been born of the Virgin Mary. We have to emphasize this. You know, that the Jews of old were filled with their ideas of the Messiah. But alas! they delighted in having false Christs, and nailed the true one, given them by the Father, to the accursed tree.

Our time has not yet got rid of the idea of the Messiah. But, alas! the true Christ is rejected by many. Hosts of

our contemporaries follow in the footsteps of Renan, who once said : "Jesus will always be my God. But Jesus is no longer the redeemer of man from original sin. Man's nature has no need of being redeemed, for it is not completed, but has its part in the divine work of progress" Such caricatures of Christ are presented to the people by many so-called leaders of religious thought. If we desire to preach Christ, let our preaching be doctrinally sound.

The preachers of false Christ's do not confine themselves to professorial chairs or to the editorial sanctum, they also invade the pulpits and lead astray many professors of religion, especially among the young, who as a rule are inclined to lend their ears to everything that is new and startling.

Some preachers in our day preach an ideal Christ. They have their own view of what church ought to be in our times. They draw a picture of a modernized Christ. They may not go as far as Renan in his negations ; in principle, however, they resemble him very much. They are not bound by what they call the traditional Christ of church history, and the more radical among them reject Paul, and confine themselves in their search for the Christ of the synoptical gospels, but they all rely more upon their religious spirit than upon objective revelation. The Christ of their own creation is their idol. They decorate their Christ with many of the beautiful feathers taken from the Christ of the Scriptures, but they rob him of his true glory. We cannot testify too energetically against the preaching of the ideal Christ. It corrupts the faith of the churches and introduces into the pulpit a leaven of a very dangerous heresy. Keep it out by all means by preaching Christ in a doctrinally sound manner.

Others maintain that the historical and not the traditional Christ has to be preached. History versus tradition is one of the great battle cries of modern theology. What is history nowadays? History is such a collection of facts, as is stamped genuine by modern science. Facts, or rather alleged facts, which are not in harmony with empirical science or with the philosophy of evolution, are

spurious, and have to be discarded as unhistorical. The distinction between the sacred and the secular does no longer exist, where such a view of history prevails. The pragmatic character of history must be maintained also with regard to Christ, whom we learn to understand not by what prophets or apostles say of him, but alone by a true insight into the character of his times.

That the preaching of such an historical Christ is in itself doctrinally unsound, is as clear as day. And that the Church will be led astray, if it listens to such siren songs, cannot be denied.

What do these preachers of an historical Christ say of the Holy Scriptures? That they do not give us a correct view of the historical Christ. Legendary and mythical parts, having crept in unawares, must be eliminated by means of historical criticism, in order to bring out the Christ as he really is. Some even go so far as to maintain, that it would not matter, if modern criticism were to come to the conclusion, that not one of the books of the New Testament could be relied on as genuine. The historical Christ would remain nevertheless the foundation of our faith. Such a separation between the Scriptures and the Christ will have a baneful effect upon the preaching, and this preaching again will undermine the faith and the development of the people.

John speaks in his prologue to his gospel about the Logos. According to the faith of the Churches this must be applied to the historical Christ, as he has come to us and has lived among us. "The Word was made flesh" is one of the foundation stones of our faith. Poor simpletons that we are. That part of John does not belong to the historical Christ at all. Our modern preachers of an historical Christ tell us, that the theory of the Logos is drawn from Philo, and is essentially Platonic. It is therefore doomed to fall as not belonging to the historical Christ, who never claimed to be the Logos.

The same fate awaits the immaculate conception of Christ by the Holy Spirit and his birth of the virgin Mary.



Mark and John know nothing about it, Jesus' mother never speaks about it; it is therefore a myth, which has been formed later, but did not belong to the original gospel, which is entirely free of supernatural elements and really begins with Christ's preaching as Mark records it.

The vicarious character of Christ's sufferings and death must also be classed with the unhistorical additions to the original gospel. Our modern historians cannot deny that the Synoptists speak about Christ's sufferings and death and that they connect them with our salvation, but they maintain, that they never present Christ's death as a prize paid in our behalf to an angry God. This idea, they say, has been evolved by Paul, whose rabbinical education led him to view Christ as a victim and a priest.

If we follow these historical preachers, we retain nothing of Christ but a man, who has appeared in the course of the history of mankind as all other men, a religious genius, the greatest perhaps of all, but a man of his own times, limited by the conditions of his environment, although far above the average of men. This is the historical Christ, according to the modern historical school, freed from the swaddling clothes of traditionalism. "Back to Christ," this battle cry in the mouths of our moderns, leads us, if we were to join in with them, to the bogs and swamps of unsound preaching and in the end will make us poor and wretched, for the Christ, to whom we would have to give homage in following these false leaders, is not the Christ of the Scriptures. It is a secularized Christ, leveled down to the position of common humanity. As one of them has aptly said: The doctrine of the two natures in Christ has to go. We say: Bury your Christ, who is nothing but a man, out of sight, for he cannot be our Saviour.

It is a very simple demand indeed: Preach Christ. But some things are too simple in order to be true. The question: What is Christ? has perplexed mankind during all the ages. We cannot and will not look upon the development of the doctrine of the person of Christ during all these centuries as a bleak field, which is nothing but a bar-

ren waste. We too say: Preach Christ, if you desire to be doctrinally sound, but let it be the Christ, revealed in the Scriptures, and brought near the churches through the ages by the Holy Spirit, who glorifies him. This is our historical Christ.

The fullness of such preaching has to be insisted on. For even in Evangelical circles mistakes have been made and harm has been done to the churches. Paul told the Corinthians that he had determined not to know anything among them, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. Is this a safe maxim for preachers nowadays? For Paul undoubtedly it was, for his view of Christ was comprehensive, including heaven and earth, the Church and the world, nature and grace. The Moravian brethren have emphasized the crucified Savior in their preaching and yet they are doctrinally unsound. Zingendorf's theology was *κατ'ἑξοχήν* the theology of the little lamb. (Das Lamurlein.) The wounds and the blood of the little lamb were both the center and the circumference of his preaching. He held the theology of the Calvinists in abhorrence as the "God Father theology," as he sneeringly called it. Let us not forget it, we may be doctrinally unsound even in making the crucified Saviour the great theme of our preaching. If we desire to adopt Paul's maxim, let us then make a study of Paul's epistles and learn of him as our God-given teacher, how we have to present the crucified Savior in all his fullness. This doctrinal fullness and soundness will enable us to be workmen in God's Kingdom, who need not be ashamed. Our own faith will then be vigorous and strong, biblical and theological, firm and rich, and as servants of Christ for the Church we will be enabled to lead our people to the streams of the water of life. We will continue to grow harmoniously and they will grow with us

NICHOLAS M. STEFFENS.

Orange City, Iowa.

### III—THE LIFE AND THEOLOGY OF JONATHAN EDWARDS.

“He that would know the workings of the New England mind in the middle of the last century and the throbbing of the heart, must give his days and nights to the study of Edwards.” Thus does Bancroft laud Edwards as the exponent of New England thought and feeling. Both the historian and the theologian admit the aptness and justness of the praise.

Jonathan Edwards, also styled President Edwards to distinguish him from his son of the same name, was born at Windsor, Conn., October 5, 1703. His father was the Rev. Timothy Edwards, pastor for sixty-three years at East Windsor. His mother's maiden name was Esther Stoddard, daughter of the Rev. Solomon Stoddard, pastor for fifty-six years at Northampton. It is said of his mother that she was queenlike in appearance and admirable in life and character. Jonathan was an only son, but there were ten daughters, four older than the boy, and who had charge in part of his early education. He resembled his mother in certain ways and evidenced precociousness in study. At the age of six he began to study Latin and four years later composed a letter on materialism. When he was a lad of twelve he composed essays on certain scientific subjects. One month before Edwards was thirteen he entered Yale College, which indeed offered meager facilities, the students being instructed in surrounding villages. Such opportunities as were offered were well improved. He “had more satisfaction and pleasure than the most greedy miser in gathering up handfuls of silver and gold from some new discovered treasure.”

When not quite seventeen years of age he graduated with first honors, in the year 1720. He was resident student of theology at Yale for two years and was thereupon licensed to preach. From August 1722 to April 1723

Edwards served a Presbyterian church in New York city. In September 1723 he received an appointment as tutor at Yale, the work being assumed the following June and continued for two years.

In February 1727 he was ordained as pastor to serve as a colleague of his grandfather, Dr. Stoddard, at Northampton. In July of the same year Edwards married Sarah Pierrepont, daughter of the Rev. Jas. Pierrepont, of New Haven. When she was but thirteen years old she attracted his attention, and is described as having been beautiful in appearance, modest and retiring in demeanor, the picture of a Puritan maiden. When she was eighteen years old, the young admirer wrote a few lines on a blank leaf which are exquisitely beautiful and show both his regard for her and a poetic thread in his makeup which one would hardly expect after reading his works :

“They say there is a young lady in New Haven who is beloved of that great Being who made and rules the world and that there are certain seasons in which this great Being in some way or other invisible, comes to her, and fills her mind with exceeding sweet delight, and that she hardly cares for anything except to meditate on him— that she expects after a while to be received up where He is. . . . She is of a wonderful sweetness, calmness and universal benevolence of mind, especially after this great God has manifested Himself to her mind. She will sometimes go about from place to place, singing sweetly and seems always to be full of joy and pleasure : no one knows for what. She loves to be alone walking in the fields and groves and seems to have someone invisible always conversing with her.”

Mrs. Edwards was a true helpmeet. According to the custom of those times, she ruled the purse for him, and was his support in the dark days of his pastoral life. Three sons and eight daughters were born to them. The death of Mrs. Edwards occurred in her forty-ninth year, about six months after the death of her husband.

At the time of his settlement at Northampton, Edwards is said to have been of handsome appearance, over six feet

tall, somewhat delicate, and requiring constant care for his health. He was somewhat subject to melancholy, but was not morose. He could and did have warm friendships, and although not of a lively disposition because, as he explains, not endowed with a great flow of animal spirits, he proved a kind father and a sympathizing pastor. He "lived by rule," rising between four and five o'clock and continuing thirteen hours in his study. Since the affairs of the busy household were entirely in the hands of his devoted wife this was feasible. Moreover he visited only the sick or the afflicted. He was not careless in pastoral work, but he did not feel well adapted for more general visitation. This feature of his pastoral life may explain, in part, the fiasco in which his disciplining certain young church members ended. It may seriously be asked whether Edwards understood his people. That he understood human nature none would deny, but a closer bond between pastor and people would perhaps have saved him his pastorate later on. Edward's study was his throne room. Sacred also was it as the oratory where Edwards and his wife communed with God.

Edwards was a deeply spiritual man. When seven years old he was anxious for his soul's safety. He prayed five times a day, and constructed a booth in a swamp where he and some companions repaired for prayer. These impressions wore away. Succeeding doubts, however, did not take root. They were dispelled. His deep spirituality is evidenced by seventy "Resolutions," which were not composed in a day, but were accumulated between the years 1722-1726, Edwards being twenty-three years old at the latter date. The resolutions were to be read once a week. We transcribe a few :

1. "Resolved, that I will do whatever I think to be most to God's glory and my own good, profit and pleasure on the whole, without any consideration of the time, whether now or never so many ages hence ; to do whatever I think to be my duty and most for the good and advantage of mankind in general, whatever difficulties I may meet with, how many

and how great soever."

5. "Resolved, never to lose one moment of time, but to improve it in the most profitable way I possibly can."

11. "Resolved, never to suffer the least motion of anger to irrational beings."

28. "Resolved, to study Scripture so steadily, constantly and frequently as that I may find and plainly perceive myself to grow in the knowledge of the same."

37. "Resolved, to inquire every night, as I am going to bed, wherein I have been negligent, what sin I have committed and wherein I have denied myself, also at the end of every week, month and year."

43. "Resolved, never to allow the least measure of fretting or uneasiness at my father or mother."

Edward's diary shows that the resolutions were solemnly and gradually made. It also shows the ups and downs of his spiritual life as the following extracts will indicate :

Wed. Jan 3, 1728. "Dull. . . It is to no purpose to resolve except we depend on the grace of God, for if it were not for his mere grace one might be a very good man one day and a very wicked one the next."

Sat. Jan. 12. "I have this day solemnly renewed my baptismal covenant and self-dedication, which I renewed when I was received into the communion of the church."

Tues. Jan. 15. "I am but a poor infant, upheld by Jesus Christ, who holds me up and gives me liberty to smile to see my enemies flee when he drives them before me ; and so I laugh as though I myself did it. . . And now the Lord has a little left me, how weak do I find myself."

Later in life Edwards referred to his early religious struggles in these words : "Absolute sovereignty is what I love to ascribe to God. But my first conviction was not so." First Tim. 1:17 made a great impression upon him. He thus meditates upon the greatness and the love of God : "Majesty and grace of God in sweet conjunction. It was a sweet and gentle and holy majesty, and also a majestic meekness, an awful sweetness, a high and great and holy gentleness." In comparing this past with his present

experience he writes: "Though it seems to me that in some respects I was a far better Christian for two or three years after my first conversion than I am now, and lived in a more constant delight and pleasure, yet of late years I have had a more full and constant sense of the absolute sovereignty of God and delight in that sovereignty, and have had more of a sense of the glory of Christ as a mediator revealed in the gospel,"

This spiritually minded man labored with zeal for his Master, and during his more than twenty-three years pastorate at Northampton had much fruit of his labor. Two years after his settlement he became sole pastor. There can be no doubt of his eloquence in the pulpit. He wrote most of his sermons in full for nearly twenty years, and read them from the pulpit. He considered this a defect and infirmity. He seldom gestured. His tone was not commanding. He fixed his eye on one point in the balcony. His eloquence was the eloquence of strong thought and feeling expressed in clear language. Back of each sentence was a world of conviction and a heart full of love. He could preach against sin and believed in "law work." Such was his sermon on "Sinners in the hands of an angry God," and the sermon on Deut 32:35, "Their foot shall slide in due time," preached at Enfield, Conn. There was so much weeping in the audience that the preacher requested silence that he might be heard. His sermons were not all of this character. Critics forget the wickedness of the times, and are equally forgetful of the character of the greater part of Edwards's sermons. The following subjects are therefore suggestive: "The blessedness of the human heart," "Praise, one of the chief employments in heaven," "Safety, fullness and sweet refreshment to be found in Christ," "The sorrows of the bereaved spread before Jesus."

Edwards' church enjoyed a great revival in 1734-5 and again in 1740-1 which was part of a great awakening in all New England. Among the agencies used of God none was more important than the preaching of Jonathan Edwards. Certain extravagances, however, soon appeared among the

more excitable of the people. Edwards did heroic service in calming and guiding into safe experiences the people who would have brought the whole movement into reproach.

In 1744 Edwards preached against immoral practices among the young people. He asked for an investigation but the children of so many prominent people were involved that the attempted disciplining utterly broke down. The incident was the small end of the wedge which later separated pastor and people. Five years later, 1749, Edwards opposed the practice of admitting unconverted people to the Lord's Supper. It meant throwing down the gauntlet to a long established custom, popularly known as The Holy Way Covenant.

In 1631 the court of Massachusetts Bay Colony ordered that none but church members should be admitted to the body politic. In 1662 the Synod decided that infants also were church members and continue such when grown up. If then they "owned the covenant, not being scandalous in life" they could claim baptism for their children and so secure church membership for them also. The danger of this decision lay in its political motive. Soon also the work of the church was transferred from "the conversion of men to the regulation of their manners." There was no Edwards to preach repentance. Instead, another serious downward step was taken under the leadership of Dr. Stoddard, who held that the Lord's Supper was a converting ordinance. Both kinds of church members were now admitted to an equal voice in the choice of a pastor and both classes supplied candidates for the ministry. A third downward step completed this evil development. It was announced that there was an "acceptableness of unregenerate doings," by virtue of which men could from self-love make such a use of the means of regeneration as would secure their salvation. Edwards opposed this baneful practice and theory, but met with great resistance. Some one has said, "He was not aware that when all the churches in the county but two had thus opened the doors



that all the ministers in it but three had become correspondingly lax in doctrine." A council of clergymen decided against Edwards and in favor of his church from which he was dismissed in 1750. The family suffered poverty for several months, Mrs. Edwards and her daughters making paper fans and selling them while Edwards used the scraps of brown paper left over, on which to write notes.

In 1751 Edwards was chosen pastor of the church at Stockbridge and was given a commission as missionary among the Indians of those regions. There were more Indians at Stockbridge than whites and Edwards' son learned their language better than his own.

Edwards labored at Stockbridge for six years. In 1757, with many misgivings and in a humble spirit, he accepted the offer of the presidency of Princeton College. He arrived in Princeton in January, 1798. Only nine weeks after taking up his residence there he passed thro the portals of death to begin a more glorious service—in heaven. He died from the effects of an inoculation for smallpox, aged 58 years, 5 months and 17 days. "Trust in God and ye need not fear," were his last words.

On June 22, 1900, a tablet to his memory was unveiled in the First Church of Christ, in Northampton, Mass. It represents him addressing his people and is two-thirds life size. It contains, besides a few facts about his life, the sixth verse of the second chapter of Malachi

#### EDWARDS' WORKS.

Johnathan Edwards exerted a great influence upon his times. His fervid preaching of the demands of the law and the consolations of the gospel bore its fruit in numerous conversions among his people. His was a voice crying "Repent ye," in a wilderness of worldly-mindedness and corruption. He was greatly blessed in the revivals of 1734-'35 and 1740-'41, being used of God to promote the cause of true religion. During this period he published, "A Narrative of the Surprising Work of God in the Conversions of Many Hundred Souls in Northampton," 1736; "Thoughts on the Revival," etc., 1742; and "A Treatise Concerning

Religious Affections," 1746. The last named treatise is noted for its fine discriminations and will bear study in our own day. In 1749 appeared his 'Life and Diary of David Brainerd,' a work which sent Henry Martyn into the foreign mission field. In the same year, 1749, Edwards published his "Qualifications for Full Communion." He defines his position in the following words: "It does not belong to the controversy how particular or large a profession should be required." He adds that a person may be accepted if evidence of conversion and holy desire exist, "however he himself might scruple his own conversion." One form of confession which would be acceptable to Edwards is thus expressed: "I hope I truly find in my heart a willingness to comply with all the commandments of God, which require me to give myself wholly to him and to serve him with my body and my spirit, and do accordingly now promise to walk in a way of obedience to all the commandments of God as long as I live." Edwards did not insist on a "relation of experience" as to time and steps of conversion, but he did insist that people should have some experience of the great things wrought, "wherein true grace and the acts and habits of holiness consist."

All these works are important, but Edward's fame as a theologian rests mainly on the treatises which he wrote after the unhappy ejection from his Northampton pastorate. He had various treatises in mind before leaving Northampton, and the quiet and seclusion of his six years' ministry at Stockbridge enabled him to give his masterpieces to the world.

The times demanded a champion of Calvinism. We have already referred to the lax views in regard to church membership. Men's thoughts were largely moulded by the "materialistic and epicurean philosophy of Locke." It was an age of cold, formal orthodoxy on the one hand and of bold deism on the other. Partly as a reaction, Arminianism had spread in England and America. Dr. Lawrence in the *American Theological Review* says: "The evangelical faith in England was ebbing before the floodgate of deism

and naturalism, while in this country the school of infidels a little later called Jeffersonian, was concentrating its forces and beginning to 'let slip the dogs of war.' . . . "The works of Dr. Turnbull and Dr. John Taylor, of England, thoroughly pelagian in their principles, were extensively circulated."

Edwards entered the lists against these Pelagian, Socinian and Arminian tendencies. The first and in many ways the most remarkable of these later treatises is "The Freedom of the Will," 1754. Dr. Chalmers considered that more than any other uninspired book, it had helped him "to find his way through all that might otherwise have proved baffling and transcendental and mysterious in the peculiarities of Calvinism." A certain writer says of the treatise that it presents "the medium doctrine of the will." The will can not determine itself for men act according to "their underlying and ruling love." Moral necessity in human affairs is explained to be the certainty of things in themselves which is the ground of the knowledge of them. The burden of the whole book is an argument against the self determining power of the will, rather than any argument for human responsibility. Responsibility is founded by Edwards rather in the moral quality of an act than in its causes. Moral inability is thus held to be consistent with responsibility for a guilty act.

During his Stockbridge ministry Edwards wrote "History of Redemption," "Remarks Upon Important Theological Subjects," "Remarks Upon Important Theological Controversies," "Types of the Messiah," and other minor works. Much more important than the above are his essays on, "The End for Which God Created the World," "The Nature of True Virtue," and "The Great Doctrine of Original Sin Defended."

The argument in the first named of these last three essays turns upon the truth that the moral rectitude of God requires that he have due respect to himself. "The infinite God can not be selfish in doing all for his own glory since it is but moral rectitude to regard himself with due respect."

“The good of the public is best secured when God has such regard for himself.”

“The Nature of True Virtue” may be called a companion essay to the foregoing. True virtue in God and man consists in love to being in general and secondarily to benevolent being. God having most being must love himself and all things for his own glory.

The treatise on original sin is one of Edwards' most important works, and the modern student will not find it tedious reading. The plan of the work had been maturing in Edwards' mind for ten years; he took a year to write it, while the longer and more metaphysical treatise on *The Will* was dashed off in four and a half months. Part I considers the evidence of original sin. Part II, the scriptural proof of the doctrine, which is stated with great fullness. Part III furnishes proof from the doctrine of redemption. Part IV, which has occasioned most discussion, contains answers to objections.

In all these works Edwards displays great acuteness and tenacity in argument. His language is often rough and is rarely beautiful. It could in many cases have been made clearer, but it has been said with truth that its clearness increases with the abstruseness of the subject. His illustrations are few and in no wise remarkable. The thought is everything, the style very subordinate. In dealing with opponents he is very fond of rushing them into a corner and then leisurely plucking them. Robert Hall said of him, “I consider Edwards the greatest of the sons of men. He ranks with the brightest luminaries of the Christian Church, not excluding any country or any age since the apostolic.” It is interesting to note that in number of votes received Edwards ranked high among the eminent Americans whose names are to be given a place in the Hall of Fame of New York University.

#### THEOLOGY OF EDWARDS.

Jonathan Edwards was a Calvinist. But a bitter controversy has in the past been waged about the relation Edwards sustains to the so-called New England theology.

New England theology is a wide term under which is embraced a great variety of theological systems, none of which is in exact accord with the others, but all being more or less serious aberrations from historic Calvinism, in spite of the claims of some that it is Calvinism made consistent. The question whether Edwards is the father of New England theology is still in dispute. Dr. Fiske says: "He had been educated in the old Calvinism of the day; but as a profound thinker and an earnest revivalist he was led to grapple with some of the practical errors which had grown out of that system; and in so doing he advanced views which logically necessitated the new Calvinism of his pupils." "His intimate friends, Bellamy and Hopkins, felt that they were only carrying out and applying more fully and consistently the principles they had learned from him." It is well known that his son, the talented Dr. Edwards, announced "ten improvements" which he alleged his father had made in the current Calvinistic theology. In spite of this, however, we find the following opinion in Princeton Essays, First Series: "Taking the premises of the Elder Edwards they (his so-called successors) deduced a system of false theology . . . which assumed the name of Calvinism to betray it to its friends." Men find premises for wrong doctrine in Scripture, as they suppose; no wonder men can find them in uninspired writings. In a new work on "The History of New England Theology," by George Nye Boardman, D. D., the author's opinion, which seems fair and discriminating, is as follows: "He thought it necessary to set forth some new statements in order to defend the main doctrines of Calvinism, but the modifications he introduced were for the sake of the old, rather than for anything new." Yet the author also says: "A study of the scheme of theology which appropriates the title, New England, properly begins with its Edwardean elements." This is true. It was not his theology, but certain apparently loose statements occasionally and his metaphysics, that were seized upon by his followers. A great mind dominates in the thinking and reason-

ing of other minds. Dr. Lyman Beecher says of Edwards: "In his train arose successive generations of ministers, men of power and discriminating minds who sustained the light and kept up the impulses which the great master spirit had given."

We have said that Edwards at times seems to use loose expressions. Let us illustrate. He says that dispositions, such as "approving, disapproving, liking, disliking, etc., are acts of the will," yet his discussion of the will shows that he uses the word, will, as we usually employ it, viz., as the determining faculty of the mind, exclusive of dispositions. Did this statement of Edwards' perhaps lead Parks to say that Edwards was with New England theology in affirming that all sin is actual sin, since even dispositions were actions? Suffice it to say at this point that if Edwards held that a child's first sin was actual sin, he held it for a far different reason than his successors who denied original sin. All that we wish to point out at this moment is that there is a seeming or real looseness of statement occasionally found in Edwards' writings. If dispositions, etc., are acts of the will, how can Edwards argue that Adam was created with good dispositions, for in his treatise on original sin he uses the fact of original righteousness as a proof of the possibility of such a phenomenon as original sin.

Let us adduce another illustration. Edwards argued that God created all things for His own glory. His successors argued that God created all things for the happiness of the creature. The following sentence of Edwards might easily lead to such a theory: "And benevolence or goodness in the Divine Being is generally supposed not only to be prior to the beauty of many of its objects, but to their existence . . . as it is supposed that it is God's goodness which moved him to give them both being and beauty." Yet it is plain that "goodness" in Edwards' view, is synonymous with virtue and holiness, a just regard for his own glory and being.

On all the great doctrines, Johnathan Edwards was sound, as the following quotations from his works will

show :

The Scriptures—"This is the great and standing rule which God has given to His church in order to guide them in things relating to the great concerns of the soul ; and it is an infallible and sufficient rule."

Total Depravity—" . . . he is utterly unable, without the interposition of Divine grace, savingly to love God, believe in Christ, or do anything that is truly good and acceptable in God's sight."

Atonement—"There must be something particular in the design of his death with respect to such as he intended should be actually saved thereby. . . . God pursues a proper design of the salvation of the elect in giving Christ to die, and prosecutes such a design with respect to no other, most strictly speaking."

Imputation of Righteousness—"Christ's perfect righteousness shall be reckoned to our account, so that we shall have the benefit of it, as though we had performed it ourselves." "Justification is a forensic term."

#### METAPHYSICS OF EDWARDS.

Edwards was a born metaphysician. Locke's Essay on the Understanding was his delight in college days, and it is evident that if we wish to understand and not misconstrue Edwards' theology we must understand his philosophical principles. Edwards is better than his principles. The latter have often led to errors which Edwards would have been the first to condemn.

A. We call attention first of all to Edwards' theory of virtue. Virtue, he explains, is "love to being in general," and secondarily "love to benevolent being." By virtue he means holiness. "The true virtue of created beings is doubtless their highest excellency." Again he says, "Virtue, or in other words, true grace and real holiness." By "love to being in general" he does not mean a benevolent love which has regard for the happiness of others, but rather the love of affection ; love is "union" to being in general, by which God's glory is advanced.

But we object, first, to resolving one moral quality into

another. Virtue, or holiness, is more than love. One quality may be used in a description of another, but not as its synonym. God is love and God's holiness is love, but in neither case does love express all there is in the first term. It is an error, therefore, to say that the essence of virtue or beauty "lies in love." Moreover, Scripture gives no warrant for using the words, holiness and love, as interchangeable. It is said in Edwards' defense that even Christ summarized the whole law for man in the words, "Thou shalt love," etc. Exactly. Christ is not giving a philosophical definition of virtue, but says that all man's duties may be comprehended in the command to love. Virtue, or holiness, is a state of the soul; love is an attitude of the soul. God is in a state of holiness; therefore is his constant attitude that of love.

Again, the idea of love as a ruling motive carries with it the idea of benevolence. Edwards makes virtue commensurate with a desire to see God's glory advanced. "A truly virtuous being, being under the sovereign dominion of love to God, above all things seeks the glory of God and makes this his supreme, governing and ultimate end." But Edwards also uses the word benevolence to describe love. This led to the position of some of his followers, who held God had ordained the existence of sin because it was most productive of happiness, and to the still stranger idea that there was no real distinction between sin and holiness, since both were for the general good of the universe.

Objection may be raised against the term, "being in general, or simply being." Such love to being in general is impossible since being or existence as such is non-moral. The love contemplated by Edwards can only be expended on moral objects. We might even object that such love would, if possible, be immoral, a species of idolatry. To be consistent, all distinction between personalities must be thought away. We must love simple being—existence in the lump, God not being distinguished from his works. Edward's purpose was the right one of making all virtue a due regard for all one finds in God, "Nothing," he says,



"may be esteemed of the nature of true virtue in which God is not the first and the last." But it is a philosophical absurdity to say that we are under such an obligation, because God has more being than any creature. This is his argument: "That Being who has most of being . . . will have the greatest share of the propriety and benevolent affection of the heart" In saying God has "most of being," Edwards begs the question. He is stealthily adding an attribute to simple being, viz., the attribute of omnipresence. We all believe that God loves himself because of his perfections, but Edwards held that such love was secondary and not the essence of virtue.

B. The next purely metaphysical principle to which we call attention is Edwards' theory of identity. This principle is advanced in Part IV of his treatise on Original Sin. The whole human race is really one. We sinned when Adam sinned. Edwards went a step farther than the realists, who believe that we were in Adam and so sinned with him. He held that we sinned in our own person when Adam fell. It has been a matter of dispute whether Edwards is to be classed with the immediate or mediate imputationists. Hodge thought that Edwards held the doctrine of immediate imputation; Dr. Lawrence, that he held the doctrine of mediate imputation. But it is as easy to ascribe the one to him as the other. His theory of identity did away with all necessity of imputation. Adam's sin was our own personal sin. There is, we think, the same indefiniteness as to any theory of imputation that we find in our own doctrinal standards.\* Original sin is there called "corruption." This "corruption" is "extended," i. e., by natural generation, "to the whole human race." Nothing is said as to an imputation of guilt, which we nevertheless believe to be the cause of the extended corruption.

Because of his theory of identity, Edwards could, consistent with his Calvinistic belief, say that all sin was actual sin. Original sin was literally the person's original sin.

---

\*The Doctrinal Standards of the Reformed Church of America.

Yet such a theory of identity destroys personality ; nor are we then less responsible for all the sins of all people who have lived than for Adam's first sin. Because of his identity scheme Edwards was bound to hold that sin in a child arises in the same order as in the case of Adam's first sin, the corrupt desire preceding the sinful act. This, perhaps, led many to class Edwards with the mediate imputationists. But, as we have seen, Edwards viewed this first corruption as a personal corruption.

C. A last philosophical principle to which we call attention is Edward's notion that providence is simply continued creation. This idea is put forth in defense of the justness of the doctrine of original sin. God, maintains Edwards, continues bad men in existence ; hence it is just that children should be born corrupt, for the continuance of an object is the same as perpetual birth. The relation of this theory to his identity theory is apparent. Edwards tries to prove that providence is continued creation by positing that either creation continued at every moment must explain the existence of an object or otherwise the past existence of that object must be the cause of its present existence. This latter is held to be an absurdity, because the past can not enter the present as a cause. It is true, the idea of the past does not lap over into the idea of the present. But past and present are but two of many descriptive terms. Another descriptive word which is just as true as past or present is the word continuity. The theory destroys secondary causes and no doubt led to Emmon's "Exercise Scheme," wherein all states of the mind are represented as mere exercises of Divine power. Emmons said that God was the sufficient cause of sin for the same reasons that he was the efficient cause of holiness.

We do not wish to add much by way of conclusion. I trust it is apparent that Edwards was a great and good man. We can know nothing of American theology if we do not give a generous portion of our time to the study of Jonathan Edwards.

#### IV.—CHRIST, THE MODEL PREACHER.

There is a wondrous witchery in human eloquence. Among all the heroes of history and romance, there are none that stand higher, or that have wielded a more tremendous influence, than public speakers. "The pen is mightier than the sword," and in one sense the tongue is mightier than the pen. There are some writers who are but ordinary speakers, and there are some orators whose speeches, or whose sermons are but ordinary compositions, looked at as literary productions.

There are certain peculiarities of temperament, certain tones of voice, certain graces of elocution that are needed to make a public speaker effective and magnetic in his influence over an audience. It is said that Jonathan Edwards seldom raised his eyes from his manuscript while he was preaching. But such was the terrific piling up of words and images and figures of speech that on one occasion, while preaching on the text, "Their feet shall slide in due time," a brother minister sitting behind him sprang up involuntarily and exclaimed, "Brother Edwards, is there no mercy in God?" Spurgeon held six thousand people every Sabbath, in the same church, in almost breathless interest by his simple but transcendent eloquence. And at each division of his subject the unconscious change of position in the vast audience would sound like suppressed applause, or like the rustling of forest leaves in autumn. Chalmers, one of the finest pulpit orators that ever lived, read his sermons closely, and so did Guthrie at one time, and then he memorized. But there was such a combination of prose and poetry in both of these marvellous men that it did not need the grace and elegance of a finished delivery for them to hold a complete mastery over the largest and the most turbulent audience.

But in the Gospel by John we have an unwilling tribute to a certain speaker from men who have been sent to arrest

him Scandalized at his growing reputation, and fearful of losing their own place and power, the Chief Priests and Pharisees had sent these officers to arrest him and bring him as a prisoner before them. They came back without the criminal, and on being asked, "Why have ye not brought him?" the officers answered, "Never man spake like this man." There was such a supernatural, overwhelming power in his speaking that they dared not lay their hands on him, but came back abashed and ashamed of their ungodly errand. Similar results have sometimes followed where other merely human speakers were sought to be arrested. Officers of the law have been unable to prosecute their calling, and even mobs have been quelled by the firm and fiery eloquence of resolute and courageous statesmen. But never was this expression used of any other speaker, "Never man spake like this man." As a preacher he stood preeminent over any other preacher that ever lived. What, then, was his mode of preaching?

There must have been something striking in the personal appearance of our Saviour, Not that this was necessary to make him an effective orator. Paul, who was himself no mean orator, confesses that his "bodily appearance was weak and his speech contemptible." But from the very nature of the case we must regard this God-man as perfect in his physical form and features. He was the second Adam" in every sense, and as such, with a body miraculously born of a virgin, he must have been perfect in all his features and in all his organs. We read of his being weary and thirsty and hungry, but we never read of his being sick. We take it then that he had a perfect human body, one exactly adapted to all the work for which God sent him into the world. But a part of that work was preaching the gospel. And so he must have had a bright, sparkling eye, a commanding person, attractive features, a clear, silver, toned, magnetic voice, that could whisper pardon to a penitent outcast, or that could still the tempest on stormy Genesaret. He must have had a mind quick in its intuitions, clear and forcible in its logical powers, impulsive and sym-

pathetic, imaginative and poetical as it caught image from all of his environment. The snow of Lebanon, the lily of the valley, the rose of Sharon, the sower, the fisherman, the vinedresser, the shepherd, the sparrow, the serpent, the dove, all these seemed to catch his attention and were utilized, in the way, not merely of ornament, but of illustration and improvement.

But, along with this, there was another element which at times made a very deep impression on his audience. "He spake as one having authority and not as the Scribes." It is an element of success in any speaker to be persuaded in his own mind that his cause is a just one. "Thrice armed is he who hath his quarrel just," in the forum as well as on the battlefield. A lawyer, defending a cause which he believes in his conscience to be unjust, is always speaking against his own convictions and he can not defend it in such a way as to do justice to himself. But let his judgment fall in with the interests of his client and he will speak in such a manner as to convince the court and the jury that he believes what he says, and whether he succeeds or not they will give him credit for honesty and sincerity in all that he says.

Let a preacher feel sure of his footing, be honest in his convictions and thoroughly impressed with the truth and importance of his subject and he will show it by his very manner as well as by all that he says. But let him get hold of a subject of speculative theology, on which honest men may differ, and there will be a stammering hesitancy, a halting uncertainty, indicating that his own mind is not fully made up on such a subject.

But Jesus always spake with authority. He felt all the time that he knew all that could be known about every subject he discussed. He knew what was in God, for he was God. As God he knew what God had a right to demand. As a man he knew what man ought to render. He knew all about nature, for he had made nature. It was just as easy for him to change water into wine as it was to make these same elements grow up, out of earth and air, into a vine, into grapes, into juice, into wine. In the one

case the process was simpler and quicker than the other, that was all. It was as easy for him to quiet the winds as to stir them up, to bring back the spirit of Lazarus as to command it away from the body.

He knew all about the Ten Commandments, for he had written them with his own finger on the tables of stone and handed them to Moses. The moral law was but a reprint of his own holy nature; and of course he knew what he meant when he made it. He knew all about the Temple service, sacrifices, oblation, and all that, because he had given Moses a pattern of all these things on the Mount, and he had been there all the time "on the mercy-seat." He knew all the prophecies, for it was he who had spoken, through Moses, and Daniel, and Isaiah, and Elijah, and Elisha, and all the rest. He had a right, then, to speak by authority, to contradict all false traditions, and to tear away that tinsel mask that hid away the precious spiritual truths embodied in all these forms and ceremonies; as well as all that genuine truth which they had superseded by their false traditions. Hence, we find such dogmatic language as this: The Scribe says this; the Pharisee says this; the Sadducee says this. "But I say unto you." I, who have a right to speak, who know what I say; who am not speculating, but asserting what I know. "I say unto you." Here was authority, rightful authority, divine authority, unquestionable authority. And it was an authority which he had a right to maintain, and which he knew he had a right to maintain in the face of all the world.

And what was true of the law, is just as true of the gospel. Of course he knew all about that. He came to preach the gospel, and in a sense he was the gospel, the impersonation, the embodiment of this good news from God to man, from heaven to earth. He knew what sin was, what it deserved, what it demanded; and he came as a "ransom for sinners," as the "Redeemer of God's elect." And hence, in regard to all this, he had a right to speak by authority. Hence, his denunciation of sin, of Phariseeism, of self-righteousness. And hence, all those sayings of his: "Except

ye repent, ye shall likewise perish ;" " Ye must be born again ;" " No man can come unto me, except the Father which hath sent me, draw him ;" " He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved, and he that believeth not, shall be damned ;" " He spake as one having authority."

Again, his sermons were eminently practical. There was no speaking for the mere sake of speaking. He never spoke merely to pass away the time, or merely to tickle the fancy, or please the ear of his hearers. He seemed to feel that three years was a very short time for such a work as he had before him, and that his words should be few and well chosen. It is not pretended that we have here in the gospels all that he spoke, even in the way of public preaching. But taking these sermons as a sample of the whole, we find every sermon, and every truth spoken, one of the greatest practical importance. There is no concerning of himself, or of his hearers, with matters that did not concern them. They tried once to turn him aside, as to the time of the second coming and the judgment, but he put a stop to the useless discussion, with these practical words : " But of that day, and that hour, knoweth no man ; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father. Take ye heed ; watch and pray ; for ye know not when the time is. And what I say unto you, I say unto all. Watch."

At another time, it is written : " Then said one unto him, Lord, are there few that be saved ? And he said unto them, Strive to enter in at the strait gate ; for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able." Thus, there was always a practical turn given to every question that sprang up for discussion ; and he would never allow himself to be turned aside from that one prominent purpose that had brought him into the world.

Sometimes we listen to sermons that are beautiful compositions, chaste and elegant in style, faultless in rhetorical finish, abounding in all the luxuriant ornaments of fancy and imagination, and delivered with the most finished grace of elocution. But after all there is no practical point to them, no intentional stirring up of the conscience, no im-

parting of useful information. Our Saviour never preached such a sermon as that. He came, not to lull men, but to startle them ; not to soothe the sinner, but to awaken him ; not to flatter men, but to denounce their sin, and thus to save them ; not to seek personal popularity, but to tell them plain, practical, wholesome truths, such as he knew would excite their animosity, and provoke their jealousy, and arouse their resentment, until, "in their folly and madness, they would put him to death on the cross. The men who have seemed most like him in this respect, are such as Paul, and Luther, and Calvin, and Knox, and Wesley, and Whitfield. Men who did not fear the face of man, but tried, through evil and through good report, in spite of all opposition and persecution, to preach the plain, simple, cutting, startling truth, in the plainest, simplest, and most practical way. Not indifferent to ornament, nor ignoring any of the graces of oratory ; but anxious to press upon the conscience and upon the heart, that which would, under God's grace, enlighten the one, and regenerate the other.

This is one of the most striking characteristic of our Saviour's preaching. With a mind such as he had, a memory, a fancy, an imagination, that had inspired all the beauties of David, and Isaiah, and Solomon, and Job, what a series of sermons, filled with poetic prose, he might have left upon record ! And knowing, as he did, all about the mysteries of election and decrees, of the millennium and resurrection, of the inter-mediate state, and the general judgment, of the employments and enjoyments of heaven, knowing all that is ever to be known of all these mysteries, what a wonderful book of sermons, he might have left for us, to answer all these vague questions, that cause us so much concern and so much anxiety ! But instead of this, he seems to take hold of the most common, every day, practical subjects, and without one redundant expression, or superfluous image, he presses these home upon the consciences of his hearers. Sitting down upon a well, he took that water as a text and preached to a woman, "which was a sinner," one of the richest and most beautiful sermons



that ever was delivered. Collecting his twelve disciples around him he gives "the sermon on the mount," the most spiritual, the most exhaustive, the most comprehensive commentary on the moral law that ever was written. And so it was everywhere. All his sermons were practical; theological in a certain sense, of necessity, but practical, pointed, pungent, directed to a certain object, and intended, all cases, for a specific purpose. "Never man spake like that man."

Once more. Our Saviour preached with a great deal of emotion. His was not a cold phlegmatic temperament: nor was his style that of a mere abstract logician, a mere philosophizing reasoner on these questions of such vast importance to the human soul. He was always calm, self-possessed, deliberate, but there must have been upon his features the play of constant emotion. When he looked at Pharisees, and said, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" We must believe that his eyes flashed fire and his voice trembled with suppressed emotion. When he pictured the scenes of the final judgment, he must have mounted to the grandeur of that august scene, and his soul must have thrilled with victory as he looked forward to that triumphant procession of all the redeemed. We know that he wept at the grave of Lazarus, and that he wept on the Mount of Olives, as he looked down on doomed Jerusalem. When he stood and cried, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink." "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls," we must believe that there was emotion in all this, deep, true, tender-hearted emotion. His voice, his features, his gestures, all must have shown that his heart was deeply moved, his whole emotional nature excited to its deepest depths, when he uttered these words.

"If you wish me to weep, you must weep yourself," is a

classic maxim, and it is true. If a speaker wishes to excite sympathy, or to arouse the emotion of his hearers, he must show that there is emotion in his own heart. This was evidently, and eminently the case with our Saviour. Not mere sentimentalism, or sham and assumed emotion. But pathos, leaved on love, and tenderness, and genuine sympathy. Denunciation, loud and pointed and deep, based on hatred to sin, and the highest regard for the law of God, and the true welfare of man.

Indeed, in him, there was all the loveliest traits of God and man, blended into perfect harmony. And when he spoke, his voice was but the utterance of a heart full of emotion. He must have shown it, in the play of his features, in the sparkle of his eye, in the tones of his voice, in every gesture, in every movement. He could electrify an audience as no other man ever did—for "never man spake like this man."

Once more Our Saviour was deeply in earnest and hence he always used the simplest language. This is always the case with a man who is really in earnest. An objection was made to the preaching of Dr. Archibald Alexander by a good old Christian woman that she could understand every word he spoke. Her idea was, that wisdom always uses the longest and most difficult words, and she did not know that in conveying truth the simplest language is always the best. But this is so, and it is a curious fact, that wherever we find a record of the words of Jesus, we find the most remarkable simplicity. It is not often the case that there is any obscurity in what he said, and the meaning is just as plain and simple as such truths can be made. In some of his teachings there are truths hard for the human mind to understand. But the difficulty lies in the truth itself and not in his mode of expressing it. He always seemed to be trying to bring himself down to the mind of the weakest hearer, and his earnestness made him use the simplest figures and the simplest words. That is very apt to be the case with a man whose soul is on fire with some truth, which he is trying to impress on others. What

are known as the mere graces of oratory. will do well enough as a display of rhetoric. But when a man is in earnest. is anxious to do good, to get people to think as he thinks, and to believe as he believes, he will trouble himself very little with these mere ornaments, these classic elaborations of style. Men who use good English are educated and cultivated as writers, or speakers, will always use language suited to convey the thought. But a man who is in earnest, thoroughly in earnest, will care very little about the style. The simplest will be the best.

And now, in this respect, as in all others, it may be said of our Saviour, "Never man spake like this man." He used the most familiar, everyday, common, homely images. He spoke in the simplest language, even while discussing the most abstruse subjects. But he felt every word that he uttered, knowing that eternity was hanging on every sermon and that what he spoke was to be "a savor of life unto life, or of death unto death." Nobody ever thought that he was assuming a sentiment he did not feel, or feigning an emotion that was not real. Everyone who came under the magic spell of his voice, or who saw what he was aiming at, in all his words, must have felt, Here is an earnest man, a man thoroughly imbued with his subject, perfectly sincere in what he says, and speaking with a purpose. with a motive, with a burning desire to do good, to glorify God, to save souls from death and hell. "Never man spake like this man."

And now, let us ask, What was the effect, and what were the results of his preaching? It would seem that such a speaker, such an orator, such a preacher as this, would sweep away all opposition and compel men to believe what he said by the very power of his eloquence. In a certain sense his sermon did make what reporters now call a profound impression. That is to say, the learned casuist was startled, the self-righteous Pharisee was insulted and enraged. Those who "looked and longed for his appearing," were delighted, and "the common people heard him gladly." Different sects were rejoiced beyond measure, as

antagonistic sects were put to silence. Multitudes collected to hear him preach, and during the sermon were held spell-bound by the witchery of his eloquence.

But when the rebound came many a time they were inflamed with the deepest indignation, and threatened his life in the way of retaliation, for his cutting rebuke and his withering sarcasm. In other cases, there was a melting down of hard hearts, under the sweet influence of truth; a softening of bitter asperities, a toning down of harsh judgments. But on the whole, there was nothing like the immediate effects that have since resulted from far inferior agents. The very men who heard him preach were ready to betray and crucify him. Judas Iscariot was a constant listener, and there never was a man who showed less of the power of truth upon his heart. The fact is, the most of his hearers were filled with crude notions of the temporal Messiah, and never seemed to take in the conception of a "Spiritual Kingdom." The most of them seemed to infer, from his words and works, that he was more than an ordinary man, that he was inspired, and had a double portion of the Spirit. But few of them, if any, seemed to have a clear conception of his divinity. And it was not until after the resurrection that Thomas exclaimed, "My Lord and my God."

In all the ministry of our Saviour there were not as many conversions as there have been under the preaching of a single sermon by a human preacher. We never hear of more than five hundred disciples together at one time until the day of Pentecost. How many there were in all we can not tell. But we must infer there were very few, even with all the preaching of John the Baptist, of the twelve Apostles, and of the seventy who went out two by two, added to the incomparable sermons that for three years had been preached by him who spake as never man had spoken, or has spoken since.

But we are not to imagine from this want of immediate results that our Saviour's was a barren ministry. Not by a great deal. The most of those who were converts under his

ministry, unlike many of the professed converts of the present day, became active preachers themselves. Eleven of them were his own Apostles, and any one of these was worth a thousand ordinary converts in the way of active agency toward the spread of the Gospel. Many others, no doubt, went to work in the ministry after the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost. There were many pious women too, who, under his influence, were made zealous and useful agents in the spread of truth, and labored with Paul and the other Apostles in the Gospel! Seeds of truth were also planted by him in many a heart which did not spring into life until after Pentecost. Saul of Tarsus may have gotten his impression of Gospel truth from some sermon of Jesus. Those thousands who were converted under the preaching of Peter and Stephen and Philip and others had been taught by the parables of Christ, awakened by his sermons' aroused by his miracles, startled and confounded by his death and his resurrection; and were just waiting for his Spirit, without whose influence even the preaching of the Son of God was utterly without avail.

Even now it is often the case that a faithful pastor, during a long and apparently fruitless ministry, is sowing seeds of truth. He leaves the field or dies, feeling that his life and his ministry are failures. But by and by the Spirit is poured out and scores of souls are quickened into life who had been impressed and almost saved under the ministry of one who may have died with a broken heart, or left the field in hopeless dejection and depression. Just so, in one sense, it was with our Saviour. "Never man spake like this man," and yet he died on the cross, with only a few weeping women to attest their sincerity and their affection. Judas had betrayed him, Peter had denied him and they all forsook him and fled. One hundred and twenty were all that met in the upper chamber, with one accord waiting and praying for the promise of the Spirit. But when these started out with "the gift of tongues," and every man's tongue set on fire by "the cloven tongues as of fire," thousands who had heard the Master preach, without a radical change of heart, were

now "cut to the heart," convicted, converted by his wondrous and irresistible grace.

And what is more, these very sermons which he spake as never man spake, were left on record. Many of them we have in our Bibles. We have read them and our fathers and mothers read them; and all down the centuries generation after generation has read them and studied them and commented on them. They have been woven into all our literature, sacred and profane. They are to a large extent the basis of all the sermons that have been preached from Paul to the present day. It is doubtful whether there ever lived a Gospel minister who did not preach from one to a dozen sermons on the "Parable of the Prodigal Son." And what is true of that is just as true of other sermons preached by our Saviour. They have been the basis of millions of sermons and millions of tracts and religious articles that have been preached with all the graces of human eloquence, or written with all the ability and devotion of earnest piety.

Of him it may be emphatically said, "He being dead, yet speaketh," and he will continue to speak in his own words, and as these are expounded and enforced by others, until the last sinner is redeemed and ushered into that everlasting home which is the incorruptible and undefiled inheritance that is now waiting for his saints.

T. W. HOOPER.

Christiansburg, Va.

## V—PERFECTIONISM.

Some questions are difficult to handle because those who err concerning them seem to many to teach what is intrinsically desirable. In contending for the truth in such cases one appears to oppose what is good. In order to avoid this disadvantage in dealing with the question before us we will begin by noticing the more common pleas which sustain the prejudice.

It is said we limit the grace of God when we deny that sanctification is ever complete in this life. The Scriptures are quoted to prove that our sanctification is the will of God; that the provisions of the Gospel are adequate to the end; that the promises of God contemplate it; that we are commanded to be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect. No doubt the Scriptures establish all these positions; but they do not touch the issue. The only question about the matter is one of time—whether or not the design of the Gospel is to make us perfectly free from sin in this life.

It is urged again, that we paralyze effort in the pursuit of holiness when we teach that it is never perfectly attained in this life. To this we might oppose the fruits of the two doctrines. It has never been questioned that the churches which oppose perfectionism are as mindful of strict Christian living as their brethren of the opposite view. But we will meet the issue as presented—the natural tendency of the two views. The Calvinist does not encourage a low standard of holiness, because he teaches that the renewed nature is opposed to all sin. The new man is incapable of being content with any degree of sin. Unless the conflict with indwelling sin is consistently and vigorously maintained the inference is that the soul is not in a state of grace at all. The conflict will be life-long, it is true; but it will end at last in complete sanctification. And no one knows how soon life may end. This is the case, as Calvinists view it; and it is not one tending to sloth or compromise with

evil. On the other hand the perfectionist brings the believer to a point in this life where there is no call for further effort. The work is all done. And most of the theories hold that what remains of infirmity is not sin. The conscience is thus drugged and the way prepared for back-sliding.

I. Having answered these two specious objections, let us see how the Scriptures speak in regard to the real question before us. We find that the teaching of the Scriptures, both direct and indirect, is twofold. This is a peculiarity that claims special recognition if our aim is to arrive at the truth. Taking up the direct teaching first, we will content ourselves with presenting two or three specimens as illustrating the point. In 1 John 1:8 it is written, "If we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us." John is speaking of himself and other Christians. The verb is in the present tense. The utterance amounts to an unqualified declaration that if any Christian, at any stage of his earthly career, says he has no sin he makes a mistake. But in 1 John 3:9 it is also written, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin because he is born of God." That is, any heart that has been renewed by the Spirit of God finds it impossible to commit sin. Not only advanced Christians, but all believers, have passed the point where it is possible for them to sin. Take a further illustration from the Old Testament. In Ecclesiastes vii:20 it is written, "There is not a just man upon earth that doeth good and sinneth not;" and in Psalm xxxvii:37, "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace." And as a third instance, Noah, Job and David are represented as perfect men; and yet Noah was guilty of drunkenness, David of adultery and Job said, "I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes." Let us turn now to the indirect teaching of the Scriptures. We find here also the same twofold form of statement. The Saviour prayed that the Father would sanctify his disciples by the truth; but he also taught them to pray "forgive us our sins." He also



said, "Peace I have with you, my peace I give unto you;" and yet the Christian life is described by the Apostle Paul as a conflict in the soul between the flesh and the spirit. As a third instance take Paul's personal experience as a Christian, given in Romans vii:14-25. After all that has been written and said on the Seventh chapter of Romans we are not ashamed to avow that we see in it Paul's past and present experience—the past referring to his experience before his conversion and the present to his experience after the great change. We cannot turn aside to vindicate our interpretation. It is in accordance with the Apostle's change from the past to the present tense of the verb. In the first part of the personal narrative he says, "I was;" in the second part he says "I find" or "I do." It is agreeable both to the immediate context and to the scope of the whole of the preceding part of the epistle. It is the interpretation given by the best reformed commentators and theologians. We introduce it here simply to say that Romans vii:14 25 is utterly incompatible with the claim that the believer ever reaches in this life a state where a twofold statement is not necessary to express the facts of his experience.

Now what is the result? Evidently both sides of this double statement cannot be true in the same absolute sense. In that case we should have a contradiction. The believer cannot be perfectly holy and actually sinful at the same time. Shall we take one part of the statement and ignore the other? If we take the favorable class of statements and discard the unfavorable, then the Bible represents the believer as free from sin. If we reverse the order of the preceding, the believer is represented as no better than other men. In other matters we do not find it necessary to resort to such devices. It takes both soul and body to make a man. The attributes of the parts are different, but this gives us no trouble. Suppose we submit to the authority of God speaking in his Word, and take both sides of the double statement. Then we have the whole truth. In the first place believers are free from the dominion of sin. They do not sin wilfully. The new nature hates evil. In the

second place, evil is still present with them. It is a law in their members. There is a sense in which they are perfect, but it is only a relative sense. The holy men of the Bible were sincere believers, not hypocrites; and they had all the graces essential to the Christian character. But their lives illustrate the truth that "no mere man since the fall is able, in this life, perfectly to keep the commandments of God, but doth daily break them in thought, word and deed."

Before we leave this double form of Scripture teaching it may be well to remind the reader that it is not confined to the doctrine of Sanctification. We encounter it frequently in the Word of God. It is necessary in order to set forth the whole truth on many subjects; and a disregard of the fact has long been the fruitful source of doctrinal errors. For instance, the Calvinist of Supralapsarian type would find it desirable to explain away such a text as 1 Tim. ii:4, "Who will have all men to be saved;" and the Arminian finds it important to break the force of Romans ix:15, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy. But the true design of the atonement is not reached until both sides of the statement is allowed full force.

II. If perfectionism is not taught in the Scriptures, on what does it rest? Strong, in his Systematic Theology (pages 488-489) says: "The theory rests upon false conceptions; first, of the law—as a sliding-scale of requirements graduated to the moral condition of creatures, instead of being the unchangeable reflection of God's holiness; secondly, of sin—as consisting only in voluntary acts, instead of embracing also those dispositions and states of the soul which are not conformed to the divine holiness; thirdly, of the human will—as able to choose God supremely to fulfill at every movement the obligations resting upon it, instead of being corrupted and enslaved by the fall." This is the solution of a strong thinker—a Calvinist, but not a Presbyterian. We prefer, however, a shorter statement of substantially the same solution of the question. We would say that Perfectionism rests upon a false philosophy which leads to false conceptions of sin and the Moral Law. It has long

been fashionable with a certain school to speak of the freedom of the will, and to predicate of that faculty a sovereign power of determining itself independently of all the other faculties of the soul. The notion is entertained that free-agency cannot exist unless the will of the agent is free, not only from compulsive power without but also from any psychological causation arising from his own views and feelings. Having thus severed the connection of the will with the dispositions, the way is open for confining sin to acts of the will. Nothing has moral quality which is not voluntary; and, by the hypothesis, this quality is denied to traits of character. The second consequence is obvious. If the moral law does not cover the dispositions and states of the soul it is not spiritual. If it is not spiritual it expresses, not the nature of God, but simply his preceptive will. The distinctions it reveals are arbitrary, and may be obliterated or modified, as to the divine wisdom may seem expedient. Of course, if this theory of the will is correct the perfectionists are right in making it a basis of their doctrine. And it serves their purpose well. It contains the seed of ability to things spiritually good. It gives to choice that is prevalently good the right to be regarded as wholly good. It brings the law down to the level of sinful subjects. As Dr. Strong says: "This view reduces the debt to the debtor's ability to pay—a short and easy method of discharging obligations. I can leap over a church steeple if I am only permitted to make the church steeple low enough; and I can touch the stars if the stars will only come down to my hand." But the philosophy of the will which underlies perfectionism can be shown to be opinions both from reason and revelation. Any theory of the will that denies responsibility for disposition of soul reason repudiates. Acts are morally appraised by their intention. Here, for example, is a court sitting and a man is on trial for murder. A homicide has been committed and it is proved that the prisoner at the bar did the act. But this does not prove him a murderer. If the testimony shows that he acted with no other intention than lawful self-defence, he is pronounced inno-

cent. If the testimony shows that he acted under great provocation and sudden passion, he is adjudged guilty of murder only in the second degree. It must be proved that the motive was conscious premeditated malice before the prisoner can be condemned as a murderer. Again, on the theory under review, there could be no such thing as character. Men could never deserve either reward or punishment. Confidence and trust in our fellow-men would be impossible. Common sense scouts a theory having such consequences. In like manner it can be shown that the Scriptures condemn a theory that sets aside the spiritual character of the law of God. The Saviour taught that the law condemns evil thoughts and designs. The Apostle Paul declares, "We know that the law is spiritual."

III. There are two classes of theories of perfectionism. The first consists of theories of Pelagian origin or affinity, and are well known to students of Church history. The second consist of more recent forms of the doctrine, which have originated, or found advocates, among those who claim to be Calvinists. We separate the classes at this point in order to make each the subject of a single criticism. Space will not permit more extended discussion.

The theories of the first class all tend to obscure the relation of Christ to our sanctification. The apostle says in I Corinthians, 1:30: "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption. That according as it is written, He that glorieth let him glory in the Lord." The effect of the Gospel is to cultivate humility in believers by keeping them conscious that salvation is wholly of grace. Whatever weakens the sense of dependence on divine grace tends to beget a spirit of boasting. Now a glance at the better known theories is sufficient to show that they are at fault in their tendency. Pelagius taught that character must be an achievement. God could bestow the necessary faculties, but man must establish his own virtue. This is a total subversion of the doctrine of grace. Rome admits the corruption of man since the fall; but holds that baptism

removes the corruption and infuses a principle of life. From that point forward there is ability, not only to keep the law, but to do more than the law demands. The Arminian begins by grounding justification on faith as a pious state of mind, and lays great stress on gracious ability throughout the progress of salvation. The Oberlin theory regards regeneration as simply a change of intention. Virtue consists in the love of being in general, whereas sin is self-seeking. When the soul ceases to seek its own gratification as an end, and learns to choose the welfare of all being, then it is both regenerate and perfect. How foreign all these notions are to the Scripture teaching as to the method by which we are renewed in the image of God, needs not to be argued with the readers of this article. We hold, it is true, that sanctification is a subjective work. We hold, also, that the believer co-operates in this work. But we hold also that the ground of it is the satisfaction of Christ. Christ not only secures justification for his people by providing an eternal righteousness for them, but he also procures their sanctification by purchasing and imparting the Holy Spirit to dwell in them and purify their hearts.

The more recent theories, on the other hand, make a great point of using Christ for present and perfect deliverance from the conflict with indwelling sin. A few citations will not only show this, but will serve to indicate the distinctive features of the several theories. "They (ordinary Christians) have learned only that their sins are forgiven through faith in the atonement of Jesus. They have not yet learned that Jesus, through faith in his name, is the deliverer from the power of sin as well as from its penalty. They sigh and groan in their bondage as if there was no deliverance this side of the grave." (Higher Life, page 32.) According to this theory, as we understand it, the first act of faith takes Christ for justification, a second act takes him for sanctification. In the first instance we cast our burden of guilt upon him, in the second instance our trouble about depravity. In the first act of faith we obtain peace with God, in the second we obtain peace with ourselves. Again:

“We conclude at present with a comprehensive statement of the truth regarding regeneration itself, with which some of our readers are already familiar. It is a new birth, the imparting of a new life, the implantation of a new nature, the formation of a new man. The old nature remains in all its distinctness, and the new nature is introduced in all its distinctness. This new nature has its own desires, its own habits, its own tendencies, its own affections. All these are spiritual, heavenly, divine. Its aspirations are all upwards.”

. . . . “Be warned that the old nature is unchangeable. The hope of transforming that into holiness is vain as the dream of the philosopher’s stone.” The sum of the theory seems to us to be that the believer has two men in him. The new is perfect from the beginning, the old incapable of transformation. Our third list of brief quotations are from a small volume bearing the title, ‘By His Life.’ “We have seen, too, that he sends down his own Spirit of life to fill his willing people. And now I wish to call your attention to the fact that in the New Testament those who receive this fulness of the life of Christ are called perfect.” (Page 64) “To Abraham, the father of all who believe, the command came with assuring preface, ‘I am the Almighty God; walk thou before me, and be thou perfect.’ . . . It may be that not a few Christian workers, in the home land and in the foreign field, have found their work unfruitful because they have not accepted the command of God to be perfect, and have not obeyed in spiritual reality as Abraham obeyed in type.” (Page 65) “There are some questions which God has put under the ban. They are indeterminate here. For us to attempt to decide them is wrong. . . . To this class belongs the question whether a man filled with the Spirit of Christ is sinning in his heart. From its very nature no human mind can penetrate it to the bottom and give it a true answer. Therefore, avoid it, pass it by.” (Page 82)

On these quotations we refrain from indulging any comment, except the remark that they teach us one of the forms of modern perfectionism. Let us turn to the purpose had

in view in making the whole series of extracts. As stated above the purpose is to make one single observation on the whole class. It is a common characteristic of the class that they deny the doctrine of progressive sanctification as taught in the Westminster Standards. The secured blessing ends the conflict in the soul. The new man is perfect from the birth. The Spirit-filled man is perfect, though he must refrain from saying he has no sin. With the processes by which these conclusions have been reached we have nothing to do just now. They unite against the teachings of the Westminster Standards. It is in defense of the doctrine of this noble creed we wish to say a word.

First, as so the Scripturalness of the doctrine of progressive sanctification. Of course, it is admitted that God can instantaneously make the soul of a believer perfectly holy, and that he does so in some instances is seen in the case of the man to whom our Lord said, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." But that the Bible teaches that regeneration does not make the new born soul perfectly holy, that there remains to be accomplished in the soul a progressive development of the new principle of life and the corresponding weakening and destruction of native corruption, that this process is not completed by any momentary impulse, that the present life is a state of discipline where this twofold work is carried on, seems so plain that we hesitate to burden the readers with accumulated proof. All the Scripture images by which the saint is compared to living and growing things—as a vine, a fruit tree, a grain of corn, a living body, an infant—are certainly indicative of steady and protracted growth. The figures of crucifixion and mortification by which we are enjoined to destroy the flesh, convey the idea of slow and gradual death. The two images used to represent the Christian's course in this life—the race and the warfare—convey in them the idea of steady progress in the face of difficulties. The account given in Ephesians iv:11-16 of the design for which Christ gives to the church ministers of the Word is to the same purport. The account of

the way in which Christian character is developed (11 Peter 1:5-10) is by adding to faith one grace after another until the man of God is complete in sympathy and beauty. The Apostle Paul had made some progress in the divine life when he said: "Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended; but this one thing I do, forgetting the things that are behind and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." In the second place, we wish to say that progressive sanctification does not cloud the Gospel. This is not only intimated but affirmed. "Now, if a man can have no better life than this, it is difficult to see how this joy can be full at present." (By His Life, page 86) Now if there was any gloom in Paul's life we have failed to discover it. And yet he says of himself as a Christian, "I find then a law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me." That he called upon his brethren to rejoice in the Lord always is known to all who read his letter to the churches; and yet we find the conflict of the flesh and Spirit impressively presented in those very epistles. The intention of the believer as presented in the seventh chapter of Romans is far from one of gloom. The act of justification has been passed. On the ground of the satisfaction of Christ the believer is free from the guilt of sin. He is no longer under the law as a covenant of works. Not only so, but he has been united to Christ by faith. Still further, he has received the gift of the Holy Spirit. All the legal difficulties in the way of his restoration to the image of God have been removed; and all the conditions necessary to that end have been secured. Indeed his union with Christ insures his final and complete deliverance from all corruption of nature. Perfectionists are very fond of talking about passing out of the "bondage" of the seventh chapter of Romans into the "sweet liberty" of the eighth. The fact is the strong fighter we encounter in the seventh chapter is the same who exults all the way through the eighth. Such is his sense of security in Christ Jesus that he fears no failure in the conflict. There is now no condemnation to him;



he is a child of God: all things work together for his good. He is persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate him from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus his Lord.

W. T. HALL.

## VI—PROOFS OF GOD'S EXISTENCE AND CHARACTER.

Man's possession of the idea of God is a proof of the dignity of his nature. Had he originated it, it would indicate an even higher nature, but it would at the same time weaken the proof that God exists. If the idea be born within man's own mind, then there may or may not be an answering objective reality. If the idea be beyond the power of human discovery or invention, then the fact that man has it shows that it must have come from God, and that therefore God exists. As we hold it to be a supernatural revelation, this fact might seem to stop any effort to prove God's existence. Occam held that none of the articles of faith are demonstrable by reason, not even the existence and unity of God; Scotus, that none of the Christian dogmas are rationally demonstrable; even Aquinas believed that the distinctively Christian dogmas are undemonstrable. Though these views be true, nevertheless any proof, outside of intuition or mathematical demonstration, may be strengthened by corroborative evidence; moreover, the proofs give shape to the idea. Beyond this it is an interesting inquiry to see what proofs that God exists can be given, outside of the Bible, on the basis of natural religion alone. There are four of these usually given.

### THE ARGUMENT FROM COMMON CONSENT.

This may be stated as syllogism. Whatever is universally believed is true; the belief in God is universal; therefore God exists. The principle of the major promise is stated by Cicero in his "Tusculan Questions" thus: "*Omni autem in re consensus omnium gentium lex natural putanda est.*" St. Vincent of Levens, in the fifth century, enunciates it in his "Comamonitorium" in these words: "*Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est.*" This principle is at least questionable. As announced by Vincent it

was limited to the church. Does it require an absolutely universal consent, of the learned and the ignorant, of the wise and the unwise? If so, there are few truths or facts that can claim such universal credence. Moreover, even of these beliefs there are some that are not true; as all men at one time believed the earth to be flat and the center of the universe.

But if the principle were true, it would not apply to the case before us; for the belief in God's existence is not universal. Plato makes Clinias say: "*Καὶ οἱ πάντες Ἕλληνας τε καὶ βάρβαροι νομίζουσιν εἶναι θεούς.*" Even as thus expressed it is not true. Some Hottentot and Australian tribes, and others, doubtless, have had no knowledge whatever of a superior being, and no belief in gods of any kind. Deaf mutes and atheistic philosophers are also exceptions. Moreover, the gods of the nation are not God, and a belief in them is not a belief in Him. The fact that the great majority of men believe in divinities may be regarded as indications of a primitive belief, now sadly perverted, in the only true God.

The argument, as presented above, is worthless. There is a modification of its suggested Whiteley, which has some force: "Whatever belief is held by the wise and good is probably true; the belief in God and the conception of Him grows in strength and purity with the civilization of man; unless, therefore, our nature is a delusion, human wisdom and virtue a mockery, the belief in God, held by the leading races and by the leading men of the race is likely true. Darwin says, in "The Descent of Man:" "The question (i. e., the origin of man), is of course wholly distinct from that higher one, whether there exists a Creator or Ruler of the universe; and this has been answered in the affirmative by the highest intellects that have ever lived."

#### B—THE ONTOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

Dr. R. L. Dabney says that this argument originated with Epicurus. Ueberweg states that Epicurus taught that "we possess a distinct knowledge of the gods, for they

often appear to men and leave behind representative images in the mind."

The argument is usually attributed St. Anselm, the Piedmontese Archbishop of Canterbury in the 11th century, famous for his dictum, "*Credo ut intelligam*," and for the clear and correct statement and development of the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction to divine justice for man's sin. Anselm's Ontological Argument is found in his "Proslogium," and has been thus summarized by Ueberweg: "All men have the idea of God, even those who deny it, for they cannot deny that of which they have no idea. The idea of God is that of a being absolutely perfect, one whom we can not imagine to have a superior. Now, the idea of such a being necessarily implies existence; otherwise we might imagine another being, who, by the superaddition of existence to the perfection of the first, would thereby excel him; that is to say, excel one who by supposition is absolutely perfect. Consequently we can not conceive the idea of God, without being constrained to believe that he exists."

The principle of this proof has been approved and adopted by some of the most astute and profound philosophers. Descartes, in his "Third Meditation," presents it in three forms: 1. "As soon as I perceive myself, an imperfect being, to exist, I have the idea of a perfect being, and am under the necessity of admitting that this idea has been imparted to me by a being who is actually perfect, who really possesses all the perfections of which I have some idea—that is to say, who is God." This form is founded on the idea of perfection. 2. He combines causality (which principle indeed underlies all three forms, which makes it questionable whether in any the argument is purely ontological) with perfection. "I do not exist by myself; if I were the cause of my own existence, I should have given myself all the perfections of which I have an idea. I exist then by another; and this being by whom I exist is all perfect; otherwise I should be able to apply to him the same reasoning, which I have just applied to myself." 3.

Finally, he puts the argument on the basis of the infinite. "At the same time that I perceive myself as a finite being, I have the idea of an infinite being. (As the corrective). This idea, from which I cannot withdraw myself, and which is derived from no other idea, came to me neither from myself, nor from any other finite being; for how could the finite produce the idea of the infinite? Therefore it has been imparted to me by a being really infinite."

Leibnitz, in his "Meditations Concerning Knowledge, Truth and Ideas," presents the argument syllogistically: "A being from whose essence we can conclude existence exists in fact, if it is possible. Now God is such a being that we can infer from his essence his existence. Therefore, if God is possible, God exists."

Cudworth, More, Clarke, Butler, and others, have also urged this proof; but, on the other hand, Gaunilo, a monk, contemporary with St. Anselm, asserted that it is a paralogistic fallacy with which the archbishop had deceived himself; and Kant has confirmed this distinctive criticism; alleging that we are not allowed, as this argument does, to infer existence from a mere definition; we could as logically infer the existence of a perfect island, because we can for such an idea.

A metaphysical argument is suggested by the ideas of space and time, those mysteries of ontology. What are they? Real, as most think, or merely ideal, as alleged by Kant and his school? We may safely say that no one but a philosopher, with a theory at stake, will deny their reality. Indeed they are so real that it is impossible for us to conceive their non-existence. We can not conceive nor believe the annihilation of either space or time. Let all mental being cease, let all matter perish, and yet space and time survive. If, however, this be not true, nevertheless the existence of any mind or atom of matter demands a when and where to be. Moreover, they are universal, omnipresent. Beyond the stellar orbits, the utmost confines of the created universe, where even ether ceases, space and time still reign, and we can not conceive it otherwise

So far we are treading the adamantine walks of necessity; we are in the relentless grasp of thoughts that hold us and yet can not satisfy us. How necessary, how immense, yet how empty? A vacant space, an unfilled time—the soul shrinks back as from a skeleton, whose eyeless sockets and fleshless fingers speak of the absence of life and soul. There must be something to dwell in space, to live in time; something as eternal, as immense, as infinite as they. They are the infinite where, and the infinite when; there must also be an infinite Who, that fills and animates them. Dr. Samuel Clarke used a somewhat similar argument as a proof of God's existence.

#### C—THE COSMOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

Whatever begins to exist must have a cause *ab extra*; the universe had a beginning; therefore it had a cause *ab extra*. The principle of this argument, found in its major propositions, is that of causality, and is an a priori axiom. It is a superficial and false philosophy, which emasculates cause of its power and makes it mere invariable antecedence and sequence. It is contrary to common sense; for who does not see the difference between the regular successions of the seasons and of day and night, on the one hand; and the warmth of spring and the melting of the snows, the rising of the sun and the appearance of day, on the other. The order of sequence is equally invariable in all these cases; but there is nothing in winter to produce spring, nor in night to bring forth day; while manifestly warmth does melt the snow, and the sun does make the day. But even on the lower view of cause, the principle is true and sufficiently answers our purpose; an effect is a sequence, which must have an antecedent.

Aristotle presents the cosmological argument, using motion as the effect to be accounted for. In common with all the Greek philosophers, he believed in the eternity of the material universe; not one of them seems to have conceived the idea of *ex nihilo* creation. Motion, however, must be accounted for; and Aristotle holds that the Deity is unmoved, passive, and, like a magnet, unmoved Himself,

His attractive power causes motion in the universe.

The argument is now applied to the entire universe ; and the issue turns on the minor premise, did the universe have a beginning ; is it an effect, a sequence demanding an antecedent ? The universe is composed of matter and mind, both of which are now known to exist. That something now exists necessitates that something must have always existed, for the absolute origination of being is unthinkable, incredible, impossible ; it contradicts the axiom of causality. Were finite mind and matter, or was either of them this eternal existence ?

It is a remarkable fact that very few have asserted that finite mind is eternal. The proof is overwhelming that it is not so upon this earth. History, tradition, geology, evolution, all affirm that there was a time when man began to exist upon the earth.

It is equally remarkable that some contend for the eternity of matter, this is perhaps the most interesting, because the most fundamental question in natural theology. That matter is not eternal is shown. 1. By the teachings of geology and evolution. If geology is a trustworthy science, and evolution is the true explanation of the present condition of matter, then it is presumably true that matter had a beginning ; for both of these teach that matter is now in its most highly developed state ; that the past has been a progress from the more simple to the more complex ; that matter can be traced back to an azoic, structural condition. If that be true, if as we go back matter tends to come to a point, is it presumable, in the midst of eternity, these converging lines become parallel ? Must we not believe that they come to an initial point ?

2. Mind is unquestionably superior to matter ; this is allowed by the materialist even. The Creator is without doubt superior to his own creation. If then matter existed before mind and produced mind, both of these principles are violated. Matter, the inferior of mind, can not therefore have been the prior and the creator of mind, its superior. The mind revolts against placing matter on the

shrine of the universe, making it the source, absolute and present, whence the things have sprung.

If matter and finite mind both began to exist, then the universe itself had a beginning and a cause *ab extra*, and that cause is God.

Kant and others have objected to this argument that it proves a finite creator alone ; that the universe, the created effect being finite, we can not argue from its origination an infinite cause. It is not a satisfactory answer to this objection to urge that the immensity of the universe, transcending, as it does, the power of human measurement and computation, makes it practically infinite. No, the chasm between the immense and the infinite is an infinite chasm, so long as the immense is a bounded, limited finite. Kant has not been answered in our current works on natural theology. Dr. S. S. Laws, late of Columbia Theological Seminary has successfully met Kant by calling attention to the simple fact. that the bringing of something out of nothing, the absolute *ex nihilo* creation of a single atom, is an infinite act, requiring omnipotence to effect it. He might conjecture an angel, wise and powerful enough to produce the universe out of preexisting material, but no angel, nor archangel, nor all combined finite power can create from nothing a grain of sand.

It is objected again that the argument proves naught but a casual power. Infinite power, however, is an attribute, which must belong to some omnipotent, casual being.

Hume's objection that we have never observed the creation of a universe, and therefore know nothing about it, has no weight, except to the theoretical dogmatic empiricist. I never saw a telescope made, and yet am sure that all the telescopes I ever saw were made. The principle of causality is a priori, universal, necessary ; so that when we recognize the universe as having a beginning, we are compelled to believe that it had an adequate cause.

This argument involves the infinitude of God in power and knowledge ; his eternity and omnipresence ; his spirituality as the creator of mind, and his unity, as there cannot



be more than one such creative being.

This principal form of the argument from causality is based upon the fact that the universe is an infinite effect, and therefore reveals an infinite cause. There are two other applications of the principle of causality, which are commonly presented as independent proofs, but which are better placed with this, as corollaries to the main argument. The first of these is :

#### I—THE THEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

Whatever effect shows design is the product of wisdom ; the universe is full of design ; therefore its Creator is wise. Socrates, Aristotle, and Cicero, among the ancients, expressly admitted and applied this principle to prove the existence of the gods. Leibnitz, Herbart, Lotze and Wendenberg, in modern times, assert it on philosophical grounds, and Paley has applied it with a rich variety of popular examples. Epicurus denied it, as is done more recently by Hume, Kant, Hegel and others.

To the every-day man of common sense there is no doubt that everything in nature has a purpose. This is conclusively shown in numberless instances, where he sees the design clearly revealed ; and even more convincingly in those rare instances, where he is puzzled to know why such a thing exists. The various parts, tissues, organs of the human body at once show the purpose of their being ; with one or two exceptions. The mammae of the male and the vermicular appendage to the intestines excite wonder and court investigation, because of the obscurity of their purpose ; while no unsophisticated person doubts the design of the heart, stomach and lungs.

Hegel's doctrine, that "final cause is simply the inward nature of the thing," breaks down in its application to those numerous instances, in which the things adapted are separate and independent of each other ; as the sexes, matter and mind, food and the digestive apparatus, the sun and its attendant system.

Kant's objection, that this argument proves an architect and not a creator, may be freely admitted as true ; as

it is merely intended to show that the creator, revealed by the cosmological argument, is also an intelligent and wise architect. By his creative power, He brought the material elements of the universe into being ; and now, as the wise architect, He gives them useful form.

The Creator then, is a designer, and a designer is a person. A person is a spirit, who freely acts with a view to ends ; so God reveals Himself in the purposes displayed in the universe. Here we are confronted by the pantheist, who asserts that God is the universe, the universe is God manifested ; and who denies that God is or can be a person, because personality implies limitation, and God is the unlimited.

This subtle, plausible objection is rarely successfully met by the theist, because of obscure and erroneous ideas of what is meant by the infinite, the unconditional, as applied to God. As understood and employed by most philosophers and theologians, there is and can be no infinite, unconditional being. The neo-platonists so refined and sublimated the notion of the Deity that they finally made Him destitute of being, and He became the non-existent. So it must be when we assert that God is the unconditioned. He can not be unconditioned except as unqualified and unrelated ; and as unqualified and unrelated, He is not only unthinkable, but unbeable ; a being without qualities, a substance without attributes, does not and cannot exist. So far from God's being the summum genus of an absolute generalization, formed by thinking out qualities and thinking in objects, He is to be found at the other end of the scale, as the individual being, a single object with the utmost plurality and richness of qualities. Every one of these qualities is a condition of His being ; so that instead of being the unconditioned, He is more fully conditioned, as He is richer in qualities, than any other being in the universe.

He has all the conditions that belong to infinite, absolute perfection. Amongst the conditions of perfection are those of personality. A personal being is a free, self-conscious intelligence ; an impersonal being is neither free, nor self-

conscious, nor intelligent. A personal being is more perfect than an impersonal. As a person, God has all the conditions of infinite excellence, intellectual, aesthetic, moral; all the conditions of perfection in His relations to the universe, as creator, benefactor, judge. God is unlimited in His perfections, but is limited by them; and he has no limitations that are not perfections and none that are not self-imposed.

Origen taught that God is self-limited; that the absolutely unlimited would be unable to conceive itself; and that God's omnipotence is limited by His goodness and wisdom.

In denying God's separate, individual personality and identifying Him with the universe, pantheism robs God of His freedom, makes man but an irresponsible wave in the ocean of being; banishes all that is moral in mechanical necessity, and makes the universe a machine run by the power of blind force.

#### II.—THE ENDAIMONOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

This is akin to the preceding. The Teleological considers the manifestations of skill or intelligence in the purposes displayed in the universe, while this has regard to the benevolent designs revealed. The universe is full of means adapted to produce the happiness of sensitive beings; therefore its creator must be benevolent. Both the principle and the facts of this argument are indisputable. The principle is intuitive, and the world is full of the evidences of God's goodness. This is most strikingly seen, when the goodness is unnecessary and is manifestly an addition to what would otherwise be complete. Note the gratification of our appetites; the needs attendant upon their satisfaction would seem to be a sufficient incentive, and yet there is much positive enjoyment in both eating and drinking.

To this argument a very weighty objection is found, which applies indeed to the teleological as well. If the principle or fact of design is admitted, it must be impartially applied, and we find some things in nature which are apparently purposeless, and other things whose design is

evil. The first form of the objection is not important, as all such apparent cases may be properly explained as due to our ignorance. There may be, and doubtless is, a purpose even when we fail to see it. If there be purpose at all, indeed if the universe as we find it is due to an intelligent creation and providence, there must be an adequate purpose in every law, fact and thing in nature. A purposeless act of an intelligent being is incredible.

But there are many cases in which the design is manifestly evil ; that is, to produce suffering. The claws, teeth, stomach and intestines of the cat are plainly adapted to and designed for the capture, killing, eating and digestion of mice. The sensor nerves are not only capable of and intended for pleasure, they are equally capable of and intended for pain. If benevolent designs indicate a benevolent creator, why do not pain-producing designs indicate a pain-wishing creator? Unquestionably they do. Every perfect being has both of these elements in his nature ; it is as real and as high a perfection to hate the wrong as it is love the right.

There is, however, a radical difficulty here, which we confess our inability to meet. We do not understand why sin was allowed to enter a world created and controlled by an infinitely wise, holy and powerful God. No theory of the will can explain it ; and the existence of satan, either as a created or as an eternal being, does not meet it. This is one of the things we know not now, but hope to know hereafter.

There are four possible alternatives : 1. The creator is a being, whose character, like fallen man's is a mixture of good and bad. No one entertains this view, although man has had gods of this character. 2. There may be two eternal beings, one producing the good, and the other causing the bad. This is the Parsee and Gnostic doctrine, but has been abandoned as ontologically incredible. There can not be two eternal, infinite beings 3. There is no design in either case. This is the position of Herbert Spencer and all materialists and pantheists ; but it is contradicted

by the intuitive belief of every man's common sense. 4. There is left the alternative, that the one benevolent creator, for reasons we do not fully know, has allowed sin to enter His universe, and has introduced suffering as the warning, chastisement and punishment of sin.

Granting the existence of sin, then the fact and the need of suffering become apparent. Pain is needed and is used for three good purposes. First, it is warning against a greater evil that threatens. If the violation of the laws of health was not attended by pain at the beginning, we should ignorantly continue practices which would eventually destroy life. An aching head is often nature's warning signal that we are approaching rocks or quicksands. Again, sufferings are chastisements, designed for the correction of our faults. As a father wisely chastises a wayward child that he loves, so does God those whom He cherishes as His children. In the third place, sufferings are also used as punishments. God is not only a father, He is also a sovereign and a judge; and as such he inflicts, even in this life, punishments upon the incorrigible. There are few things in this world so sad as the spectacle of a soul, whose sere and irresponsive conscience attests that capital punishment has been executed.

The teleological and endaimonological arguments are designed to show the character of God, rather than prove His existence. They reveal the Creator to us as a wise, benevolent and just person.

#### D—THE ETHICAL ARGUMENT.

There are no connate ideas, but there are innate or native ideas. These are not connate, born with the mind, nor are they bestowed upon it at any time by the Creator; they are not adventitious. They are innate or native to the mind, because they are born in it, are native to it. The mind has the power in and of itself of thinking them, and must think them, when the occasion comes which suggests them. They are the conditions of thought and of being, and are sometimes called the categories. Such innate ideas are being, time, space, cause, and others.

Of these primary, fundamental ideas, one of the most important is the idea of right with its opposite, wrong. When the mind is sufficiently mature, as soon as it observes a moral act, an act that has a moral character, an act that is either right or wrong, the mind at once apprehends the ideas of right and wrong as moral co-relatives. These, as original ideas, have two pairs of derivations inseparably associated with them ; one is the idea of approval, and the other that of obligation. We naturally approve the right and condemn the wrong ; we naturally judge ourselves and others under obligation to do the right and shun the wrong. Obligation can not be an abstraction but must be a person. Obligation implies an authority who imposes it. There must therefore be a moral law-giver, whose nature is the right, who approves the right and condemns the wrong, and who lays on us the obligation to shun the one and do the other. This is the usual form in which the ethical argument is given.

Kant rejected, in his later thinking, all the other arguments as fatally fallacious, and based the belief in God's existence upon an ethical argument different from the above. He does not found it upon his categorical imperative directly ; but, as he gives it, it is substantially the same as that which Addison puts into Cato's mouth as proof of immortality. His argument in brief is this : Virtue and happiness are not the same ; virtue is the *supremum bonum*, and happiness the *summum bonum* ; they ought, however, to harmonize—the virtuous man ought to be happy. Manifestly he is not so in this world ; we are bound, therefore, to conclude that there is a being who can and will harmonize them. Kant went through the woods and picked up a crooked stick at the last. It requires his strong mind to see the cogency of this ethical argument.

A survey of the battle ground shows the cosmological argument, buttressed by the teleological and endaimonological, and the ethical as the impregnable fortresses of theism. These have been assailed and battered, but they have not been demolished nor captured. God is the creator, an infinite, single, wise, good and righteous person.

## CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

NATURALISM AND AGNOSTICISM—The Gifford lectures, delivered before the University of Aberdeen in the years 1896-1898, by James Ward, Sc. D., Hon. LL. D., Edinb.; Prof. Mental Philosophy and Logic in the University of Cambridge; 2 vols. The MacMillan Company, New York and London, 1899.

The author of these lectures has published little aside from contributions to philosophical magazines; but his pen is recognized already to be that of a master. Perhaps no one article has been read so extensively and referred to so often, as Prof. Ward's essay on psychology, contributed to the ninth edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*; and no student of the science can hardly be ignorant of it. Hence, it was with impatient expectancy that the philosophical world awaited the emergence from the press of these Gifford lectures. Their reception has been cordial, and the criticisms in the main kind.

Prof. Ward discusses a theme of the greatest interest to the professional student, and one by no means without attraction to the lay reader. He seeks to lay anew the foundation of theistic philosophy—a foundation set deep in the bed-rock of fact and reason. The old traditional arguments for the existence of a supreme intelligence in the world, are no longer of weight with a large class of scientific students, and this class concluding from the insufficiency of these old arguments, have embraced a philosophy that denies this most fundamental postulate of reason. These lectures are a vigorous attack on the strongholds of materialism and agnosticism—the philosophy which grim old Carlyle has called the “philosophy of dirt.” The attitude of the author is that of an assailant, and his arguments decidedly dynamic. There is a vigor and nerve about the book highly stimulating and attractive to the reader.

While there are positions taken in the details of the argument that I demur to, yet on the whole I think all lovers of a spiritualistic philosophy will sympathize with the aim of the author. It is imperative upon one who reads the treatment of philosophical questions, to understand the limitations which the author throws around himself—limitations arising from the nature and predilections of the minds to which the argument is addressed. In conducting a successful argument in philosophy, as in preparing for a case at bar, it is imperative that between the two parties a point at issue must be reached; and in philosophical discussions this is reached often only by concessions from both sides. To some, doubtless, these lectures will be lightly regarded because of the concessions which the author feels constrained to make. These lectures are not a complete system, but furnish an excellent outline and plan for a system of theistic epistemology and philosophy.

I believe it would do the work an injustice and give the reader of this review a wrong conception of the argument, if I culled from it here and there an extract. The argument is so compactly built that sometimes the strongest positions taken would appear indifferent if detached from their contexts. So I shall neither review the aim and method of the author, hoping to elicit a desire from those who read my words to go to the book itself. I shall make some introductory remarks which I hope will shed light on what follows in my exhibition of the book.

Modern science, flushed by the success of her wonderful achievements, has grown haughty and proud with a self-sufficiency and omniscience truly appalling. She has attempted to appropriate to herself all the fields of human endeavor; and has waged a fierce war against the kingdom of spiritualistic philosophy. Such men as Huxley, Tyndall, Du Bois, and Raymond, have offered to the world a system of metaphysics and a theory of the cosmos that have no dealings with that theory which insists upon the postulate of a supreme intelligence. We are told that inexorable law binds this world fast; and mechanism, not teleology, is the rational conception of things. Every thing in heaven above and earth beneath, is to be explained on the conception of mechanism—"a concatenation of laws, binding nature fast in fate," and in no wise prefiguring a God or suggesting the fashioning fingers of a Deity.

This wide-spread, yet more or less tacit rejection of idealistic views of the world result from the assumptions of modern science, which, however, are no part of the general body of the natural sciences, but rather prepossessions that "after taking shape in the minds of many absorbed in scientific studies, have entered into the current thought of our time." These prepossessions are the inevitable outcome of the standpoint and premises which natural science starts from. "If," says Prof. Ward, "with the history of science and the results of science before us we pass straight on to the construction of a philosophy, idealism has no chance. But in truth 'modern science' hardly needs to construct its philosophy; for without any conscious labour on its part, the naturalistic view of the world seems to stand out clearly for itself." But a critical examination of the formal and real principles of modern science will result in great disorder to this naturalistic view of the world. This conflict of modern science with philosophy is only another phasis of the warfare waged between mechanical and teleological views of the world—a warfare old as philosophy itself. Almost from the very rise of philosophy in Greece this problem of cosmology has been prominent. This cosmological problem is far and away the most important one with which Greek philosophy deals. In the school of Democritus the mechanical conception is regnant, giving us atoms and the void in which things are formed by the workings of pure mechanical laws. On the other hand we have the teleological conception of Anaxagoras, whose *apeiron* was the *nous*. And in the second period of Greek thought—in the post-sophistic or post-Socratic; and the Socratic period the problem emerges



and climbs into the ascendent. In Socrates and Plato this is the problem of chief concern, and the latter gives us his doctrine of the world-soul. Aristotle's principle of explanation, as all know, was teleology. In Epicurus the old doctrine of Democritus is revived; while over against him is set the teleology of the philosophy of the Porch. In early mediaeval times the church fathers were dominated by the mighty spirit of the Stagerite, and the teleological conception is in the fore again. But we have a return from Aristotle in Galileo, who pressed the principles of mechanism into science; and for a long period thereafter continental philosophy has a decided mechanical twang. In post-Kantian philosophy this conception is modified by the doctrine of evolution. We have a two-fold teleological conception here; Hegel, with his idealistic Pantheism; and Lotze, teaching that mechanism is to be conceived as a means to an end—the Divine mind working His purposes thro' mechanism.

The central theme in Prof. Ward's books is this conflict between mechanistic materialism and teleologic spiritualism—a conflict old as historic philosophy, yet of perennial interest. His aim is by examining the hypotheses of this philosophy of modern science, to show that it is inadequate to the demands made upon it, and falls short of its claim as an explanation of the cosmos. This would-be world-philosophy is what comes from the attempt to combine two incompatible isms—agnosticism, for which Mr. Huxley was proud to be sponsor, and which is essentially sceptical; and naturalism which is essentially dogmatic. In nothing is the contrast between naturalism and agnosticism seen better than in their epistemology. To quote Prof. Ward: "This distinction of known and unknown, as science intends it is, we may say, a mere objective distinction of fact; the distinction of knowable and unknowable as used by the agnostic, on the other hand, brings the knower himself to the fore, and entails an examination of the standpoint and of the premises from which science, without any preliminary criticism sets forth." This rather monstrous *raison* has proved damaging to the beatitude of naturalism, but on the contrary has subserved the ends of spiritualistic philosophy. The result of such a compact as naturalism has made is, that the old materialism has fallen into desuetude and in its place has come an agnostic or neutral monism—a nihilism in the parlance of some. And here "modern science" seems between a Scylla and Charybdis; either the "non-descript" monism must lapse back into materialism or pass up into spiritualism. Such strictly epistemological problems Prof. Ward reserves for the latter half of his work, for detailed treatment (i. e. Lectures XIV-XX), preferring to devote the greater part of his book to the discussion of what has been styled the real principles of naturalism. So that the much longer part of the lectures, and in my opinion the most valuable, is taken up with searching examination of the postulates and conclusions of science.

His method and argument, in brief is this: 1. You cannot apply the theory of abstract mechanics to the actual world in a theory of nature, because mechanics, as a branch of mathematics deals simply with the

quantitative aspects of physical phenomena and can dispense with the "real categories;" but the mechanical theory of nature, which aspires to resolve the actual world into an actual mechanism, must admit these real categories. An inquiry into the character and mutual relations of abstract Dynamics, molar mechanics, and molecular mechanics, results in showing how idle is the modern dream of finding a mechanical beginning. (Lectures II-VI.) 2. Mr. Spencer's attempt to base a philosophy of evolution on the doctrine of the conservation of energy is then examined and shown to offer an unintentional refutation to the above theory. When naturalism is forced to take account of the facts of life and mind, then it is that the mechanical theory exhibits its utter incapacity. Mr. Spencer has failed to write two volumes of his "Sympathetic Philosophy"—the volumes that should connect inorganic with biological evolution. (VII IX.) 3. Finally, when naturalism is made to take account of the relation of mind and body, it is driven to put forward psychophysical theories, which flagrantly contradict, not only sound mechanical principles, and sound logic, but the plain facts of daily experience. The body is said to be the phenomenal machine and the mind merely epiphenomenal—a kind of by-product, yet the correspondence cannot be called casual in our physical or logical sense. (XI-XIII.)

In reading this part of the book one is struck with wonder at the author's mastery of the technical details of the teachings of modern science. He has been criticised for making such copious citations, but to my mind this is a decided virtue. When he assails a doctrine of science he always sets forth the doctrine in the phraseology of its author. This gives the work a tone of sincerity; and makes one feel that Prof. Ward is more intent on reaching truth than winning laurels.

After this examination of the "real principles" of Naturalism, the author goes into the discussion of the epistemological questions on which the justification of Spiritualistic philosophy depends. His general conclusion here is (to quote): "Once materialism is abandoned and dualism found untenable, a spiritualistic monism remains the one stable position. It is only in terms of mind that we can understand the unity, activity, and regularity that nature presents. In so understanding we see that nature is spirit." (xviii-xx.)

The monism of Prof. Ward, as indeed that of Profs. Ladd, Bowne et. al. is not numerical monism but a monism of kinds;—there being in their conception only one kind of being (at last analysis) in the world. This is the knottiest question of modern metaphysics; and there is much diversity among the philosophers who hold to the above view, and often inconsistencies and lapses in the same author.

*Naturalism and Agnosticism* opens with an introductory lecture which admirably sets before the mind of the reader the enemy to be met, the methods of attack and "what weapons to select, what armor to endue." It shows that the method of Paley and the Bridgewater treaties are no longer of force in defending theism before those leaders of scientific

thought who are colored by naturalistic theories. When La Place went to make a formal presentation of his *Mecanique Celeste* to Napoleon, the latter said; "M. La Place, they tell me you have written this large book on the system of the universe and have never even mentioned its Creator." Whereupon the little Frenchman drawing up his shoulders bluntly replied: "Sir, I had no need of any such hypothesis." Nearly a century has passed since Napoleon expressed surprise at La Place's omission. Sciences that were just then coming into existence—chemistry, geology, biology, and even psychology—have now attained magnificent proportions. And any one who should compare the recognized works on these subjects to day, with the *Mecanique Celeste* would find the latter no longer singular in the omission that struck Napoleon as so remarkable—an omission which even Newton had already pronounced absurd in his famous letters to Bentley. The reason for this can readily be explained by the fact that now we have natural sciences whereas formerly we had natural philosophy. The hypothesis of a necessarily existent Being, a First and Absolute Cause, could be of no working service to a chemist in his laboratory discovering new laws and compounds; nor would such an hypothesis help the biologist or geologist. But this concession is far from admitting that when we leave particular sciences, concerned only with contingent causes, and begin to view things as parts of one whole—as universe, world or nature—that here too we do not need such an hypothesis. It is when we seek to rationally conceive and interpret the sum total of things that we feel the imperative need of the pre-suppositive of an Intelligent First Cause.

The last Lecture (xx) is taken up with a more specific argument in support of such a pre-supposition; and a defense of spiritualistic monism. Dr. Ward urges that the conception of law, even in science, is essentially and primarily a jural conception. Scientific writers use the laws of nature in two very different senses. "sometimes such laws are spoken of as self-existent and as independent of the phenomena which they are said to govern and which of necessity conform to them. But this language is only defensible on one of two suppositions: either the so-called self-existent laws are themselves causal agents and phenomena the result of their interaction; or by a metonymy, such as we commonly employ in speaking of civil law, the laws are said to be and do, what the sovereign executive really is and does. And we find scientific language that favors now one, now another of the alternatives," . . . "nevertheless the thoroughgoing naturalist, as we well know will not defend this usage of law . . . Laws of nature with him are only uniformities of co-existence and succession." (Vol. ii., p. 259.

The final conclusion of this lecture, and indeed of the whole course is that when we divest ourselves of the scientific bias and contemplate the world in its historical concreteness, we can see the true reality to be not mechanical, but a "realm of ends."

The work is far and away the greatest contribution to philosophy of the decade, and a Yale professor pronounces it the greatest since Lotze's *Microcosmus*.

FRAZER HOOD, M. A.

Smyrna, Tenn., Fitting School.

HEREDITY AND HUMAN PROGRESS. By W. D. McKim, M. D., Ph. D.  
Pp. 283. G. P. Putnam Sons, 1900.

This is a book essentially of today, and symptomatic of the age. Scientifically it is a crudity, and morally it is a blemish. The quotation from Hamlet which it carries on its title page is singularly *apropos*, "'Tis an unweeded garden that grows to seed; things rank and gross in nature possess it merely."

The most cursory survey of the book reveals the fact that the author's mental attitude toward the problem which he fronts is hopelessly one-sided. The swamping of the capables among men by the incapables is the ever-present ghost that haunts him, and pessimism flows as readily from his pen as the inky liquor from the cuttle-fish, and with the same result. In fact, this phase of the discussion is so overdone as to arouse the suspicion that the intention is the more certainly to attract attention and cause discussion. For example, on the very first page we find the assertion that "the application of a wise solution to the problem created by 'defectives' and criminals, will begin a true rejuvenation of the race." Surely nothing could more clearly reveal the author's failure to comprehend the great problem of moral evil which for ages has darkened our human horizon. It is preposterous to suppose that the reformation or extermination of a few thousands of pitiful "defectives" and criminals will strike "at the very root of all human misery." Unfortunately for the race the cause of the disease lies too deep, and its operations have been too long continued, to yield to so simple a remedy.

On the same page we find the equally sapient remark that "although the most highly developed of all animals, we men appear to be the least in harmony with our environments," a palpable contradiction. The least that can be said about such a statement is that it reveals a woefully superficial view of anthropology. The plain truth is that man is the best adapted of all the animal creation to meet or overcome obstacles wherever he may choose to have his habitat. If it were not so, it is plainly evident that he never could have become "the most highly developed of all animals." Physiological and pathological variations occur not only among the *genus homo*, but more abundantly still among the lower animals, the striking difference being that misshapen and idiotic animals invariably perish, while such men can and do survive. Among animals the law of natural selection remorselessly weeds out all variations from the normal or healthy type. Among men such individuals are nursed and protected by an artificial environment.

Our author devotes forty-five pages of his book to what he calls the dark side of human existence, summing up the darkness under the three heads of poverty, disease and crime. Indiscriminately mingled with moral idiocy and similar serious blemishes the catalogue is made to include such reprehensible behavior as shyness and blushing—a classification which places the overgrown and awkward school boy and girl on a par with the expert and hardened criminal. The better to justify the

impression of this dark side of existence, a half dozen or so examples of happily very rare cases of moral depravity are cited. But one swallow never yet has made a summer.

We next have forty-five pages devoted to the cause of human wretchedness. And no reasoner of the seventeenth century could more certainly have led us to what the theologians would describe as original sin, except that in this instance it is original sin dressed up in nineteenth century scientific toggery. In other words, heredity is said to be the dirty fountain-head of all our woe. And this theory is pushed to the very edge of the blandest materialism and the total obliteration of all responsibility. Happily, like most great men, our author is frequently inconsistent, an inconsistency, in this instance, really delightful in its *naivete*. On page 7, for instance, we are told "that to the influences which move the average man to repentance and uplifts him to higher endeavor, the low-grade 'defective,' whether weakling or habitual criminal (a noteworthy definition) is organically deaf and blind." But on page 194, while advocating his 'remedy,' his proposed universal panacea for all our woe, our author urges us to believe "that the remedy once generally adopted, many individuals who now appear incapable of reform would be induced to break their habits of vice and crime, and to become useful members of the community." But how could they, if "organically deaf and blind" to influences for right?

On page 185, again, he says, in effect, that human nature is heredity, but human nature understood as any given individual's specific tendency to action. To change human nature, that is to say, to counteract and overcome the influence of heredity, we need, he says, merely to change this tendency by stimulating certain functions of the brain and repressing others. But on the very next page that specially obnoxious demand of human nature which is fatal to the advance of the race is defined as selfishness, and this, while the race endures, we shall, according to our author, never be able to eliminate. Apparently, no stimulating or repressing of brain functions will suffice for the task, and the reader is left to wonder where eventually a race will land that is so thoroughly impregnated with this obnoxious and ineradicable element.

But it is characteristic of our author to treat this as yet obscure problem of heredity with the *quod est demonstrandum* air of a tyro. It is here that his obliqueness of mental vision is most clearly seen. The emphasis, throughout, is not only upon heredity, but upon abnormal heredity, but physical and pathological. It is treated simply as a stream of foulness incessantly pouring its pollution into the blood of the race. The fact is utterly overlooked that this self-same law is, as frequently as not, a positive rectifier, by its grim operations quickly getting rid of undesirable material. There is in nature not only evolution but dissolution. Nature fights against the propagation of the unfit. It is impossible to continue a family all idiots, and our author ought to have grasped the significance of his own words when he tells us that "idiots die early," scarcely ever reaching maturity. The same is true, of course, also of the

drunkards and moral imbeciles. It is a melancholy reflection that in fighting the dreaded tubercle bacillus we are arrayed against one of nature's corrections, a true friend of the race which attacks no healthy man or woman, but only the feeble and potentially unfit.

We have next about sixty pages upon the results of the law of heredity on the defective classes, idiots, imbeciles, epileptics, criminals and drunkards. In the last named class the curious distinction is drawn between "the toper and the dipsomaniac proper." After citing a number of cases in which "taunts" were clearly enough transmitted from one generation to another, and the already badly frightened reader has almost come to the conclusion that the inheritor of a poor, or viciously developed body or mind can only fold his hands and say it is useless to try do better, and that another century or so will witness the total obliteration of all health both physical and moral, the admission is made that it still a matter of considerable controversy whether criminals are increasing or diminishing, and that the question cannot as yet be definitely answered. Our author himself inclines to the belief in an increase of moral turpitude. He could not, indeed, do otherwise in anticipation of his climax, the "essential feature" of his plan for the amelioration of the race. After one hundred and eighty-four pages of more or less important matter this "essential feature" is finally sprung upon the reader much like the final coup of an highly erotic novel. And novel indeed it is, namely, by means of carbonic acid gas to secure "the gentle removal from this life of such idiotic, imbecile, and otherwise grossly defective persons as are now dependent for maintenance upon the State, and of such criminals as commit the most heinous crimes, or show by the frequent repetition of crimes less grave, by their bodily and mental characters, and by their ancestry, that they are hopelessly incorrigible. As an academic proposition this is surely sufficiently startling, but the effect is considerably heightened when the reader learns that this wholesale legal taking of life should have eliminated from it every element of punishment and be looked upon as a purely altruistic proceeding for the benefit of society as a whole. Men are to be taught to consider it a kindly necessity for the offender and for the race, for some judge, or jury, or committee of public safety to apply to an unfortunate the odious doctrine that said unfortunate, because of the cares, burdens, troubles and dangers grouped about his person thro no fault of his, should be put out of existence with neatness and dispatch. Without going into the history or philosophy of punishment as society's condemnation of wrong-doing, it suffices to say that this scheme is utterly repugnant to all the finer feelings of our humanity. It would, engaged in to an extent sufficient to test its value, possibly secure a physically more perfect society, but at the awful expense of a human heart as dead to sympathy and benevolence and love as a stone.

And our author has qualms of conscience that will not down. He rightly anticipates that his "remedy" will "meet with much hostile criticism," and himself attempts to forestal a few of the most obvious ob-

jections. There is the objection, for instance, that his plan grossly violates the sentiment "that human life is sacred," is a something which "it is the greatest of all impieties to extinguish." Dr. McKim insists that this "sentiment"—for he will allow it to be nothing more than that, is of quite recent origin in the race's history, and is therefore something wholly artificial, the product of the self-same vicious process that not only allows a "degenerate" to live, but actually takes care of him. To prove his point that reverence for human life, this idea that "*homo sacra res homini*," is of comparatively recent origin. Dr. McKim tells us that "as late as 1820, there were over 200 crimes punishable with death in England," and that in that country "men, women, and little children were hanged by thousands for offences that would now be punished by a small fine or short imprisonment. It is in this connection also that we find a casual reference to the practice of infanticide "in the early history of every people." Now, our author ought to have seen, and but for his obliqueness of vision, would have seen that the statement of such facts quite thoroughly refutes whatever arguments he might be able to advance in favor of his plan of death for the degenerate. If our forefathers put the degenerates away at such wholesale rates the present generation ought to be pretty generally purged of scamps and criminals. But Dr. McKim himself asserts that the breed is alarmingly on the increase. It is still a condition and not a theory that confronts us.

Then there is the objection that such a slaughter of the innocent and guilty alike—of the epileptic, the petty thief, the harlot, the murderer, the insane, the toper, thus making a veritable shambles of the land—"would have a brutalizing influence, through which there would gradually disappear that tenderness of sympathy which is the loveliest flower of our human life." Dr. McKim complacently thinks this is not "really probable," although in a previous chapter he is quite solicitous lest the mere aggregation and incarceration of the degenerates and defectives in large numbers would brutalize their keepers. But to prove that this objection is pertinent, it is necessary only to point to the brutalizing effect of the atmosphere of the Chicago and Kansas City slaughter-yards. It is stated upon good authority that judges in those cities have sometimes declined to take the evidence of men employed in those yards, on the ground that they had become, by their bloody and brutal business, heedless of the finer distinctions between right and wrong.

But, compared to its effect upon the community at large, this brutalizing of a few executioners would be a trivial matter. Imagine the effect upon the people of this country of the careful inculcation of the principle, by the authority and example of the State, that a human life, physically and mentally defective, is worth only so much carbonic acid gas. The deduction would be swift and irresistible that infanticide is justifiable and suicide commendable in all cases where unusual disorder or trouble is encountered in infant or adult. Soon no patient anywhere, child or man, would be safe. The interval between private vengeance and the action of the State for public weal would be speedily filled up.

This is sufficiently illustrated by the medieval French experiments with the so-called *tours de force*, or baby turnstiles. Those contrivances for getting rid of bastard children cheapened child-life everywhere, and almost instantly the murder of infants increased in the provinces where the pernicious "conveniences" were installed. Humanity's warm instinct about the transcendent value of human life may safely be trusted as a wiser guide than Dr. McKim's cold-blooded reasoning. Dr. McKim would indeed guard against such a dangerous lowering of this "sentiment of reverence for human life," a process which he himself so sedulously fosters, by prescribing "with even more than old-time vigor" "the infliction of death for private ends." He thinks the "rapid increase in the number of condemnations for murder" would soon convince the public of its error. But surely such a proceeding, increasing the extent of the awful blood-bath, would only serve to foster the evil instead of eradicating it. The effect would in turn become a cause and there would be a sort of endless chain of murders, private and judicial, that would be simply intolerable.

But there is also this fatal objection to Dr. McKim's plan. Granted that the excesses to which we have just alluded would be, in the end, self-regulative, like the terrors of the French revolution, it remains to be said that the plan, in its operations as proposed, would reach only those defectives who are really the least dangerous to society, having the least opportunity to propagate their kind, those namely who are already in the absolute control of the State, confined within the limits of public institutions. What virtue would there be in slaughtering these already comparatively harmless, while untold thousands of potential consumptives, or actual epileptics and moral imbeciles, protected by family pride, or wealth, or position, would be allowed to rage like a consuming fire in society and multiply at will? What justice would there be in ruthlessly making away with the children of the poor, thrown perforce upon the care of the State, while the equally defective and much more dangerous offspring of the rich would continue to be luxuriously fostered?

This question also remains: How could a safe and practicable line be drawn "between cases suitable for removal by death and those unsuitable?" Theoretically our boasted modern science might easily surround the difficulty, but we imagine that in practice so much injustice would be enacted, and so much of anguish inflicted, that the plan would crush itself by its own weight upon the public conscience. It would never secure the needful social sanction.

We have space, in conclusion, simply to call attention to the author's almost whimsical suggestion that, if applied at all, this "inspiring" idea should first be tried on a small scale. But that is just what society has been doing for all these years. And how would an experiment like this on a small scale prove the efficiency claimed for it? It would be very much like administering a small dose of strychnine to a dog to determine whether a larger one would kill or cure him!



In short, just as, in the past, attempts to interfere with the instincts of man have been futile, so must this one also be. There is no royal road to perfection. The race must continue along the *via dolorosa*, slowly, painfully, but yet surely, to its divinely destined goal of renewed likeness to him who made it, and guides it, and loves it.

In the meanwhile it would seem that the system of segregation, both custodial and curative, is the best method yet devised for the solution of the problem Dr. McKim would remove by wholesale murder. Already in our "poor-house" plan, our asylums for idiots and insane, for deaf mutes and the blind, and our colonies for epileptics, the State acknowledges its responsibilities in the premises. That there is abundant room for existing institutions for the classes named need not be doubted for a moment. But the idea behind them is the right one; segregation, both custodial and curative. Let everything be done that a true benevolence, reinforced by the best of scientific skill, can do for these unfortunates. But, by all means, let society see to it that the propagation of their kind is reduced to the least possible minimum.

W. W. ELWANG.

Columbia, Mo.

THE PERCEPTIONALIST, OR MENTAL SCIENCE. A University Text-Book.

By Edward J. Hamilton, D. D., Professor of Philosophy in the State University, Seattle, Washington; Author of "The Human Mind," "The Modelist," "A New Analysis in Fundamental Morals," etc. New York. Hinds and Noble, Publishers, 3, 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, Cooper Institute.

This is a revised edition of a book published by Robt. Carter & Bros., 1886, under the title, "Mental Science." The name has been changed, because the work is based upon the philosophy "That mankind are not deluded in claiming that they perceive fact and truth, and what they call their perceptions are true perceptions of those very things which they say that they perceive," in antagonism to "a materialistic or to an idealistic agnosticism."

The discussion in fifty chapters is divisible into four parts. The first nine chapters are introductory, and treat in a general way sense and the mind. The second, chapters 10-29, discusses the intellect, whose powers are ranged under two sections, the primary and the secondary; the primary are thought and belief; the secondary, attention, acquisition, reproduction, association, analysis, synthesis, abstraction, and generalization. The third, chapters 30-48, goes over the intellect again under three divisions of its faculties, the perceptive or presentational, the reproductive or representational, and the discursive or rational. The fourth, chapters 49 and 50, makes still a third analysis of the intellect into the experiential and intuitional.

Kant calls the underlying philosophy of this book dogmatism, an ill chosen term to designate it. Perceptionalism (which would better be perceptionism) is a new word coined by the author, and suits the theory better. Nevertheless it would not of itself at all suggest the meaning here assigned to it. This, properly understood and applied, is the cor-

rect epistemological attitude. There is enough truth in philosophic skepticism to make us critically careful and cautious that we accurately discriminate so as to ascertain just what we do perceive or cognize, leaving us sure that we may rely upon the knowledge thus discriminatingly obtained.

The author's philosophic position is indicated only in a general way in the preceding paragraph. He seems to locate himself more definitely when he says, "We oppose the principles of perceptionalism to those of the sensationalism, the materialism, the idealism, and the pantheism of our age." Though not a sensational associationalist, he is a Lockian empiricist. This is seen throughout the discussion and is clearly shown in his 49th chapter, Experience and Intuition. In this chapter it is manifest that he either does not understand intuitionism or else that he does not fairly represent it. He treats it as though intuition was that power of the intellect whose province is the necessary; a mistake which might be suggested, indeed, by Leibnitz discussion and maintenance of it. He strangely perverts the fact in the assertion, "Pure intuitional reasoning, in which only ontological principles are employed, may have favorable conclusions, while experiential knowledge and the inferences from it may be perfect and absolute." He confounds the abstract necessary universal with the concrete contingent particular. He merely refers in this chapter to the categories of being, time, and space and other intuitive ideas and practically confines the discussion to intuitive judgments.

He thinks himself an anti-materialist, and yet surrenders to materialism in admitting and asserting that the soul is extended. He avers that Hamilton and Porter teach this in the accepted phrase of the schoolmen, *totus in toto, totus in parte*. The same phrase is applied to God and would make him an extended being. If divisible extension is not the differentive of matter, as distinct from mind, what is? Is not God's presence an omnipresence? If so, is it an extended presence? Is not its extension denied in *totus in parte*? If God's presence is complete at every point in his universe, surely it is not an extended presence. It is equally so with the soul, should its presence pervade the nervous system. This is indeed an incomprehensible mystery, and yet must be, if mind is not matter. The truth seems to be that spirit has ubiquity, whereness, in space, but has no extension in space.

He is a noumenalist, opposed to the relation of Kant and Hamilton; that is, he believes that the intellect directly cognizes the substance of mind and matter, as well as their acts and qualities, or phenomena.

There are certain details in this volume which we may briefly notice. He makes much of the distinction between thought and belief. "By thought or conception, we mean that intellectual activity in which we have the idea of a thing, and also of its existence or of its non-existence." "By belief or conviction, we mean that confidence in the existence, or in the non-existence of a thing, which, under certain conditions, arises in the mind either intuitively or inferentially." By the side of this we place his distinction between knowledge and belief; he holds them to be

essentially the same, differing only in degree of certainty. "Knowledge is simply well-founded certainty; and belief, as contrasted with this knowledge, is conviction of some degree falling short of certainty."

Psychology he makes a generic term, including intellect and sensibility and will; while mental science is that specific department of psychology which treats of the intellect alone. He seems to think that Porter is the author of the threefold analysis of the mind into intellect, sensibility, and will, and that Sir Wm. Hamilton originated that into the understanding, the feelings, and the curative powers. Nicolas Tetens deserves credit for the former, while Kant is responsible for the latter. His own arrangement of the fundamental powers is a "sixfold division; first, sensation or sense; secondly, thought or intellect; thirdly, emotion or sensibility; fourthly, desire or motivity; fifthly, exertion or creation; and sixthly, the capability of pleasure and pain." This is a psychological curiosity in the order of the powers, in the omission of the affections and hopes, and in the separation of the sensibility into four fundamental faculties coordinate with the intellect.

Dr. Hamilton, the author, asserts that there are two kinds of propositions, "the presentential and the inherential;" the former asserting merely the existence of the subject, and the latter some qualifying predicate of the subject; and adds that this distinction is "not to be found in the writings of any authority, ancient or modern." To say the least, this latter is a bold statement and assumes that Dr. Hamilton knows what is found in all the writings of all the authorities, ancient or modern. This is more, probably, than Scaliger, or Sir Wm. Hamilton, or the most learned German philosophical bibliophile would claim. The distinction is "self-evident in its simplicity," and has been noticed by others; the presentential judgments being designated, with greater propriety, essential.

The author is haunted by thoughts so original that no words exist to express them, and he is compelled to coin for the purpose; other thoughts are so rare or so obsolete that he must use corresponding expressions; and still other thoughts demand new meaning for old and familiar terms. Objectuality, principiated, presentential, perceptualism are examples; as are also scheme phenomena, and sensorium in unrecognized meanings.

As a text-book this work was found unsatisfactory, both to students and teacher. It is nevertheless the production of a thinker.

Washington and Lee University.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

PSYCHOLOGY AND PSYCHIC CULTURE. By Reuben Post Halleck, M. A., (Yale), Principal Louisville Male High School, author of "The Education of the Central Nervous System." New York, Cincinnati, Chicago—American Book Company.

This duodecimo of 368 pages is a credit both to author and publishers. It speaks well for our public school system in the South, that such a scholarly and thoughtful production should have come from one of its teachers. The treatise is not pretentious in aim, style, or treatment; but

is simple, clear and primary, designed for the use of high schools and academies. Its distinguishing feature, beyond this, is its practical character; along with the discussion of each faculty, there are given suggestions as to its proper culture. The treatment is comprehensive, embracing a physiological introduction, followed by discussions on consciousness, attention, presentation, representation, memory, imagination, thought, feeling, emotion, and the will.

The one serious criticism is the extreme position taken as to the dependence of the mind upon the nervous system. It is not the attitude of materialism; for the book, though non-committal, seems to recognize the entity distinct from the nerves or the brain. Its standpoint is stated on the first page: "Marvelous as are the mind's achievements, we must note that it is as completely dependent upon the nervous system as is a plant upon the sun, rain, and air." This is the keynote to the whole discussion. To say the least, this is a conjecture which has never been scientifically verified; while some facts seem to render it doubtful. If true, what is the state of the soul after death? The objection to such a wholesale statement is that it suggests materialism and makes the young mind favorable to its reception.

JAMES A. QUARLES.

Washington and Lee University.

SCIENCE PRIMERS—HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY. For use in High Schools, Academies and Colleges; by Thomas Hunter, M. A. (Glasg.) New York, Cincinnati, Chicago—American Book Company.

As indicated on the title page, this is one of the series of Science Primers, prepared by leading specialists, and brought out in excellent style by the American Book Company. It is a 16 mo of only 128 pages, and yet contains a clear statement of the important views on ontology and ethics held by every master mind of our western civilization from Thales to Herbert Spencer. It is a *multum in parvo*; valuable not only to the teacher and student of philosophy, but also to every one who wishes to know something of the world's greatest thoughts and thinkers.

JAMES A. QUARLES.

Washington and Lee University.

TEN GREAT RELIGIONS; Part II.—A Comparison of all Religions. By James Freeman Clarke. "He who only knows one religion can no more understand *that* religion than he who only knows one language can understand *that* language"—Tylor. *Primitive Culture*, vol. I, p. 421. Eighteenth edition. Boston and New York. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1898.

The ten great religions are Confucianism, Buddhism, Brahmanism, Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Mohammedanism, and those of Egypt, Greece, Rome and Scandinavia. Of course we miss Christianity from this list. The omission is not due to inadvertence nor contempt; on the contrary, Dr. Clarke is a rationalistic Christian, and means to honor his religion by reserving a separate place for it. We must not, however, conclude

from this that he considers Christianity the only divinely inspired religion. He thinks it to be the best of all faiths and destined to become the future religion of the entire world. Its superiority he holds to be in the fact of its pleroma, its fullness, its completeness. All other creeds contain truth, important truth, more truth than error; but all of them are partial, incomplete, and more or less one-sided; while Christianity sums up all the good that is found in every one of them. The supernatural in Christianity he does not positively deny; he rather ignores it, assuming that it does not exist. Christianity is simply the best result of the human mind and heart, the brightest product of mental evolution.

Religion is defined as "the worship and service by man of Invisible powers, believed to be like himself, yet above himself." It is held to be natural to man and universal. Its origin is in the consciousness of our own spirits leading to a belief in ghosts, fostered by our experience in dreaming. Its primitive form is Animism, which develops into polytheism, and degenerates to idolatry.

The religions are classified into Tribal, Ethnic and Catholic. The tribal are the faiths of man in his uncivilized state of the child-like, primitive races, "which show an undeveloped ritual, priesthood and creed, without sacred books, with no religious architecture or music, (?), and which exercise little influence on the worshippers." "The Ethnic religions are confined to special races, are not founded by a prophet, are polytheisms, and do not lay stress on morality. Catholic religions spread beyond the boundaries of race, are founded by a single prophet, are monotheisms, and inculcate morality." As representative of the ethnic class, he gives the religions of Egypt, Assyria, Greece, Rome, Confucius, the Brahmans, and the Scandinavians; of the Catholic, those of Moses, Buddha, Zoroaster, Mohammed, and Jesus. It will be observed that his differentiations do not apply in all these instances; Confucianism was founded by a prophet, is not a polytheism, and does lay stress on morality; neither Buddhism nor Zoroastrianism are monotheisms; Judaism and Zoroastrianism are confined to special races.

Every religion is said to have its own special type, which persists throughout its history amidst all the variations outside the type. He arranges eight in antithetic pairs: The rites of Brahmanism is spirit, of Egypt body; of Zoroaster is freedom, of Mohammed fate; of Scandinavia is nature as force, of Buddhism nature as law; of Greece is development from within, of China discipline from without. "The essence of Judaism is the worship of one supreme, spiritual being, the Maker and Lord of all things;" while that of Rome is civil law and order. The chief peculiarity of Christianity is that "it is all-sided, all-embracing, hospitable to all truth."

Part I, was written and published ten years before Part II, and treats the great religions consecutively, presenting many interesting facts as to each, and altogether giving a fairly complete and correct account of them. This latter volume is on a different plan, "instead of describing

and discussing each of the great faiths of mankind separately, it attempts to show what they all teach on the different points of human belief \* \* \* concerning God, the soul, the future life, sin and salvation, human deity, prayer and worship, inspiration and art." This enumeration, taken from the preface, is incorrect in two particulars: It omits the origin of the world, treated in the seventh chapter, and it mentions sin and salvation, of which there is no discussion in the book. There is also a valuable bibliography in the preface, a concluding chapter on the Future Religion of Mankind, (Christianity), and an appendix giving the views of others on important points of the discussion.

The essence of Christianity is to be determined by Vincent's principle, the consensus of opinion, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, and results in reducing Christianity to four points: 1. Jesus as its founder, teacher and leader. 2. Worship of one God, the Father. 3. The law of love as the rule of deity. 4. An immortal life. This excludes everything supernatural: The Trinity, the incarnation, the atonement. Nevertheless, he condemns free-thinking: "Nor will the needs of the religious nature be met by any voluntary association assembled for free inquiry into religious matters. Freedom alone tends to pure atomism; it will turn an association into a heap of sand; it can not organize life."

One of the interesting points is that he repeatedly alludes to a primitive monotheism. There is no insinuation given of polytheism developing into monotheism; there are several in which monotheism has degenerated into polytheism, in India, Egypt, Mexico and China. This does not suggest evolution, but rather the Biblical teaching, that man was originally given the knowledge of God, but as he did not like to retain God in his mind, he was given over to a belief in degraded and degrading gods.

In discussing the origin of the world he says that three theories have been held, emanation, evolution and creation, and affirms as a possible fourth that the universe "has always existed as it is now, a cosmos of order." This last, he declares, has never been the belief of mankind. This is true, and yet there is a fifth view, which holds that the world in some form has been eternal. This fifth theory was practically universal among the Greek philosophers, and was not abandoned until the spread of Christianity led the Neo-Platonists to substitute for it the doctrine of emanation, which is at last but a special form of the theory itself. There are at bottom but two radical positions as to the origin of the world. 1. That it is eternal, in some primeval form; this may embrace emanation, evolution, and even relative creation, so far as special creatures are concerned. 2. That it is an *ex nihilo* or absolute creation; and this may consist with evolution or with relative creation, to account for the present state of the universe. So far as known to this writer, no one, outside of Biblical influence, has ever held to absolute or *ex nihilo* creation.

These volumes are written from the standpoint of the extremest, optimism or softheartedness; the author has allowed his critical faculty to atrophy from absolute non-use. This is amiable and makes the discus-

sion pleasant and entertaining ; combined as it is with the gift of a clear, flowing, elegant style It, however, puts upon the reader the necessity of keeping his own critical eye wide open, lest he be misled by positive and sweeping but unverified statements.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

Washington and Lee University.

**THE SIEGE IN PEKING.** China Against the World. By an eye-witness, W. A. P. Martin, D. D., LL. D., President of the Chinese Imperial University ; author of *Cycle of Cathay*, etc. New York, Chicago, Toronto. Fleming H. Revell Company. 1900. 12mo. 190 pp.

Dr. Martin went to China as a missionary of the Northern Presbyterian Church (as it is now) in 1850, and worked as such in Peking forty years, of late he has been placed by the Chinese government as president of the Imperial University at the capital. There are four other Americans of the same Board in Peking. There are two native churches in the city, with Chinese pastors, and 360 members are reported as the result of the work there done. Manifestly Dr. Martin and his helpers have not been successful in this branch of missionary work. Dr. Martin was for some years professor of international law in the Imperial College at Peking, and has translated into Chinese Wheaton's *Treatise on International Law*. He appeared in New York early in October of the past year, on his return from China, with a rifle strapped across his shoulders ; he ostentatiously belongs to the church militant.

There are eight chapters in the book. The first of which calls our attention to the fact that the allies in China marched under eight banners, and that the present imperial dynasty in China is known as the eight banners ; and the chapter is mainly occupied with a brief historical sketch of the Manchu emperors, who have reigned since 1644, A. D. The uprising of the Chinese is attributed to three motives : Political jealousy, religious antagonism, and industrial competition. The political jealousy is due to the fear of the Manchus, as foreign conquerors, that they will be dethroned. What is good is attributed to the Chinese proper ; what is bad, to the Manchus, who are Tartars.

The second chapter is devoted to the present "Emperor and the Reform Party." Kwang Su has held the scepter since 1874. He is a Manchu and is said to be physically weak, but having "a mind singularly acute and a heart capable of being moved by the wants of his people." The leader of the reform party was Heng Yu Wei. The purpose was to introduce western methods. "Innovations succeeded each other with startling rapidity," during the reform movement ; taking Japan as the model. The conservatives were removed from office. "The furious driving of this young Phaeton" of an emperor was too much for the staid Chinese, who in 1898 appealed to the Empress Dowager to interpose.

Chapter third tells of "The Empress Dowager and her Clique." The Dowager is not of a slave family, as is sometimes said, but belongs to the highest nobility. She was the secondary wife of the Emperor Hien Fung and the mother of the Emperor Tung Chi, and the present Emperor

is her adopted son and was chosen for the throne by her. Dr. Martin says, she is "beautiful, gifted and well educated." "In the eyes of most of her subjects her intervention was not merely justifiable—it was imperative." She did not radically oppose the reforms, but judged that the Emperor was pushing things too fast for his people, and in the reaction she was moderate and stopped the execution of the reformers. She introduced some western ideas "in the way of social progress;" for the first time the ladies of the foreign legations were received at court. She "took pains to conciliate foreign powers." Two things changed her, the first was the plotting of the reformers against her; "the young emperor prompted by his advisers had even despatched General Yuen with secret orders to take the life of the Viceroy Yu Lu, a main supporter of her cause." "Nor is it to be credited that she had any designs on the life of the young Emperor, whom she found it so convenient to employ as a tool." "That which appeared to bring about a change in her foreign policy was the occurrence of repeated aggressions on her territory by foreign powers," Germany, Russia, England, France and Italy being the aggressors.

"The Boxers and their Allies" form the subject of the fourth chapter. The Boxers are an old order, until recently like the Masons, with beliefs and rites which are a blending of Confucianism, Taoism and Buddhism. They practice pugilism and are hypnotists. The building of a railroad in Shan Tung, which they looked upon as a representative of foreign aggression, which they thought would revolutionize their labor system, and which in its construction ruthlessly desecrated their ancestral graves, incited them to a frenzy of fury, and the organization became political in its character, with the rallying cry of "Down with the foreigners!" The country was ripe for such an uprising, so that multitudes all over the eastern and especially the northeastern provinces sympathized with the Boxers and joined them. Even the women formed female brigades. The imperial government issued orders for their suppression and removed the governor of Shan Tung because he had not done so. The Boxers published a manifesto, in which they set forth their grievances: "The foreigners have taken our seaports, got possession of the administration of our revenues, and they do despite to our gods and sages." Most of them belonged to the laboring classes. Dr. Martin charges the Dowager with duplicity in the treatment of the Boxers; publicly condemning them and secretly favoring them.

Chapters fifth and sixth treat of the "Siege of the Legations in Peking," which he characterizes as "The uprising of a great nation against the whole of the civilized world." The besieged were in the British legation grounds and numbered four hundred and fifty marines, five hundred and fifty other foreigners, and two thousand native Christians. The siege began June 9th and closed August 14th, and had two stages, the first, in which the Boxers alone were engaged, lasted ten days; the second continued to the end, during which time the government soldiers aided the



Boxers. The charge was due to the attack upon and capture of the Taku forts, June 17th and 18th. This attack upon their forts was regarded by the Chinese government as an act of war, and caused the Chinese foreign office to notify the legations in Peking to this effect: "This is an act of war. Our country is therefore at war with yours. You must accordingly quit our capital within twenty-four hours, accompanied by all your nationals." There is no proof, however, that the imperial forces, as organizations under imperial orders, assailed the besieged; on the contrary, Dr. Martin says, that Prince Chiung, who commanded fifty thousand men in the city, "exerted a powerful, though secret influence" in favor of the besieged. The regular soldiers who took part in the siege seemed to have done so on their own responsibility. The death of Baron Ketteler was provoked by his ordering the arrest of two Boxers, who were parading the street in front of the German legation. One was captured and beaten by the Baron with his cane; two days after Ketteler was shot in the back as he was walking through the streets. The besieged were compelled to eat their horses and mules. The middle of July a supply of fruit, vegetables and flour was sent by the authorities to the besieged, and the same day there was displayed in their view a sheet of paper, on which these words were written: "We have received orders to protect the foreign ministers." The women among the besieged are said to have been especially heroic; and Dr. Martin says of himself, "Never was the thought of death less pleasant to my mind;" he did not covet martyrdom. He says, "One of our greatest privations was the want of newspapers;" their condition could not have been very serious. "The health of the imprisoned community was remarkably good." "Within our walls but few were killed or wounded by shot or shell." Protestants and Catholics affiliated, "the lines of creed and nationality appeared to be obliterated." "There was no time for praying or singing. Sunday was as busily devoted to fighting as week days, nor did I once hear of a prayer meeting." During the siege one lady made the portrait of another, "with untrembling hand," we are told. Dr. Martin and Li Hung Chang belong to a mutual admiration society; Dr. Martin tells Li that he and Confucius are the only two names in all China known to the western world, and Li makes Dr. Martin president of the Imperial University.

"Rescue and Retribution" is the title of the seventh chapter. Dr. Martin regrets that the American Admiral did not join in the attack upon the Taku forts. After the capture of Peking, he says: "The punishment of the guilty city would not have been too severe, had it been formally given up to be sacked by the soldiery. It was not formally given up to pillage, but the commanders, though announcing their intention to forbid looting, appeared to be in no hurry to impose a check on the mingled wrath and cupidity of their men. \* \* \* The expected prohibition was long delayed, giving many of them time to fill their pockets and knapsacks." "Well were it had they confined themselves to the looting of empty houses. Some of them, I blush to say, violated

the sacredness of poor families who had been unable to make their escape." "The American Board Mission, being installed in a prince's mansion, the Rev. E. G. Tewksbury discovered there and in neighboring buildings large quantities of furs, silks and other valuables, which, having previously advertised them to the army and the legations, he sold at public auction for the benefit of the native converts. Of these things Mr. Squiers, the gallant Secretary of the U. S. Legation, became a large purchaser; and the Rev. W. B. Stelle, a self-supporting missionary, purchased four boxes of furs to be sold in New York for the benefit of suffering Christians. So much for the charges of looting that have been brought against missionaries! Gladly do I share in the blame which they incur, and confess myself guilty with them, though the only object I appropriated to myself was a goat-skin rug." The stealing was not confined to the property of the Chinese, but was extended to that of foreigners.

The last chapter is headed "reconstruction." What does this aged missionary of the Prince of Peace advise? The Court must "lay its neck beneath the headman's ax," and must "indemnify eight foreign nations for a long campaign, and their people, with a large body of native Christians, for the destruction of their property. The war must go on until the Manchu government consents to do this, and to give suitable guarantees against the recurrence of any similar uprising in the future. They must be disarmed, and rendered incapable of again jeopardizing the peace of the civilized world." "We must wage war on the powers of darkness until the true light shall be allowed to shine without hindrance into every nook and corner of the land." "Let America bear her full share in the Christian crusade of the coming age." "To undo the mischief done by the Empress Dowager, let her be sent into exile." "Let the powers mark out their spheres of interest, and each appoint a representative to control the action of provincial governments within its own sphere. For China complete independence is neither possible nor advisable." "The joint commission of foreign powers should have an absolute veto on all measures hostile to their common interests." "China might concede us the island of Hainan, a stepping stone between Hong Kong and the Philippines." "If an island be not desirable, a sea-port on the mainland will give us all that is needed." "The punishment of the guilty princes commends itself to our sense of justice. The Chinese negotiators plead for their lives, and their was reason to fear that they would escape the death penalty. It would have been an outrage on the moral sense of Christendom to allow Prince Tuan to go with hoary hair to the grave in peace."

I have never read a sadder book. The impression it leaves is disheartening. The Christian powers, by their unprovoked aggressions, goad a peaceable and happy and prosperous people to desperation; until finally they turn with wretched impotence in a vain attempt to get rid of the grasping, intruding foreigner. Eight of the leading nations, without

justification, attack the seaports that defend the capital of this unwarlike empire. They seize the capital and give it up to the pillage of brutal soldiery. The missionaries of the meek and lowly Jesus appropriate, steal, the property of the unhappy private citizens of the sacked city; taking it from their houses, and selling it as booty for the cause of Him who said: "Thou shalt not steal." These Christian nations now propose to punish these patriot leaders, and to demand from an invaded and despoiled people an impoverishing indemnity, the removal of all the defenses of their capital, and the stationing of foreign legions at their seat of government. A veteran Christian missionary, highly honored by the Chinese government, and ex-professor of international law, records all this with approval, acknowledges that he took, stole, a goat-skin rug from a private house, and urges severer measures than the diplomats are willing to approve. All this is the name of civilization; by the professed representations of Him who said, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of; for the Son of man is come not to destroy men's lives, but to save them." This is Mohammedanism, not Christianity.

JAMES A. QUARLES.

Lexington, Va.

THINGS THAT MAKE A MAN. By Robert E. Speer. Pamphlet; pp. 28. Philadelphia—The Westminster Press.

We give the "foreword." "Every true hearted young man wants to build up in himself a noble and worthy manhood. This little book may have its inspiration toward 'whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honorable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely,' in Christly character, and may point out the way that leads to such attainments."

RULES FOR JUDICATORIES AND FORMS OF RECORDS AND CERTIFICATES FOR CHURCH SESSIONS. By Rev. W. H. Roberts, D. D., LL. D. Pamphlet; pp. 45. Philadelphia—Presbyterian Board of Education.

This book is an extract from the author's "Manual for Ruling Elders," and is what its name implies.

SERMON READING AND MEMORITER DELIVERY. By Rev. Alexander Melville Bell. Pp. 42; paper 25 cents. Washington, D. C.—The Volta Bureau.

This is a new edition of an old tractate. It was originally published in 1863, and by request of the students attending the Free Church College in Edinburgh. It is a contribution to the art and Science of elocution.

THE DOUBLE MAN. A novel. By F. B. Dowd. Paper 50 cents Denver—The Temple Publishing Company.

This is one of the Temple Series

CHURCH UNITY. Pamphlet; pp. 45. Presbyterian Board of Publication

This is a record of the progress and suspension of negotiations between the Protestant Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches looking to organized union, conducted from 1886 to 1895.

**WHAT THE BIBLE TEACHES.** A thorough and comprehensive study of all the Bible has to say concerning the great doctrines of which it treats. By R. A. Torrey. Smo. Pp. 539. Cloth, \$2 50. New York. Fleming H. Revell Company.

This is Mr. Torrey's most elaborate work on the Bible he has yet published. It is a careful, systematic study and statement of Bible truths, though not claiming to be exhaustive as to either all topics located in the Bible, or all that the Bible has to say on the types selected.

The method is inductive—thorough analysis followed by careful synthesis. Exactness of statement is first aimed at, and then clearness. The plan pursued is to give first the Scripture passages, then a proposition embodying their contents and expressing their meaning and follow the proposition with comments.

The contents are divided into six books. The subjects of the books are as follows :

Book I, Chapters 12—What the Bible Teaches about God

Book II, Chapters 8—What the Bible Teaches about Jesus Christ.

Book III, Chapters 9—What the Bible Teaches about the Holy Spirit.

Book IV, Chapters 18—What the Bible Teaches about Man.

Book V, Chapters 1—What the Bible Teaches about Angels.

Book VI, Chapters 4—What the Bible Teaches about the Devil, or Satan.

**THE POWER OF PENTECOST.** Chapters on the relation of the Holy Spirit to Christian Life and Service. By Thomas Waugh. Pp. 125. Paper 15 cents. Chicago: The Bible Substitute Colportage Association.

Ten chapters by the author and a concluding chapter by F. B. Meyer constitute the contents of this book. The subjects treated are: The Power of Pentecost; The Need of all Needs; The Spirit of Purity; The Spirit of Gladness; The Spirit of Power; The Spirit of Sympathy; How This Power is Obtained; How This Power is Retained; The Billing of the Holy Spirit.

**ANECDOTES, ILLUSTRATIONS AND INCIDENTS.** By D. L. Moody. Pp. 126. Paper, 15 cents. Chicago. The Bible Institute Colportage Association.

This is a collection of apt and forceful anecdotes, illustrations and incidents. The collection was made in the hope that it may be useful to the ministry and profitable to readers. It is both.

**SUGGESTIVE ILLUSTRATIONS ON MATTHEW, JOHN AND THE ACTS.** Three volumes. By Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D. D. New York. E. R. Herrick & Co.

This series of volumes is the summing up of the whole life work, in this line, of the famous author. He has prepared for us a repository of useful materials, among which are illustrations from all sources, picturesque, Greek words, library references to further illustrations and photographs of celebrated pictures.

It is designed for leaders in prayer meetings, young people's societies, Sunday-school teachers and pastors.

**MATTHEW, THE GENESIS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.** By Rev. Henry G. Weston, D. D. Smo. Pp. 147. Cloth, 75 cents. New York. Fleming H. Revell Company.

Dr. Weston has done good and valuable service in giving Bible students this result of his years of study. The book is a connected paraphrastic exposition of Matthew, exhibiting its purpose, character and method. It is deeply unctuous and spiritual. There is great power for good in the mere reverence and devotion of the writing. There is suggestion to all interpreters and expounders of the Bible in the principles by which this writer sought to be guided. Three rules he especially emphasizes: 1. A writing must be interpreted in view of its purpose character and method. 2. All true interpretation must be sympathetic. 3. Ascertain the sequence of thought. What thought did the Holy Spirit intend to convey by the words he has employed and the place he has assigned them?

**STUDIES IN THE FOUR GOSPELS.** By Prof. Wm. G. Moorehead, D. D. Pp. 230. Philadelphia. The Westminster Press.

This is a most useful book for Bible students. It is neither a commentary on, nor an introduction to the Gospels, but is what the title implies, a study. Its aim is clearly and briefly to point out the main design of the spirit in revealing and presenting the truth in the form and record of the four gospels. The work is carefully done, and the results of long study are given in such concise and attractive way as must prove exceedingly profitable to all who will buy and study the book.

**THE BIBLICAL MUSEUM.** The New Testament. Two Volumes. By James Comper Gray. Revised with additions from the later Biblical Literature. By Rev. George M. Adams, D. D. New York: E. R. Herrick & Co.

The Biblical Museum is a collection of notes explanatory, homiletic and illustrative forming a commentary on the Holy Scriptures. It has been useful to many students of God's Word. Geo. M. Adams has now done a good work in revising it. The purpose in revision was to bring the work up to date by additions from modern Biblical Literature, in the hope that it will prove as valuable to present day Bible students, Sunday school teacher and families as it was in its original form to those of the earlier generation.

**ONE THOUSAND AND ONE THOUGHTS FROM MY LIBRARY.** By D. L. Moody. 12 mo. Pp. 396. Cloth \$1.00. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

This is a selection of expository and illustrative thoughts from the library of Mr. Moody. The method is to give the text and follow it by the selection. The texts are arranged in the order of the books and chapters of the Bible. Certainly these selections are good, apt and useful, for they are made by Mr. Moody.

**THE GIST OF THE LESSONS.** A Concise Exposition of the International Sunday School Lessons for the Year 1901. By R. A. Torrey. Cloth, 25c. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

This a satisfying, stimulating, spiritualizing study of the Sunday School Lessons for this year. It is the product of exceptional fitness. Mr. Torrey is a student and teacher. This excellent and remarkably compact work should be in the hands of all busy Sunday-school teachers. It is for the busiest of the busy.

**LOVE TO THE UTMOST.** Exposition of John xiii-xxi. By F. B. Meyer. 12 mo. Pp. 293. Price \$1.00. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

This is the second volume on the exposition of John by Mr. Meyer. The first on Chapters i-xii is entitled *The Life and Light of Men*. The exposition is in lecture form. Some key text is selected as suggesting the thought of an entire passage, then that subject is discussed and expounded as the thought is developed in the progress of the passage. This work has all the excellent marks of Mr. Meyer's writings. It is modest, simple, pointed, practical, earnest, spiritual. Of course the reader may expect to find the author's distinctive views in the book.

**THE FACT OF CHRIST.** A Series of Lectures, By P. Carnegie Simpson, M. A., Minister of Renfield Church, Glasgow. Pp. 188. Cloth, \$1.25. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

These lectures were delivered in the author's church to a public class which met on Sunday evenings after service. The subject is treated strictly within certain limits, the inquiry being carried on as an individual question, little account being taken of the way in which religion comes to us or the way in which it must express itself in the social life of the world. The topics discussed are: The Data of Christianity; What is the Fact of Christ; The First Meaning of the Fact: (1) The Christian Character, (2) The Moral Motive Power; The Further Meaning of the Fact: (1) The Foundation of Faith, (2) And the Word was God; The Final Meaning of the Fact: (1) The Reality of Sin, (2) The Problem of Forgiveness; Addendum: The Principles of the Atonement; What is a Christian.

This book was written by a strong thinker, thoroughly conversant with the literature of his thought. Of its kind, it is one of the most satisfactory discussions we have ever read. Few arguments equal this in adaptation to the needs of thinking men and women, who may be honestly inquiring concerning these things. Scholarship and conscience characterize every chapter. A "dignified catchiness" of expression and a fervor of spiritual experience make the book exceedingly entertaining, yes, fascinating. Every honest doubter, would-be sceptic or agnostic and every spiritual guide having to deal with such persons should buy and read *The Fact of Christ*.

THE LIFE AND LITERATURE OF THE ANCIENT HEBREWS By Lyman Abbott, D. D. Pp. 408. Price \$2. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., New York.

There are two facts about this book that are bound to attract attention. In the first place it is from the press of Houghton, Mifflin & Co. To the book-lover this carries with it the assurance that there will be nothing lacking to make a beautiful book. The paper is clear and heavy, the binding is handsome and neat while the type will always rest tired eyes. There is no publishing house in this country that does better work than this one, and we always are delighted to handle one of their books. The second fact about this book that will attract attention is that it is from the pen of Lyman Abbott,

Fame in this world is often mere notoriety, and in the case of Dr. Abbott it is a combination of notoriety and merit. He is notorious as the successor of Mr. Beecher, who has in his vagaries of belief out-heroded Herod, and as that one who has crept into Christian homes by means of the *Outlook* and sowed seed of rationalism and unbelief; yet on the other hand, even his bitterest enemies must admit that he is a man of great ability, of a clear style and of the courage of his convictions.

In this book he gives a careful analysis of the law, politics, poetry, history, drama, philosophy, ethical culture, theology, folklore and fiction of the ancient Hebrew people, and from such an analysis by means of higher criticism he proposes to construct a synthesis, from which, he believes, will emerge a less dogmatic and more spiritual theology than the old.

It is a book that cannot be read without danger to one's faith, unless the reader has a mind trained to pierce sophistries, and to remember that the dogmatism of the anti-dogmatist is often as dogmatic as that of the most bigoted theologian.

We would say that it is a book that ought not to be admitted into the homes of our people but for the fact that the *Outlook*, in which these papers appeared, is found in a great many of these same homes.

THE CURIOUS CAREER OF RODERICK CAMPBELL. By Jean N. McIlraith. Pp. 287. Price \$1.50. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., New York.

We are having the historical novel in abundance these days, but there are many degrees of difference in these novels.

Some give you history in homeopathic doses, and of such quality that you are content with the dose, while others give it in strong and wholesome potions.

This book is by far one of the best of its class. The scene is laid in Scotland, where the hero, a red headed Cadie of Edinburgh, fights for the Young Pretender till the cause goes down at Culloden—all for love of a girl far above him in station.

He then turns up in New York and Canada where as an officer in the French army he takes part in the war between France and England for possession of "New France."

The author is true to history, taking no liberties with facts, and also gives us excellent pictures of Montcalm, Bougainville, and Legardeur de Saint Pierre.

There has always been a freshness and charm about "New France" and the struggle for its possession, caught, it may be, from the woods and breezes that now make it so attractive.

Add to these native attractions the brave Scots, ready for a fight, beautiful women and cruel Indians, and you have the ingredients for a first class story, and then let the book come from the press of Houghton, Mifflin & Co., and then you will be sure to have a book for your library or reading club.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY NEW TESTAMENT IN MODERN ENGLISH.  
Part Two—Paul's Letters to the Churches. Price 50c. Fleming H. Revell Company, Chicago and New York.

The Fleming H. Revell Company has an enviable reputation of publishing good books. Their work is itself good, and some of their books in their mechanical make up are gems of their kind.

This book is not a paraphrase nor a literal translation, but a rendering with as much freedom as is consistent with fidelity to the true sense of the original Greek.

It comes highly endorsed, being valuable in the minds of many, because it gives a freshness to the Word.

Of course no one holds to the inspiration of the English translation, as we have it in King James' Version, yet association has given it a certain sacredness, and no other Version can take its place. Imagine, if you can, a dying man getting comfort from any of the new Versions.

While we prefer the Bible of our fathers, yet we can imagine why to others such books may be a great blessing. The translation seems to be accurate, and every one will find it a great help for reading in connection with the Version as we have it.

STRINGTOWN ON THE PIKE. By John Uri Lloyd. Pp. 414. Price \$1.50. Dodd, Mead & Co., New York.

This story, though written by a new author, was chosen as the Bookman's Serial for 1900, and no one can read it without endorsing the wisdom of the choice.

When one has to wade through the multitudinous books that come from the press in these prolific days it is a real relief to find a book that claims the attention and stirs the blood and for that reason we turn to its review with pleasure and advise its purchase.

The scene is laid in Kentucky during the Civil war, though the war does not figure very materially in it.

It revolves around the superstitions of an aged negro, who is a firm believer in hoodoo signs.

He is a descendant of a negro King, and nothing in the book is better sustained than his character.



The Redhead Boy, as he is called, is a mountaineer who has inherited a feud, and right well does he fulfill his calling. We doubt whether the mountain feud with all of its horrors has ever been more graphically described than is done in this book.

There are several scenes in the book that show dramatic power of a high order, such as the strangling to death of the Virginian, or the poisoning of Mr. Manley.

The love story that naturally goes with such books is of minor importance, and yet it is a book of such power and interest that no one can lay it down after they once begin it.

When we read of the wonderful run other books far inferior to it have we wonder where is the judgment of the reading public that this book does not excel them all.

HOW TO PROMOTE AND CONDUCT A SUCCESSFUL REVIVAL. Edited by R. A. Torrey. Po. 336. Fleming H. Revell Co., Chicago and New York.

This book is a symposium on Revivals written by different men who have been successful in the work.

Mr. Torrey in his preface states that feeling that a revival is coming he is anxious that it be conducted along right lines, and that he has asked men, whom God has used in winning souls to Christ and building up believers, to write out their own experiences.

Some of the methods described will doubtless appear novel to many, but they are methods that have been tried and have been found effective.

He sends it forth as an aid to those ministers who are longing for a revival, yet have had no experimental or even theoretical knowledge of how to promote such a revival.

IRENE PETRIE, MISSIONARY TO KASHMIR. Pp 343. Price \$1.50. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York and Chicago.

The Fleming H. Revell Company has put the church at large in debt to it by the many charming missionary biographies it has given us. The one before us is that of a brilliant young woman who could have thrived in London society by reason of her many accomplishments and social rank, yet who laid them all upon the altar of God's service, and after three years of work in a heathen land, yielded up her life for his glory.

The roll-call of the missionary dead is one of incomplete lives, as men count lives, and as they would say, another has been added to the list, but we who look beyond the present know that each of the incomplete lives, such as Martyn, Keith, Falconer and Mackay, is still doing its work and sowing seed for a harvest that only eternity can measure.

This is the first biography of a student volunteer and it is written by the loving and partial pen of a sister. To keep the flame of missionary enthusiasm burning in our churches we must have facts such as this book gives us.

REUBEN DELTON, PREACHER—A sequel to "The Story of Martha." By S. O. H. Dickson. Pp. 296. Price, \$1.

THE LITTLE BURDEN-SHARERS—By Annie M. Barnes. Pp. 95. Price, 60 cents.

These two books from our Committee in Richmond, Va., ought to go at once into every Sabbath-school library as well as home in our Church. The printers and binders have done excellent work, while the contents are in keeping with the excellent quality given us by the same writers before.

The scene of the first is in the mountains of North Carolina, where a great work is being done, while the other is in Mexico. We venture to say that if each pastor of our city churches would read through his Sabbath school library, it would not only be a revelation to him, but that he would destroy at least ten per cent. of the books.

Our Committee's books are always safe.

IN WHITE AND BLACK—By W. W. Pinson. Pp. 357. Price \$1.25. The J. W. Burke Co., Macon, Ga.

This book has been sent to our table with the request that we make some mention of it.

There are three facts connected with it that ought to recommend it to a Southern reviewer. It is written by a Southern preacher, is published by a Southern house, and treats of Southern life.

The reviewer, however, in justice to the reading public, has to deal with books as they are, not as he would wish them, and candor compels him to say that the mechanical work on the book is of very inferior quality, poor paper and flimsy binding, while the story, good enough in its moral, is as clumsily put together as we have ever seen.

The plot is commonplace, in fact rather threadbare, but the negro characters redeem it.

We feel sure that the writer can do better, but if this be his best, then the shoemaker would better stick to his last.

IN THE HANDS OF THE RED COATS—By Everett T. Tomlinson. Pp. 370. Price, \$1.50. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., New York.

Since the older ones in this generation have begun to take their history in the shape of a novel, it is only natural that the form of a story should be employed to teach the young the same truths.

This is by no means a novel, but only a story of the sufferings of prisoners while in the hands of the British, and it also gives us a vivid picture of the outrages perpetrated by the Revolutionary Tories.

It is well to keep each generation acquainted with the struggles and sufferings of our forefathers, lest they forget the price paid for what they now enjoy.

“THE BOY IN GRAY”—By G. G. Smith, Chaplain of Phillips Legion, Georgia Volunteers. Pp. 267. Price 75c. G. G. Smith, Macon, Ga.

If it be thought important that the young should be taught the Revolutionary story it is infinitely more so that they be taught the story of our own Civil war, for while we have been neglecting this duty, the

North has been busy, and false statements concerning the Civil War are found in even our Sabbath school libraries. Of the literary style of this book we can say very little, for the English is not Addisonian, but the story itself is so true and the spirit of the book is so well calculated to teach the truth without engendering bitterness, that we soon overlook the lack of grammatical accuracy.

It is the story of a Southern planter and his son, who enter the Confederate Army, and whose experiences in camp, hospital and prison, go to show that there were good people on each side.

There is a strong religious tone throughout the book, which, together with its low price, and Southern coloring, makes it a book that ought to be in the hands of our boys and girls.

CONSTRUCTIVE STUDIES IN THE LIFE OF CHRIST. By Ernest DeWitt Burton and Sailer Mathews, Professors in the University of Chicago. Pp 302. Price \$1 00.

For many years we have been receiving invitations to take a course in Bible study in the University of Chicago, but with the exception of a course in Hebrew, we have declined the invitations. We have, however felt a natural curiosity to learn just what the Bible course is, and to see if the devil is as black as he is sometimes painted.

Recently there has come to our table the book whose title is given above, and to it we eagerly turned, especially when we read the following in the preface: "It is our hope that it may contribute to the religious well-being of those who use it."

After examining it we wish to warn all readers to leave it alone, for the "religious well being" of any man must be in a sorry condition that can be benefitted by such a book. It is scholarly and thorough, scientific and exact in its methods of work, but like Mary at the empty tomb we can but cry, after reading it, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him."

As we have remarked, the writers are scholars, and in a scholarly manner they have done their work. In all that pertains to the human side of our Lord's nature, they have given us a very charming treatment, but mingled with these choice bits there are many dangers, such as the average reader would not notice.

The cloven foot is seen when we approach the mysterious struggles of the last days, the full meaning of which no man has ever been able to fathom. Yet these modern critics, brushing aside as unworthy of mention, the usual interpretation of the prayer, "Father, save me from this hour," inform us that the prayer expressed his natural desire not to be put to death by sinful men; "not to have shrunk from this, in view of the sin that was involved in it for men, would itself have been sinful."

When they would interpret His prayer that the cup pass from Him, they wisely inform us: "It is not legitimate to read into the words any reference to bearing other men's punishments. It is a universal law that the good, because they are good, suffer from the sin of the wicked.

Jesus dreaded suffering and death, not punishment. Punishment, as such, cannot be transferred from the guilty to the innocent. Further than this, speculation as regards the agony in Gethsemane should not go."

With due respect for the scholarship of the University of Chicago, we would advise our readers to beware of their book.

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY IN THE CIVIL WAR. By John Fiske. Pp. 368. Price \$2.00. Houghton Mifflin & Co., New York.

To say that this book is from the famous Riverside Press is sufficient to assure all lovers of beautiful work that this volume is in binding, type and paper used, all that one could desire—while to say that it is from the pen of John Fiske is sufficient to assure the reader that he will not put it down as long as one page remains unread.

Of all the writers and lecturers in history we know no one who can approach Prof. Fiske in clearness of statement, charm of style or in the possession of the true historical spirit.

Those who have read his former books such as *Old Virginia and Her Neighbors*, *The Beginnings of New England*, and *The Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America*, will doubtless be prepared to find in the present volume his characteristics as a writer, as enumerated above—but the Southern reader will expect to find him full of partisan bias, raving about the Old Flag, and exalting the North at the expense of the South. To all such the book will prove an agreeable disappointment.

Since the writer was a boy of eight, spelling out the war news amid the sound of cannon and the beating of drums, he has read many volumes on the Civil War from Northern and Southern pens—but he has never yet read a book written from a Northern point of view that is so fair in its treatment, or so generous in its estimate of Southern value.

In his preface Prof. Fiske alludes to the objection of Southern people to the term "rebel" used in his book, as if some sort of stigma were attached to it.

For his part he has sympathized with many of the great rebellions in history and therefore he cannot conceive of "rebel" as a term of reproach. He claims that his use of it is to avoid the excessive iteration of the word "Confederate," and at the same time to express the undeniable fact that his Southern friends were trying to cast off an established government. He confesses that his sympathies have always been intensely Northern, as befits a Connecticut Yankee, yet he could in all sincerity take off his hat to the statue of Lee when he passed it in New Orleans. Concerning Lee he expresses the following sentiment: "His devotion to the self-government which seemed to him in mortal peril was no more reprehensible than the loyalty of Falkland to the prerogative of Charles I, though in both cases the sentiments were evoked under circumstances which made them dangerous to the nation's welfare."

The book has a peculiar charm of its own, in that it gives character sketches of Northern generals in a fearless manner and with a spiciness of treatment that adds much to the enjoyment of the reader.

We do not propose in this brief review to follow him in his clear accounts of the various battles of the West, where he seems to show that with the exception of General Jos. E. Johnston, the Confederates were out-generaled as well as outnumbered, but we propose to give some extracts which will serve as pen-pictures of the Western generals.

We in the East remember Gen. John Pope, whose baggage Stuart captured, and whose army Jackson defeated—and who stands out in history as the Falstaff of the Civil War. Fiske is speaking of the capture of Island Number Ten, where three generals with 7,000 men, 123 heavy guns, 25 field pieces, 7,000 stands of muskets, tents for 12,000 men, several hundred horses and an immense quantity of ammunition were captured without the loss of a single man on the Federal side, and he says, "the credit for the achievements was as usual given to the commanding officer and Pope for the moment achieved a reputation which seemed to rival Grant's, but which he was destined within six months to lose, when confronted with a problem which abler men than he found insoluble,—the problem of outgeneraling Robert Lee and Stonewall Jackson."

He also pays his respects to our old friend Beast Butler. After describing the preparations made for the capture of New Orleans, according to which there was a strong fleet under Farragut and a land force under Butler, he says, "Concerning whose military qualifications one need only say that it was fortunate, so far as the capture of New Orleans was concerned, that the conditions of the case were such as to give all the serious work to the fleet." Again speaking of Butler's famous "Woman Order," he says, "Had its wretched author, however, understood in the smallest degree the feelings of gentlemen, had there entered into his composition so much as a single fibre of true manhood, he would have seen that this vile edict insulted no one else so grossly as the officers and soldiers under his command. Such an outrage ought to have led to his immediate recall." His opinion of the fighting qualities of the Confederate soldier is high as shown by his comment: "The losses at the battle of Stone river were nearly the same as at Shiloh—about 10,000 men on each side, or one-fourth of the total infantry and artillery force engaged. In point of bravery it is impossible to award the palm to one side more than to the other. It was simply Greek against Greek."

Of Grant as a soldier he has a profound admiration, yet he does not hesitate to criticise him severely, and to confess that his reputation suffered when pitted against Lee.

Speaking of the much discussed questioned whether Grant was surprised at Shiloh, he says that a sober study of the documentary evidence seems hardly to justify the extreme statement that when Johnston's first blow fell upon Prentiss' camp, men were captured by wholesale in their beds, or that Buell's timely arrival was all that saved the Federal army from utter destruction or capture, yet that these statements come much nearer the truth than Grant and Sherman in their published memoirs are willing to admit.

He says that it is unquestionable that Grant sharpe with Daniel Webster a somewhat over-weening fondness for whiskey, though there is nothing to show that Grant's usefulness as a commander was ever impaired by this personal trait,

We must conclude this personal review by the following extract:

"Moreover, with regard to that frightful tale of bloodshed, from the Wilderness to Petersburg, it may be doubted whether it really added anything to Grant's first reputation as a soldier. To start with an army twice as large as the enemy's, and then to throw away 60,000 men in killed and wounded, without either inflicting a proportionate loss or advancing perceptibly toward the goal of the campaign, is hardly a record of great generalship, and it is not the kind of record Grant made for himself at Vicksburg and Chattanooga. When Grant, after three weeks of slaughter, arrived at the North Anna river there could be no doubt that he had been outgeneraled. General Sherman once told me that that fearful amount of slaughter was after all necessary, because the South would never give up so long as it had an army of any size worth mentioning. It was therefore a melancholy necessity to pound the life out of Lee's army, even at the cost of half a dozen lives for one, a price which the populous North could afford. But to admit that Grant could not avoid paying such a price is to concede the superior generalship of Lee.

"In truth, when Grant first came to Virginia he evidently underrated his antagonist. The obstacle to Federal success in Virginia did not consist in the fancy that the army of the Potomac had not had the full fighting capacity drawn out, but in the fact that its antagonists' movements were guided by superior genius. At the West Grant had been opposed by generals of varying degree of ability, for the most part good soldiers, but none of them a demonstrated genius. In Virginia he found himself opposed by a general of the calibre of Turrenne or Marlborough, and his eyes were gradually opened to the difference."

We close the book with sincere regret that its fascinating pages are finished, and with the hope that Mr. Fiske will some day give us the history of the Civil War in the East.

## EDITORIAL.

### THE FIVE GREAT SYSTEMS.

Lyman Abbott is writing in the *Outlook* a series on the Rights of Man. In the issue of April 20, his discussion touches upon the five systems, Judaism, Romanism, Calvinism, Arminianism and Universalism, though he does not name the last system there. He examines them with reference to the doctrine of election held by each. While we are far from agreeing with his conclusions, his admissions as to Calvinism are noteworthy. They indicate more than we have recently seen that Calvinism is coming into its own. The recent discussions which have been provoked by the efforts to revise the Westminster Confession are bearing fruit. We can trace in this article the influence of such works as Kuyper's Lectures on Calvinism and, whether directly or indirectly we cannot say, such articles as "Three Maligned Theologians" in the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY. The fact is that the whole question of the severity of the Calvinistic system and of the cruelty of the man for whom it is named has been re-opened and a re-statement is being made by the opponents of Calvinism, which is very much nearer the truth than the formerly current caricature of Calvin and Calvinism.

Judaism contended for a narrow doctrine of election, according to Dr. Abbot. "They believed that religion was only for the Jews and God was the God of the Jews only." This is a one-sided statement. The Jews during the Old Testament period were not intended to be a missionary people. The whole spirit of the Old Testament religion as sanctioned by God himself was the conservation rather than the propagation of the truth. The Gentiles were not the material for conversion but the source of contamination. Christ said to the woman of Samaria, "Salvation is of the Jews." With Christ began the new era, when "neither in Jerusalem nor yet in this mountain shall men worship the Father." And then the Spirit broke down the barrier of

exclusiveness that had hedged in the Jew, for a time, but whose breaking down the Jewish prophets and psalmists had themselves foretold.

Romanism, following the argument, contained "a new and broader doctrine of election."

God is the God of all the baptized. Whoever was not baptized was left forever outside of his grace. And this is still the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. "Infants dying unbaptized," says the Catholic Dictionary, "are excluded from the Kingdom of Heaven."

This is a fair statement of facts and we only pause to remark upon the injustice, the astonishing perversion of history and doctrine, that has held up the Presbyterian Church as believing in infant damnation and has passed by the Roman Catholic Church and too many of its imitators among the Episcopal clergy who teach that the neglect of a ceremony will send an infant to perdition. Dr. Abbot continues :

Paul, using Jewish philosophy to broaden the Jewish conception of God, had insisted that God was not confined in his choice to any race; he might if he pleased choose a pagan and he might, if he pleased, pass by a Jew. John Calvin, partly resting on the authority of Paul, partly employing his method, used a similar argument against the baptismal election of the Roman Catholic Church.

The reader will please notice the inevitable conjunction of these two names, Calvin and Paul. Dr. Abbot is fair-minded enough to see that they stood for the same system. He would say that Paul is not a final authority, he used the "Jewish philosophy." We accept Paul as an inspired authority and still claim that Calvin and Paul speak the same things.

He (Calvin) insisted that God was not confined within either national or ecclesiastical lines; he might choose whom he liked and he might pass by whom he liked. Whether Calvinism was, in the intention of John Calvin, a broadening spirit or not—a question not necessary to consider here—it was so in effect.

We are daring enough to say that Calvin knew the effect of his system as well as Dr. Abbot does.

It opened the way for a supposed choice by God of Jews who had lived before Christ, of pagans who had lived without a knowledge of Christ, and of infants who had died before they were able to exercise faith in Christ. In lieu of the Catholic doctrine of election which sent all



infants to a *Limbus Infantum* where they would forever be excluded from Heaven, the Calvinistic doctrine of election allowed that, 'elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated by Christ through the Spirit who worketh when and where he pleaseth,' and also mercifully left the hopeful believer to entertain the pleasing faith that all infants are elect and therefore all infants are saved. At the same time it opened a similar door to "all other elect persons who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word." Calvinism, as interpreted by the Westminster Confession of Faith, does not involve the damnation of infants nor of the heathen; respecting both its attitude is one of agnosticism. The election of Calvinism is broader than that of Romanism as the election of Romanism is broader than that of the popular conception in Judaism.

Now this is a most notable admission for the *Outlook* to make. Hitherto it has been enough for the *Outlook* or the *Independent* just to quote that expression from the Confession about elect infants to prove that Calvin and the Westminster fathers believed in infant damnation. How does the *Interior* feel when a far more radical journal than it has ever dared to be deserts all its allies and says that Calvinism as interpreted by the Confession does not involve the damnation of infants? Lyman Abbot has been studying this question in the light of recent literature, and not in the light of the Briggs-Vandyke output of fifteen years ago, and the *Interior* and the *Independent* have not taken that trouble.

We do not wish to make any claim that cannot be substantiated with regard to the change in sentiment toward this question, but we know these facts to be true, that six months ago there was not a paper or magazine that stated the belief that John Calvin believed in the salvation of all infants dying in infancy; that the articles of Rev. John W. Stagg, D. D., in the *Presbyterian Standard*, and more elaborately in the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, were a demonstration of that fact; that these articles have been largely quoted and the excerpts from them made the basis of other articles, including one in the *Interior*, which was republished in the *Literary Digest*, and that we have at present no information that would account for the change which this article in the *Outlook* indicates except the discus-

sion that was begun here.

As for the salvation of the heathen Calvinism holds that the Spirit, who worketh when and where he pleaseth, can regenerate a heathen soul and reveal to that soul enough for saving faith. Whether the Spirit has ever thus pleased we do not know. We believe that there is evidence enough that the vast body of the heathen die in their sins, unrepentant and unforgiven. But we leave them all to God.

And right here we take issue with Dr. Abbot as clearly as possible. He says :

Arminianism still farther broadened the doctrine of election, though it still maintained a line of exclusion and inclusion. It is in a word that God chooses all who choose him.

That seems to us a strange philosophy. That it is more merciful to leave men to themselves than to leave them with the God whose name and whose nature is Love. It indicates a low conception of the Deity. Granted that some men are lost; that Christ's own words about dying in sin, about the quenchless flame and the undying worm are true, and there can be no broader doctrine than Calvinism. Calvinism does not despair of a man who will not or cannot choose God. It believes in Irresistible Grace, in Effectual Calling, in the new nature wrought by Regeneration. There is no such thing as despair for any soul because Infinite Love sits upon the throne, and Infinite Power is his. Surely if it be granted that in his Infinite Wisdom some are lost, are passed by and left in their sin, it is still infinitely true that more will be saved if we are left to his blessed will than by any system that leaves God out of the reckoning and leaves the choice with man alone.

If Romanism was an advance on Judaism and Calvinism is an advance upon Romanism, Arminianism is a step backward. In leaving man's destiny to himself it is infinitely narrower than Calvinism, which leaves it wholly with God.

But Dr. Abbot is not content with Arminianism. It "is not broad enough for the broadening life of man. The doctrine that for want of a better name may be called the New Theology is that God is the universal Father; that he chooses the Jews and also the Gentiles, he baptized and unbaptized, the elect and also the non-elect, the repent-

ant and also the unrepentant."

We stop right here. Says Lyman Abbot, "God chooses the unrepentant." Says Jesus Christ, "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." That seems to us to be a contradiction. Says Lyman Abbot, "God chooses the non-elect." That reminds us of Christian Science. There is as much sense in it if you read it forward as backwards. It means that God does what he does not do, that he chooses whom he does not choose and elects the non-elect.

But wait, the learned Doctor is bolstering up his position with Scripture :

That he is the Father of the prodigal son or of the elder brother ; the Saviour of Zaccheus as of Peter, James and John.

Yet it always struck us that both the Prodigal and Zaccheus were repentant. One said "I have sinned" and the other, "If I have taken anything, I restore four-fold." No, the Prodigal and the Publican are not fair illustrations of the salvation of the unrepentant and the election of the non-elect. Judas would have been a better example.

Dr. Abbot makes a mistake in calling this the New Theology. It was propounded by the serpent in the Garden of Eden when he said "Ye shall not surely die." If it means anything that people outside of a lunatic asylum can understand, it means Universalism—which is a very comfortable doctrine but one which Jesus Christ contradicted in all his preaching and which the enemy of souls has used for deceiving men since the first syllable of recorded time and will to the last.

Here is the latest word on the five great systems of thought, Judaism, Romanism, Calvinism, Arminianism, Universalism. Here is one of the really great minds of our age debasing itself, involving itself in contradictions which would negative all thought, in the endeavor to prove that there is something better than leaving our sinful race to the electing love of God. This is the best that Lyman Abbot can do. We may ignore his feebler imitators. As predicted, Calvinism emerges triumphant from the discussion begun a year ago when Lyman Abbot's successor in

Plymouth Church, Newell Dwight Hillis, made his onslaught upon the Confession and the system he had sworn that he received. And we pity the Presbyterian who is not able to join the swelling chorus of victory.

---

### THE CHINESE MISSIONARIES.

Dr. Quarles has the advantage of us in having read the book which he reviews, *The Siege in Peking*. We simply say, therefore, that his quotations from the book do not make out his case against the Missionaries, nor can we see how any one who has read the accounts of Chinese affairs can say that eight of the leading nations "without justification" attacked the seaports that defend the capital of this unwarlike empire, and seized the capital, and so on. Has it been forgotten so soon what the very title of this book purports? That there was a siege in Peking in which the representatives of these powers with their women and the other foreigners of the city were in daily peril of their lives for long weeks; that 183 missionaries in China, men, women, and children were massacred, with nobody knows how many thousand native Christians, and that pure and refined women suffered unspeakable indignities at the hands of the Chinese? It should not be forgotten that Peking was largely deserted of its inhabitants who fled with the guilty Empress Dowager, and we have no idea from the quotations of this narrative that the furs and rugs which were sold were taken from houses which were not deserted. Nor should it be forgotten that the proceeds of the sale were devoted to the needs of the native Christians who were helpless except for what the Missionaries, their only friends, could do. And we do not believe that the world at large will hold Dr. Martin guilty of the theft which Dr. Quarles charges, because he brought away with him a goat-skin rug, whose ownership, we suppose, it would have been impossible ever to determine. We have felt that this much of a protest should be made against the opinions in the last paragraph based upon the book which is reviewed.

## RECORD AND REVIEW.

An anti-Catholic organization has been founded in Manila, and although it does not commit itself outwardly to Protestantism, it is in strong sympathy with Protestant freedom of thought. Senator Buencamino is one of the leaders of the new movement. After his address at a largely attended meeting he introduced Mr. Rogers of the Presbyterian Board, who was followed by a Methodist minister, in explanation of the Protestant and Evangelical faith. The priests forbade Roman Catholics to attend the meetings. The Catholic Church has yielded to the sentiment against the friars, and the demands of the people have been favorably considered by the Philippine commission. Only the Jesuit friars in the city of Manila will be allowed to remain in the Philippines, and the financial interests of the Orders will be amicably settled by the United States Government.

\*.\*

Quite a furore has been created in college circles by the dismissal of Prof. E. A. Ross from the Leland Stanford University. There was much to be said on both sides of the case, but it seems certain that the dismissal of the professor was due to Mrs. Stanford's wishes in the matter. Mrs. Stanford, for a rich woman, has made many sacrifices for the endowment and equipment of this famous University, but the institution was badly damaged by the admission that the wishes of Mrs. Stanford rather than the judgment of the president and faculty were dominant in such a delicate matter as the political views of one of the professors. Other professors resigned to show their sympathy with Professor Ross, and it was a good opportunity to sympathize. The fact has been shown that even an endowment of twenty-six million dollars cannot accomplish everything, since one of the most valuable assets of an institution of learning is public confidence and respect. There has been a magnificent response to the sentiment aroused among the whole teaching profession of the United States.

One of the burning questions of the last three months has been that of the conduct of the missionaries in China. One trouble about a perfectly fair statement of the case is that discrimination must be made between Catholic and Protestant missionaries. We think it undoubtedly true that the interference of Catholic missionaries in the administration of justice among the Chinese was one of the provoking causes of the Boxer movement, which was in its essence an anti-foreign agitation. It is undoubtedly true also that there has been extortion by the priests, and that a demand for an excessive indemnity has been filed, France as a Catholic nation backing up the claims of the Catholic priests. But two Protestant missionaries have been severely criticized, Mr. Tewksbury, of Peking, for having had an auction sale of Chinese property which had been deserted, the Chinese having fled from the city, the proceeds of the sale being given to the defenseless Chinese Christians who had no friends but the missionaries. The other case was that of Dr. Ament which created wide attention through the criticism of him by Mark Twain in the *North American Review*. A mistaken cablegram that Dr. Ament was collecting thirteen times the amount of the damage done instead of one-third more was the basis for Mark Twain's accusations against the missionaries in general. The facts of the case, however, have been well established, that Dr. Ament was acting in accordance with the wishes of the Chinese themselves, Li Hung Chang himself having given his consent to the procedure, that it is Chinese law to hold the community responsible for violence done, that the Chinese in general sympathized with the Boxers in their attacks upon the missionaries and the native Christians and that the Christians who suffered the loss of their property were indemnified through the influence of Dr. Ament upon the Chinese officials. One-third more than the loss actually suffered was claimed for the benefit of those families who had been bereft of a husband and father in the massacre. We have all confidence in these earnest, self-denying soldiers of the cross and they have been amply justified since

by the testimony of such men as Minister Conger, as well as by that of our own Southern Presbyterian missionaries. It is worthy of note that the missionaries of our own church have decided not to ask for any indemnity for property that was destroyed during the Boxer outbreak, and that the Executive Committee in Nashville has endorsed this position, which was described in an admirable letter to the committee from the missionaries.

\* \* \*

Dr. Winslow, of the Egypt exploration fund, made an announcement last month which was of the utmost importance as to recent discoveries in Egypt. A papyrus has been discovered containing a large part of the first chapter of Matthew's Gospel, and one containing the 18th verse of the first chapter of John, and the 14th verse of the 20th chapter, dating between the year 150 and the year 200 A.D. They belong to the same class as the famous Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, and the text is almost identical with that of Wescott and Hort, proving the truth of the principles that were used in the production of the text of Wescott and Hort. These manuscripts have been distributed among American Universities, so that America may now claim to have the very oldest copies of the manuscripts of the New Testament.

\* \* \*

An interesting discussion was had in New York in March on the Westminster Confession, Prof. DeWitt, of Princeton, taking the ground that the Westminster Standards should be reaffirmed and left unchanged, President Stewart, of Auburn Seminary, contending that new Standards are now needed, while Prof. Herrick Johnson, of McCormick Seminary, may have his name connected with another "Rider" his position being that the Confession should be unchanged, but a supplementary statement issued. We think it would not be too much to say that Dr. DeWitt carried off the honors of the occasion. The Revision Committee appointed by the last General Assembly will make a majority, and

perhaps a minority report to the Assembly, and it is thought that the whole subject may be dismissed, or that a moderate revision, requiring only verbal changes, may be called for. The editor of the QUARTERLY expects to attend the Philadelphia Assembly and will report the interesting debates of that body for his readers.

\* \*  
\*

One of the great religious movements in England has been what is called the Simultaneous Mission. The preachers of England signalized the opening of the century by an evangelistic movement lasting for a week at a time, held in London, Manchester, Liverpool and other great centers, and then extending over the length and breadth of England. The Non-conformist churches now about equal in members the Established Church. Their evangelical spirit is so much more evident that it is only a question of time when the Established Church shall be in a decided minority among the religious forces of England. A striking contrast is presented between this evangelistic movement of the free churches and the discussions which are agitating the Established Church as to incense, the Confessional, etc. Mr. Kensit, who is a sort of male Jenny Geddes, is still making his protests publicly against the lawlessness of Catholic tendencies, which he deplors. The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States has been agitated by similar discussion over some innovations introduced into the consecration ceremonies of certain bishops at Fonddu Lac, Wis. The prayer book was laid aside and new rules for the conduct of the ceremonies printed, the rules having excited the amusement of the general public on account of the requirement that at a certain stage of the procedure the bishops should kiss each other. This will be one of the causes of contention in the next general convention, and it does appear to be a rather smaller matter than the controversies over the questions of truth which are agitating the Presbyterian Church.



LOUISVILLE  
**PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY**  
105 EAST BROADWAY,  
LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY.

---

Under the Control of the Synods of Kentucky and Missouri, and  
Subject to the Supervision of the General Assembly.

---

REV. J. G. HUNTER, D. D.....President of the Board of Directors  
REV. J. S. LYONS, D. D.....Secretary  
W. T. GRANT, Esq.....Treasurer

---

**FACULTY:**

W. HOGE MARQUESS, D. D., Chairman of the Faculty, Old Testament and English Bible.  
CHARLES R. HEMPHILL, D. D., LL. D., New Testament.  
FRANCIS R. BEATTIE, B. D., D. D., Ph. D., Systematic Theology and Apologetics.  
THOMAS M. HAWES, D. D., Elocution and Rhetoric.  
EDWIN MULLER, D. D., Clerk of Faculty, Church History and Polity.

---

The course of study is broad, thorough and flexible. It is also made practical by means of various forms of city mission work. Instruction in music is given by a competent teacher.

---

Good comfortable rooms, well furnished, are provided free of cost to the students. Board, fuel, light and attendance cost three dollars a week. For rooms apply to Professor Beattie.

---

One day each month is devoted to the special study of Missionary themes. The liberality of a number of friends enables the Faculty to give students remuneration for Mission work during the session. The Faculty has in view the founding of certain scholarships to be awarded on examination.

---

For Catalogue and further information, address any of the Professors. Sessions begin the first Wednesday of October, and continue seven months.



# FISHBURNE SCHOOL,

## Waynesboro, Va.

---

English, Classical and Scientific Courses  
with Military Training.

---


A Christian School for boys and young men, preparatory for higher classes of College and University, or for practical life.

The mental, the moral and the physical man carefully looked after.

The Westminster Catechisms and Standards made a part of the Bible Course.

No vulgar, profane, or vicious boy received or allowed to remain.

---

 Write for catalogue, giving full particulars.

JAMES A. FISHBURNE, A. B.,

PRINCIPAL.



**SOUTHWESTERN**  
**PRESBYTERIAN UNIVERSITY,**

**CLARKSVILLE, TENNESSEE.**

THE ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT has nine professors, and its Schools and Degree courses offer unusual and improved combination of study, along with flexibility of detail.

FIVE DEGREE COURSES, as follows: (1), Master of Arts; (2), Bachelor of Arts; (3), Bachelor of Science; (4), Doctor of Philosophy (three years residential course).

Every student is taught the English Bible, as a necessary part of a Christian Education, and is rewarded for faithful work in this as is in other studies.

THE DIVINITY DEPARTMENT has six instructors. The complete course leads to the degree of Bachelor of Divinity.

Board, including furnished room, fuel, lights and attendance, from \$2.00 per week to \$4.00 per week.

The location is healthful, the community excellent, and the moral and religious tone unrivalled.

The whole time of a Physical Director is given to the new and completely equipped Gymnasium.

Free tuition to ministers' sons and candidates for the ministry.

In the Academic Department, one hundred and eighty-four dollars will pay for tuition, incidental and library fees, room, furniture, board, fuel and lights.

Send for a Catalogue; or, better still, write for full particulars to

GEORGE SUMMEY, Chancellor,  
CLARKSVILLE, TENN.

JULY, 1901.

~~~~~

# THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

VOL. XV.

CONTENTS:

No. 3

- I. THE TREND TOWARDS ANARCHY, ITS CAUSE AND  
CURE. Rev. E. C. Gordon, D. D. . . . . 317-341
- II. CHRIST'S SECOND COMING CANNOT BE BEFORE THE  
MILLENNIUM. Rev. C. S. M. See. . . . . 342-363
- III. THE THEOLOGIES. Rev. J. A. Quarles, D. D., . . . . 364-385
- IV. THE EARLY VIRGINIA PURITANS, FOUNDERS OF AMERI-  
CAN PRESBYTERIANISM. Rev. Edward Mack, D. D.. 386-413
- V. HAS THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH ANY DIS-  
TINCTIVE PRINCIPLES. R. A. Lapsley. . . . . 414-430
- V. EDITORIAL,—THE PHILADELPHIA ASSEMBLY. . . . . 431-453  
THE LITTLE ROCK ASSEMBLY. Rev. R.  
A. Lapsley . . . . . 453-471
- VI. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS. Rev. W. T. Hall, D. D.,  
George Summey, D. D., J. A. Quarles, D. D. . . . . 473-485

CHARLOTTE, N. C.

PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

\$3.00 A YEAR, - - 75 CENTS A COPY.

IN ADVANCE.

Address all communications to A. J. MCKELWAY, Editor, Charlotte, N. C.

# THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY

---

A Theological, Philosophical and Literary Review, conducted by an Association composed of the following Ministers :

|                               |                              |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| W. M. MCPHEETERS, D. D.       | W. W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D.   |
| D. J. BRIMM, D. D.            | B. M. PALMER, D. D., LL. D.  |
| JOHN F. CANNON, D. D.         | ROBERT PRICE, D. D.          |
| WM. C. CLARK, D. D.           | J. B. SHEARER, D. D.         |
| J. N. CRAIG, D. D.            | SAMUEL M. SMITH, D. D.       |
| A. B. CURRY, D. D.            | R. K. SMOOT, D. D., LL. D.   |
| C. R. HEMPHILL, D. D., LL. D. | C. C. HERSMAN, D. D., LL. D. |
| T. W. HOOPER, D. D.           | ROBERT A. WEBB, D. D.        |
| C. W. HUMPHREYS, D. D.        |                              |

---

A. J. MCKELWAY, EDITOR.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS : G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D., GEO. SUMMEY, D. D.;  
F. R. BEATTIE, D. D.; S. C. BYRD, A. M.

---

CHARLOTTE, N. C.:

THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

**\$3.00 Per Annum.**

**75 Cents Per Single Number.**

---

Address all communications and make all remittances to

**A. J. MCKELWAY, Charlotte, N. C.**

Subscriptions are discontinued only upon written request of subscribers and settlement of account to date.

---

---

Every Tennessean Should Read a State Paper

## The Nashville American, NASHVILLE, TENN.

DAILY and WEEKLY. Is the only State paper published in the State at the Capital. This gives The American advantage over all other papers in the State. Besides giving all the State news, it gives more general news than any paper published in Tennessee.

The price of the Daily is 65 cents a month, or \$7.80 a year. The price of the Weekly is 50 cents a year. Sample copies free. Agents wanted. Address

**THE AMERICAN,**  
Nashville, Tenn.

## I. THE TREND TOWARDS ANARCHY: ITS CAUSE AND CURE.

Anarchy strictly speaking is the non-existence or total absence of government. As thus defined it is an impossible condition among men ; a condition which is scarcely conceivable by the human mind, though the imagination of Milton saw the place

" Where silent Night  
And Chaos, ancestors of Nature, hold  
Eternal Anarchy, amidst the noise  
Of endless wars, and by confusion stand."

The word is commonly used in a broader sense to describe a condition in which there is no settled government, no supreme authority recognized as such and sustained by adequate power ; a condition in which every one does what is right in his own eyes, as far as he dares.

No such condition as this now exists or has ever existed in this country since its occupation by the white man, except possibly for a short time in a few places on the frontier of our advancing civilization. No such condition is likely to exist. For whatever trends towards anarchy may be discovered at any time, and if it be not arrested and removed by educational and other quiet agencies, would be counteracted, before it reached anarchy in fact, by despotic power of some sort. The alternative presented to our people is not anarchy or despotism ; but the timely arrest of the trend towards anarchy, if any such trend should be discovered ; or despotism. The object of the discussion to which the reader's attention is now invited are, first, to present the evidence that there is now in the United States an ominous trend towards anarchy in the broader sense of that word ; secondly, to point out the most efficient factors which produce this anarchical spirit ; thirdly, to indicate the cure for this evil spirit which menaces the future welfare, if not the liberties, of our people.

At the beginning of our inquiry for evidence, we meet the

all important fact that crime is steadily and rapidly increasing in the United States ; increasing far more rapidly than the population, notwithstanding the boasted beneficent results of our comprehensive system of public instruction, our complicated and expensive system of police, and all the influences for good exerted by the Christian Church, and countless societies organized to suppress lawlessness and to promote morality. It is admitted that this increase of crime, to a considerable extent, is to be attributed to the enormous and rapid increase of wealth and population ; the population ever tending to mass itself in cities, and the wealth to gather in the hands of comparatively a few men. This increase of wealth and population forms a common ground of boasting by our people. It is in reality a serious menace to the future welfare of the country. It presents incentives and inducements to vice and crime, which, as human nature is now constituted, are almost irresistible. When men are separated from each other on farms and engaged in agricultural pursuits, when there is little accumulated wealth, then there is small incentive to, and but little opportunity for, flagrant wrong-doing. The case is altogether different when men are massed in mines, factories, in cities, in constant contact with each other ; when modern machinery makes the creation of wealth easy and affords leisure to many ; when a virgin soil and untold resources hidden beneath the soil lavishly pour forth boundless wealth at man's intelligent touch, rendered easy and efficient by the great natural forces he has subdued to his will ; when the government enacts and enforces laws which make it easy for the more fortunate, the more intelligent, the more unscrupulous to secure more than their fair share of the bounties of nature ; then the passions and appetites of men are greatly excited, and they are moved to every species of lawlessness.

But a careful and fair comparison of our national life with that of other English-speaking countries will serve to show that the portentous increase of crime among us is not to be wholly ascribed to the increase of wealth and population.

In these other countries there has been an increase of wealth and population to some extent commensurate with our own. This is true of England, and very much so of her colonies in the southern hemisphere. In none of these countries has there been any such increase of crime as is fast making the United States in this respect a by-word and a hissing among all well governed peoples of the earth. We must, therefore, look for the increase of crime elsewhere than in the increase of wealth and population. This cause, it is now alleged, is chiefly to be found in the temper of our people ; a temper which more and more is coming to disregard law ; a temper which fails to recognize the real foundations upon which law rests and to fear the sanctions by which it is or ought to be enforced ; a temper which is becoming so marked, so pronounced in its expression, as rightly to be regarded as an ominous trend towards anarchy.

It is not implied in these statements that our people are worse than their ancestors ; that there has been any real deterioration in their moral fibre. As a race we are still a law respecting people. We have a genius for governing ourselves and other people. In this respect there has been improvement rather than deterioration. We have had experience in government, and we are more capable of self-government than our fathers were. The wonder is that under the trying circumstances in which we have been and are now placed we should have maintained, not to say improved, our capacity for government, and that so great a law-abiding spirit remains as a controlling factor in the life of the nation. And yet it is also true that there is a widespread and ominous spirit of lawlessness manifesting itself among us that calls for serious treatment at the hands of all lovers of their country.

It may be alleged that such a temper always has existed in this and every other country. This is true. Sin is lawlessness and lawlessness is in spirit anarchy. The averment is that this spirit is a growing one in the United States. An immense impetus was given to it thirty odd years ago. Then the administrators of the Federal government for a



time flung away the constitutional principles on which it was founded, and went about to establish a government founded on force. They succeeded, and forced the States which had withdrawn from the Federal Union to return to it. This return was characterised by every species of lawlessness. The conquerors imposed their own illegal and monstrous conditions. The conquered resorted to every device to ignore or to nullify these conditions. Because of false swearing the land mourned. Oaths binding to future conduct were taken only to be violated. Honest elections were scarcely known. Fraud and force alike were resorted to. Lawlessness begat lawlessness, which was overlooked or even excused even by those who desired to remain law-abiding. Indeed the conquerors, when they saw the fearful moral and economical results of their policy, looked on with indifference. Thus the political and the moral virtue of the people was for a time most fearfully corrupted. The only wonder is that the situation became no worse. Fortunately conditions improved. The sober common sense of the people asserted itself. Opportunities for creating wealth began to multiply enormously. New fields opened up for enterprise. The people turned away from the horrors of reconstruction to money-making. But the evil influences continued to work; not so openly but still powerfully. Lawlessness is self-perpetuating. Macbeth's views now, as always, have been verified :

"In these cases

We still have judgment here ; that [since] we but teach  
 Bloody instructions, which, being taught, return  
 To plague th' inventors ; this even-handed justice  
 Commends th' ingredients of our poison'd chalice  
 To our own lips."

And so the lawless spirit, somewhat checked, it is true, continued to grow.

It is not proposed in this discussion to exhibit in detail the evidence that such a spirit now exists and is growing among our people. The evidence obtrudes itself upon the attention of every intelligent observer. As has already

been remarked, it is to be found in the enormous increase of crime, which is at once an effect of this spirit and a cause of its continuance and growth. A few general statements, exhibiting the manifestations of this lawless spirit in the Family, the Church and the State, are all that need to be made for our present purposes.

It has come to be a well-known fact that children are early, all too early many moralists think, emancipated from the control of their parents. After due allowance has been made for the exaggerations of humorists, there remain some elements of truth in their assertions that children govern and train their parents. Even serious writers on child-training deprecate what they call "over-estimate of obedience," viz., of the obedience which children ought to render to their parents: as if such obedience could be over-estimated.

In the Church, discipline has almost totally disappeared. "The right of private judgment" has developed into a right to ignore the divine authority of the Church to interpret the Scriptures and to declare the will of God concerning salvation. Any one who chooses may do these things; and the opinion of the most unlearned and irresponsible of self-appointed preachers is by many as much esteemed as are the formal and carefully prepared utterances of the Church, or the views of those who after careful training are authorized by the Church to speak in Christ's name. Indeed many resent the claim that there is any God-appointed Church authorized to speak in His name and with His authority. They assert that, in the matter of religion, it is the "inalienable" right of every man to believe what he chooses: a right to be asserted not only against our fellow-men, but also against God. Christian liberty has degenerated into license. Even Church courts neglect or refuse to obey the legitimate orders of the superior courts. Constitutional Rules, designed to protect the Church against error in teaching, against unauthorized and inefficient service, are flagrantly violated, and the violation is approved and defended not only by laymen, but by officers who have sol-

emly sworn to obey these Rules. Indeed the Church has many officers who take no special pains to ascertain their duties; who never think of performing them at any cost of self-denial; whose attendance upon the services of the sanctuary or the meetings of the courts is largely a matter of comfort or convenience. In many cases it never occurs to them that any business interest should give way in order that their witness for Christ should be clearer or more potent. Along with this official neglect, irreverence for God, His word, worship and law is so common in and out of the sanctuaries of worship, that jurists, moralists, infidels, as well as Christians, note and comment on it.

The condition of affairs in the State in this respect is no better; perhaps it is worse. The trouble is not so much that flagrant, horrid, outbreaking crimes are committed by bad men in ever increasing numbers. This is to be expected. The portentous facts are that good men, honorable men, men highly esteemed by their neighbors, disregard the law when they are, or when they think they are, sustained by public opinion; that the officers of the law, men paid to execute the law, men who have sworn to do this, in many circumstances are indifferent to its execution; nay, more, they connive at its persistent violation, and boldly declare that they have no intention of seeing to the execution of the law unless public opinion forces them to perform their duty. Here may be mentioned the growing practice of lynching, which unless speedily checked will become a very serious menace to the welfare of the country. A rare case of lynching, under exceptional and peculiarly trying circumstances, however much it might be deplored, would not excite alarm. But when it becomes common for mobs to execute criminals real or supposed without any legal process, the practice must be regarded as a symptom of a lawless temper, marking a most ominous trend towards anarchy. In no other way can the facts be accounted for. Neither race prejudice, potent as it is, nor the desire to shield women from the witness stand in cases of rape, nor both combined, account for the increase of lynching. The

practice now extends to every species of crime; to criminals real or alleged of every race. It is fast becoming an orgy of lawlessness, a fierce expression of the passions of men who regard themselves as sovereigns, responsible for their beliefs and doings only to themselves. These manifestations of lawlessness are all the more ominous because the masses of the people remain indifferent to them, whether made by individuals, or by officials or by mobs; except as some event or series of events, more than commonly shocking, arouses them temporarily from their habitual unconcern.

Enough has been presented to evince the fact that there is in the United States a widespread manifestation of a lawless spirit, and of a temper which, among the great mass of the people, is habitually indifferent to this lawlessness. Attention is now called to some of the chief causes of this strange attitude of a people, who as a race are law-abiding.

Unquestionably this attitude is partly due to the absorption of the people of this country in creating wealth and in enjoying the comforts and luxuries of a splendid material civilization. As long as any one can make money and enjoy spending it in safety, he is willing for the world to wag on its way, for officials to disregard their oaths, for mobs to execute criminals, for men to cheat the law if they can. He is not altogether unwilling to do this last himself, if he can at the same time avoid losing his social position and the esteem of his fellows.

Undoubtedly this temper so tolerant of lawlessness is partly due to an optimistic spirit born of an inordinate national self-esteem. As a people we have infinite confidence in our ability to manage ourselves and all the world besides. We are so sure that, whenever we get ready, we shall be able to suppress mobs, to reform municipal corruption, to make everybody law-abiding, that we fail to see how serious the situation is, and to appreciate the truth that the time may come when a strict enforcement of law will not be so easy as it now appears to be; when we shall be face to face with the dread alternatives, Anarchy or Despotism.

Another factor producing the attitude we are discussing is the infinite confidence we have in our system of public instruction to make men moral. "The schoolmaster is abroad in the land"; and the schoolmaster is the *deus ex machina* who is to bring order out of chaos. We are thoroughly persuaded that illiteracy and ignorance are the most potent causes of vice and crime. We are perfectly sure that, when our children are caused to see the direful effects of alcohol on the nervous system, they will avoid alcoholic drinks; that, when the people learn the economic folly of drunkenness, debauchery, fraud and violence, they will become sober, chaste, industrious, honest and law-abiding citizens. We are, therefore, tolerant of a condition which continually grows more menacing to our welfare because we regard it as temporary; we believe that the rising generation will know better and do better than we are doing. We shut our eyes to the fact that crime has steadily increased with the decrease of illiteracy. We forget that we have divorced our system of public instruction from the sanctions of religion; sanctions which all the past experience of the human race has shown to be needful in restraining the inordinate passions and appetites of men. Thus forgetting the lessons of the past, thus trusting in the schoolmaster and the schoolmistress, we regard with indifference the trend towards anarchy. We are persuaded that the intelligence of the people will easily deal with it.

Attention is now called to another cause producing the situation we are considering. This cause consists in a current perversion of several of the great truths upon which the governments of the United States is founded. This perversion has led to the acceptance of a number of fundamental political errors which have become very powerful factors in fostering this spirit of lawlessness which is now under discussion.

The first of these truths is that respecting the equality of all persons before the law. This political doctrine is based on the statement of the Declaration of Independence "that all men are created equal." This equality is not defined in

the Declaration; nor is any precise definition of it given in any constitution adopted in this country which I have seen. The Fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States asserts "that all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the States, and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law." This seems to imply that all persons, men, women, children, born or naturalized, being citizens, have the same and equal privileges and immunities. But this implication is nowhere stated, and is contradicted by the uniform legislation of the country. The only rights assigned to all persons as "inalienable" are "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," and "the enjoyment of the gains of their own industry." It is therefore clear that neither the authors of the Declaration of Independence nor the authors of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution meant to teach that the privileges and immunities of all persons were the same or equal. The true doctrine is that every person, of every race, sex, age and condition, in his own place and circumstances, is, equally with every person, entitled to the protection of the law. The peasant as well as the king; the slave as well as the master; the criminal as well as the innocent man; the private citizen as well as the official; the woman as well as the man; the child as well as the adult; the idiot as well as the scholar; the pauper as well as the millionaire; the weak as well as the strong, are all equal before the law, in that the law must protect alike each and all in their respective privileges, and exact alike from all a performance of their respective duties.

This grand truth has been perverted. It is not easy to indicate with precision the metes and bounds of this perversion. These vary with the individual perverters. Some extend them farther than others. In a general way the ac-

cepted doctrine may be thus stated, though no one perhaps would propose to put it into practice along all lines. There should be no political distinctions based on race; all races should be welcomed to the country and accorded equally with our own Anglo-Saxon race the rights of citizenship. There should be no fixed class distinction; no relation of master and slave, no hereditary political and social privileges. The pauper as well as the millionaire, the ignorant as well as the scholar, the tramp as well as the industrious laborer, the woman as well as the man, should be equally entitled to vote and hold office. It must be observed that the perversion now pointed out does not consist in the assertion that any one or all of these lines of procedure may not be adopted as political rules if at any time the people entitled to govern should so determine. The perversion is that the doctrine as stated announces "inalienable rights," which cannot at any time be disregarded by any government with justice. All, in respect of this right to rule, are born equal, having equal rights and privileges as citizens, and all equally entitled, as soon as "infancy" is passed, to exercise sovereign authority. The perversion may be summed up in a single brief but pregnant sentence: We are all sovereigns.

As thus stated the error and its evil effects become apparent. The sovereign makes and executes law. Inasmuch as "all political power is vested in and derived from the people"; inasmuch as the people are all alike sovereigns, having equal immunities and rights, they make or repeal laws at will, execute or refuse to execute laws as they please. Public sentiment, however expressed, is the law. Out of this conception of sovereignty and equality comes that disregard of the law as enacted which is becoming so serious a menace to the peace and welfare of the country. It is *Δημοκρατία* gone mad.

The result of this perversion may be seen still more clearly by noting a perversion of another political truth closely allied to that which we have been considering. The doctrine is that all political power is vested in the people,

is derived from them, and is expressed according to the will of the majority. This doctrine is a sound one, if by "the people" is meant those who are entitled under constitutional provisions to determine what the form of government is. But those wise men were careful to set forth clearly how the will of the people was to be expressed, how the voice of the majority was to have the force of law. They did not propose that any set of people who happened at any place at any time to be in a majority should be allowed to enact or to repeal law, to execute or refuse to obey law as they pleased. Yet this absurd notion has come, to no little extent, to be the accepted doctrine and practice. The doctrine is expressed in the words: Majorities rule; no law can be enforced unless it is sustained by public sentiment; all laws, becoming operative, ought to be referred to a popular vote. Too often the practice is conformed to the perverted doctrine. Mobs get together and deprive criminals real or alleged of their legal rights. For the time being the mob is a majority. The men who compose it are sovereigns, public sentiment is with them, they have power. The will of the people legally expressed is ignored and insulted.

In a similar way and to an equal violation of the law, municipal officers frequently ignore and insult the will of the people. They refuse to execute the laws designed to suppress vice and crime, to promote morality, to protect citizens in their natural and legal right to a seventh-day rest. They are sustained by what they are pleased to call public opinion. A majority of the covetous and vicious are with them for the time being and for the matter in hand. Majorities rule. Similarly great corporations and private citizens violate the law. They conduct their enterprises, sell their merchandise, print and publish their newspapers, contrary to law and in disregard of the legal rights of their employees; because, as they suppose, they are sustained by public sentiment. They do not know, or they find it convenient to forget, that their doctrine as to majorities and public sentiment is a perversion of the true doctrine on



these subjects. No one can know what public sentiment in this country is, except as that sentiment is expressed by law ; no one is authorized to say what the will of the majority is except the duly elected representatives of the people. All others who profess to know or to voice public sentiment in any authoritative way should be regarded as charlatans and treated as public enemies. They teach and practice deadly political error and foster a lawless spirit which leads to anarchy.

Our view as to the power of these perversions of fundamental political principles to foster an anarchical spirit may be further vindicated by considering the practical errors which have gathered about another of these principles : the doctrine that governments derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed." If any fair minded man will take the trouble to read this famous utterance as it stands in the Declaration of Independence, and consider it in the light of the well known position, opinions and practices of the authors of that instrument, he will be convinced that all they meant to assert by it is the "right of revolution." The truth in regard to this right, like the other truths which they assert to be "self-evident," is not self-evident. It is a just inference from the doctrine that "all political power is vested in and is derived from the people," as this doctrine was understood by the founders of our government. More than this : the right of revolution is a God-given right, recognized as such in His revealed Word ; a right to be sacredly guarded, though its exercise always brings most serious responsibilities. On this right our own governments rest, as do most of the governments now existing on the earth. But unfortunately we have read into this doctrine a lot of error. We found all authority to govern on the consent of the governed : a principle which is false in theory, impossible in practice ; which is utterly repudiated by any and every one whenever it suits his purpose. It is only useful for the purposes of the demagogue, and only powerful to corrupt the thinking and temper of people who seek excuse for lawlessness.

Such people argue in this fashion : Consent of the governed is essential to all just government, to the enactment and enforcement of all laws. Consent, however obtained or expressed, is sufficient for the enactment or repeal of any law. In some cases silence gives consent. A speaking minority accompanied by a silent majority may authorize any procedure. By this reasoning, though it may be unconsciously pursued, private citizens, corporations and officials justify almost any amount of lawlessness. They do not know or find it convenient to forget that government is an ordinance of God ; that the "consent of the governed," at its utmost, has only to do with the choice of the particular form of government which is to be adopted, with the particular methods by which laws are to be enacted and enforced ; that the law itself is the only authoritative expression of the "consent of the governed ;" that, therefore, the law is always and under all circumstances to be enforced because it is the only expressed will of the people and because God so requires. Ignoring these profound and far-reaching truths, too many of our people have become corrupted by errors concerning the rights of the governed, and are ready under many circumstances to take the law into their own hands, to obey or disobey, execute or abolish, as they may choose or dare, reckless alike of the authority of God, of the rightful authority of the people, of the welfare of the State. They foster that lawless spirit which threatens to destroy the peace or the liberty of our people.

There is another political truth, a perversion of which enters as a factor in producing this trend towards anarchy. This truth regards the relation of the State to religion. It is expressed in the formula: There should be a total separation of Church and State. This means that the State as such is to make no profession of religion in any form. It is to be neither pagan nor Christian. It must extend its protection alike to persons of every religion or of no religion. It must impose no religious tests of any sort. This is a Christian doctrine and expresses the relation which Christ desires his Church to sustain to the State. The

framers of our government sought to build on this doctrine. At the same time they did not propose to establish an atheistic government, nor to maintain one on atheistic principles. They believed in God. They recognized him as Creator, Preserver and Ruler. They sought his favor; they appealed to him to witness the rectitude of their intentions. They proposed to leave men free to worship God each according to the dictates of his own conscience; and, in fact in their constitutions, they so left them free.

In our time there is a manifest disposition to transcend the limits which in this respect our fathers observed: a disposition which insists that the State shall make no recognition of God, and shall pursue its objects, including a universal system of public instruction, on principles which are practically atheistic; as if there were indeed no God, and the State had so declared. This departure to some extent may be traced in the constitutions which from time to time have been adopted. For example, in 1820 the State of Missouri in convention assembled declared "that all political power is vested in and derived from the people." This leaves room for God, who may be regarded as the ultimate source of political power and who vests it in the people, from whom it is then derived by those whom the people appoint to exercise it. In 1865 the same State said "that all political power is vested in and derived from the people; that all government of right originates from the people, is founded upon their will only, and is instituted solely for the good of the whole." This declaration leaves no room for God; and, in temper if not intent, is thoroughly atheistic. The circumstances in which it was made may be regarded as its excuse. The madness of the hour is evinced by the fact that the men who made it, with the most glaring inconsistency, proceeded at the same time to deprive thousands of the people of the State of some of their "inalienable rights"; people of all in the State best qualified to hold and to exercise those rights; simply because these people had dared to assert by word and deed that "governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed." But

he madness of the hour cannot be pleaded as an excuse, for the declaration with which we are now concerned; because ten years after, when the madness of the hour had passed away, another convention of the same State made the same declaration. which is now a part of its organic law. It is also contrary to the laws of this State, according to the opinion of one of its Attorneys-General to repeat the Lord's Prayer as a school exercise; and the present State Superintendent of Public Instruction advises, that whenever objection is raised, religious exercises be discontinued. Practically this advice has the force of law.

It is admitted that it is difficult to put into practice the principles which our fathers had in mind : to have the State recognize God as Creator, Preserver, Ruler, and yet make no recognition of him as revealed in the Bible as Redeemer, Saviour ; to regard God as the ultimate source from which government derives its authority, and yet to require no worship of him in any form from its citizens. This difficulty, combined with the protection guaranteed by our laws to men of every religion, together with a wide spread growth of purely naturalistic views, which fosters infidelity of every kind, has brought about that departure from the principles of our fathers which is now under review, and which is rapidly giving us a government atheistic both in theory and practice. This result is deliberately sought by all the infidels in the land, and by all the pagans among us, ever increasing in number. It is unconsciously promoted by those Christians who, fearful of losing liberty of conscience, and being unable or unwilling to devise for government a theistic *modus vivendi*, are content to let the State drift towards practical atheism. Hence less and less is God rewarded by our people as the ultimate source of all governmental authority in the Family, the Church and the State ; less and less are laws regarded as rules of conduct based on conditions which God has created or ordained. More and more do our people come to regard themselves as absolute sovereigns, and their will, however expressed, as the supreme authority. Hence the recklessness with which laws are

enacted and repealed, obeyed or disobeyed, at the caprice of legislatures, at the dictate of wealth, at the bidding of the mob. There is no fear of God before our eyes.

In view of these perversions of fundamental political truths, of the efficient causes which render the public mind indifferent to many manifestations of lawlessness, of the temptations to lawlessness which our increasing wealth and population make so powerful, we may congratulate ourselves that we remain to so great an extent a law abiding people. The situation is hopeful. But hopefulness is based on the ability and willingness of the law-abiding among us to ascertain the root of the trouble, and on their courage to apply the remedy.

If the views presented thus far in this discussion are just and in accord with the facts, it is evident that some of the causes producing the trend towards anarchy cannot be removed. It is impossible to stop the rapid increase of wealth and population. We still have an immense domain, the wealth of which has been little more than gleaned from a portion of its surface. We are more and more utilizing the great forces of nature which makes the creation of wealth sure and swift. These conditions attract to our shores the most intelligent and energetic men of other countries. Our government is committed to the principles which welcome these men, and which accord to their children, if not to them, equal political rights with ourselves. The rapid increase of population and wealth will, therefore, go on. Our people will continue to be absorbed in the acquisition of wealth. Temptations to crime, the conditions which condone crime, will be more effective than ever. We must look elsewhere than to a cessation of growth in population and wealth for checke trend towards anarchy.

Some remarks will now be made in order to indicate the directions in which we must look for a remedy for this anarchical spirit ; a cure for the growing lawlessness which threatens our peace and liberties.

1. Our statesmen, moralists, Christian preachers and teachers must carefully consider the situation, and address

themselves seriously to the work of improvement. The overweening confidence of our people, born of their past success in dealing with difficult situations, must be shown to be ill-founded. We must bear in mind that more than once have our political principles been sorely tried ; more than once have we barely escaped ruin ; that one escape cost countless treasure of money and blood, to say nothing of the fact that for a time all our fundamental political principles were trampled in the mire of armed strife. The situation steadily grows bigger, more complex, and therefore more serious and difficult to deal with. Success in the past, while encouraging, gives no sure guarantee for the future. The intelligence, moral stamina, fortitude, and patriotism of our people must grow with the situation, or the result will be not anarchy, for anarchy is intolerable, but despotism. To maintain in this country, so vast, so populous, so rich, both liberty and order will tax to the utmost the political virtue of our people. We shall need a patriotism very different from that which merely shouts itself hoarse on holiday occasions ; which hoists a flag on a school house with one hand and loots the public treasury with the other. We shall need a patriotism which is willing to sacrifice individual and family interests for the commonwealth, which prefers well ordered liberty rather than property or life.

2. There must be a practical recognition of the truth that illiteracy is not an efficient factor in producing crime ; and that, therefore, the removal of illiteracy is not to be relied on to prevent crime, or of itself to make people law-abiding citizens. The only efficient cause of crime is the inordinate appetites and passions of men, influenced by temptations and unrestrained by the sanctions of law and the motives of religion. Intellectual developmtns and attainments, not thus restrained by the sanctions of law, and reinforced by religious motives, are quite impotent to make men moral. These vaunted advantages simply make bad men worse and more dangerous. These averments can be sustained by abundant facts as well as by arguments based on the well known characteristics of human nature. It is of the utmost

importance that those who mold and control public opinion in this country should be convinced of these truths and set themselves to wean the public mind from the notion that our system of public instruction contains a panacea for all social and political evils. They should either supply the fearful defects in this system by introducing into its courses of instruction a sound philosophy, the fundamental truths of morality and religion ; or, if introduction be found to be impracticable, they should curtail the whole system of public education within narrower limits, and leave instruction in history, philosophy, morality and religion in the hands of those to whom God has committed it ; teachers employed by parents and the Church. As the matter now stands, we are face to face with a most glaring inconsistency on the part of the State, an inconsistency of a most practical character, likely to do incalculable harm to itself, to say nothing of Christians and their religion. The indifference of many intelligent and patriotic men to this inconsistency is marvellous, and can be accounted for only by the fact that their minds are blinded by their worship of the great American idol, Universal Instruction on all subjects but religion by the State. These men think it unreasonable that the State should pay a man to teach any doctrine of the Christian religion, although a very large majority of the people are favorably disposed to this religion ; but they think altogether reasonable that the State should pay a man to teach doctrines in history, science and philosophy, which undermine the Christian religion, although very few of the people approve of or endorse such doctrines. The State formally declares that it has no authority and no purpose to teach religion ; yet already in some of its schools is taught an anti-religious science, an anti-religious philosophy, an anti-religious morality. The number of such schools is steadily increasing. Thus while professing to ignore religion, the State is quietly and sedulously sapping the foundation of all religion, so far as the vast majority of its people know or care anything about religion. The State proposes in matters pertaining to religion to treat all its citizens alike. It plays in

fact into the hands of a few materialistic infidels and pantheistic atheists, while it sharply discriminates against the vast body of its best and most law-abiding people. If we are to arrest the trend towards anarchy, this condition of things must be improved. It is impossible to maintain a free government on atheistic principles. Hence either the public school or the Christian school, or both, must find access to the mind and conscience of the masses of the people far more than it is now doing, and enlighten the public mind and sustain the public conscience by the motives and sanctions of religion.

3. We must reject these perversions of the political truths to which attention has been called ; we must return to a practical recognition and application of those truths as they were understood by the founders of our government. The appeal here is chiefly to Christians and all others who in any way regard Christianity as the best philosophy or the best religion which the world has known. Taking these truths in order reversed from that in which they have been stated in this discussion, I submit on the subject now directly before us the following remarks :

(1) We must hold on to the doctrine of the separation of the Church from the State. The State must enter into no alliance with the Church. It must continue to guarantee liberty of conscience and of worship to all its citizens alike; must make no religious tests and protect all in the observance of their religious rites, subject to police regulations respecting nuisances. With all this, a theistic *modus vivendi* must be devised and executed. The State must continue to recognize God as Creator, as providential Ruler, as the ultimate source of governmental authority. The God-given power of the sword must be contended for against all atheists, socialists, fanatics, political and religious. The right to punish, to punish with death, to wage defensive war against domestic and foreign enemies, must be vindicated and maintained. The worthlessness of individual human life, even in the case of the best citizens, in comparison with liberty and the enforcement of law must be inculcated and



enforced. The essential principles of the moral law as these are summarily comprehended in the Ten Commandments must continue to furnish the foundation of jurisprudence. The fact that these principles are published in the Bible and are therein sustained by the sanctions of religion is no good reason why they should be suppressed or abolished. It is all the better for us that the political wisdom of our fathers is sustained by the word of God, as well as revealed in "the nature of things." These theistic principles, with which we are so familiar, which furnish the firm basis upon which our government was founded, must be preserved. To this end they must be taught in every school, proclaimed by every political party, explained and enforced on every platform and in every pulpit in the land.

(2) The right of revolution must be maintained. It has been controverted among us in a very practical and costly fashion. But it is God-given and an inalienable right; yet one which, in its exercise, brings very solemn responsibilities. At the same time the dogma that all government is founded on the consent of the governed should be repudiated. It is atheistic in origin, false in theory and preposterous in practice. Recent attempts in this country to rehabilitate this doctrine in the baldest form are as silly as they are vain. Government is an ordinance of God, and is to be respected and obeyed as such. This profound truth with all its necessary implications should be diligently taught to the people. The young especially should be impressed with the fact that this truth lies at the basis of all government in the Family and in the State as well as in the Church.

(3) The truth respecting the rights and rule of majorities should be set forth and vindicated from all the perversions to which it has been subjected. In this country the majority rules; but it rules according to law. The expression of its will must be positive, formal, by means of laws enacted and executed by representatives duly elected. Otherwise no one knows what the will of the majority is. After the majority has thus uttered its will, its silence is not to be

regarded as giving assent to the views of any set of people, however numerous, intelligent, wealthy, or influential they may be. The real or supposed indifference of the majority to the execution of the law is not to be construed as justifying a failure on the part of officials to execute it. After their will has been formally and legally expressed; after officers have been duly elected and inducted into office, why should the majority be expected or required to hold meetings, to organize leagues, to appoint "vigilance committees" or otherwise to set themselves up as enforcers of the law? Let the appointed officers of the law enforce the law. If they will not, let them be removed; and, if need be impeached and punished. The remedy at this point is to be found in the training of public opinion so that a majority, or if need be, an efficient minority, will deal according to law with inefficient and dishonest men in office. The summary removal of these, their due punishment according to their ill-deserts, would have a most salutary effect. To secure this training of the people, the utmost energies of all patriotic citizens should be directed. They should utilize the school, the press, the platform, and the pulpit; above all the enforcement of the law itself; for there is nothing more educative of public opinion than a calm, judicial, inexorable execution of the law.

(4) The truth respecting the equality of all men should be disentangled from the specious perversions which have gathered about it. Both the truth and the error have been already indicated in the course of this discussion. We need now to teach and apply the truth. People in this country are not born sovereigns, each and all with equal inalienable rights, privileges and immunities; entitled alike to make and execute, to repeal or to repudiate laws. They are not rulers in any sense at any time except as the right to rule and the duty of ruling are conferred on them by God and by the State. Males, like the females, are born and continue, not immune of authority, but subject to authority. The first, chief and perpetual duty of everybody is to obey. Obedience is at once a right and a duty. It is the only in-

alienable right ; the only duty which may not be repudiated. Every other political right may be alienated; every other political duty under some circumstances may cease to bind the conscience, because the conditions out of which it arises may not exist, or may pass away. The right to rule, to vote, to hold office, is a right conferred on some of the people as the law, enacted in accord with constitutional principles, may declare. Those from whom these rights are withheld have no just ground of complaint on the score that they have been deprived of native and inalienable privileges. Any such persons may contend that it is unwise to deprive them of these rights ; that the State suffers because they are not called on to discharge these duties ; that they are unfairly treated in comparison with others no better qualified than themselves to exercise these functions. But they have no just ground of contention on the ground that they have been deprived of rights which belong to them equally with all other persons in view of the fact that they are human beings. No such right now exists, or ever has existed. Every person who votes or holds office or exercises any ruling function does so either because he has secured the right and opportunity by superior intelligence or force ; or because the right and opportunity have been conferred upon him by a power and authority other and higher than any which he naturally possesses. The basal truth is that people are not born free, in the sense that they are born outside of the domain of government and law, with a natural and inalienable right to make laws for themselves; they are born under government, born subject to authority and law. Notwithstanding the fear expressed by some moralists and writers on pedagogics as to the "over-estimate" coming to be placed on obedience, one remedy for the anarchical spirit is to be found in giving the utmost emphasis to obedience. Obedience may be sought by unwise means ; it is impossible to over-estimate its importance as an end. We need to discard these errors concerning the freedom and equality of all mankind, and to inculcate and enforce by every educational and training agency which we

can employ the doctrine that it is the native and inalienable privilege, as it is the imperative duty, of every one, not to exercise authority but to respect authority; not to enact laws but to obey laws. Liberty, the only liberty worth having, is voluntary obedience to lawful authority.

3. The application of the cure for the spirit of anarchy indicated in the foregoing remarks depends very largely on earnest minded Christian people. If there is to be any general return to the sobriety of truth by those who have fallen away from it, this return will be secured mainly by training given in Christian schools and in schools controlled by those who are under the influence of Christian principles. The pulpits and platforms of the Church, the Christian press may also contribute much to the proper training of the public mind and conscience. Our Southern Presbyterian Church is justly jealous of the introduction of political themes in its pulpits. It has a zeal for the proclamation by its ministers of a pure gospel. This is as it should be. But the gospel is a very comprehensive term. It includes all the facts, doctrines and duties revealed in God's word. All these are proper subjects of pulpit treatment. It is to be feared that in our zeal for a pure gospel we have narrowed our view of it until we see only the few fundamental truths, and duties which are essential to saving faith and justification unto eternal life. This may become a very serious error by defect. The Church's duty is to teach all nations to observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded. How little emphasis nowadays is put upon that word "observe"; upon "all things!" There is no truth presented in this discussion which may not be a proper subject of treatment in the pulpit; no error which our preachers may not state, expose, refute and warn against. Because a preacher may not in the pulpit advocate or attack any given law which proposes to restrict or to extend the elective franchise is no reason why he may not show that no person is born with an inalienable right to vote or to hold office. Because we may not use the pulpit to advocate under any given circumstances the exercise of the right of

revolution is no reason why we may not in the pulpit show that the right is a God-given right, to be exercised in his fear and under a solemn sense of our responsibility to him. Because we may not use the pulpit to attack men in office is no reason why we may not inculcate the duty of observing oaths and obeying the law. Because we may not attack the political principles which under-lie our government, nor undertake to settle the relations of the States to the Federal government is no reason why we may not show that government is an ordinance of God; that laws are to be obeyed whenever they do not command what God forbids or forbid what God commands; that, in the exceptional cases, the Christian citizen must disobey and quietly suffer for conscience sake. To do all this is surely the duty of all preachers of the gospel. How else are they to teach people to observe all things which Christ has commanded?

This discussion may properly close with an appeal to all the people of God to respect and obey the laws of the land. Example here is most potential for good. It is altogether "vanity and vexation of spirit" for one set of Christians to be zealous to have railroad companies, newspaper publishers, merchants and others to observe the State's laws requiring a seventh-day rest from business occupations, when they violate these laws in the prosecution of their own business. It is worse than idle for the Church to expect State officials to be faithful in the execution of law, when it permits its own officials to do the same with scarcely a mild protest or rebuke. It is vain for Christian people to expect unconverted people to respect and obey the laws of men when they show an astounding indifference to the laws of God; to expect unconverted and professed godless men to observe their oaths, when they, under covenant and obligations to Jesus Christ, flagrantly neglect their baptismal vows.

The cure for that trend towards anarchy which, thanks to a merciful God, has not yet gone so far nor become so powerful as to be without remedy, is to be sought in a revival of a spirit of obedience—a revival which must come at first mainly in and from the Church of God; a revival which

is to be secured by the inculcation of the great God-given truths respecting government and social order ; in an energetic repudiation of the errors which have gathered about these truths, and by the training of our people in the practice of respect for and obedience to God-appointed authority in the Family, the Church and the State.

E. C. GORDON.

## II. CHRIST'S SECOND COMING CAN NOT BE BEFORE THE MILLENNIUM.

### PREFACE.

The writer of this article had his interest in prophecy awakened in early youth by Nebuchadnezzar's dream, as it was told and expounded by Daniel. Scott's Notes gave enough of history to present a rough outline of the four dominant Empires, beginning with Babylon and ending with Rome. And this study was made easier by Daniel's Seventh Chapter covering the same main points, adding other important visions and extending the field of view farther down the scroll of history. And this earlier interest was revived, and richly rewarded, by "Lectures on the Prophecies," delivered by Dr. George Junkin, when he was President of Washington College. Daniel, especially seventh and twelfth chapters, are very helpful in studying the fuller and more complex symbols of the Apocalypse from Chap. vi:1—xxii:16, inclusive. Revelation, first five chapters and twenty-second, v. 17 to end are didactic and parnetic, not properly Apocalyptic. Some sound men have blundered fearfully by overlooking this and trying to make the Seven Epistles prophecies of seven scraps of the two hundred and twenty-five years from John to Constantine. Dr. Ramsay's "Spiritual Kingdom" would have saved all this. But we are giving no scheme of prophecy; only aiming to show the totally unscriptural character of the Premillennial Theory. And this will be done in the simplest way we can by selecting a few standard texts, bearing directly on the main points, and showing that these clash fatally with all the main postulates of that theory. I would advise any one who wishes to study the whole subject more thoroughly, to get Dr. David Brown's Book, "The Second Advent." To save time and space get clearly the meaning of a few terms and phrases. Parousia, which means "com-

ing" and "being present," and which, when applied to Christ, perhaps always means his personal coming, we shall use often in that sense, instead of the phrases, "his personal coming," "his Second Advent." And instead of the longer words, "pre-millennarians," "pre-millennialists," "pre-millennial Adventists," we shall use sometimes the shorter term, "pre-Adventists." (See outline of discussion next section)

*Outline.* I. Mat. xxiv:14 shows one thing which must be done before the "end" came. Explain this by Mat. xxviii:18-20 II Many "comings" are not the Parousia. Examine three; Rev ii:5; John xiv:2, 3; Luke xxii:40. III. Acts iii:20, 21. This very forceful. IV. Does the Bible teach that there will be two resurrections of the dead? And does it give any authority for the closing of the "age" or "eon" at the beginning of the millennium? V. 2nd Thess. i:6-10. VI. Rev. xix:11-16 and xx:4-6. VII. Injurious Tenets and Tendencies of the Pre-Adventist Theory.

*Discussion.* I. Mat. xxiv:14. "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations; and then shall the end come." As Jesus was leaving the temple, when he had closed the last day's public teaching he would ever do there, some of the disciples came to him to call his attention to the size and beauty of the stones used in building it. And he answered, "Verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." When they had gone to the Mount of Olives, four of them came to him privately and asked him three questions, "When shall these things be? What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" Jesus gives such answer to each of the three questions asked him as would be useful to his people in the after times; he warned them when and with what haste to flee from the doomed city; to give no heed to false Christs, etc. But in our text we have an important mark of time. Look at it. Our pre-advent brethren try to give very scant meaning to



these words, "Not for conversion of the world, but for a testimony to it." The gospel is a testimony to the great facts of the sinner's lost condition, and of the great salvation freely offered and effectually applied to all who will accept it. Here the Master simply asserts the fact that the gospel should be so widely preached, but says nothing as to the thoroughness with which it should be done. But six weeks later, when the time for doing the work was drawing near, he did give very specific directions on the points not touched upon in this brief mention at all. Matt. xxviii:18-20, "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them. . . . Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you." And any man who reads the original Greek knows that even this strong language does not bring out the full force of the command. "Make disciples of all the nations" might mean "gather some disciples out of every nation." "Disciple all the nations" means more than that. Bring the nations, young and old, learned and unlearned, men, women and children, into the school of Christ, and having them enrolled, teach them all, that I have commanded you. It is very likely that in some mission work this very short-cut has been attempted in what we may call "sporadic evangelism," mission stations and forces, located not to do efficient work, but to cover the ground. Good authorities put the number of languages and dialects in the world at four thousand, while the number of translations is about four hundred! One-tenth of the languages have a portion of the Bible in them, often one book of sixty-six, and very few of those using such language have come into any sort of contact with any portion of inspired truth! It is too soon to say the "end is in sight."

II. Many "Comings" are promised in the Scriptures, which are not the parousia. Some pre-adventists deny this with great emphasis. Still it is true. Rev. ii:5, "Remember, therefore, from whence thou art fallen, and repent . . . or else I come to thee, and move thy candlestick

out of its place, except thou repent." This promise was executed centuries ago. That was not a parousia. John xiv:2-3, "For I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I come again, and will receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also" All those to whom these words were spoken passed from among the living by the end of the first century. Where have their souls been through these eighteen centuries? He who made the promise determined the time and the manner of their death to its minutest circumstance. It was no accident that James, the son of thunder, was the first apostle to shed his blood for the truth's sake. He who dictated the fourth verse of the twenty-third Psalm, verified it to David and to hosts since, had come one vast step nearer to our humanity since the Psalm was written. And did he, could he, leave them to a sense of orphanage when they passed through the martyr gate into the palace of the King? Try another: Luke xii:40, "Be ye also ready; for in an hour that ye think not the Son of Man cometh." Let our readers remember that nearly all pre-adventists assert with great confidence that every sentence in the New Testament which speaks of the coming of the Son of Man (or Son of God) is a prophecy of the second advent; and that all such expressions mean only that. Another assumption is that Christ commanded us to expect and watch for his second coming each and every moment of time, from his ascension until his return. We deny the truth of both these assertions, and will give some reasons for our dissent. By the ascension of Christ from the Mount of Olives the prophecy of Daniel vii:13-14 was fulfilled, "I saw in the night visions, and behold there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a Son of Man, and he came even to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given to him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." He has been administering his government over this vast

dominion in every moment of time since his coronation, and so minutely as to care for the sparrows and to number the hairs of our heads. Some of these works are of deepest import, for they fix the eternal destiny of souls; and death is surely one of these. I cannot conceive of any higher act of Divine authority than that. The decisions of the great white throne only reaffirm what was irrevocably fixed, at some critical moment of the life, or in the article of death. And this is surely a coming of the Son of God, and, of all in the universe, a special coming to the soul, whose destiny is decided by it. The day of Judgment is no more; not so much. For that is a day for all; but this is a special assize for the one soul at the bar. It is beyond doubt of these crises of destiny that our loving King speaks, when he gives us this and many like warnings. These comings are most intimately connected with that one coming, but they must not be childishly confounded with it. That coming is to be only once, "In the end of the world;" but these other comings were not only impending as things about to be, but they have actually come upon every soul that has departed out of this life, and they shall visit all who shall enter and pass through life till the throne is set and the "Last Day" has come. Our King is on the highest throne to-day. And here and now we should worthily honor him. The pre-Advent scheme does two things in this, which are abhorrent to piety and right reason. That the countless things which our King is doing always should be ignored is impious, and that a coming, which is to be only once in the ages, is just ready to take place in every moment of time, is irrational. And it is this feature of the scheme which sometimes dethrones reason. Both these are delusions of the devil, and may the Lord deliver his people from them.

III. Acts iii: 20-21, "And that he may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus, whom the heaven must receive, until the times of the restoration of all things, whereof God spake by the mouth of His holy prophets, which have been since the world began." This

evidently refers to the many things which have gone wrong through the entrance of Satan and sin into the world. Without attempting an exhaustive list of these, the following are plainly prominent parts of the great work of restoration. (1) Satan with the co-working of man has held such sway in the world that he is called "the prince," "the god of this world." And in the First Epistle of John it is said, "To this end was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." And the work of restoration will not in this be complete until the usurper has been cast out and punished, and the usurped territory is conquered and reclaimed by its rightful owner. This will not be accomplished till the end of the Gog-Magog war, long after the millenium, and near the time of the final judgment of men. Therefore, The heaven must receive Christ until then. See Rev. xx:10. (2) Men will be born in a state of sin during the period that has been called the "Millenium"; and onward till the close of the gospel dispensation. We mean by this the whole time during which Christ shall be saving His people from their sins. The Gog-Magog war makes this plain. For if there was not in man "by nature" an evil heart of unbelief how could Satan raise against the Church of God an army of human enemies, "the number of whom is as the sand of the sea?" And this part of the restoration is thus described, "Matt. xxii:30, "For the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as angels in heaven." (3) The earth must be freed from the defilement of its dead, and this can only be when the last body is raised that sleeps there; the mortal shall put on immortality, and death shall "be abolished." (4) The earth shall be delivered from "the curse" which has rested upon it ever since it has been the abode of sin; shall receive its lustration of fire, and be made "a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." (5) There is but one more act of restoration which I need mention, and that will be complete when the last soul that shall ever be saved from our fallen race has been regenerated and made im-

mortal. Pre-adventists quietly assume, that this is almost the only part of the restoration, to which Peter refers. We answer that it is not likely that Peter refers to this at all. For the conversion of souls was no new thing, for that had been going on from the beginning of the world. The only new thing about them would be its being brought to a close. So there can not be a reasonable doubt that the "Times of the Restoration" are the separate times in which the different acts of the great work shall be wrought. Beginning at the destruction of Satan and his followers, at the climax of the Gog-Magog Apostasy, and ending with the descent of "The New Jerusalem." And those are the times "until which the heaven must receive the Christ." We believe the word is so plain, that its meaning cannot be mistaken. By some necessity, say the wise purpose of God, Heaven must be the dwelling-place of the bodily presence of the Son of God; and there cannot be any Parousia until then.

IV. (1) Does the Bible teach that there will be two resurrections of the dead?

(2) Does the Bible give any authority for ending the "Age" or EON at the beginning of the millennium? As closely connected questions let them come under the same head. (1) Will there be two far-separated resurrections? The word far-separated is used purposely; for no one objects to the saints being resurrected on Monday and the sinners on Tuesday, when the resurrection time comes. Some have thought that there are some scripture intimations, (not 1st Thess. iv: 16, 17; no sinners raised there), that such a thing might be. But it is a totally different thing, for which pre-adventists contend. They insist that this rising shall be at the beginning of the great Ingathering which may continue for many thousands of years; and the risen shall continue on, in some kind of an official station, through the whole of the great apostasy; a useless oligarchy of preferred saints; but as the result shows, no match for the devil, for he carries every point! Think for a moment how absurd the whole contention necessarily is.

During the millennium, "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

This will continue for a thousand years of prophetic time. Now there is one penalty of sin, from which the Redeemer did not deliver his saints; "The body is dead because of sin." Then saints will die during those times, in which they will be so numerous. Omit infants, and count only those who have "repented and believed the gospel," before dying; begin with Abel and count to the very beginning of the millenium. Then begin again and count every sheaf gathered by the sickle of death, until the fire of God smites the Gog-Magog army at a stroke. How pitifully small the first roll will be in comparison with the second. And yet this first little company is the only body of saints which can be raised when the millenium begins; for they will be the only saints then in existence, who have lived and died. Now it is this corporal's guard that is scrambling for the best rooms at the Feast; and are putting the holy book to torture to compel it to say they will get them. As it is almost certain that the duration of the millennium will be many thousands of years; and as almost all will be saints, their numbers will probably be a thousand times as great as all who preceded them. And as the saints in the millennial times will be as good saints as those who went before; there is no clear reason, why this little company should be specially honored. Listen to three sayings of the Master:

Matt. xiii : 30, "In the time of the harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather up first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them ; but gather the wheat into my barn." Here the tares seem to be burned before the wheat is garnered. Matt. xxv : 31-46, "But when the son of man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory ; and before him shall be gathered all the nations ; and he shall separate them one from another, as the shepherd separateth the sheep from the goats, etc."

This is a resurrection scene painted by the Lord himself.

The pre-millennial theory of a resurrection of the saints first, and then thousands of years afterward another resurrection of sinners hardly seems consistent with this picture of the gathering of the nations, good and bad, before him as a promiscuous throng, and their separation afterward into two "classes" of the blessed and the cursed. Jesus spoke again, John v : 28, 29, "Marvel not at this; for the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice and shall come forth; they that have done evil unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done good unto the resurrection of judgment." "The hour cometh," would such a teacher as Jesus have called the time of the resurrection act an hour, if the beginning and end of it were to be a thousand years apart? This looks as if the same word of command had summoned all the dead, and as if all had instantly obeyed.

(2) The word "Age" or "Eon" seems to mean a long, indefinite period of time; as a Geologist would speak of the Carboniferous Age, or period of the coal formation; so in the New Testament the word is used to denote the life or duration of the world, in its present state. "So shall it be in the end of the world," or "end of the age." That is the time of the "harvest" when both the tares and the wheat are to be gathered; and in the contrast, "This world or age," and "the world or age to come." It has thus come to express the idea of the whole duration, of the present state of things; until the promise is fulfilled, "Behold I make all things new." And the Eon extends to the end of the human race, in its present fallen condition, propagating a fallen offspring, it is during this whole period, that death reigns; during this time that the gospel is to portions of this race, the power of God unto salvation, to all that will obey it. And we might call it "the Eon of man;" "the Eon of sin;" "the Eon of Redemption;" "the Eon of the curse upon the earth." But it will surprise many to know that there is not a particle of valid scripture authority, for fixing the end of the "age," at the beginning of the millen-

nium. Rev. xx : 4-6 has been depended upon for this purpose ; but it is only by a gross misrepresentation, that it can give it an atom of support. Let us take our bearings.

(1) Pre-adventists assert that the Advent may be expected at any hour. We say, far from it. For Jesus says, "This gospel shall be preached in all the world, etc. ; and then shall the end come." As yet, not one-tenth of the languages of the world have received any portion of the Bible ; and a very small fraction of the people using each language have been reached by the truth. Notice, that if the word "end," in the sentence above be taken in its ordinary sense, the millennium will have to come before the "end" has come ; which is just what other scriptures teach ; and pre-millennialism is at an end. (2) It was a monstrous blunder to mistake every act of the vast and supreme government of the Son of God, by which a soul's destiny was settled, for the One coming.

(3) We have seen, "That the heaven must receive the Christ until the times of the restoration of all things," and these are the times, which cluster together, at the closing of the eon of the world, in its present estate of mixed good and evil. (4) We have seen that the way in which Christ speaks of the resurrection gives no hint of two resurrections, but even excludes that theory completely. It is now proposed "to carry the war into Africa." A very common belief among pre-Adventists is that the true Church is declining : that the number of real converts is very small ; and that she will go from bad to worse till Christ comes ; that the means employed for the conversion of the world will accomplish very little, and that they were not intended to convert the nations ; "Christ must come in person to convert the world." Let us test this whole theory by one section of Scripture.

V. 2nd Thess. i:6-10, "If so be that it is a righteous thing with God to recompense affliction to them that afflict you, and to you that are afflicted rest with us, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of his power,



in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus ; who shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and the glory of his might, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints . . . in that day." Notice the meaning and force of this Scripture. (a) This is the Second Coming of the Son of God, the very coming which is to convert and save the world, as all pre-millennarians tell us. (b) What effect will this coming have on the ungodly ? (c) The Lord Jesus is revealed from heaven "in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus ; who shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord." These words are unmistakable and very strong, describing very clearly those who are not the people of God, and declaring that vengeance is rendered to them, and that they shall suffer punishment, which is eternal destruction from the face of the Lord. Not one word is spoken of repentance, of pardon, of salvation. The whole field is swept, and all the tares are burned. Now put this at the beginning of the millennium, where pre-adventists insist that the Great Coming shall be, and consider the inevitable result. When the ungodly have been swept into "eternal destruction," will the "conversion of the nations," which they tell us Christ is coming to effect, be possible ? Has the gospel ever been preached to the dead and the doomed ? Put two pre-advent sayings together, and behold what havoc this Scripture makes of the whole theory ! "When Christ comes religion will be almost extinct on the earth ;" "Christ must come in person to convert the nations." But if his coming will destroy the nations, who will be left to be converted ? Put the Second Advent at the end of the eon of man—at the end of the eon of redemption, and that which Paul has described, is just what must be. But let us examine the Gibraltar of pre-millennialism, and lo ! how weak it is ! Please read Rev. xix:11-21, Rev. xx:1-6.

VI. Rev. xx:4-6, "And I saw thrones and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them ; and (I saw) the souls of them that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and such as worshipped not the beast, neither his image, and received not the mark upon their forehead and upon their hand ; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. The rest of the dead lived not till the thousand years should be finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection ; over these the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years.' The words just quoted will require close scrutiny ; but we believe the main part of our work here will be removing the rubbish of wrong interpretations, which have been built upon them. But before we begin this work let us glance at verses 11-16 in the previous chapter.

(a) Turn back to Rev. vi:1-2 Here we have the first appearance on the Apocalyptic scene of him who is the chief character in the scene in the nineteenth chapter, "And I saw when the Lamb opened one of the seven seals, and I heard one of the four living creatures saying as with a voice of thunder, come. And I saw, and behold, a white horse, and he that sat thereon had a bow, and there was given unto him a crown, and he came forth conquering and to conquer." This is the chief messenger of the gospel proclamation. And it is plain, from the way in which the vision is given, that it has a retrospective as well as a prospective meaning. The horses and riders of the next three seals, representing the great chastening and providential agents of war, famine and death, (coming in all forms but those of violence and starvation) began their course very near the beginning of our race, and have continued through the whole Eon of man. So he whom John saw in vision on Patmos, as if he was just beginning his vast war of conquest, was he who, when Eden was forbidden ground, planted somewhere, not far away with the first sanctuary of atone-

ment, with its altar of earth, its shekinah of sword-like flame, and its Cherubim, to keep the way of the tree of life." And here he is still in the camp and not in the palace ; still in the attitude of advancing conquest ; ruling as David ruled, when in so short and vigorous way he subdued Philistines, Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Syrians, and extended the borders of Israel to their prophetic limits. So we see Jesus here, already his one crown has become many crowns, and he is not alone now, as at first, his ransomed people are following and helping. But this can not be his bodily, personal coming, for the vision does not represent him as being on earth, or coming to the earth, but as being in heaven ; and "the clouds," "the angels," "the throne," the attendant "glories" are none of them here—an ominous omission for pre-adventists ! Now to the citadel ! Glance at the map :

(a) II Thess. i-6-10 showed us very plainly that the parousia could not be at the beginning of the millennium ; for in that case there could not be any millennium. (b) We have found the trend of Scripture unfavorable to two resurrections, if both are literal resurrections of dead bodies. (c) The beginning of the millennium does not furnish an appropriate ending point, for any Eon, or world-age. And the New Testament furnishes no text in which "the end of the age" can be taken as co-temporaneous with the beginning of the millennium. And the premillennial Advent interpretation of Rev. xx:4-6 has proven so unsatisfactory that it is evident some other ought to be found. (d) In a real resurrection of a dead man it is specially the body that is made alive ; and yet in this whole passage not one word is said about bodies, either dead or alive ! (e) "I saw the souls of the beheaded . . . and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." This sentence contains the clew to the right interpretation. Look and find ! Events move thus ; the great foes to civil and religious liberty have been destroyed, Satan is bound, and the time has come when "A stone cut out without hands smote the image," (State and

Church Despotisms) became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." Dan. ii:34-35. Compare carefully Dan. vii:24-27, for these are the times we are talking about now; and in the twenty-seventh verse under-score these words, "And the kingdom and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven, shall be given unto the people of the saints of the Most High." Christ's supreme dominion is over all but the visible earthly administration is "Given to the people of the saints of the Most High;" and Daniel leaves premillennialism entirely out of his, which is God's scheme! The chief human powers "that wore out the saints of the Most High" have been destroyed. If persecution ceases will the martyr spirit of zeal and devotion survive in the Church? When the tyro in mathematics, after groping and guessing and trying many ways of solving his problem succeeds in finding a right way, he does not need a master in the science to tell him, "that is right," for every step is self-evidencing. So here, take the clew which the Spirit gives, and each part will be in harmony with every other part.

Rev. xx:4-6, "And I saw the souls of them, that had been beheaded," etc. The only ones mentioned as having died by violence belonged to kind of martyrs so rare, that up to the time of this vision, we know of only three who had suffered in this way—John the Baptist, James the brother of the Apocalyptic seer, and Paul. All these had been very tenderly associated with the writer of this book. It is doubtful whether any one of all the disciples of the fiery prophet of the wilderness, entered more fully into the spirit of the New Testament Elijah, than John the son of thunder; and perhaps James, the other son of thunder, glowed with as holy indignation as he; when the man, who was another Elijah, unmasked hypocrisy, showed the wickedness of formalism, and turned their boasted legalism into ashes and filth. For four hundred years this coming prophet had been called Elijah. But why did Malachi by the Spirit give him the Tishbite's name, seeing he was not Elijah?

Gabriel makes the reason plain, Luke i:17. "He shall go before the face of God in the spirit and power of Elijah." And the angel quotes one part of the prophecy, and paraphrases another, Malachi iv:5-6. The writer of these words remembered so tenderly the birth-day revels of Herod, the dancing of the beautiful Salome, the spite of Herodias, and the gory head of the Baptist. He remembered his brother, who with himself and Peter was three times honored by the Lord; and was the first of all the apostles to suffer martyrdom; beheaded by the sword of Agrippa I. And the last of the beheaded was Paul, in whose greatest work in Asia Minor, the seer of Patmos had been laboring till he was banished to the lonely isle. The exposition is easy and sure. Just as John had seen the fervent soul of Elijah in the Baptist, so did he see the fervent spirits of "the beheaded" and of other "faithful confessors," burning with their wonted zeal, in the Christians of the blessed millennial times. (f) But you have not told us how these "souls of the beheaded," as they are produced, in other souls like them; just as Elijah's spirit lived again in the Baptist—how they sat on the thrones, reigned with Christ, were blessed and holy, "on whom the second death hath no power"—and especially how the indwelling of such "blessedness," "holiness," "dominion over sin," "deliverance from the second death,"—how of all this it is said, "This is the first resurrection." John has sometimes been called the "Apostle of Love." If you have noticed it, look along that line of thought a little and learn how eminently he might be called "The Apostle of Regeneration." Chapter iii. . . . "Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Chapter v:24-25. Read these verses. Chapter viii:32 and 36. "And he shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." "If therefore the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." And other places, and not the least of these the very text before us. What a glorious exalta-

tion it is for one, who had been the slave of Satan, of sin, of death, to have every chain of this bondage broken ; and to be brought into the life, light, liberty, and joy of " the new life in Christ Jesus. " If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature; the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new." I would have asked other questions, but space forbids. It can easily be made a demonstration that "The first Resurrection" is Regeneration—"is the New Life of God, in the soul of man." Can any men but those who "have been born anew, enter into the kingdom of God?" Can any bodily resurrection "make men blessed and holy?" This the first Resurrection does for all who have "part in it." The whole monstrous figment of "a first and a second" bodily resurrection is annihilated. It might be well to notice "a straw," at which both Christocracy and Maranatha eagerly clutch; namely verse 5a, "The rest of the dead lived not"—("again" is a spurious reading; see any good Greek text)—"until the thousand years should be finished." Here is the argument: "This must be a real resurrection of dead bodies in verse four, for that is a real resurrection of dead sinners, in verse eleven to fifteen, at the end of the chapter." But to the end of the millennium is not to the Last Day, for the whole Gog-Magog Apostacy comes between. This badly spoils the argument. The Antichrists and Despots ceased at the beginning of the saints' "taking the kingdom." But when Satan is loosed again, then the "bloody Marys" will abound. In the millennial times the antichrists and persecutors will have no successors; but when the great apostasy comes this class will have their like-minded representatives in the world; but that is not the time for any bodily resurrection either of saints or sinners.

The passage, Rev. xx:4-6, has been through the ages "the chief corner-stone" of premillennialism. We have found that it contains neither the Parousia nor a resurrection of the saints who had previously died. Both of these are necessary postulates of any and every phase of Pre-adventism. They have both failed; and the system is baseless

as the world in the pagan Cosmologies. Perhaps it will not be unprofitable to notice some points which stand in very close relation with some that we have examined. Let these come under.

VII. General Discussion. 1. Will the people of God "have tribulation" during the millennium? The word seems plainly to teach that persecution will not then exist. But this is only one out of many sources of pain and sorrow. The body of the Christian is as truly under the sentence of death as the body of the criminal; and is by a title as sure heir to all the infirmities, pains and sicknesses which portend and produce death. Rom. viii:10, "And if Christ is in you, the body is dead because of sin." And being born in sin the saints of millennial times will have the same old conflict between the New Nature and the Old, which saints have now. And the Refiner will heat the furnace just as every nugget needs. Many of the purest saints have been specially the children of affliction. And so it shall be till the end comes. There is no hint anywhere that death shall cease during the millennium, or that the period of life will be prolonged; it may be shorter; for then the crop will ripen earlier.

2. A common article of the Pre-advent creed is, that the command which the Christ gave to his church just before his ascension, to evangelize the whole world, will accomplish very little until his second coming. The great command is given in four different forms, in as many places; we will give one topic, which is common to all. Matt. xxvii:19, 20, "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them. . . . ; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I had commanded you." Mark xvi:15, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation" Luke xxiv:47, "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Acts i:8, "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem and in

all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." Will this commission fail? No, not in its time, for God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, is under promise to see it done. Daniel ii:34, 35, "Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image . . . and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth." The stone, but a boulder or quarry-block at first, became a great mountain and filled the whole earth. Maranatha searched the Bible for scriptures to show that no progressive growth of Christ's kingdom was anywhere promised. But this escaped him. Maranatha did however find some language he thought suited him, Daniel vii:21, 22, 26, 27, "I beheld and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them until the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom." In four places we have the duration of this war with the saints given; in this chapter, verse 25, "Until a time and times and half a time;" Rev. xi:2, 3, "For it (the outer court) hath been given unto the nations; and the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months; and I will give unto my two witnesses and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and three score days, clothed in sackcloth." Rev. xii:6, "And the women fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that there they may nourish her a thousand two hundred and three score days."

These are all evidently the same period of time—three years and a half, forty-two months, twelve hundred and sixty days. One commentator calls this period "the ordeal" and during it the church will not bring in the whole earth. But "the stone" will be growing towards its "mountain greatness." And it is false and treasonable to deny it. Much has been accomplished, and more will be, by the time that the twelve hundred and sixty years shall end. Dan. vii:8, 20, 24.

The most striking thing about this study has been the



unaccommodating way in which the scriptures deal with Pre-adventists. They wanted two resurrections—could not well do without two—and yet our Lord and his apostles mention only one! They were eager to have Christ, in bodily manifestation, to open the millennium; and Paul comes in and spoils it all by telling them that if Christ comes before the millennium there will be no millennium! For he will come then “to be glorified in his saints;” and to take vengeance “on them that know not God and obey not the gospel, even eternal destruction.” Maranatha was trying to show that the church would make no progress till Christ came; he looked first at Dan. ii. But the stone growing from a boulder to a mountain looked unpromising.

3. All is becoming “worse and worse, and will till Christ comes.” God speaks to us in his works of creation and providence; as well as in his word. The last is clearest and fullest, but the others are also appealed to as giving valuable instruction about some things. Let us glance at a chapter of history. We can scarcely imagine the vast change which passed over the mind of Europe during the 15th century. Great quickening of thought and a deep state of moral degradation coming close together was beginning to show the need of a reformation. In the 16th century came the Reformation, in Switzerland, Germany, France, Holland, Scotland, England. Then came the great persecutions, but the Church lived on and grew. There have been times of reaction and formalism, but there have been revivals and onward movements. The union of Church and State was everywhere, and exerted its paralyzing influence on both bodies, and necessarily for the worse. Two hundred and fifty years ago nearly every State in Europe believed it to be its duty to draw the sword to enforce conformity to the State religion. Who could have believed, then, that by the beginning of the twentieth century no country in Europe would have been willing, or able, to draw the sword in a “holy crusade” against the Protestant faith? Who would have thought, then, that the idea of religious

toleration could have spread so widely as it has in the world to-day? We believe it is safe to say that there are more true Christians in the world to-day than ever in one generation before; more Bibles and Bible-readers, and certainly more missionary zeal than in any century since the first. Nearly all of this has developed within the century just passed. Moravians began their work in 1732, and about sixty years later William Carey went to India. A few months ago a general missionary conference reported the amount of funds handled by those represented by it at more than nineteen million dollars. This work ought to vastly increase in the century upon which we have now entered. Read two verses of scripture before we leave this point. Rev. xvii., 16-17, "And the ten horns which thou sawest, and the beast, these shall hate the harlot, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and shall burn her utterly with fire. For God did put in their hearts to do his mind, and to come to one mind, and to give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God should be accomplished." Pre-adventists have assumed as an axiom that Christ must be visibly present on the earth, to overthrow these united foes of civil and religious liberty, this despotism of beast and false prophet. The march of events has gone a long way toward it already. If he has done all this without his personal advent, he can, if he will, do the rest. For some reason, perhaps to try the faith and patience of his saints, he drew these powers together. Now the united zeal has become indifference, and their relation will ultimately be one of bitter hate. Some verses in the latter part of Rev. xix intimate that there will be some bloody conflicts before the two tyrannies perish.

(4.) What kind of authority and dominion is that which our Redeemer King wields to-day? Look at an old prophecy of great interest here, Dan. vii : 13-14, "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, and he came even to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him.

And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Compare Acts 1:9, "As they were looking he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight." Can we not fix the very day in which the first verse from Daniel, quoted above, was fulfilled? You remember he had said forty days before, "I ascend to my Father." The disciples had seen Jesus ascend "till a cloud received him out of their sight." Daniel was permitted in vision to see the other end of that sublime journey and in this verse he tells us of it. We know who "one like unto a son of man" was; and now, if not before, we know who "the Ancient of Days" was, even the Eternal Father. Some may have taken this as the coming of the Son of Man, "with the clouds of heaven," but clearly it is not that, but his "ascent to the Father." The words in Matt. xxviii:18-20, "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore," etc., were spoken not long before his ascension—may have been spoken as Jesus stood on the very spot from which he ascended. Here is his investiture, his coronation, and his enthronement. Of all this little is said, but much is said of the universality, and perpetuity of his dominion. Read the words of Paul, Eph. i:20-23. Can this be the exaltation and glory, and dominion expressed in Matt. xxiii:18:30, of which pre-adventists scarcely deign to speak. And are the last words, "And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," worthy of so little appreciation? This is a serious, if not fatal symptom of the pre-advent infatuation. "What harm can it do?" We close this whole discussion with an answer to this question.

Pre-adventism has made the great commission mean a gospel work so scant, that it can be adequately done by a little gospel talk in one-tenth of the languages of the world, and to one in a hundred or a hundred thousand of the peo-

ple who speak those tongues.

It has persistently ignored the sublime saying, "All authority hath been given me in heaven and on earth."

It has made the great promise, "And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," unworthy of remembrance and of trust.

It has tried to force into the mouth of Christ two resurrections, while he speaks of only one, and has put the first where it would be unjust and absurd. It has tried to end the great world Eon, almost at the beginning of it; if the thousand years are taken, as other prophetic dates must be. And it has done this against many scriptures; and with none to support it.

It has fixed the coming at a date when it would make the millennium impossible; but both will be, in their times.

It has represented the One Advent, as impending at every moment, and always about to be, which is both untrue and irrational.

It has said "worse and worse," though day has been breaking for five hundred years! And by the watch-word, "No millennium till Christ comes," it has greatly discouraged all hopeful, earnest effort to win the world for our King. And now we know that there was grievous error in that watch-word.

The conclusion of the whole matter seems to be clearly this: (1) That the purpose of God is, that the bodily presence of Immanuel must remain in heaven until the times of the restoration of all things; that these restorations are the manifold adjustments which will be necessary when he comes to execute the promise, Rev. xxi:5, "Behold, I make all things new." And (2) That until the time when the Restoration begins, the present administration, under the supreme government of Christ, under the Holy Spirit's seven-fold power, and through the instrumentality of the churches, will continue. His people will be "the salt of the earth," and "the light of the world." And that the beautiful imagery of the Rev. I. chapter shall continue to guide through the whole millennial times.

C. S. M. SEE.

Philippi, W. Va.

### III. THE THEOLOGIES.

Theology is sometimes used in a broad sense as including all God's relations to His universe. In this discussion we employ it with a restriction to the views which have prevailed as to the nature of God.

If there be a God, and He is a single, spiritual person, infinite in every perfection, then every doctrine of God which ignores, or denies, or adds to this conception of the Deity that which is inconsistent with it, is a false theology. Moreover, every false theology is virtual Atheism, as Buchanan asserts, because it does not accept the existence and character of the true God.

#### ATHEISM.

Atheism proper is the belief of those who do not recognize the existence of any kind of a god as the fit object of man's divine worship. This belief may be either theoretical, or merely practical. Theoretical atheists are, of course, also practical, but there are some practical atheists that are not so in theory.

Of the theoretical atheists there are two classes: Those intelligently and avowedly so, and those ignorantly so. To the first class belong those whose philosophy leads them to deny the existence of a god. Here will be found the materialists, especially those of the grosser school. This is their proper logical position, and those who fearlessly accept the consequences of their philosophy are bold to say so. Materialistic evolutionists are like La Place, who is said to have declared to Napoleon that he had no need of the hypothesis of a god in his theory of the universe; matter is eternal, and from itself and by itself has evolved all that is.

There are two kinds of ignorant, theoretical atheists, those who are unaware of the existence of God, who are non-believers, but not disbelievers. The first are those degraded savage races whose language indicates the

utter want of the conception of any kind of a Deity. It is disputed by some that any such races have been found, and it is as confidently asserted by other intelligent travelers that they have come into contact with those who had no word to express the idea of a being superior to themselves, or to whom they paid religious worship. The other class are deaf-mutes, who have never had the power to hear a word spoken by their fellows, and who are said by those familiar with them to be, prior to their instruction, entirely ignorant of any being superior to man.

There are also two classes of merely practical atheists. To the first belong those agnostics, like Herbert Spencer, whose logic convinces them that there must be an infinite God, but whose philosophy teaches that He is unknowable, and therefore ignorable. Here are also to be found a large number throughout Christendom who have been taught to believe in God, and who have never, perhaps, doubted His existence, but who live without any recognition of Him. There is no class so unreasonable and without excuse as this. There is no stronger proof of man's mental and moral fall than the fact that he can believe in a Creator, Father, Saviour, Judge, and yet act day by day for years as though there were no God.

Atheism still exists as a speculation, as well as a sentiment; it sadly exists the world over as a life. Moreover, it is by no means logically the puniest foe with which the truth has to contend. On the contrary, we assert not only that all the false theologies are virtual atheisms, but also that atheism proper is the most logical of them all. If there is no single, infinite, personal God, then surely there is no God at all; there is, there can be no other being, nor collection of beings who meet the demands of the case, and we must perforce launch our barks on the dark, shoreless sea of atheism.

#### POLYTHEISM.

This is the belief in many gods, and probably has been the popular faith of the race of man; taking into considera-

tion his entire history. As it is the lowest form of belief as to the Deity, its prevalence is a lamentable proof of the degradation of the race. Its forms have been protean. It reaches its lowest depths in Fetichism, the worship of stones, plants, any material object upon earth not in human form ; a belief which is held chiefly by the negroes of Western Africa.

Among the more civilized races, polytheism has prevailed in the personifying deification of the objects and forces of nature : the sun, the moon, the sky, the earth, fire, the storm, etc. This characterizes the ancient religions of Chaldea, Persia, Egypt and India. The Greeks and Romans advanced a step beyond this mere animism to the higher conception of anthropomorphism ; their gods were persons. Among the Greeks they were largely ideal conceptions of virtue ; with the Romans, they were useful ministers to the people, and especially to the State. This finds an analogue in the deification of the Platonic ideas, suggested and begun by the great philosopher himself.

Hero-worship is another form of polytheism ; closely related to the preceding, especially to anthropomorphism. Those give personality, godship to the forces or objects of nature, or to the abstract virtues of humanity ; this worships the extraordinary manifestations of the animate and concrete. It begins with the lower animals, and finds its simplest form amongst the rude tribes in the adoption of some beast or bird or fish as the hero, the patron, the totem, the god of the family. Then we find civilized peoples exhibiting this cult, as the Egyptians, Persians, and the Israelites, in their worship of the bull. From this the step is easy to the deification of some noted ancestors, and then to the worship of all parents. The process culminates in cutting loose from the narrow bond of descent, and selecting some distinguished hero of the tribe or race, as the object of religious veneration.

Idolatry, or the worship of deities as seen in images, has been and is widely prevalent. This is not necessarily con-

nected with polytheism nor limited to it. It is possible for a polytheist to have unseen gods, and to make no image to represent them ; and it is equally possible for a monotheist to use idols in his worship. Idolatry has its degrees. The very ignorant among the barbarous races look upon the image itself as their god. Others, doubtless, believe that the idol is the dwelling place of the deity, as our bodies are the homes of our souls. This was probably the belief of Cyrus as to Bel and the Dragon ; for it is hard to think that so intelligent a man could have believed the very images themselves to be animate gods. There are others still, who look upon the images as merely the representatives to them of the gods whom they adore. So probably the Ephesians regarded the effigy of Diana, and so the Athenians looked upon the figure of their patroness, Pallas-Athene. Here too we place those Christians, who use images of the saints, of Mary, and of the Christ, as helps to their faith ; not that they are polytheists, but that they use images for the same purpose that the most intelligent class of polytheistic idolaters do.

In these several ways, there are "lords many and gods many," not themselves the creators but the creatures of their worshipers, deified by the imagination of those who bow the knee to them. Fear, the offspring of guilt, makes the avenging gods, and hope, the child of love, creates the propitious ones.

#### TRITHEISM.

This is a species of polytheism. It is nowhere found as a separate and complete doctrine of the Deity. While several religions have gods in groups of three, they are all systems of polytheism, and there are only two in which the triads are a distinctly marked feature. In the Hindoo mythology of Brahmanism, we have the Trimurti:—Para-Brahm, Creator ; Siva, Destroyer, and Vishnu, Restorer and Preserver ; represented by the sacred trilateral A U M.

Plato's speculations suggested to his followers, the Neo-Platonists, their triple ternary:—I. The Absolute, from



which emanated (1) Being, (2) End, (3) The Finite ; II. Life, from which (1) Potentiality, (2) Existence, (3) Intelligible Life ; III. The Nons, including (1) Static Thought, or Pure Reason, (2) Thought in Motion, or Perception, (3) Reflective Thought. These metaphysical concepts were deified by them, and regarded as real gods. This well justifies Paul's criticism. "The world by its wisdom knew not God."

#### DITHEISM.

This may be regarded as a form of polytheism and is usually so reckoned ; and yet it is really a distinct belief. Its peculiarity consists in its doctrine of two infinite, metaphysically equal beings, of diametrically opposite moral characters. The one is the supremely good God ; the other, the supremely evil. This was the belief of the ancient Persians, under the teaching of their prophet, Zarathushtra, whom the Greeks named Zoroaster. There are a few, known as Parsees, who still represent this view. The good God was called Armazd, sometimes Mazdoo, sometimes Ahura Mazda ; the first name is also written Ormazd, and Ormuzd. The evil principle is Ahriman, or Angromainyush. Their theology is found in the Zend Avesta, their Bible. The faith is sometimes called Mazdaism, but more commonly, from its founder, Zoroastrianism. This ethical dualism is a feature of all religions, but Zoroaster stands alone in his monotheistic deification of the two opposite principles.

#### HENOTHEISM.

Says Max Muller, in the *Science of Religion*, "Henotheistic religion differs from polytheistic, because, although they recognize the existence of various deities, or names of deities, they represent each deity as independent of all the rest, as the only deity present in the mind of the worshiper at the time of his worship and prayer. This character is very prominent in the religion of the Vedic poets. Although many gods are involved in different hymns, sometimes also in the same hymn, yet there is no rule of prece-

dence among them; and according to the varying aspects of nature, and the various cravings of the human heart, it is sometimes Indra, the god of the blue sky, sometimes Varuna, the ancient god of the firmament, who is praised as supreme without any suspicion of rivalry, or any idea of subordination." This form of henotheism is what in other passages he calls kathenotheism, or the supreme worship of one god at a time.

Prof. C. P. Tiele, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, writes, "Henotheism. not the henotheism of Max Muller, or of Harkman; or of Asmus, but a practical henotheism, i. e., adoration of one god above others as the specific tribal god, or as the lord over a particular people, a national or relative monotheism, like that of the ancient Israelites[?], the worship of an absolute sovereign who exacts positive obedience. This practical monotheism is totally different from the theoretical monotheism to which the Aryans, with their monistic speculative idea of the godhead, are much nearer." This henotheism is tribal monotheism, but does not deny that other tribes may have other gods.

A third view of henotheism seems presented by Sir Henry Rawlinson as a monotheism of the ancient Babylonians. Of this Prof. Sayce says, in the *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, "The various deities of the popular faith are all resolved into the one supreme God, the Maker of the world and man, who was worshiped at Babylon under the names of Bel, 'the Lord,' and Merodach, the sun-god; at Eridu under that of Hea; and at Nipur, under that of Anu. The gods of the multitude are said to be only the fifty names of the Creator." This seems for the unintelligent, a monotheism with polytheistic names for the supreme God; and for the masses, a real polytheism.

Shamanism may be considered still another phase of henotheism. It is the worship of one supreme deity, and of numerous subordinate ones, to whom the management of the world is held to be entrusted. This reminds us of the Neo-Platonic philosophy, which taught substantially the

same doctrine; the ineffable One not condescending to concern himself with such vulgar matters as the creation and care of worlds. Shamanism is the faith of certain Finnish tribes that inhabit the Ural-Altaic regions of Asia. Its devotees also use charms, practice magic, and believe the present state superior to the world to come.

We see that henotheism is a curious combination of polytheism and monotheism, and may be regarded by the evolutionist as the most advanced stage of the former; but in truth is more probably a decay of monotheism and a step towards polytheism. Max Muller asserts, "This peculiar phase of religion, this worship of single gods, forms probably everywhere the first stage in the growth of polytheism."

#### PANTHEISM.

Of the three forms of monistic philosophy, idealism, materialism, and absolutism, the last is the most subtle and plausible. The highest, best minds in all the past have been far more inclined to idealistic views of the universe than to materialistic. Since Spinoza's day, idealism has yielded largely to the monism of absolute identity, the doctrine that mind and matter are but phases or attributes of the one universal substance. Absolutism, pure monism, or the belief in the absolute substantial sameness of mind and matter, is the philosophic basis of pantheism.

The semi-Christian Jew, Spinoza, a man of superb intellect, is its worthy founder. This monism originated in this scholastic definition of substance, as *Ens per se subsistens*. Descartes, who started the modern mind towards ontological study, adopted this definition, declaring substance to be "that which so exists as to need nothing else for its existence;" and even down to the present day, dualistic philosophers incautiously admit this as a correct definition. Spinoza accepted this fundamental tenet from the orthodox philosophy of his day, modifying its expression so as to read, "Substance is that which is in itself and is conceived by itself; *Id quod in se est et per*

*se concipitur.*" Upon this as a basis he built his system of pantheism. If substance is *ens per se subsistens*, then substance must necessarily be the infinite, the uncaused, the self-existent, the independent God. Matter does not exist of itself, nor does finite mind; God alone does. There is, there can be only one such substance. Spinoza made this the corner stone of his edifice:— One substance, God; with two attributes, thought and extension; individual objects, the finite modes of the one substance. Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel have developed the system, each with marked peculiarities. Cousin introduced it to the French; Herbert Spencer is its English apostle. *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* and the Concord School have taught it to Americans. It is the philosophy of *Faust*. To-day pantheism and materialism are the giant foes of orthodoxy in philosophic theology; materialism working upon lower minds and pantheism upon the higher.

Is Pantheism true? It is not true: I. Because it is philosophically, metaphysically, ontologically false. The underlying basis of pantheism is pure or absolute monism; that form of monism which holds that all forms of being are substantially one, neither distinctively matter nor mind. Monism in all its forms is contradicted by facts; because there are two irreducible, fundamental dualisms in the universe. The first, most radical, most important is the dualism of the infinite and the finite. If God and time and space exist, there is a category or class of the infinite. If human minds and human bodies exist, there is also a category or class of the finite. This dualism monism cannot overcome, except by denying the reality of all the infinities, on the one hand, or of all the finites, on the other. That the chasm between the infinite and the finite, (should both exist), is infinite and beyond the power of any monistic engineer to bridge is unquestionable. Dualism lies at the very root of being.

There is another radical dualism, within the realm of the finite. The finite presents things to our cognition, which

are divisible; such are all solids, all liquids, all gases; such are all physical forces, light, heat, electricity, gravity, etc. These same forces are also characterized by the fact that they are always active in certain definite ways; they must act and must act in a fixed way. There are other finite things present to our cognition, which are not divisible; such are all minds; and such are all mental forces, thoughts, feelings, volitions. Light is divisible, so that no two eyes receive the same rays; truth is indivisible, so that a million of minds can receive the same truth in its entirety the same time. Mental forces are not always active, and when they act their words are indefinitely varied. They act or not, they act in this way or that, as pleases them. The finite has this line of cleavage running through it, separating it into the world of matter, divisible and necessarily active, and the world of mind, indivisible and freely active.

Dynamism is probably true; everything that exists is a force, a power, an agent, an actor, a cause. In this sense monism is true. But forces, powers, agents, actors, causes are irresistibly of two kinds, the infinite and the finite; and the finite are either irreducibly divisible and necessary on the one hand, or indivisible and free, on the other. Pantheism, which obliterates both of these dualisms, cannot be true.

II. The theology of pantheism is unsatisfactory. 1. The universe is God; God is the universe; the two are identical. God is being; there is no being but God. But the universe is finite, however immense it may be. Then God is finite, however immense He may be. If we escape this by saying that space is a part of the universe, and space is infinite, then all space, beyond the circumference of the finite universe of matter and mind, is empty, vacant, cold, dead; and God is saved from finiteness by His expansion as empty space.

2. The God of pantheism is without self-consciousness. Pantheism teaches that God attains a temporary, finite consciousness in individual men; but this no more endows the Deity with intelligence than do the fireflies make a starless

night luminous; it only makes the lack of consciousness that characterizes his nature the more perceptible and striking. A God without a knowledge of Himself is no God; he is inferior to His own finite manufactures, man.

3. The God of pantheism is not a person. A person is a being, separate and distinct from all other beings, and endowed with the power of free, rational action. In denying God's personality, pantheism bereaves Him of His individuality by identifying Him with the universe. This is done on the plea that personality is a limitation and God must be unlimited. Personality is a limitation, without reasonable doubt; it is, as it were, a hedge, a boundary around the being of God, separating Him from his Universe, making Him a distinct being. The question arises, Can God have limits? The answer depends upon the further question, Are all limits imperfections, or signs of an imperfect being? If so, God cannot be limited; if not, He may be. Most limits are marks of imperfection, but there are others which are signs of perfection; and so God is omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient. On the other hand, limitations of character to right thoughts, feelings, purposes, words, acts, are perfections. And so it is impossible for God to lie or to be unjust. Is the limitation of personality a perfection or an imperfection? Were the Siamese twins more or less perfect than other twins? Manifestly, less so. Why? Because of their lack of complete individuality, their want of perfect personality. God's personality separates Him from the universe, and at the same time is an infinite, omnipresent, immanent personality.

Pantheism says that God is the infinite, the absolute. All believers in the true God assert that He is infinite; not that He has no limitations, but that He has none which are not perfections, and none which are not self-imposed. God is infinite within the limits of perfection. All theists believe that God is the absolute, in the sense of complete perfect, that he is possessed of every excellence to an unlimited degree; also, in the sense that He is the independ-

ent source of His own being and nature. It is, however, not true that God is the absolute in the meaning of the unrelated. All finite beings have relations, many of which are independent of their will. God has more relations than any finite being, as He is the center and source of all beings, and He is thus universally related; but all of God's relations are self-imposed.

III. There are ethical objections to pantheism. 1. Its theory of the universe is mechanical, necessitarian. According to it God is not a master artist, conceiving an oration, and then, as an agent distinct from the instrument, expressing His grand thoughts and feelings by simultaneous and successive touches of the various keys in the several banks of the organ; but He is made nothing more than the coiled spring in the music box, or rather He is the music box itself, and man is but a cog on the cylinder, making a predestined sound, without variation or possibility of variation in and of itself. These sounds, high or low, weak or strong, harmonious or discordant, are due to the unchanging nature of the cog and its place on the cylinder: conditions which are fixed for it, and over which it has no control. If this is true, men are not agents but instruments; God is the only cause in the universe; and truth and error, right and wrong have no subjective significance, are contraries due to nothing in the free action or character of the agents involved, but are mere objective facts, qualities of things, differing just as sweet and bitter, cold and hot differ. physical but not moral opposites, and are the creations of God, who is responsible for them. But while sweet and bitter are physical opposites, which we immediately recognize by our senses, as qualities of material things; truth and error are intellectual opposites, which we immediately recognize by our reason as qualities of assertions in their relation to fact, assertions made by responsible minds; and right and wrong are moral opposites, which we immediately recognize by our reason as qualities of conduct or character belonging to free agents.

The obliteration of moral distinctions from truth and error, right and wrong, is due to the denial of free moral action to the human mind. That man acts out his nature is true. We do not object to this assertion of the pantheist. Man's freedom depends primarily on his determination by internal as opposed to external impulses. It may be said, as it has been, that all mechanical and chemical action is determined by the inner nature of the agents involved ; and man's action being similarly determined has no more freedom than has a lever or an acid. It is true of all being that its nature determines its action ; but it is not true that all beings have the same nature. There are two essentially different kind of beings. The one kind must act and must act in a fixed way ; there is with it no deliberation, no pondering the question whether it shall act, or in what way it shall act ; it acts regardless of rational or moral considerations ; such is the law for acids and levers and all chemical and mechanical forces. The other kind may or may not act, and may act in this way or that ; before it acts it deliberates, it ponders whether it shall act and whether in this way or that ; it sometimes finds it hard to decide, sometimes decides hesitatingly, turns back, renews the question, and then confirms or reverses the former decision ; it decides and acts from rational and moral considerations ; such is the law for all mental and spiritual forces. It is vain for us to ask, why is this ? As well ask why oxygen is not hydrogen, why red is not blue. It is a fact, an ultimate fact that is incapable of explanation ; and that does not need an explanation. Man is free ; he is the author of his own acts : he freely determines, for reasons rational and moral whether and how he will act ; he holds himself and other men morally responsible for the truth and error, the right and wrong of personal belief, action and character. This is so ; he knows it is so ; it is an axiomatic truth ; all history, every language, all legislation, every conscience shows it is so. Men may evade it, reason around it, deny it, but in their hearts remorse and conscious wrong-doing shows their philosophy false.



2. Pantheism is fatal to moral responsibility, chiefly because it takes away freedom from moral action; it is none the less really so for another reason. It must deny God's responsibility, because it denies God's conscious personality. In a sense a stick may be held responsible for being crooked, as for this reason it is rejected or burned. In a sense a rose may be rewarded for being fragrant and beautiful; it reposes on the bosom of a belle. But in both of these cases the responsibility is not moral, because the consequences are not felt by the stick or the rose. So God, according to pantheism, does not realize the consequences of His acts.

With man responsibility is not wholly excluded, but is radically abridged. Pantheism denies any personality, any self-consciousness to God; it also denies immortal personality or self-consciousness to man. With the denial of conscious immortality, morality loses one of its strong props; distressed virtue is bereaved of a blessed hope; and prosperous wickedness gloats in triumph over its success. This objection cannot be met by the assertion that men feel the full and just consequence of their acts in this life, because it is not true. It is the pure, virtuous, sensitive soul that feels the keenest regret for wrong-doing; while the fiend, who has steeped his soul in sin, is undisturbed by the reproaches of conscience. Let men believe that there is no future retribution, and the masses will sink into sensualism; "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

#### PANENTHEISM.

This is the name given to his theology by the Belgian philosopher, K. Chr. Fr. Krause, who was dissatisfied with Pantheism as founded upon the theory of absolute identity, and sought to improve upon it by teaching that everything instead of being God, is in God. There is, of course, a sense in which this is true. God's infinite presence, knowledge, and power, as it were, encompass the finite universe; all things were originally in God's conception of them and remain ideally present to His view; and all things originate

in God and remain dependent upon His power; in Him we live and have our being.

There are other meanings in which it is not true that all things are in God. If it means that the universe is not a separate being or collection of beings, but is consubstantial with God, then it is but another name for Pantheism. If it means that the universe does not really exist at all, but is a form or manifestation of the Deity, then it is idealistic Pantheism, based upon the nihilism of finite substance.

The old Greek philosophers, down to the time of Christ, held that the world was uncreated and eternal. After the Christian doctrine of *ex nihilo* creation was revealed and taught, the Neo-Platonists and Gnostics conceived and promulgated the theory of emanation; that is the universe was primarily in God as a part of His being but was sent forth by Him as a fulguration, or as light from the sun. It being dishonoring to the Absolute, the One, that this world should proceed directly from Him, it was held that He gave forth a Demiurge, an inferior God, from whom this finite universe emanated. It is curious that Sir Wm. Hamilton seems to have resuscitated this old doctrine. In discussing his pet law of the conditioned, he says, "Can we realize it to ourselves in thought that, the moment after the universe came into manifested being, there was a larger complement of existence in the universe and its Author together, than there was the moment before in the Deity himself alone? This we cannot imagine." If it be true that the complement of being was not increased by the creation, then, 1. There is no such thing as *ex nihilo* or absolute creation; it is a mere evolution, or a simple change in the mode of being. 2. If the universe is so much subtracted from God, then He has been proportionally lessened, and thus rendered incomplete by the amount of the subtraction. 3. God no longer infinite in being, He and the universe,\* mutually supplementing each other, constitute infinite being. Sir William can escape from these conclusions by applying his principle, "All this may be possible, but of it we cannot

think the possibility; that is, by admitting that, though inconceivable, the universe was nevertheless not originally a part of God, but was created by Him *ex nihilo*. This doctrine of emanation is based upon a theory of panentheism, that all things were originally in God.

#### DEISM.

This view of the deity is of modern English origin, and was due to a recoil of the British mind from scholasticism, traditionalism, formalism, and despotism in Church and State. As a protest against extreme orthodox positivism, its influence was probably, on the whole, salutary, resulting in the enlargement of the views and the strengthening of the faith of Christians.

It is difficult to define historical deism, for the reason that its adherents differ greatly among themselves. Lord Herbert, of Cherburg, who has been called the father of deism, formulated its creed into five articles: 1. One Supreme God. 2. To be worshipped. 3. By virtue and piety. 4. Sins to be repented of and forsaken. 5. Rewards and punishments, here and hereafter. All deists may be said to agree: 1. That there is but one God, a person distinct from the universe. 2. That God works by natural means alone; and so they discard prophecy, miracles, a vicarious atonement, and supernatural revelation. They differ: 1. As to God's immanence in the universe; the majority probably denying it, but some, like Franklin, holding to a special divine Providence and the efficacy of prayer. 2. As to the freedom of the will; Collins denying and Morgan affirming it. 3. As to Christianity; some, as Woolston, bitterly opposing it; some, as Herbert, ignoring it; and others, as Chubb, professing and rationalising it. 4. As to immortality; being divided into what were called "mortal" and "immortal" deists. 5. As to retribution; some basing their ethics upon it; others, as Shaftesbury, pronouncing it immoral. It is enough for our purpose to know, that deism differs from all the theologies we have so far considered in holding to one

personal God ; and that it differs from theism, which we are yet to examine, in denying all supernaturalism.

In teaching the personality of God, deism is a decided advance upon pantheism, and so far has our sympathy. We join issue with it in its denial of supernaturalism. Supernaturalism may be discussed as a possibility and as a fact ; it may be possible and yet not actual. As a possibility it is an *a priori* question ; we ask on what grounds can deism deny the possibility of God's directly interposing in the affairs of the universe. It cannot do so on the ground of a want of power on God's part ; for God as the Creator has both the power and the right to do with his creation as His perfect wisdom and justice and love shall see fit. Nor can it do so because God sustains such a relation to the universe as the mainspring to the watch ; for this would make God a part of the universe, which deism denies. Nor because God is the machine itself ; for this is pantheism, and is repudiated by deism. Granting the mechanical theory of the universe, and assuming with deism that God is its creator and is a being distinct from the grand machine, why is it impossible for God to be directly concerned in its movements ? Because, says the deist, the universe is a watch or a music box that needs no interfering hand to assist or to regulate its action ; God made it able to run its course, and now leaves it to work out its destiny uninfluenced by him. It is not denied that this may be true ; this is a possible conception of God's relation to the world. But is it necessarily the relation ? Is it not possible that God might have thought it wisest to make the world a mere tool or instrument, useful in the hands of an intelligent manipulator, but useless otherwise ? May not the universe be an organ, or a violin, dumb until played upon by the skilled hand whose thought and feeling it then expresses ? Is there not, moreover, a third possible conception of the universe as a machine ; God may have made it like a music-box, with its power of movement wholly in itself ; or He may have made it like a violin, silent, motionless except as used by a power external to itself ;

may He not also have made it a complex machine, part of whose movements are self-produced and self-regulated, and part produced and regulated by an external force? The candid rational mind must see and admit that one of these three conceptions is possibly true. There is still a fourth possible relation between God and His creation; He may have made it in any one of the three ways above suggested, with the additional fact that He is not an indifferent, careless spectator of the machine He has made, but stands ready to repair any injury it may sustain. He may be a watchmaker, whose watch runs of itself and yet as finitely imperfect may occasionally need his correcting, readjusting skill. On *a priori* grounds, then, the theory of natural deism or of supernaturalism, or of a combination of both is credibly possible.

God could then have so arranged the universe as to leave Himself free to directly affect its movements; this, however, does not prove that He has so made the world; still less does it show that He actually does immediately or supernaturally intervene in the affairs of creation. As to the ordinary operations of the world, any one of the three theories mentioned above is consistent with theism; while the first alone is allowed by deism. Let us assume that this deistic theory is correct and that the universe is a machine like the watch or the music box, run by its own inherent, natural forces. Does this preclude the possibility of the direct interposition of the Creator for reasons satisfactory to Himself? Suppose the watchmaker so constructs the watch that it will run automatically for thirty hours and then stop, making it necessary for him or some one distinct from the watch to wind it up and set it going again; may not this be, and is it not the way in which the watch has been made millions of times? Suppose again that the music box has been so adjusted that when it begins to move it will sound the notes of a certain melody and then stop, unless readjusted to strike the cogs which send forth a different air; may not this be, and is not this the way in which

music boxes have been made? Still again, suppose the watch runs its repeated cycles of thirty hours with uniform regularity, but not in accordance with true time, making it necessary that some one shall accelerate or retard its movements; may not this be, and does it not often occur? Suppose, finally, that the watch is the perfection of skill and moves with less varying uniformity than does the sun, but its wheels and pinions wear, as all finite things do, or that some shock shall dislocate or damage the parts, making it imperative that the maker shall interfere to repair the injury; may not this be, and is it not a frequent fact? We thus see that the most extreme form of the mechanical theory, as exemplified in the works of man, does not shut out the occasional intervention of the Creator, and this is all that, as opposed to deism, we now affirm. As a fact, no one ever made or saw a machine which did not need the interposition of some one at some time in some way to regulate, adjust, or repair it. On the mechanical theory of deistic naturalism, the presumption is strong in favor of the need of occasional interventions on the part of the Creator.

But we are not out of the woods yet; we have not yet reached the deistic citadel, though we have captured the deistic outworks. Let the above be granted, it overlooks a radical difference between a machine made by finite man and one made by the infinite God; the former we may expect to be imperfect and to need adjustment and repair, but the perfect Creator will make a perfect machine, one that will need neither regulation nor mending. Were the issue thus defined, whether God could have so created the universe, it would be admitted at once that God could have made a perfect and indefectible universe had He thought it wise to do so. Were the issue, whether God would probably so make world, this would also be admitted as an inference from His own perfection. But what is the real issue? It is, Did God as a fact make the universe not only finitely perfect as originally created, but also indefectible, so that it could not go wrong and has not gone wrong; a

perfect watch that has never needed regulation nor repair? Let us open our eyes and see. Look upon nature in all its aspects. Inanimate nature; do we find nowhere imperfect specimens of elementary or compound minerals? The vegetable and animal, the organic world; are there none but faultless plants and beasts? The intellectual, the world of truth; is error unknown, is no ignorance found? The moral; is the heart of man a pure fountain, sending forth naught but pure thought, pure words, pure deeds? The spiritual; has every soul a supreme regard for the unseen, the eternal, the holy, the heavenly, loving God with all the heart? These questions need no answer; imperfection, wreck, depravity, everywhere mar God's creation. Instead of asking whether imperfection can be found, we need to inquire whether anywhere in this universe, a perfect being exists.

Now, as we must believe, from the perfection of God's nature, that He originally made the world finitely perfect, and as it is now marred by imperfection, the conclusion is that the watch has been injured and needs the regulating, repairing interposition of its maker; the world has gone wrong and calls for the wise and gracious intervention of its Creator to readjust it. When we further bear in mind that God's supernatural acts are no more His acts than are His natural; that the natural is God's working as well as the supernatural; and that the supernatural differs from the natural only in being extraordinary, unusual, we can even more clearly see that the deistic denial of the supernatural is unjustified. But, finally and especially, when we remember that God's supernatural acts are not capricious, are not for the sake of causing wonder, but are all due to emergencies that call them forth and are thus wise and beneficent interventions, we are satisfied that the supernatural is as rational and as credible as the natural.

Deism is dead; rampant a hundred years ago, it is now scarcely to be found. It has yielded to materialism, in those skeptically inclined minds who are interested in the physi-

cal sciences ; to pantheism, in those of metaphysical and monistic tendencies ; and most largely to rationalistic Christianity, in those whose religious natures find satisfaction in the perfect character and ethically sublime teachings of our Lord. We have given such extended attention to this form of theology, because its distinctive characteristic, a denial of supernaturalism, survives, and is a living issue within the pale of Christian theism.

#### THEISM.

Theism agrees with deism as to the unity and personality of God ; indeed, it accepts all the positive tenets of deism, including Lord Herbert's five articles, and objects only to its denial of all supernaturalism. Deism removes God from all direct active participation in the affairs of the universe He has made ; while theism regards Him not only as immanent, directing all things by His general providence, but also as so interested in man as to reveal Himself in supernatural ways in order to meet man's needs. The vital difference between the two theologies is that deism contends for an exclusive naturalism ; while theism combines with ordinary naturalism for the every day providences an extraordinary supernaturalism for spiritual emergencies. With regard to the lower orders of creation, theism has no dispute with the better class of deists, those who believe in providence.

Theism as here discussed, differentiates itself from deism, not as to the metaphysical nature of God, but as to His relations to man. They agree as to the essential absolute, unity, spirituality, and personality of the Deity, and differ solely as to His supernatural revelations to man.

There are two classes of theists. Judaism believes that God made Himself known to the fathers of our race by theophanies, visions, dreams, Urim and Thummim, miracles, prophecies, inspiration, and revelation ; this revelation is contained in the Old Testament. Mohammedans accept this belief of the Jews, and affirm that God has made an ad-



ditional and final revelation to man in the Koran. Both assert the absolute unity of God.

#### TRINITARIANISM.

We have given the theologies in an ascending series. Beginning with blank atheism, polytheism, tritheism, ditheism, henotheism, pantheism, panentheism, deism and theism have been presented. Theological beliefs culminate in Trinitarianism, frequently called Christian Theism. It differs as radically from theism, as theism does from deism, and should therefore be considered a distinct creed.

As already seen theism raises itself above deism in its assertion of God's supernatural dealings with man, in the way of revealing His will and making Himself known. Trinitarianism is in accord with theism upon this point. It differs materially from theism, however, both as to God's nature and as to His relation to man. Theism asserts the absolute, unqualified oneness of the Deity; Trinitarianism agrees that there is but one God and that He is in nature essentially one; but it affirms, on the authority of God's own revelation, that there is a non-essential, non-substantial threeness in the Godhead, relative to Himself and relative to His created universe. The Trinitarian's Bible teaches that God is one; and that this one God is the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit; that as Father He sustains certain relations to man, as Son other relations, and as Holy Spirit other relations still.

In another fundamental point, Trinitarianism is quite distinct from theism; it affirms the hominification (if we may coin a word that seems to be needed) of the Deity, or, as it is commonly called, the Incarnation. By this is meant, not simply the assumption of a human form or body, but more, that God became man in soul as well as in body; not that He ceased to be God and was transubstantiated into man, but that, continuing to be God, humanity in Him became consubstantiated with the Deity; not that from eternity He was God and man, but that in time this consubstantiation

occurred, and, having occurred, continues as an everlasting union; that this taking of human nature into vital and perpetual union with Himself was not a caprice, nor an evolution, but was His free act, prompted by His infinite love for the race of man, whom He thus restores to filial relations with himself.

Trinitarianism is the teaching of the New Testament, and the creed of Christianity; as all three of the grand divisions of the Church, the Roman, the Greek, and the Protestant, accept and proclaim it.

It might seem at first view that Trinitarianism is rather a retrogression towards polytheism, than an advance upon the absolute monotheism of the Jews and Mohammedans. This is true when Trinitarianism becomes nothing more than a disguised tritheism. Indeed some Christians refuse to believe either in the Trinity or the Incarnation, thus placing themselves theologically with the theism of the Jews and the Moslem. But Christianity is in this, as in every other point of difference, markedly a progress beyond theism. The theistic conception of the Deity is manifestly naturalistic, rationalistic; it does not advance beyond deism; while Trinitarianism, in its two cardinal, differentiating doctrines, presents truths that transcend human reason, are incomprehensible and supernatural, and that are thus both examples and proofs of the inspired revelation of the New Testament.

The ten theologies, Atheism, Polytheism, Tritheism, Ditheism, Henotheism, Pantheism, Panentheism, Deism, Theism, and Trinitarianism, are all shades or combinations of three radial views: Atheism, Polytheism, and Monotheism. If Trinitarianism is true, then all the other conceptions of the Deity are defective or positively false. It is the conception which underlies the Gospel of Redemption.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

Washington and Lee University.

#### IV. THE EARLY VIRGINIA PURITANS:—FOUNDERS OF AMERICAN PRESBYTERIANISM.

The busy Presbyterian has been too indifferent to the history of his church. More concerned with principles and having to face ever impending crises, he has not exercised himself enough about the gathering and presenting of facts for present vindication and future information. Partisan statements and public opinion have gone unchallenged. If care had been taken to examine the facts, the mists of not a few popular fancies would have been dissipated and the real form of truth brought into view, to disturb the over-confident calm of some. Too often we have hurried through the records of the past without taking care to separate the doubled leaves or to read the foot-notes. For this reason we have failed to see much that Presbyterians have been and have done.

The Presbyterian faith and form exist in many lands where the name is not popularly adopted. Holland, France, Switzerland, Germany and other countries have their Presbyterians in principle and practice. And if this be true of other countries to-day, it is just as true of other ages. In many periods of the Christian era the principles and forms of what is known as Presbyterianism have exercised beneficent and extensive influence. The presence of Huguenot and Waldensian elements in our own Church is clear evidence of community of interest and concord of faith in all ages.

This applies particularly to that important factor in English life and history, commonly called "Puritanism." There has never been a time in the history of the British Isles, when the principles and customs of apostolic Christianity were not stoutly maintained. The great truths, that found emphasis and propagation on the Continent through the Reformation, were always in evidence in some part of the

islands across the Channel. The Gospel was first carried to the Britons by the Roman soldiers, who were sent to garrison the country, and when the trials and dangers of Rome began to multiply these legions were withdrawn to strengthen and defend the heart of the Empire. Thus they left the Christianity of the Bible, not yet corrupted by the apostacies and innovations of the South. Patrick, Columba and others like-minded continued the aggressive work of a church, comparatively pure. Even the acceptance of Rome's religious supremacy by the Saxon kings did not eradicate the freedom and simplicity of the old faith; and almost down to the eve of the Reformation the Scottish Church was not submissive to Rome.

John Wyclif, the "Morning Star of the Reformation," espoused mightily and enthusiastically the great truths, peculiar to Presbyterianism in all ages. Through him the English people received the Bible in their own language. He was the founder of the Lollards, who kept the fires of pure faith and true piety alive, until they blazed out into the great Reformation. Wyclif taught that the Bible, not church traditions and papal bulls, is the rule of faith and life; that only two Church offices are necessary to a Scriptural Church: the elders, or bishops, and the deacons; that transubstantiation is false; that itinerant preachers, called "Bible-men," should be instructed and sent out to teach and evangelize, and that the ceremonies and inventions of the papacy are impious. Fierce persecution thinned and scattered the Lollards, but their cherished principles were perpetuated in devoted hearts and pious homes, which finally turned the tide of English life to the Reformation.

The Puritans, so-called first in the reign of Elizabeth, were in part the spiritual heirs of the Lollards, and in part the adherents of the Continental reformers, especially the Dutch and Genevan, who like the Lollards were thoroughly Presbyterian. Puritan and Presbyterian were practically the same. Doctor Wm. Hill (*American Presbyterianism*, pg. 2 and 3) says, that, with reference to their opposition to

papacy and prelacy and their advocacy of a government by elders, they were called Presbyterian ; with reference to their hostility to vestments and the forms and ceremonies of the Anglican Church, they were called Puritan. The name, Precisian, was also given them because of their high ideas of morality. The evidence is convincing that the Puritans were more closely allied to the Presbyterian Church than to any other, if indeed we may not consider them thorough-going Presbyterians. The following are some of the facts in evidence :

(1) Their leaders went for instruction, and times of peril for shelter, to the Presbyterians of the Continent. Among these notable refugees were Hooper, who refused to be consecrated bishop in episcopal vestments, and suffered martyrdom under "Bloody Mary," and Cartwright, the theologian of Cambridge and organizer of Presbytery in England.

(2) On the other hand many of the Dutch and Swiss leaders came to England to be teachers and advisers of the Puritans, rapidly rising to prominence. Bucer and A. Lasco were two of these.

(3) John Knox was a minister of the Church of England during the reign of Edward VI. Drysdale (*Presbyterians in England*, pg. 62) says that being "released from the French galleys by the King and council, he devoted five of his best years, 1549-1552, to their service in England." He was a royal chaplain and was offered a bishopric. We know what kind of a Puritan Knox was.

(4) The religious elements in the struggle between Charles and Parliament were divided between three parties : Romish, Independent and Presbyterian. The last was strongest of the three. In the Westminster Assembly, selected and called by this parliament, the majority were Presbyterians ; and representatives of the Scotch Church were welcomed to their sittings. The Presbyterian system formulated by this notable gathering, and subscribed by millions of Presbyterians to-day, must have been the expression of an exceedingly strong and numerous body.

(5) After the death of Charles I petitions from many of the eastern counties of England for the organization of Presbyteries were presented to parliament, and in some counties the organizations were really effected. Now Puritanism was the strongest factor in that section and in London, this strength being explained, in part at least, by the great number of refugees from Holland and France, who settled there and were principally Presbyterian.

(6) The questions in dispute between the High Church party and the Puritans were precisely those that distinguish between Presbyterianism and Prelacy.

Among the Puritans themselves there were two parties. The first and smaller party was composed of the Separatists, or Independents, who would not conform in the least degree to the moderate Anglican Church, many finding refuge on the Continent, whence the Pilgrims sailed for Plymouth. Knox, the great reformer of the Continent, and the leading Puritans themselves, disapproved of this separation, and expressed their disapproval in strong terms. The larger and more influential body of Puritans preferred to remain in the national church, cherishing with good reason the hope of more thorough reformation, enjoying a measure of liberty and honor. They were bound to the existing order by political, social and material interests; and Presbyterians have always been conservative and loyal. In this way they furnished to the Anglican Church its low, Calvinistic and evangelical element, which has been its brain, bone and muscle. The principles of those stalwart Puritans, Hooper, Ridley and Cartwright, are too thoroughly Presbyterian to admit any doubt of their adherence to that time-honored faith. At one time federation between the Presbyterian bodies of the Continent and the Church of England was contemplated, Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, agreeing to the plan of union, on condition that his church should retain its prelatic claims, notwithstanding as being received "from Pope Gregory of Rome, but from Joseph of Arimathea." (Dyrcdale, *History of Presbyterians in Eng-*

*land*, p. 97) We have always suspected just what this eminent Anglican discloses, that their beloved claim of Apostolic Succession is as visionary as the connection of Britain with Joseph of Arimathea.

Admitting then, as we must, the existence of a strong and thorough Presbyterian party in England at the time of the early settlements in Virginia, we should like to know what part it had in the origin and character of the new colony. Presbyterians always make their influence felt, and we should be surprised to find that they had nothing to do with one of the most important enterprises of that age. What are the facts? Have they all been made known? Let us see. Careful reading of the history of the seventeenth century leads to the conviction that the Puritans, or English Presbyterians, were profoundly interested in the new colony and exercised decided influence on it. This statement is based upon the following proofs:

1. The original purpose in the colonization of North America was the formation of a Protestant power, which would cripple Spain by cutting off the sources of her wealth. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries almost unceasing war was waged between Catholic and Protestant nations, and Spain, the most powerful nation of Europe, had pledged her strength to the Catholic cause. She had poured out five thousand millions of her treasure in the effort to crush Protestantism. The hope of European peace was the overthrow of Spain, and Protestant nations determined to bring this about by stopping the inflow of her gold and silver from America. This purpose was carried out in the development of the Dutch and English navies, and the colonization of North America. The effort of that noble Huguenot, Coligny, to plant a Protestant colony in Florida was ruined by the Spaniards, who attacked and utterly destroyed the first colony on St. John's River. Sir Walter Raleigh was in sympathy with Coligny's idea, and adopted his plan (Fiske, *Old Virginia*, p. 30); but his first attempt also was frustrated by the war between Spain and England,

and the expedition of the Spanish Armada. The little Roanoke Island colony, cut off from its friends at home, was lost beyond recovery, when the relief expedition arrived. But early in the reign of James I a permanent settlement was effected in Virginia, which grew rapidly into a strong colony, the first-fruits of a great nation, which in these days of ours has indeed broken all the strength of Spain. What better people could be found for such a colony than the English Presbyterians, the readiest to oppose Rome and the last to surrender to or compromise with her !

2. Virginia was not a crown colony in the beginning, but was granted to a chartered company, known as the "Virginia Company of London," which had complete control and through which the colony was formed. Many of the members of this company, and its officers for several years, were in sympathy with the Puritan party. The Earl of Southampton, for four years treasurer of the company, whose name is borne to-day by a Virginia county, was of Puritan inclination. Sir Edwin Sandys, also treasurer at one time and controlling spirit of the company during most of its existence, was of the same party. He was the son of Dr. Sandys, Archbishop of York, who was a refugee on the Continent during the reign of "Bloody Mary," and returning to England, became prominent in the Church of England at a time when Puritans were influential in it. That he never lost his Puritan convictions is evident from his own words while Bishop of Worcester: "Disputes are now on foot concerning the Popish vestments, whether they should be used or not ; but God will put an end to these things." (*Stowell's History of the Puritans*, p. 116.) His son, Sir Edwin, was a pious man, opposed the High-Church and autocratic tendencies of the Stuarts, and during his administration as treasurer, inaugurated representative government in the colony. His brother, George, went to the colony in 1621 as its treasurer. The majority of the Virginia Company were of the same mind as Sandys, and from 1620 until the revoking of their charter they were in open con-



flict with the king. Drysdale, in his *Presbyterians in England*, says: "On account of these tendencies in the Virginia Company its charter was revoked by King James in 1624." It could not but be expected that a company with such decided Puritan tendencies, would favor their own faith in their colony. And we shall see that they did.

3. The reigns of James and of Charles, until the meeting of the Long Parliament, were perilous days for non-conformists. The true Protestants of England were sorely disappointed by Elizabeth's attitude toward them. Instead of the spirituality and liberality of Edward VI., she soon developed Romish ideas and tyrannical opposition to freedom of faith. James, notwithstanding his early years in Scotland, brought them no relief. Quickly abandoning his Presbyterian professions and espousing high-churchism, he threw open the doors to Rome. Taking the prelatical yoke upon himself, he gave order that the whole kingdom should bear it with him. In a conference held at Hampton Court in 1604, which has been characteristically described by Carlyle, the Puritans, or Presbyterians presented to the King the Milienary Petition, so-called because signed by a thousand ministers. It contained four demands: a correct translation of the Bible: the use of a seventh part of "lay tithes" for the support of ministers in dark regions, which had none; the organization of Presbyteries by districts; and that "pious preachers might not be cast out of their parishes on account of genuflections, white surplices, and such like, but allowed some Christian liberty in external things." Of the demands of this noble petition only the first was granted, by which the Presbyterians secured for the English-speaking peoples that glorious possession, the Authorized Version of the Bible. The others were denied with this brutal threat: "I shall make them conform themselves, or I shall harry them out of this land." (Stowell's *Puritans*, p. 227-229). This he quickly made good by proclamation enforcing conformity, and on account of the resulting persecution multitudes fled from the kingdom. Stowell, p. 232,

quoting Rayn, goes on to say: "For that reason great numbers of these people resolved to go and settle in Virginia. Accordingly some departed for that country; but the Archbishop (Bancroft) seeing many more ready to take the same voyage, obtained a proclamation, enjoining them not to go without the King's license. The Court was apprehensive this sect would become in the end too numerous and powerful in America." This occurred just at the beginning of the Virginia Colony. The same reasons for the escape of Presbyterians and other dissenters existed for more than thirty years after this, while at the same time James and Charles made conditions at home too much to the liking and comfort of churchmen for them to leave and face the hardships of the new world.

4. The same causes that sent the Puritans to New England after the landing of the Plymouth colony, existed before that time. Whither, then, did the persecuted flee for refuge before 1620? Much that is false has been said about the social and religious differences between Virginia and New England in the early years of their settlement. The terms "Cavalier" and "Puritan" have been generally misunderstood and misapplied. Dr. William Hill, John Fiske and others have conclusively disproved the existence of such sharp distinction. Many Puritans of both Virginia and New England represented families of the highest standing in England; and Presbyterianism, which claimed an exceedingly strong following among English Protestants, was a prominent factor in New England's religious life. The formation of the Virginia and New England companies was effected under similar conditions. The relations between the two colonies were generally cordial, and comparative intimacy was maintained by the coming and going of colonists and by frequent intermarriages. The need of such a refuge as New England offered existed for years before the first settlement there, and we cannot avoid the conclusion that from 1607 to 1620 the "harried" Puritans must have sought greater liberty in Virginia. The periods of

most rapid colonization correspond to the times of severest persecution in the old country. While decrees and orders for conformity were numerous in England, none was issued in Virginia until 1531, and none was enforced until 1642. Surely these facts mean something.

6. The section of England, from which the majority of the early colonists came, is evidence of the presence of many Puritans among them. In the latter half of the sixteenth century, and in the early years of the seventeenth, there was constant coming and going of persecuted Christians between England and the Continent. The hunted Huguenots, and the Netherlanders, suffering under the tyranny of Charles and Philip, fled to England; while the Scotch and English, oppressed by the conformity laws of Mary, Elizabeth and James, sought safety and freedom on the Continent. This passing and sojourning made London and the East and South of England strong dissenting communities. The Southeast especially was near to and in close touch with the Netherlands; and there the French and Dutch found homes and opportunity to live and propagate their faith. There were, during this period, foreign Protestant congregations in London on the Genevan plan. Even the University of Cambridge, located in this section, was in sympathy with the Puritans. Many foreign Protestants taught in its halls; Calvin and his followers were the popular models for Cambridge professors and students, and Cartwright, the great Presbyterian, was long professor of theology there. The Presbyterian majority in Parliament was sent largely from this same section, and the various counties sent up to the Long Parliament petitions for the organization of a Presbytery in each.

It was from this part of England that the great majority of the early Virginia settlers came, as the "Original Lists," of these colonists, published by John Camden Hotten, conclusively show. The local names in Virginia still testify to the origin of her first settlers: Norfolk, Suffolk, Southampton, Isle of Wight, Surry, Essex, New Kent, Sussex,

Middlesex, Portsmouth, all remind us of Eastern and Southern England.

6. We know that many of the prominent persons in old Virginia were staunch Puritans. Their influence in the colony and the positions of responsibility to which they were chosen, indicate a large following among their fellow-colonists. The names and record of some of these worthies will bear repetition. These men, who laid so well the foundations of our country, were not the refuse of the earth, but in many cases were the best that old England had to give.

It has already been shown that the Sandys family was interested in the colony, and that Sir Edwin was with the Puritan party. Two other members of the same family were among the colonists: George, for years an official of the colony and a man of extensive literary attainments, and "Mr. David Sandys," supposed to have been another brother, who was a minister and was enrolled in the muster of Capt. Samuel Matthews, a Puritan leader in Virginia. The company that "Mr. Sandys" kept, as well as his kinship, shows us what his religious convictions were.

Several of the early governors of Virginia were men of well-known Puritan views, and what we know of the associations and characteristics of some others causes a strong presumption that they were of the same mind. All of these were good men and true, serving well their own age, and leaving honored names as a heritage to their country and their posterity. Governor Edward Digges, who sought to introduce silk-culture into Virginia, who also brought the quarrel between Virginia and Maryland to a happy end, was probably a Puritan, having been governor during the supremacy of Cromwell, and having as associates such men as Bennett and Matthews. Sir Francis Wyatt became governor in 1621. He was elected by the company in opposition to Samuel Arzall, a tool of the king. Wyatt's wife was the daughter of Lord Samuel Sandys and the niece of Sir Edwin. He was twice governor, being appointed again in 1639.

Sir Thomas Dale and Sir George Yeardley, who were appointed governors in the early years of the colony, were two of the ablest and best men of early Virginia. Dale was a soldier, having learned his profession in the Netherlands. When he came to Virginia in 1611, he brought with him Alexander Whitaker, the Puritan and missionary. Dale's administration was one of severe discipline, but also of rigid morality, of thorough organization and of great progress for the colony. Whitaker, in a letter to a cousin, wrote thus of him: "Sir Thomas Dale, with whom I am, is a man of great knowledge in divinity and of good conscience. Every Saturday night I exercise in Sir Thomas Dale's house." Yeardley went out to the colony so early as 1609. He was able, industrious and thrifty, and became deputy-governor under Dale. After Dale's departure he was made governor and knighted. During his administration, in 1619, representative government was inaugurated, and laws were enacted against drunkenness and "excessive apparall." He was elected again in 1625, but died soon after. In 1616 Whitaker was the minister of the parish in which he lived. Neill, in his "Virginia Company of London," p. 142, says of Governor Yeardley: "His wife's name was Temperance, and it is supposed his sympathies were with the Puritan party. He died lamented, in November, 1627, and left two sons. Both were on the Puritan side during the civil war."

Capt. Samuel Matthews came to Virginia in 1622. He was well-connected in London, and soon became the wealthiest man, and one of the most influential, in the colony. He received grants of land in different counties, but had his home in Warwick county, which was described by a visitor of those days as the ideal Virgiuia home. He won distinction in the wars against the Indians, and also served in the Colonial Council for many years. He was the third governor to serve under the Commonwealth, being elected in 1656 to succeed Diggs, and continuing in office until his death. Capt. Matthews was one of the indignant and resolute councillors who in 1635 forcibly deposed Governor

Harvey, the tool of King Charles, for the perversion of the wealth and rights of the colony, and sent him to London to give account of his evil deeds. He was not only a staunch Puritan, but evidently an earnest Christian, for in Hatten's List of Virginia Settlers appears the name of "Mr. David Sandys, Minister," on the muster of Capt. Matthews' plantation, and an inmate of his home. Fiske calls him "that brave gentleman and decorous Puritan"; while a writer of 1648 describes him as "worthy Captain Matthews, a most deserving Commonwealth man." He was influential in Virginia, not only during Cromwell's ascendancy, but in all the nearly fifty years of his life there. He was the friend and helper of Richard Bennett and William Claiborne, of whom we shall now hear.

One of the noblest and most useful men in Old Virginia was General Richard Bennett, of Nansemond, the first governor under the Commonwealth. He also was of a wealthy and influential London family. The large plantation of his uncle, Edward Bennett, was in Isle of Wight county. Rev. William Bennett, the first minister of the Puritan settlement, and Robert Bennett were of the same family. His valor and wisdom in the wars with the Indians, who from time to time assailed the settlements south of the James, won for him honor and preferment. He held a prominent place in the colony for half a century, as soldier, statesman, planter and Christian. He was successively burgess, councillor and governor. His ample plantation was in Nansemond county on the river bearing that name. The many Puritans, who came to Virginia, settled principally south of the James River in Isle of Wight, Nansemond and Norfolk counties. Bennett was a leader of these, and in 1641, after Nansemond had been divided into three parishes, he united with others in a petition, which was borne to the New England churches by Philip Bennett, for three dissenting ministers. In 1649 he was driven to Maryland by Governor Berkeley's persecutions in order to enforce conformity to the Church of England. But returning in 1651 with Wil-

liam Claiborne, they having been appointed Parliament's Commissioners to remove Berkeley, he was elected governor. It is unfortunate that we know so little of the life of this good and brave man; for nearly all of the Nansemond records have been destroyed.

In the oldest parish-book of Lower Nansemond Parish, now existing, there is an extract from his will, copied in 1749, by which he bequeathed three hundred acres to the parish, the rental of which should be used for the care of the poor. The name of this brave and useful elder deserves an honored place in the annals of the Presbyterian Church, as also in the esteem of his countrymen. Bennett's piety and fidelity are still bearing fruit in the active Presbyterianism of Eastern Virginia, which he, more than any man of his time, helped to pass through the dark days of persecution. In 1675, full of honor and years, he fell asleep. Nine years later Francis Makemie, not the founder but the organizer of the Presbyterian Church in America, was preaching to the faithful Presbyterians of Virginia, the "Old Guard," which had survived the battles and hardships of more than half a century.

William Claiborne, another Puritan, came over about 1621 as Surveyor of the Colony. We hear of him in 1630 as Secretary, at which time he was sent to England to represent the colony in matters of importance. The tyrannical Harvey thrust him out of his office in 1635, but he was at once restored, when the colony passed under the authority of Parliament. Claiborne's chief distinction was the persistent energy with which he maintained the claims of Virginia to the northern part of the Chesapeake Bay and its shores, which he believed, and with much reason, the Stuart Kings had dishonestly signed away to the Baltimores. Claiborne established lucrative fur stations in that region and planted a settlement on Kent Island. Naturally collisions resulted between his men and the followers of Lord Baltimore, in one of which he was defeated, captured, and imprisoned for a time. Because of this, Bishop Hawkes was pleased to write

of him as a renegade convict, which is an insult without justification, an unwarranted calumny on one whose known record is his best defence. Failing to win Maryland for Virginia, he was nevertheless liberally indemnified for his own losses by large tracts of land in Virginia, and died in 1676 at the good age of eighty-nine. To the last he was a non-conformist, being kindly disposed toward the Quakers in his old age.

Time and space permit a sketch of just one more interesting character from the goodly list of original Virginia Presbyterians. The name of Daniel Gookin, Junior, is associated with both Virginia and New England. The elder Gookin was a native of Kent, but moved to the neighborhood of Cork, Ireland, whence he came in 1621, with eighty colonists and a thorough equipment, to Virginia and settled in the vicinity of Newport News. He was a man of large estate, and shortly after the Indian massacre of 1622 returned to the old country, and so far as we know never made Virginia his home. His large interests there were left in the care of his son, Daniel. About 1640 Captain John Gookin, probably another son, married the widow of Adam Thoroughgood, one of the most influential men of Lower Norfolk County. The younger Daniel received in 1637 a grant of twenty-five hundred acres on Nausemand River, to which he soon removed ; and in 1642 he was president of the court of Upper Norfolk County. The Gookins' could not have been Catholics, as they would not have been permitted to settle in Virginia ; nor were they Scotch-Irish, as Dr. William Hill, p. 65, has supposed ; but English Presbyterians, who took advantage of the "Ulster Plantation" to settle in Ireland. This is evident from their origin, the time of emigration to Ireland, and their subsequent history. When William Tompson, the New England minister, labored so earnestly in Virginia in 1642 Daniel Gookin, Junior, was one of the many converts, and returned with the minister to New England, when Governor Berkeley banished him. He rose to such prominence in his new home, that Cotton Mather wrote of him in his memoir of Tompson :



“A constellation of great converts there  
Shone round him, and his heavenly glory wear,  
Gookin was one of them, by Tompson’s pains,  
Christ and New England a dear Gookin gains.”

In all probability the many colonists and laborers, who came with the Gookins’, were of the same faith. They were known as the Irish Colony, and were so serviceable that the Virginia officials wrote high praise of them, and wished for the coming of more.

These are not all of the Puritan worthies of Old Virginia, but time would fail to tell of them all. It is by no means claimed that Virginia was altogether a Puritan colony ; but it is maintained that the Puritan element was a larger and more influential body than historians have admitted or the general public has supposed ; and that their beneficial influence has continued to this day.

7. Another proof of this is found in the early Virginia ministers, some of whom were unmistakeably Puritan. It is to be regretted that so little is known of them, often nothing more than the name. Mention has been made already of David Sandys, minister of the Mathews plantation ; and of William Bennett, first minister of the Puritan community south of the James River, who came over in 1621, but died two years later. He was a near relative of Edward and Richard Bennett. His successor in the Isle of Wight congregation was Henry Jacob, who took refuge in Holland in 1593. Returning to England in 1616 he became pastor of the first Congregational church in London ; but eight years later came to Virginia as the successor of Bennett, remaining there until his death. Neill in the *Virginia Company*, p. 194, ventures this opinion of the Isle of Wight settlement : “The first settlers were Puritans, and they may have built the Smithfield church still standing.” This seems quite probable, when we remember that Jacob was in charge in 1624, remaining until his death, while that church was erected in 1632.

Rev. Haut Wyatt, brother of Governor Wyatt, came to Virginia, but returned to England in a few years. There

“opposing the retrograde tendencies of Archbishop Laud, he was arraigned before the High Commission” (*Virginia Company*, p. 222). This position and his family connection suggest that he too was a Puritan. In the same year, 1621, Thomas White was sent out by the Company, as a “worthy minister of good sufficiency for learning and recommended for integrity and uprightness of life.” The Governor and Council were so well pleased with him, that they sent thanks to the Company, and requested more of such learned and sincere ministers. But Harvey, who became Governor in 1630, and was evidently in sympathy with the civil and religious attitude of the Stuarts, censured Mr. White because he could show no orders. Whereupon he went to the Maryland colony, in which there were so many of his own faith (*Neill's Virginia Company*, p. 248). Two other ministers “without orders” are mentioned in the same work: Samuel Macock and William Wickham, both friends of the Puritan Governor, Yearley, and members of his council. Wickham took up the work of Whitaker at Henrico. About the middle of the century there were two non-conformist ministers on the Eastern Shore. Daniel Richardson, who was set aside when Berkeley fled to Accomac during Bacon's rebellion, and Francis Doughty, who had been in charge of a parish in Essex county, and in both places was complained of as a non-conformist.

In addition to these there were several ministers, whose history is better known, and whose Puritan convictions are beyond question. The first of these was the noble Alexander Whitaker, “Apostle of Virginia,” who gave up much when he left England with the purpose, not only of preaching to the colonists, but also of evangelizing the Indians. Fiske speaks of him as “a staunch Puritan, son of an eminent Puritan divine, who was Master of St. John's College, Cambridge.” He was minister at Henrico, and was the friend, as we have already seen, of Dale and Yearley. Pocahontas was instructed, baptized and married by him. He was drowned in the James River in 1617, but a short

time before his death wrote a letter to London lamenting that so few Puritan ministers had come to Virginia, where neither the surplice nor subscription, against which they were so hot in England, were even spoken of. "When in 1617 the good Whitaker was drowned, he was succeeded by George Keith, who was also a Puritan." (Fiske, *Old Virginia*, Vol. I, p. 302). Keith did come at this time, but did not settle at Henrico. Hatten's Original Lists place him at Elizabeth City.

Patrick Copeland, a missionary in the East Indies, became interested in the Virginia colony; and as early as 1621, while returning from the East, he began a movement which led to the founding of America's second college. On this homeward journey he collected "for the good of Virginia" seventy pounds, which the Company in London devoted to the founding of a free college in the colony. Copeland then preached a sermon for the Company in the interests of this institution, and much more money was subscribed. Henrico was chosen as the site, and Copeland was made Rector, with every prospect for successful establishment. But the Indian massacre of 1622 and the revoking of the Company's charter caused indefinite postponement. In 1625 Copeland went to the Bermudas as a minister, and with authority to establish a free school there, in which Indian boys from Virginia should be educated. He soon took his place in the ranks of the non-conformists, and endeavored to bring about union of the dissenters in Virginia and Bermuda. It is well worth remembering that the agitation begun by this Puritan minister finally resulted in the establishing of William and Mary College.

In 1641 the Assembly divided Upper Norfolk county, which included the present Nansemond and a part of the present Norfolk county, into three parishes; and shortly after Richard Bennett and about seventy other prominent men of these parishes signed a petition and sent it to Boston by Philip Bennett, asking for three ministers to take charge of these parishes. This proves beyond doubt that

the Norfolk section was overwhelmingly Puritan, and that the colonial assembly winked at it. This petition met with a hearty response, for William Tompson, John Knowles and Thomas James sailed at once for Virginia. In the meantime Sir William Berkeley had become governor. He was determined upon conformity; and the labors of the New England ministers speedily brought down his wrath upon them and led to stringent legislation against non-conformists. Knowles and James returned at once to Boston; but Tompson remained several months longer, by able and heroic service gathering into the church more than a hundred souls. He also was forced to leave at length, and some of the new converts returned with him to New England, notably, Daniel Gookin, Junior, whose acquaintance we have already formed.

But the good work was not left to die. God raised up an able and courageous successor to Tompson in the person of Thomas Harrison. It is supposed that he was the son of Benjamin Harrison, of Nansemond, who was clerk of the Council for many years. A copy of a call from Lower Norfolk parish for the services of Thomas Harrison in 1640 is recorded in the old Order Book of the Lower Norfolk County court. In 1642 he became Berkeley's chaplain, and acquiesced in the banishment of the New England ministers. But the Indian massacre of 1644 seemed to him the Divine retribution for the Governor's cruelty. He not only repented, but also rebuked Berkeley, for which of course he was dismissed; and then became the minister of the Nansemond Puritans. After a faithful service among them he was driven out of the colony by Berkeley, sojourned for a time in New England, and finally went to England, where he attained distinction as a Puritan minister.

From the beginning of the century until the coming of Makemie we hear little of Puritan ministers in Virginia. But surely under the protectorate of Cromwell these non-conformists of Nansemond and Norfolk must have had their own ministers in all honor and peace. Indeed there is a

record in the old book of Lower Norfolk County, preserved in the Clerk's office in Portsmouth, that the non-conformists of that county called a minister in 1656. But of this again—

8. Our last proof, and it is one of the surest, of the existence of strong Puritan sentiment in the Virginia colony is found in the religious laws and customs of the time. In 1618 King James issued the famous "Book of Sports," in which certain social and athletic games were recommended for Sunday diversion, such as archery, leaping, wrestling, dancing. We do not need to be told that this went against the Puritan grain. It met with such indignant opposition that the King had to forbid interference with these pastimes on the part of ministers and civil officers; and ordered that the strict Sabbatarians should either "conform themselves or leave the country," which many brave and true souls for conscience sake at once proceeded to do. The King's action was immediately followed by a season of rapid growth for Virginia; it was at this time also that the section South of the James River, notably Puritan, began to be settled. The Bennetts, Matthews, Claibornes, Gookins and kindred spirits were emigrants of this period. The enactments of the Virginia Assembly concerning the Sabbath were radically different from the Book of Sports, and clearly reveal Puritan influence. In 1631 it was ordered that no person should take a journey on the Sabbath, "except it be to church, or for other causes of extreme necessitie." It was forbidden to fire a gun on that day, except for defense against the Indians. Swearing was made punishable, strict laws were enacted against gambling and all other dishonest dealings. Simplicity in dress and the avoidance of slander, flirting and many other evils, too common and too little rebuked in these unregenerate days of ours, were exacted by the pious fathers of early Virginia.

One of the chief subjects of controversy in the Church of England during the second half of the sixteenth century and nearly all of the seventeenth, was the wearing of vest-

ments by the ministers. The high churchmen held to them as part of the order and worship of the church ; others regarded them with indifference, while the great Puritan party made opposition to these "relics of Popery," a principle of their religious existence. Hooper, in the days of Edward VI., refused to be consecrated Bishop of Gloucester in the Episcopal vestments, because they savored of Romish superstitions ; the Puritans of later days refused to have to do with them, because they were unscriptural. For some reason, that the historians of olden and modern days have not been pleased to state, the clerical vestments were not worn by the ministers of Virginia. There is abundant and undisputed evidence of this. What other reason can there be than that the early Virginia settlers and their ministers belonged in large measure to the Puritan or Presbyterian party in the Church of England ? Here we see one of their great principles put into practice. Alexander Whitaker, in a letter in 1614, states that vestments were not worn there in his day. Surplices began to be used in Virginia about 1724. (See Fiske, Vol. I., p. 302, note.)

It must be acknowledged that the state of religion in Virginia in early colonial days was not all that might be desired. Separation from home and religious associations tended to indifference, if not irreligion, then as now. Rigid laws were enacted, therefore, to enforce church-going, and also to keep the ministers in moral bounds. The worst specimens were sent out from England, and too often were cock-fighters, horse-racers, gamblers, drunkards and brawlers. Meade tells of one athletic specimen, who had a free fight with his vestrymen, floored them all, and justified himself the following Sabbath to the congregation by a sermon from the text, "and I contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair."

With such conditions existing we are not surprised that hundreds of dissenters in the Nansemond and Norfolk district were ready to leave their comfortable homes and

goodly acres rather than conform to such a church, and that the godly seed, which remained, was willing to endure persecution until the Revolution in order to keep alive a better faith and a purer life. It is probable that the Puritan fathers of Virginia preserved their principles by home worship and instruction, where they were too few to form a congregation, and that some, as Samuel Mathews, had ministers in their homes.

We are now prepared to accept the conclusions to which the preceding facts of history necessarily lead. The first concerns the character of the Episcopal church in Virginia. This body is famous for its low-church proclivities and its evangelical and conservative position. In no other part of our country does this church show such uniform spirit of sympathy toward other denominations, and so little of that senseless and unchristian intolerance, which in other sections is the chief reproach and weakness of a noble Church. In one of the oldest counties of Tidewater Virginia, where the old spirit still lives and the old manners are still cherished, there is a very feeble Presbyterian church. The Episcopalians have rallied liberally to the pastor's support, have taken part in a union Sabbath school and in evangelistic meetings, and have even united with their Presbyterian brethren in the Communion service. The writer shall always remember with sincere pleasure the hearty Christian welcome given him by the intelligent and evangelical Episcopalians of that county, while he was assisting the pastor of our little church in special services. This commendable liberality is not an accidental virtue, nor an inexplicable freak; it is to be understood only as a heritage from the days of old, the abiding influence of the Presbyterian fathers of Old Virginia. We could wish that such a worthy example might be emulated by their church at large and the good day at last come, when even Episcopalians shall be given grace to recognize that a Christian is a Christian for a' that.

Another necessary result of early religious life in Vir-

ginia, as influenced by the Puritans, has been the fitness and possibility of Presbyterianism for Eastern Virginia. Dr. Charles Hodge has said: "The Presbyterian Church in the Atlantic portion of Virginia was, in great measure, built up by those who had been previously Episcopalians" (*Presbyterian Church in the U. S.*, p. 46). At the present time no denomination is enjoying more substantial growth in this old section than the Presbyterian. Within the past fifteen years the number of ministers, pastorates and communicants has been doubled in the territory now included in Norfolk Presbytery. And this is just as it should be. No other church has a clearer title to the field; no other is better suited to the people; and if past history and present promise are trustworthy indications, our churches have only to go forward courageously and earnestly, and they will possess the land.

A fitting close to this paper, and a suggestive summary of its contents, will be a brief review of the long and honorable history of the Norfolk Presbyterian Church, which evidently deserves the honor of being known as the oldest Presbyterian organization in America, still maintaining its existence.

1608. It has been shown already that as early as 1611, or even 1608, according to Starnell's testimony, many Puritans emigrated to America under the conformity acts of James; and as New England was not settled until 1620, these early settlers came to Virginia and were distributed through the colony, exerting good influence on it, we may be sure. Among this goodly company were Alexander Whitaker and George Yeardley. In the expedition of Sir Thomas Gates and Sir George Somers, which left England in 1609, but was detained by shipwreck in the Bermudas for some time, were some Puritans, "one of whom, Stephen Hopkins, assisted Chaplain Buck in conducting the services" (Neill, *Virginia Company*, p. 34).

1618. A much larger number of Puritans came at a later period, from 1618 to 1622, during the Sabbath controversy



in England, to which reference has been made. In 1618 one hundred and fifty Presbyterians, under the leadership of Elder Francis Blackwell, sailed for Virginia. All except twenty died during the voyage, but the coming of this small party shows the Puritan drift toward Virginia. About the same time Capt. Edward Brewster, son of the famous William Brewster, the Plymouth Pilgrim, came to Virginia. The Bennetts, the Gookins, the Wyatts, Mathews and others were emigrants of this period. To some extent they were scattered throughout the colony, but seem to have settled principally south of the James River in Isle of Wight, Nansemond and Norfolk Counties; and it is in this particular section that they gave their steadfast testimony to truth: it is here they left an honored memory and an abiding Church.

1621. The first minister to these Puritans was William Bennett, of whose work we have already written. It is by no means a contradiction of our claim that Bennett's name is found in the Bishop of London's list of Virginia ministers; for at that time the Puritans had not separated from the Church of England, but were the Presbyterian party in it. And what is still more decisive, the names of well-known non-conformists are found in the same list, for example that of Jacob, Bennett's successor.

1622. William Bennett's life in Virginia was brief. Dying about 1623, he was succeeded at once by Henry Jacob, who continued in service until the time of his death, which is unknown to us. It is to be regretted that we know nothing more of the life of this brave and zealous man.

1632. A prominent figure of those days was Capt. Nathaniel Basse, who came over in 1622, was one of the founders of the Isle of Wight plantation, and for many years was one of the governor's councillors. Little is known of his religious sympathies; but a recorded item of 1632 leaves the impression that he also was of the Puritan persuasion. At that time he was authorized by the colonial council to invite New Englanders, who "disliked coldness of climate

and barrenness of soil" to emigrate to the shores of Delaware Bay (Neill's *Virginia Carolorum*, p. 91). The question at once rises: was not Capt. Basse appointed to this duty because of religious affiliation with the New England dissenters? About the same time, through Archbishop Laud's influence, the Virginia Assembly passed an order for religious conformity; but there is no record nor indication that it was enforced. Indeed the evidence is to the contrary; for ten years later Governor Berkeley found much lack of conformity, and at once re-enacted the former law.

1637. The younger Daniel Gookin crossed over from Newport News to Nansemond in this year, having received a grant of twenty-five hundred acres on the Nansemond River. He was soon president of the court of Upper Norfolk County, and prominent in all the affairs of the section, especially the religious, having been one of those who called the New England ministers in 1641. About this time John Gookin, probably his brother, married the widow of Adam Thoroughgood, who was a large landowner in Lower Norfolk County and had been the president of its court in 1637; and thus another prominent family in that section is shown to be closely allied with the Puritans.

1641. Since the days of Bennett and Jacob the Virginia Puritans had been growing in numbers and influence, until in this year they were strong enough to have the colonial legislature divide the Nansemond District into three parishes, for each of which they at once called a minister from New England. When Tompson, Knowles and James came, they found fields white to harvest; the heart of Virginia was open to their gospel, and the progress of their work could only be checked by bitter persecution. Berkeley had come to the colony as its governor in the meantime. He at once reissued the decree for conformity, and banished the three ministers and some of their followers from the colony.

1644. But the wrath of man was made to praise God. Thomas Harrison, the governor's chaplain, formerly min-

ister of Lower Norfolk Parish, who had given reluctant consent to the harsh measures against the New England ministers, was greatly moved by the Indian massacre of 1644, believing that it was a divine retribution, and himself became the minister of the Nansemond non-conformists. The church grew steadily under his care, but again in 1648 the heavy hand of Berkeley fell upon them, and Harrison, Bennett, Durand and others were forced to leave Virginia. Harrison first went to Boston, where he said that a thousand dissenters were in Virginia, and that many of the Council of the Colony were in sympathy with them.

1651. Berkeley's downfall was at hand. In 1651 he was forced by Cromwell to surrender his post as governor; and Gen. Richard Bennett, sent as one of the commissioners to receive the surrender, was then elected governor by the Council. Doubtless many of the exiles returned with Bennett to their Virginia homes and fields, and the people of the Nansemond parishes rejoiced again to worship God according to the dictates of conscience. Beyond controversy, peace and praise were the happy lot of the Virginia Puritans during the Commonwealth; but after the preaching of Harrison until near the close of the century references to them are so rare, that we only have enough evidence to prove that they lived on and kept the faith.

1656. Among the old records of Norfolk County, which are in Portsmouth, the following interesting document has been found:

“Copie of a letter sent Mr. Moore, a minister of New England.

MR. MOORE:—Sir, after salute please take notice that we are informed by Capt. Fran: Emperor that at his being at the Mannadus hee treated with you concerning your coming over hither amongst us, and that you were unwilling to come at such uncertainties or without the knowledge or good likings of those you were to come amongst; and further that you weare pleased to promise him not otherwise to dispose of yourselfe till you heard from him.

Therefore wee underwritten in behalf of the whole, gladly embracing such an opportunity, do engage ourselves that upon your arrivall here for the maintenance of yourself and family to allow unto you the yearly quantity of tobacco and corn, and also to provide for your present entertainment upon arrivall and convenient habitation and continuance amongst us, to the content of yourselfe and credit of us, upon whom at our invitation you have throwne yourselfe, and for the transportation of yourselfe and family wee have taken full and sufficient course with Capt. Rich: Whiting, and to these promises we underwrittsn have subscribed."

We do not know whether "Mr. Moore" threw himself upon the underwritten without the knowledge or good liking of them; but this unique letter does prove that the Norfolk Puritans of 1656 had freedom to call a minister of their own faith and the means to support him.

1675. Governor Richard Bennett died in 1675. The fragment of his will, which we have, says that he remained a Christian to the end of his life. We may also court it as certain that he watched over and nourished the church, in whose behalf he had suffered persecution and exile. A good evidence that he helped to maintain the faith is the fact that within nine years after his death Mekemie was preaching to the congregation in Norfolk county.

1678. While Makemie was ministering to the people on the Elizabeth River in 1684 he wrote a letter to Increase Mather, in which he states that the people of Lynnhaven parish had a dissenting minister from Ireland, who died the preceding August. There has been much speculation about this dissenting minister, Makemie's predecessor. The old records of Norfolk county offer the solution of the mystery. On August 14, 1678 a marriage contract was fully, firmly and freely concluded between the parties following, viz: James Porter, minister of Linhaven, on the one partie and Mrs. Mary Ivy, Lawfull daughter of Capt. Thos. Ivy on the other part." This Mary Ivy was the sister of Thomas Ivy, Jr., whose house on the eastern bank of the Elizabeth River

was one of Rev. Josias Mackie's licensed preaching points. Mr. Porter's will,\* a very lengthy document disposing of very little, was made June 8th, 1683, and admitted to record Dec. 16th of the same year. He must have died between the two dates, which exactly agrees with Makemie's account.

1684. Francis Makemie, as he was going toward Charleston, in 1685, visited the people of Lynnhaven parish; and being driven back by contrary winds from his southward journey, he accepted the invitation of Col. Anthony Lawson and other inhabitants of the Lynnhaven section, and spent the whole or yart of a year with them. He must have kept in close touch with that congregation, for his will in 1708 makes mention of his "lot and house at the town in Princess Anne county on the Eastern Branch of the Elizabeth River." It deserves to be noticed that Makemie does not say that he preached to a congregation of dissenters, but to the inhabitants of the parish of Lynnhaven. Nor does he say that his predecessor, James Porter, was the minister of a dissenting church, but the dissenting minister of the parish. "Mr. Moore" was probably called by the same parish in 1656. Evidently the preaching of Harrison and Tompson was bearing fruit in a community either thoroughly Presbyterian or thoroughly happy under Presbyterian preaching.

1692 The next minister to the congregation on the

---

\* The will of Rev. James Porter begins thus: "The only soveraigne wise God, who hath only power of life and death, by the voice of his rod calls me to fix my thoughts and desires upon the time of my dissolution, for which cause as one of the nigh forlorn and undone souns of Adam, I betake myself to the satisfaction and blessed merits of his deare and only Sonne Christ Jesus, Renouncing all Selfe Righteousness, I alonely Relye on his for salvation, and that my sins are out of measure sinfull and for multitude innumerable, yett hath hee spoken peace to my soul, and given me assurance of Remission and the Lively hope of a blessed and joyful resurrection at the last day. Being at this time sound of judgement and memory and not desirous that the settling of my poor affayres or simple Estate may be troublesome to any when I am gone, I have taken the paynes to dispose particularly thereof myself."

Elizabeth River was Josias Mackie of County Dougal, Ireland. In all probability he was induced to come to Virginia by Makemie. There is a record in the books of the County Court of Lower Norfolk that in 1692 Mr. Mackie took the oath required by every minister, renouncing the Roman Catholic Church, declaring allegiance to the King, and accepting the "Articles of Religion" with the exceptions allowed to dissenters. He had four preaching points, which were registered by the County Court: the house of Thomas Ivy on the Eastern Branch of the Elizabeth River; a house belonging to John Phillipot, in Tanner's Creek precinct; another belonging to John Roberts on the Western Branch; and Mr. John Dickson's house on the Southern Branch. All of these are near the present site of the city of Norfolk. Mr. Mackie died in 1716, after a quarter-century of service.

1801. We do not know who were the ministers of this congregation during the remainder of the eighteenth century; but near its close the Rev. Benjamin Porter Grigsby, while on a missionary tour through Eastern Virginia, became acquainted with the descendants of the early Puritans, still worshipping God as an organized congregation. They made him a call in 1801, and accepting it, he entered at once on his labors in Norfolk. In 1804 a substantial brick church was erected, which is still standing, but was superseded in 1836 by the present and more commodious church building. This noble old church, whose beginnings we have traced far back into early colonial days, is surrounded to-day by eight daughters and grand-daughters, but she herself remains unsurpassed by any of them in strength and zeal.

EDWARD MACK.

First Presbyterian Church, Norfolk, Va.

## V. HAS THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH ANY DISTINCTIVE PRINCIPLES?

This question has come into prominence through the debate in the General Assembly over the consolidation of Danville and Louisville Theological Seminaries. The majority report of the Assembly's Committee upon Theological Seminaries recommended that the Assembly should not give its assent to this consolidation, mainly for the following reason: "The Agreement for Consolidation expressly excludes the teaching of the distinctive principles of our church."

The distinguished elder who presented the minority report, and who was the first speaker in favor of the consolidation, joined issue with the majority report right here, and stoutly maintained that our church has no distinctive principles which differentiate us from the Northern Presbyterian Church. The difference between the two churches is one of expediency merely, and not of principle. And his argument in support of this position was a very adroit one. Inasmuch as a church's principles are contained in its constitution, its doctrine and governmental standards; and inasmuch as the doctrinal standards of the Northern and Southern Churches are the same, and their other standards nearly the same, therefore in the nature of the case there can be no differences between the two Churches founded on authoritative constitutional principles.

This argument of Col. Bullitt has made at least one convert, for we find it echoed in the columns of the *Southern Presbyterian* for May 30th, p. 5:

We used to think that the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of our Church constituted its distinctive principles. It seems, however, that marginal notes have been added without being printed, and we have men who talk of distinctive principles as if those principles were of con-

stitutional authority. For ourselves we distinctly repudiate any and all such traditional views when they are advanced in this manner. Our church, as a church, has no business with "distinctive principles" which are not part of our constitution. Privately we may entertain prejudices, and profess views extra confessional, but to saddle them upon the church as distinctive of the church without consent of that church is going it a little too strong for us. We must legislate on the basis of the standards and regardless of traditions, prejudices and distinctive principles. Any other basis is unconstitutional and wrong.

All of which reminds us of a little incident in the life of Artemus Ward. Artemus was one day accosted by an inquisitive stranger, who was bent on taking his measure from a moral point of view. "He axed me," says Artemus, "'what was my prinserpuls?' I said I haint got any, nary prinserpul; I'm in the show bizness."

The Southern Presbyterian Church, it seems, has been in "the show bizness" these forty-one years past, and so far from having any principles which warrant our separate and independent existence, we "haint got any, nary prinserpul."

We propose to show in this article, that the separate existence of our church is not a mere question of expediency, nor is it due to private prejudices, nor is it a geographical accident; but that it is founded upon and justified by fundamental principles. And we will take up the gage of battle, which these brethren have thrown down, and appeal directly to our Standards as the supreme arbitrator in this discussion.

Of course, if we were discussing all that divides us from the Northern Church, we would have to give this article a much wider sweep. We would have to treat of at length, what Dr. Beattie\* in his argument for the Kentucky consolidation termed the distinctive features of our church,

---

\* In justice to Dr. Beattie, it should be said that his plea for the Kentucky consolidation was on a different line from Col. Bullitt's; and that we have his assurance that in the new Kentucky Seminary the distinctive principles of the Southern Presbyterian Church will be fully recognized.



matters of administration and practical policy, rather than of constitutional principle.

For example, we differ from our brethren North as to the best policy to be pursued towards our brethren in black. We agree with them fully so far as the principle is concerned, that our colored members have an inalienable right to all the principles of the Church of Christ, irrespective of their race and colour. But we differ on the question of policy, our church insisting that it is for the best interests of both races that the negro be set apart in a church to himself.

In the matter of woman's sphere in the church, there is no difference in principle. We have never heard that anybody in the Northern Church denies the canonicity of the second chapter of First Timothy. And yet, throughout that church, by reason of their Christian Endeavor Societies, they are rearing up a generation which knows no distinction of sex in the conduct of divine worship.

Still further, there stands between the two churches, the grim specter of the Walnut Street Decision, which puts every theological seminary, every denominational school or college, every church building, every dollar of invested church funds, at the mercy of whatever ecclesiastical party may obtain a majority of votes in the General Assembly.

These practical matters have no right to be called distinctive principles, yet they are none the less potent in keeping the two churches apart, and have, in fact, more influence on the popular mind than deeper issues in which the constitution of the church is concerned. Beyond this brief allusion, however, they have no further place in the discussion before us, which will be kept within limits that are strictly constitutional; only asking our readers to admit in evidence, not only the standards of the two churches, but also some of the well-known facts of recent church history.

Admitting the proposition that the distinctive principles of a church are to be found in its constitution alone, how can there be differences in principle between the Northern

and Southern Presbyterian churches, when "the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of said churches are the same, and their other standards are nearly the same?"

This question, which is found on the third page of the Agreement for consolidation of the Danville and Louisville Theological Seminaries, figured extensively in the discussions before the assembly, and we ask the reader to keep his finger on it, for we want no better basis upon which to found our statement of the distinctive principles of our Church.

With regard to the doctrinal standards, the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms which are those of the Westminster Assembly and are still common to both the Northern and Southern Presbyterian churches, we think the reader will fully agree to the following proposition. In case there is any part of these common standards which has been strictly adhered to by one of these churches, but departed from by the other, that part of the standards becomes a distinctive principle of the church adhering to it, and is a just ground of separation from the church which has departed from it. No one can deny this proposition in the abstract, however they might dispute its application to the case before us. But once admit this proposition, and it will be seen how two churches can have the same constitution and yet different principles. The church holding to the constitution is certainly actuated by different principles from the one violating the constitution. And the question before us becomes a simple question of fact: has our church remained true to our standards, while the Northern church, in some important particulars, has departed from them? Now it is a notorious fact that it was just such a violation of the express provisions of the constitution which gave the occasion for the organization of the Southern Presbyterian Church. In May, 1861, the Assembly of the then undivided Church, met in Philadelphia, and under the influence of the war excitement, passed a paper, known from its author, as the Gardiner Spring Reso-

lutions. Resolution 2 reads :

*Resolved*, That this General Assembly, in the spirit of Christian patriotism which the Scriptures enjoin, and which has always characterized this church, do hereby acknowledge and declare our obligations to promote and perpetuate, so far as in us lies, the integrity of these United States, and to strengthen, uphold and encourage the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions under our noble Constitution ; and to this Constitution in all its provisions, requirements and principles, we profess our unabated loyalty.

Let any man who has two eyes look at this and then at

Confession of Faith, Chap. 31, Sec. 4, "Synods and Councils are to handle and conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical, and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth."

It will be seen at once that this section of the Confession, embodying the great scriptural truth of the spirituality of the Church, becomes the distinctive principle upon which our church rests its separate existence.

The violation of this principle by the Northern Church cannot be more forcibly stated than was done at the time by fifty-eight members of that same Assembly, under the leadership of Dr. Chas. Hodge. At the conclusion of an elaborate protest against the Spring Resolutions which Dr. Hodge drew up and all fifty-eight signed, this language is used:

"The General Assembly, in thus deciding a political question, and making that decision practically a condition of membership to the Church, has, in our judgment, violated the constitution of the Church and usurped the prerogative of the Divine Master."

This action of 1861 is paralleled by a similar action in 1866. The Northern Assembly of 1866 required of all its Presbyteries, in receiving a minister who had lived South during the War, to examine him,

"Whether he has in any way . . . been concerned at any time in aiding or countenancing the rebellion and the war which has been waged against the United States, and if it be found that he has been so concerned, that he be required to confess and forsake his sin in this regard before he shall be received.

"Church sessions are also ordered to examine all applicants for church membership by persons from the Southern States; and if it be found that

of their own free will they have taken up arms against the United States, such persons shall not be admitted to the communion of the Church until they give evidence of repentance for their sin and renounce their error."

And if any one should think that all this was done in the fever heat of a great civil convulsion, and was repented of when the passions of that cruel strife had cooled, we answer by giving one more signal instance in line with the above, and long after the war. In 1882, at the Atlanta Assembly, the Southern Church took the initiative towards healing the breach between us and the Northern Church by passing the *mutatis mutandis* resolution as follows :

"That while receding from no principle, we do hereby declare our regret for and withdrawal of all expressions of our Assembly which may be regarded as reflecting upon, or offensive to the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America."

This was telegraphed to the Northern Assembly, then meeting at Springfield, Ill., which adopted the same resolution and telegraphed it back to Atlanta. And then came an unofficial telegram from their moderator to ours, informing us of the further action of their Assembly making this addition to the concurrent resolution: "That in the action now being taken, we disclaim any reference to the action of preceding Assemblies concerning loyalty and rebellion, but we refer only to those concerning schism, heresy and blasphemy." If ever there was a time when their former violation of the constitution of the church might have been repented of and disowned, here certainly was that time. Instead, the one exception which they made to their *amende honorable* is a flagrant repetition of that very violation of constitutional principle which at the first separated their church from ours. And here the matter has stood for nineteen years, with the Confession of Faith, chapter 31, section 4, on our side, and this historical record of the Northern Church on the other.

The only possible answer to this is to say that our church

is as deep in the mud as they are in the mire—in other words, that our war record, as a church, is as inconsistent with the principle of absolute separation between things political and things spiritual as that of the Northern Church. This charge was made on the floor of the last Assembly, and it has been repeated elsewhere by those who ought to have known better.

In refutation of this charge, we might put in evidence the solemn assertion of the spirituality and independence of the church, which runs through that immortal document, the "Address to all the churches of Jesus Christ throughout the earth," drawn by the hand of Thornwell, and adopted by our first Assembly, December, 1861. We might also allude to the reaffirmation of the same principle by the Assemblies of 1866, 1870, 1875, 1876, etc.

But we cover the whole ground by directing attention to the action of our Assembly in 1875 and 1876. See first, Minutes 1875, p. 45, where there is record of the following action :

"Whereas, The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States did, at its first organization in 1861, and also at various times since, formally and distinctly declare its conviction as to the nature and functions of the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, especially as to its non-secular and non-political character ; and,

Whereas, Notwithstanding this, it may be that certain expressions have been inadvertently admitted into some of the papers on our records, which, as it is alleged, are not consistent with the well-considered and formal views aforesaid ; therefore,

Resolved, That this subject be referred to a committee of three, whose duty it shall be to make a careful examination, and make report to the next General Assembly, to the end that no vestige of anything inconsistent with the clearly defined position of our General Assemblies, may be left to impair the testimony of our church upon this vital point."

The committee contemplated in this resolution was duly

appointed, and reported to the Assembly of 1876, and that Assembly took this action upon their report: "Inasmuch as some incidental expressions uttered in times of great public excitement are found upon our records, and have been pointed out in the report of the committee aforesaid, which seem to be ambiguous, or inconsistent with the above declarations and others of like import, this Assembly does hereby disavow them wherever found, and does not recognize such as forming part of the well-considered, authoritative teaching or testimony of our church."

We could wish the time to come when our brethren North shall have cleared their skirts of all departures from constitutional principle by a like ingenuous and sweeping declaration.

We have thus sufficiently exhibited the comparative record of the two churches upon the great principle of the spirituality, the non-secular and non-political character of the Church of Jesus Christ.

We make our appeal to this record of facts, as showing our fidelity to this principle of our common standards, and their departure from it, and as fully justifying our laying claim to this, as a distinctive principle of the Southern Presbyterian Church.

But there is another difference between the two churches, with regard to our common doctrinal standards, which is of a still more fundamental character. This second difference is the allowed latitude of subscription to the Standards themselves, which was characteristic of the New School body from its origin (see Palmer's *Life of Thornwell*, pp. 182-198), and was taken into the bosom of the reunited church North, when the Old and New School Assemblies came together in 1869

The official statement of this union, as given in the Historical Summary prefixed to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., is: "In 1869 the 'two bodies claiming the name and rights of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and which separated in

1837, were reunited 'on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common Standards.' "

The subscription to these common doctrinal standards, which the Constitution of the reunited church imposes upon each of its ministers, elders and deacons at their ordination, is found in the familiar question, "Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith of this church as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures?" This question, it need hardly be said, has been the same in every branch of the Presbyterian Church, Old and New School, North and South, from 1821 to this present time. Upon the basis, then, of "the Standards pure and simple, and with this iron-clad subscription to the system of doctrine embodied in the Confession of Faith, the New School was taken into the bosom of the Old School, and they twain became the present Northern Church. And yet it was a notorious fact, that there were, at the moment of union, tolerated in the New School body, those who held doctrinal views at variance with the system of doctrine taught in the Confession of Faith. The proof of this is from the Minutes of the Old School Assembly, 1768, in a protest (not against this union, but against certain New School propositions relative thereto,) which protest contains the following statements :

After eight specifications of doctrinal error to be found in the New School Church, they continue : "We are far from believing or insinuating that these doctrines are generally approved by the New School Church. We have no doubt that they are repudiated by many in that Church as sincerely as they are by us. But they are allowed by them as consistent with the system of doctrine contained in our Confession. The fact is notorious. It is confessed and avowed. These doctrines have been for years matter of public discussion. They have been taught in some of the Theological Seminaries of our land. Students from those seminaries, professing these errors, are freely admitted into the New School Presbyteries. Men of the highest eminence in the other branch of the Church, teach them publicly from the pulpit and from the press. They are contained, more or less of them, and some of the most serious of them, in books and tracts issued by the Publication Committee of the New School body. They are openly avowed in some of the periodicals

sustained by ministers of that Church, and apologized for by others. These are not matters of speculation belonging to the schools, but concern doctrines taught in the Catechism, and presumed to be known even by the children of the Church." [Minutes (O. S.) 1868, p. 658; Moore's Digest, 81].

The number of signers to this protest was fifty-nine, and the inclusion in this number of such names as Chas. Hodge, A. A. Hodge, E. P. Humphrey, R. J. Breckinridge, John C. Barkus, is a sufficient guarantee of the accuracy of these statements.

It was upon this state of facts that the Southern Assembly based the judgment expressed in its pastoral letter of 1870. While this letter was addressed to our own churches, it was occasioned by an overture from the Northern Assembly, looking to organic union, and referring as a precedent to the union the year before of the Old and New School North. "This reference," said our pastoral letter, "is singularly unfortunate; for, in our judgment, the negotiations through which this union was consummated, betrayed those sacred testimonies of a former generation, for the most precious and vital of the doctrines of grace. Our difficulty is not the mere fusion of these two Assemblies into one. A similar fusion took place six years ago between ourselves and the United Synod of the South. But the difference between the two cases is wide as the poles. The Synod of the South united with us upon the first interchange of doctrinal views, upon a square acceptance of the standards, without any metaphysical hair-splitting to find a sense in which to receive them, and without any expunging of whole chapters from the history of the past, with the sacred testimonies with which these are filled. It is not, therefore, the amalgamation of these bodies at the North, simply considered, which embarrasses us; but it is the method by which it was achieved, the acceptance of the standards in no comprehensible sense, by which the United Assembly becomes a sort of broad church, giving shelter to every creed lying between the extremes of Arminianism and



Pelagianism on the one hand and of Antinomianism and Fatalism on the other.”

The language of this pastoral letter may be harsh; it was keenly resented by our Northern brethren at the time; (see Dr. VanDyke's pamphlet July, 1870), and it is stronger language than we would use. But it brings out distinctly the fact on which we are insisting, that there is a latitude of subscription to the Confession of Faith tolerated in the Northern Church which we have never allowed.

The reader will also notice the contrast to which allusion is made in the Pastoral Letter, between the methods in which the union of Old and New School was consummated in the North, and the similar union which took place in the South six years before. The union between the Southern Assembly (Old School) and the United Synod of the South (New School), like the union of the two bodies at the North, was effected upon the basis of the common standards, but not until it had first been ascertained through conference committees that the two churches were in entire accord as to their doctrinal views.

And there was another feature of this union in the South which deserves special attention. And that was the retention of what now appears as Par. 75 of our Book of Church Order, “Ministers seeking admission to Presbytery shall be examined . . . as to their views in Theology and Church Government.” This, as the reader may know, is the famous “examination rule” adopted by the Old School Assembly just after the New School schism, and designed to protect the sounder portion of the Church from the intrusion of heretical views arising in any other portion of the same body. The history of the examination rule in the Northern and Southern Churches is a striking commentary on the point we are discussing. It was in force in the Northern Assembly, Old School, as late as 1866 (see the reference to that Assembly above); it is no longer to be found in the Constitution of the Northern Church.

How this rule was adopted we have no means at hand of

ascertaining. It was in force four years before the new school reunion, it has since disappeared, and we do not think we are far wrong in conjecturing that here is a case of *Post hoc, ergo propter hoc*.

Two or three years ago a minister went from one of our Southern Presbyteries to take charge of a large church in the Northern Assembly. He wrote back to one of our church papers an account of his reception into their Presbytery, and he commented especially upon the fact that he was received upon his certificate from his former Presbytery, without examination, "thus emphasizing the essential unity of the Church." When we read this we felt like saying, "your glorying is not good." No more effectual safeguard to the doctrinal purity of the Church was ever devised, than the examination rule which was thus disregarded, or rather was no longer in force in the Northern Church.

Our contention then is, that our brethren North tolerate a latitude in subscription to the standards which we do not. And our line of argument has been, first, the known "loose construction" principles of the new school body North; second, the union of the old and new school bodies North, upon the basis of the common standards, when it was a known fact that the new school body included some who held doctrinal views inconsistent with the system of doctrine embodied in these standards; third, the emphasis laid upon this line of proof by the abrogation of the Examination Rule, at the time of the New School Union, or subsequent thereto.

The reader will now be ready to ask the question, Do you then charge the Northern Church with being an unsound body? Not at all, we not only do not make such a charge, but we do not believe it when anybody else makes it. That church has made full proof of its devotion to sound doctrine upon the persons of such heresiarchs as Profs. Swing, H. Preserved Smith, Briggs and McGiffert, to say nothing of others of lesser note. Yet we believe that they might not have had these heretics to get rid of if they had

not broadened their basis of subscription in the manner we have just indicated.

The reader is now asked to turn back to that quotation\* on which he was asked to keep his finger. We have examined sufficiently the first half of it viz: "The Confession of Faith and the Catechisms of the two Churches are the same."

We think we have demonstrated that while this is true, yet through the departure of the one church from some portions of these common Standards, they may and do become the distinctive principles of the other.

2. We turn now to the second part of that quotation, "and their other Standards are nearly the same." The other Standards referred to are, of course, the Form of Government, the "Rules of Discipline and the Directory for Worship." With regard to these we will make a statement of fact, and have the reader to judge how far this part of the Constitution is the same or nearly the same in both Churches.

When the two Churches separated in 1860 the whole Constitution was the same—the Constitution of 1821. In 1879 the Southern Church adypted a new Book of Church Order, including Form of Government and Rules of Discipline.

In 1884 the Northern Church adopted new Rules of Discipline, which follow pretty closely those of the Southern Church; and in 1894 the Southern Church adopted a revised Directory for Worship; thus the Northern Church has still the old Form of Government and Directory for Worship practically unchanged, and the Southern Church has new Govermental standards throughout.

This simple historical statement ought to give any man pause, who is disposed to pronounce this part of the Constitution of the two churches "nearly the same." But let him go further and make a careful comparison between our new Form of Government and the Old Book, which is still

---

\* "The Confession of Faith and Catechisms of said Churches are the ame, and their other Standards are nearly the same."

the standard of church polity for the Northern Church, and he cannot but be impressed with the many important differences between the two churches in the matter of Church Government.

The most superficial comparison of the two books, will cause anyone familiar with the practical working of our New Book to notice the absence from the Old Book, of such requirements as, the opening and closing of the meetings of session with prayer; the review of the deacons' books by the session; the examination rule, which has already been commented upon; and the next paragraph in our Book Par. 76, which requires the written subscription of every minister to his ordination vows, upon his reception into Presbytery.

He will also notice how much larger the New Book is than the Old, the one almost twice the size of the other. And, besides such matters of detail as have just been referred to, he will notice that the enlargement of the New Book is brought about mainly by the fuller statement of important principles, some of which are not recognized at all in the Old Book, or are only obscurely hinted at there.

It is a well-known fact that the old Book of Church Order, while it comes down to us from the Westminster Assembly, does not fairly represent the principles of church polity held by the Westminster divines. Along with the Presbyterianism of the Assembly itself, there are found in the Form of Government, Erastian, Congregational and Prelatical elements, forced on the Assembly by the Parliament of England. Every student of Church History knows how this came about. It is sufficient for our present purposes, to see how the Congregational element in the Old Book is distinctly traceable, in its definition of Church Government, Ch. 8, Sec. 1. The student who has the Old Book before him will observe in this section both the failure to assert the *jus divinum* theory of church government, and the assertion that "government by congregational assemblies is agreeable to the Word of God."

The leaven of Prelacy also may be traced in Chs. 3 and 4, when the terms bishop and pastor are restricted to the minister of the word; in Ch. 5, where the elder is simply a layman, the representative of the people; and in Ch. 13, sec. 4, where the elder or deacon is ordained without the laying on of hands of the session, prayer by the minister constituting the whole of the ordaining rite.

While the Old Book thus exhibits distinct evidence of admixture from sources outside of pure Presbyterianism, our New Book is a far more accurate representation of the real ecclesiology of the Westminster Assembly. It is in fact the Presbyterianism of Rutherford and Gillespie, revived in the last generation by Thornwell and Breckinridge, and embodied in our new Form of Government by such ecclesiastical statesmen as Adger and Peck, and Armstrong and E. T. Baird, and Stuart Robinson, and Girardeau and Palmer.

In our search, then, for the distinctive principles of the Southern Presbyterian Church, we have only to notice those principles of church polity which are clearly stated in our New Book, and either not recognized by, or dimly hinted at in the Old Book. We can only note this in the briefest manner. There is, first, the doctrine of the divine right of Presbytery, which rings out in the very first words of our New Book, "The scriptural form of church government, which is that of Presbytery"—and so throughout—and which cannot be found at all in the Old Book. There is next, that vital distinction as to church power, Par. 16, the clear discrimination between the power of order, which is several, consisting of the duties severally pertaining to the minister of the word and the ruling elder in their respective relations to the church; and the power of jurisdiction, which is joint, and which is exercised conjointly in church courts. The reader will search in vain for any hint of this distinction in the Old Book. Still further, you find in our New Book a clear definition of the vocation, par. 96—the three-fold call—"the calling of God by his spirit . . . the

manifest approbation of God's people, and the concurring judgment of the lawful court of Christ's house." Here, again, is a scriptural principle of which the Old Book contains hardly an intimation.

A like clear and important statement of principle is found in the doctrine of ordination, laid down in par's. 99, 100, 101 of our Book. The vital principle there stated is that ordination is the act of a court made up of Presbyters, formally inducting into office one who, in their judgment, has been duly called of God thereunto.

The explicit language of our Book in the above paragraphs and elsewhere, guards this most important principle from Congregationalism, on the one hand, and Prelacy on the other.

In the Old Book there is no statement of the doctrine of ordination at all, and while scriptural principles are recognized in the provisions for the ordination of a minister, ch. 15, they are, as we have seen, completely set aside in the form for the ordination of ruling elders and deacons, ch. 13.

I might mention other distinctive advantages of the New Book over the Old, such as its clear demarcation of the sphere of jurisdiction of each court in the series from the session to the General Assembly; also, its limitation of the right of voting in the election of church officers and pastor to communicants only.

But I must hasten on to that which is the crowning distinction of our new Form of Government. In no other statement of constitutional principles, will you find a clear recognition of that great doctrine which lies at the head of the Presbyterian system, the doctrine of the parity of the eldership. Our book states this principle in so many words, in Par. 43, where it is said that . . . "ruling elders possess the same authority in the courts of the Church as the ministers of the word." It is given practical recognition in the provisions for ordination, where the elders lay on hands and give the right hand of fellowship, not only in the ordination of elders and deacons by the session, but especially

in the ordination of ministers by the Presbytery. And it is further recognized in making the ruling elder an indispensable constituent of the quorum of Presbytery, Synod and General Assembly. And we have brought this principle into still greater prominence by the amendments to the New Book, in 1888, authorizing "elder moderatorship" of the higher courts of the Church; and in 1899, permitting a ruling elder to deliver the charge to the people in the installation service. The importance of this principle requires no comment, but we could wish that we had space to show, how much of the worthy history of the past is perpetuated in these features of our Form of Government, what struggles toward the incorporation into the Constitution of the Church of a Scriptural Church polity, have therein attained a triumphant issue.

We have thus made a brief comparison between our Form of Government and the Old Book, which is still the constitutional expression of the principles of church polity held by the Northern Church.

It passes our comprehension to see how any man, not wilfully blind or culpably ignorant, can make this comparison and still say that there is little or no difference in constitutional principles between the two churches.

And this brings us back to our starting point. We believe that if ample citation and careful examination of the law and the testimony can prove anything, we have demonstrated that the separate and independent existence of the Southern Presbyterian Church rests upon the bed-rock of fundamental principle. While a variety of causes at the first combined to force us out of the great church of which we once formed an integral part, yet we owe our continued separation from our brethren North, and our own special place in the Church Visible, to these distinctive principles, our loyalty to which is no small part of our duty to Him, "whose we are, and whom we serve."

R. A. LAPSLEY.

Greenville, Va.

## EDITORIAL.

### THE PHILADELPHIA ASSEMBLY.

Dr. Dickey was in the pulpit when we reached Calvary Church and was preaching on the kingdom of God in its relations. The sermon was literally the origin, progress and result of all things. Probably it will read better than it sounded for his delivery is slow and he had the appearance of having memorized, and imperfectly at that, so that he kept us waiting sometimes a long time for the proper word. Dr. Dickey is one of the Psalm-singing brethren who have concluded that the exclusive use of Rouse's version is too narrow a platform for a separate church. But he had to show his raising by quoting *in extenso* from "good old, rough, rugged Rouse."

Dr. Sparhawk Jones, the pastor of Calvary Church, is one of the great preachers of America. Of course he will not preach in his own church during the Assembly, but it would be a great treat to the visiting brethren if he could be persuaded so to do.

The election of a Moderator took up most of the time of the first afternoon session of the Assembly. The calling of the roll was a monotonous proceeding, there being 613 commissioners present. We noted the names of Rev Hugh K. Walker and Rev. Joseph A. Vance on the list and hastened to look them up for the sake of Auld Lang Syne. Rev. W. C. Roberts, D. D., of what was until recently Danville Theological Seminary, is one of the commissioners, just as Drs. Blanton and Beatty and Converse are to look after the Kentucky Consolidation at the Southern Assembly. Mr. John Converse, president of the locomotive works, is one of the officers of the last Assembly and a commissioner to this. He is a fine type of the successful business man.

Dr. Roberts, of Kentucky, said that he represented the great Southwest from Mason's and Dixon's line to the Gulf, that he was deeply in sympathy with the missionaries and had been on the board of Home Missions himself, that there



were two sides to missions, and that Fifth Avenue Church represented the giving side and therefore he nominated Dr. Purves. Dr. James A. Moffat, of Baltimore, seconded the nomination, and Dr. Herrick Johnson made a third approval of this selection. He spoke of Dr. Purves as the child of godly parents, reared in a home which was an outer court of heaven and whose memory was a benediction. He was born in Philadelphia, was a member of the church in which the Assembly was then meeting and it would therefore be a gracious thing for the Assembly to give him the highest honors it could bestow. His only fault, was that he was like Zaccheus in stature, but he did not need to climb a tree to see things.

But a Southerner followed Dr. Johnson and saved the day for Dr. Minton, the Pacific Coast candidate. He made a genuine Southern speech, full of fire and earnestness, he told of the struggle for the very existence of Pacific Coast Presbyterianism and of the very great part Dr. Minton had played in its development. He had made great sacrifices for the Church and refused flattering offers from the East in order to stay in California and teach the students in the seminary there. Dr. Walker made the impression that Dr. Minton was a considerable man and a burst of applause followed his effort that showed the drift of sentiment westward. Then President Moffat made a plea for fairness to the Western minority, reciting that the East had had the last three moderators and had the Assembly this year, besides he wanted a "continental congress of Presbyterianism."

Then Dr. Edgar Hill, of Portland, Oregon, reminded the Assembly that California was really the centre of things, as the central point of the United States was now a thousand miles west of San Francisco.

So there were three speeches for Dr. Purves and three for Dr. Minton. It is striking that each man stands for the same things, namely, the old, orthodox Calvinistic faith, and if the moderator has much to do with shaping the action of

this Assembly the Confession is in the house of its friends. Dr. Purves is one of the editors of the *Religious Outlook* and thus known to many Southern readers, and Dr. Minton has been a valued contributor to the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY and thus known to others of our Southern people. Dr. Minton was elected by a pretty fair majority. It seemed to this writer that the radicals of each section voted for the man from the other, rather risking trouble that they did not know than the danger to their hopes that they did know. There was a scattering Western vote for Dr. Purves and New York Synod cast only three votes more for Dr. Purves than for Dr. Minton. California achieved greatness and New York very nearly had the moderatorship thrust upon it.

The Assembly adjourned after a debate over the adoption of the Peoria plan as the rule of the Assembly. This is, in brief, the formation of the Assembly committees by the Synods as electing districts, meeting in council, there being certain positions on each of these committees that come to each electing district in turn. It is a complicated plan but after a sharp debate the Assembly resolved to try it and see what comes of it. It was said to be a protest against the officiousness of the stated clerk and a few others in dictating the committees and thus shaping legislation.

The second day of the Assembly was given to the Twentieth Century movement. It was the celebration by the Assembly of the opening of the century and it was well planned and finely executed. The session had as presiding officer Mr. John H. Converse, who is a man of deeds rather than words and who has the gift of giving rather than the gift of speech. He introduced to the Assembly as the first speaker Dr. Willis G. Craig, of McCormick Seminary, Chicago. Dr. Craig is a Kentuckian of Virginia ancestry, small in stature and spare of flesh, with a face that shows its intellectuality in every line. He made a scholarly address, a sort of review of the century, or rather a contrast between the open-

ing of the nineteenth and of the twentieth century. It is impossible to do justice to this and the other great speeches of the day in giving a mere abstract of them.

Dr. Henry C. McCook, of Philadelphia, followed in an address on the progress of Presbyterianism during the century. Dr. McCook is one of the fighting McCooks and evidently the part of Presbyterian history on which he loved to dwell was the fighting part.

He mentioned such facts as that in 1805 James Hogue was sent as a missionary to the Ohio territory and the Natchez district and that now we have 100,000 members in Ohio alone.

He spoke of the debt of the Presbyterian Church to New England for the Beechers and Fields, for Dr. Shedd and John H. Converse. He remarked that Princeton was always cosmopolitan. It went to New England for Jonathan Edwards, to Virginia for Davies, to Scotland for McCosh and to the West Indies for Patton.

Of course he mentioned the Mecklenburg Declaration and Morgan's rifle brigade and Marion's men and the King's Mountain heroes. Dr. McCook is a man of discrimination and intelligence.

But the two great speeches of the day were by Dr. Minton and Dr. Purves. Dr. Minton is a handsome man, of medium size, with a blonde mustache, hair getting thin on his forehead after the manner of the Westerner who has had to work hard and think fast, and with a brow that is furrowed more than his years ought to allow. He is clear-headed and warm-hearted and the Assembly made no mistake in selecting as its only candidates for the Moderatorship him and Dr. Purves, as the two greatest men in its membership, certainly among those who have not already had the honor.

Dr. Purves is a small man, but he makes the impression that he is a bundle of compressed energy and activity. He has a bright eye and a clear voice and is altogether a pleasing and attractive speaker. It was a great joy to all con-

servative thinkers that these two addresses should have rung so true on the questions that are to be settled for a while by this Assembly.

Mr. Speer, who is one of the Secretaries of the Foreign Mission Board followed in an admirable address. We liked to hear him change his subject from, Bringing the world to Christ, which he said only God could do, to, Bringing Christ to the world, which is our duty. He has a resonant, far-reaching voice, almost too loud for those sitting near the speaker's stand.

At night Dr. Nicolls, of St. Louis, represented the "Liberal" side in telling what the Church must do to keep up with the Twentieth Century, one of the things being, of course, to modify the old creed.

Routine work was done on Saturday forenoon. The Assembly was shocked at the news of the death of Dr. Maltbie Babcock, of typhoid fever, in Naples, and Dr. Purves led the Assembly in prayer.

On Saturday afternoon a reception was given by the University of Pennsylvania to the Assembly.

The first three days of the second week of the Assembly were devoted to the work of the Church as exemplified in the reports of the various Boards. The speakers talked about "foreign mission board" or the "home mission board" where we would say the "foreign mission cause;" so completely have these boards identified themselves with the causes which they represent. Nevertheless there is some feeling as to the unlimited authority of the boards and now and then one hears that they are a refuge for "preachers out of a job." This is not said openly as disloyalty to a board would be the same thing as disloyalty to a cause, and we have no doubt that the boards are for the most part well manned and well managed. The Assembly elects or re-elects but there is no responsibility to the Assembly or to anything else for administrative acts, which is somewhat foreign to the spirit of a true representative government.

On Monday the Freedman's Board had the right of way,

presenting the first report in the morning, with addresses by Dr. Sanders and a negro who was especially interested in industrial education; and there was a popular meeting at eight at Bethany Church, with an address by the pastor of the negro churches in Atlanta and a stereopticon lecture by a negro minister of Baltimore, a Dr. Weaver, the lecture dwelling especially upon the work of Biddle University. There is no more adroit orator than the negro. Of course any Southern man understands that he is the prince of flatterers and of diplomats.

Dr. Weaver knew how to fire the Northern heart though there was nothing in his speech especially objectionable. As an imitator of others he had abundant authority for his references to the War of the Rebellion. He paid a just tribute to Colonel Myers, the Confederate soldier who gave the land for Biddle University, and one of the pictures was an excellent likeness of the old colonel. Dr. Weaver is a member of the Freedman's Board and he evidently enjoys the brief authority that is his, to its utmost value. The letter which he quoted as having written to a white minister of Goshen, New York, "as the accredited agent of the Assembly's Board" was a delightful piece of impudence which evidently drove the unwilling minister to accept his services as the representative of the cause from the pulpit. As Abraham Lincoln said, For those that like that sort of a thing, that is the sort of thing they like.

Nevertheless, there is nothing that strikes one now, one who has been North before, more than the change of attitude on the negro question. The Northern Church is beginning to ask itself whether it has acted with the highest wisdom in dealing with this problem. The statistics of the results of forty years of work and the spending of an enormous sum of money ought to be of educative value.

There are twenty thousand negro members of Presbyterian Churches under the care of this Assembly. Without having been able to obtain accurate statistics on the subject we are persuaded that there were fully that many in con-

nection with our white churches before the war. These were absorbed bodily by the Northern Church or went over into the Baptist and Methodist Churches, so that the Southern Church had to begin its work for this race almost *de novo*. The policy, therefore, that can show no more members after forty years than there were before the policy was put in operation, has some radically wrong with it. The few have been pauperized by and the many prejudiced against the white man's church. But the educational work is more promising than ever before and we trust that with a better knowledge of the conditions among the negroes themselves the cause of Presbyterianism may steadily advance. We believe it is universally recognized that the Presbyterian negroes with the few Episcopalian members are the best specimens of the race to be found in the South.

There are some twenty-five negro commissioners among six hundred here, so that the number is not larger relatively than in some of our Synods and Presbyteries. A friend from the South called attention to the fact that in the popular meeting in the interests of the negro on Monday night the negroes of Philadelphia did not attend at all. The two sections are really of about the same mind on the subject, extremists on both sides excepted, though it is not generally understood how near the two have come together.

The Home Mission meeting of Tuesday night was an inspiring one. The idea of a national church, with home missionaries working from arctic Alaska to tropical Porto Rico is an inspiring idea. Dr. Dodge, president of the Home Mission Board, presided and introduced the speakers. The only debt resting upon the Board is what remains to be paid on the great office building in New York City, from which an income is received sufficient to pay all the administrative expenses of both the Home and Foreign Boards, so that every cent of every dollar contributed will go directly to the work itself. The first speaker was Dr. Marsh of Point Barrow, Alaska, who described the superstitions of the Esquimaux, who will kill a whale with modern

tonite and then sing the death-song that their fathers sang as an act of worship. An Esquimaux elder from the First Church, Point Barrow, was introduced to the audience as an example of the work done.

Dr. Young of the Presbytery of Yukon was the originator of the first Protestant church of Fort Wrangle, with six ministers. The territory of the Presbytery is as large as the United States east of the Mississippi, and the ministers do not exchange pulpits often, only meeting once a year to elect delegates to the Assembly. He mentioned an "adjacent mission only 700 miles down the river." His description of the amazing growth of the Alaskan cities and of the intellectual character of the people, many of whom are college bred men, was very vivid. He wanted men who can sleep on the snow with the thermometer 50 degrees below zero and who could cook for themselves without committing suicide. Dr. Babcock's church has recently given \$10,500 to this work in a plate collection.

Rev. W. S. Holt, of Oregon, told of the work in Oregon. He had been a missionary to China who was prevented from staying in the foreign field and at once devoted himself to the home mission. He made a telling speech, sparkling with witty allusions. The first church organized in Oregon, he said, contained two men and two women and the men and women had not been equally matched since in any of their congregations.

James Hayes, a nez Perces Indian, received a hearty round of applause as he rose to his feet and told his story, in broken English. He said with regard to his mission to another tribe: "I know about the Indian because I was one time Indian myself. Nobody told these people about Jesus and about their lives before me. I preach to them in sign language. Now there are Christians sixty-two, also church house I explain to them morning and evening and at noon. I am full-blooded Indian and full Presbyterian."

There is the same question before the Northern Assembly

and before the Southern as to the unification of the Home Mission work. Some of the stronger Synods are contributing to a treasury of their own and giving a per cent. to the Board. They objected very vehemently to being classed with the non-contributing churches, when many of the so-called contributing churches draw back more than they receive. Dr. Logan, of Illinois, spoke for the Synodical work.

Dr. J. Milton Greene spoke of his work in Porto Rico. He was for ten years a missionary to Mexico. One church with 74 members has been organized and from that membership has gone already a missionary colporteur to Cuba. A Spaniard said to a friend, that it did not sadden him to see the United States flag flying over Morro Castle at Havana, but rather the fact that the United States had done more for Cuba in two years than Spain had done in four hundred.

Wednesday was given to many other reports, among them that of the Committee on Church Polity, with Dr. Purves as Chairman. He recommended "no action" in the case of some score of overtures for changes of the Form of Government, and the Assembly agreed without a division and with scarcely a dissenting vote. The Assembly likes to shift responsibility upon a committee when it can do so.

Wednesday night there was a great foreign mission meeting in the Academy of Music, and a notable address by a young man, Mr. Robert Speer, Secretary of the Board. We have no space for even the mention of this meeting, but it was near akin to what we have all seen in our own Assembly except that the money given to the cause is about \$1,300,000 this year—high water mark. In fact, all of the Boards are out of debt.

On Thursday came

#### THE GREAT DEBATE ON REVISION.

The desk was cleared for action on the Revision question, which soon changed into the Dismission question. It was brought before the body by Dr. Dickey, Chairman of the



Assembly's Committee, who read the majority report. He was followed by Dr. McKibben, one of the two who signed the minority report. These reports agree in their findings together with the recommendation (a) that a Committee be appointed by this Assembly to formulate certain verbal changes in Chapter III of the Confession, in the elect infant class, the confessional teachings as to oaths and vows and to the Pope as Antichrist. The reports differ as to the proposed new summary of doctrine (b) the majority favoring this and the minority opposing it. We think it would have been better for the Committee to report its findings of facts as to the mind of the Church without recommendation.

After the majority and minority reports had been read, Dr. Nichols adroitly moved that as the majority and minority reports agreed on the first point, that should be adopted. But this involved a discourtesy to the sponsors of the reports, Dr. Dickey and Dr. McKibbin. The motion was so strongly opposed that it was withdrawn. Then the adoption of the minority report was moved. Then an amendment was offered, the adoption of the minority report.

The following is the

MINORITY REPORT ON REVISION.

*To the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church:*

The undersigned, a minority of the Committee on the Revision of the Confession of Faith appointed by the last General Assembly, would report respectfully as follows:

In the judgment of your minority the returns received from the Presbyteries justify all the conclusions reached and recommendations made in the majority report save the one contained in Recommendation "B," which is as follows:

"B. We recommend that this Committee be instructed to prepare a brief summary of the Reformed Faith, bearing the same relation to the Confession which the Shorter Catechism bears to the Larger Catechism, and formed on the general model of the Consensus Creed prepared for the Assembly of 1892, or the 'Articles of Faith of the Presbyterian Church of England,' and submitted to the Assembly to be referred to the Committee that may be appointed.

"This summary is not to be a substitute for the Confession and is not to affect the terms of subscription, but 'to vindicate and clear the doc-

trines of the Church from false aspersions and misrepresentations, 'to give a better understanding of what is most surely believed among us, and is in no sense to impair, but rather to manifest and maintain the integrity of the Reformed Faith.'

Your minority believe that this recommendation is not identical with what many of the Presbyteries requested in their answer to question 3 of the Committee's inquiries, and has therefore no considerable element in the Church which regard it as at this time desirable. They further believe that it is liable to nearly all the objections which lie against a new creed for the formulation of which but fourteen Presbyteries expressed a preference.

It erects an additional standard of orthodoxy, equal in authority with the Shorter Catechism which is a standard of our Church, containing therefore a new statement of the essentials of the Confession of Faith and determining what the system of doctrine to which we subscribe in the Confession of Faith really is.

To that extent it must affect the terms of subscription, and substitute for the generous and liberty conserving terms of our present subscription an *ipsisissima verba* subscription, with all its attendant dangers. It would plunge the Church into a discussion as to the essential meaning and heart of all her doctrines, with all the disquietude and uncertainty and strain inseparable from such an undertaking.

It would do all this to secure relief from a few points of irritation affecting the form rather than the essence of the teaching of the Confession, and which can be best reached by the method set forth in recommendation "C" of the majority report.

For these and other reasons we would recommend that Recommendation "B" of the majority report be stricken out

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM MCKIBBIN.

E. W. C. HUMPHREY.

Then a substitute was moved by Dr. Baker, of Philadelphia: "Whereas, the vote of the Presbyteries indicates an utter lack of unanimity; and, whereas, the lack of unanimity presumes continued controversy; and, whereas, any revision will be in the way of any union with other churches; be it resolved, that this Assembly deem it expedient that the question be not prosecuted at this time, and that the whole matter be herewith dismissed." This motion to dismiss became the matter to be debated.

Dr. Dickey took the floor and expatiated on the discourtesy shown by the Assembly in not allowing him to make

the speech he had prepared and changing the matter of debate. He answered, or rather referred to, the charge of unfairness in the appointment of a one-sided committee by saying that he had not known the predilections of the most of the committee, and had appointed one man (Dr. Warfield) to represent the anti-revisionists, who had declined to serve.

He defended the the action of the committee and at the same time magnified his loyalty to the Confession, saying that it suited him as it was. But we must do what the majority want, seemed to be the burden of his address.

Dr. McKibben made an admirable address in favor of the minority report, but it was felt that the logic of it was really in favor of dismissal. He made the point that only 14 Presbyteries asked for a new creed. He himself was not in favor of changing twenty lines of the Confession. He made a strong point for preserving the liberty which we now have by the terms of subscription, which do not commit us to every proposition of the Confession, while the summary of doctrine would commit us to its *ipsissima verba*.

Dr. Baker, of Philadelphia, believed that the church was unwisely driven to the the agitation which now troubles it. Only 30 Presbyteries overturned the last Assembly for revision, while 110 did so in the former revision controversy. That indicated a dimiution of interest. But the matter is now before us and I am glad to see the manifestation of the spirit of thoroughness and fair play. We will have it out like men.

But it seems strange that the Revision Committee should not have regarded the utter lack of unanimity among the Presbyteries as a providential indication that for the present there is no possibility of revision. Three men wish to keep together and go on a journey, one to Africa and one to Asia and one to Europe. Now in order for them to keep together they must stay at home.

It is said that there is unrest in the Church. The shot

that was fired was fired from outside our church and from a pulpit that is accustomed to fire at us. (Dr. Hillis and Plymouth pulpit.) It was answered by a counter-fire from our papers. That started the agitation and we ourselves have kept it up. It is said that the love of God is not in the Confession. He who says that does not know the Confession. It is written large there. It is not written there disproportionately. It is said that there are things in the Confession hard to be understood. But they were in the Bible before they were in the Confession. If there were not these hard doctrines in a Confession it would not be Scriptural. The attempt is to so soften these doctrines as not to make them repugnant. But we, at our peril, will lift the burden which the Word of God lays upon men's consciences. It is said that this is only a small revision of the confession. One of the speakers is in favor of a revision that is next to nothing. What do we want with a revision that is next to nothing?

I wish to say something as to re-union with other churches—especially union with the Southern Church. I am one of those who devoutly pray that these two churches may soon be one. We all know that revision will be an obstacle in the way of that union.

Dr. Herrick Johnson adduced first the historic argument in favor of the majority report. I have no attack to make upon the Confession. Our creed as it stands to-day is the consummate flower of the Reformed symbols. I pass from that to the men who made it. They were rarely gifted and godly men. They made lucid statements and clear definitions. But they were not infallible and they wrote some things because of their age. They held among other things the unlawfulness of marriage to a deceased wife's sister. They wrote that it was the duty of the civil magistrate to punish heresy. And we put that out. They wrote that the Pope was Antichrist and that it was a sin to refuse an oath. And nobody believes it. We shall be following in the footsteps of the Westminster Divines if we make a new creed,

because they tried to revise an old creed, the Thirty-nine Articles, and gave it up. We quoted their own words as to the "aspersions" that have been cast upon the creed. Nobody likes the occasion for this agitation, but we must face the situation.

Over three-fourths of the Presbyteries voting voted for some change. Nearly two-thirds of all the Presbyteries vote for some change.

The law is that the Assembly must send down an overture for a specific change when one-third of the Presbyteries ask for it.

Consider the character of the returns that were sent to the Committee. One hundred and fifty of the Presbyteries agree that the integrity of the Confession shall not be impaired. This decision, according to my colleague in McCormick Seminary (Dr. Craig), is authoritative and final. So in the seeming diversity as to other points there is a remarkable unanimity.

There are some things in the Confession that ought to be out of it. The authentic statement in the realm of morals as to the number of the saved being neither increased or diminished. The reference to the Pope of Rome ought to be out of it.

Then there are some things not in the creed that ought to be in it. There is no formulated statement concerning the Holy Spirit, concerning missions, and concerning the love of God for all men. Across our creed should be written: "The Gospel for the elect only." To shut up this Gospel to them is to diminish its glory.

Dr. Purves followed:

The Confession of faith is not perfect document. I am not a blind worshipper of it. I might be able to suggest some points in which the language might be amended. We are not guilty of unnecessary veneration of a human document. We simply ask what is the wise and faithful thing to do. We do not wish to be governed by either passing sentiment or traditionalism. This is a deliberative assembly.

There seems to be an impression that the Assembly is bound by the action of the Presbyteries. This is a constitutional part of our Church. We must be guided by our own judgment as we see the whole Church before us. The returns indicate both a desire for a change and a wide diversity of view. Our judgment is that nothing can be done. It was the judgment of the committee to give us an omnibus bill providing what all parties to a change might want. To me the returns denote a hopeless future for any specific overture we may send down to the Presbyteries. Nothing can carry a two-thirds majority or anything like it.

The changes, so far as they have been proposed specifically, are too unimportant. I do not think it is wrong for a Quaker not to take an oath or that the poor old Pope is Antichrist. But I am astonished that Dr. Johnson has objected to the arithmetical statement. It was put in there to guard against the theory of election of classes instead of individuals. We have some scriptural and arithmetical statements. "As many as were ordained to eternal life believed." The number of the sealed was 144,000. To be saved from Sacramentarianism on one side and Rationalism on the other, we must say that men are saved by the sovereign, elective grace of God.

Moreover, these changes will not effect what our friends desire. Does any one suppose that the taking out the numerical clause or the elect infant clause will stop the aspersions against Calvinism. If you are going to take away the aspersions you must take away Calvinism. The world will continue to hate Calvinism and Calvinism will continue to say that the Gospel is for those who are saved by the electing love of God.

When we cast a supplementary statement we interpret the system and thus limit the terms of subscription to the system of doctrine. You cannot help making such a statement authoritative and a limitation of our liberty. And whenever we amend, even in small particulars, we define, and definition is limitation. When the Westminster Divines

strove to remove "aspersions"—I call Dr. Johnson to witness—they did so by building up an articulated statement of faith. And that is the opposite of what we are trying to do.

Dr. Nicolls, of St. Louis, concluded the debate of Thursday:

This question of revision will not down. It is like Banquo's ghost. It may be suppressed here, but it will arise again.

We are all agreed that the system of doctrine must not be impaired. We are all agreed that a written creed is not a finality. The Confession itself tells us that Synods and Councils may err and have erred. There has been a development of doctrine in the consciousness of the Church.

The facts which we of the committee have found to be true, are, first, that in all parts of the church there is a growing dissatisfaction with certain statements in the creed. The next thing is that the dissatisfaction is not on the outside, but is expressed by our own people, by regenerate men, as we believe. The Southern Church has modified an immortal clause of the Confession by a foot-note. Men among us elected to the eldership have refused to serve because they could not subscribe to the Confession.

Now it is no infringement upon our liberty to say authoritatively what we mean. We may well say, paraphrasing Madame Roland, O Peace, what strife is engendered in thy name.

There are two methods of finding out truth—the *a priori* and the inductive method.

Now we have suggested that the third chapter of the Confession be interpreted in the light of God's free offer of salvation. Over against the Ebal of this tremendous statement of God's justice, we put the Gerizim of his love. "As I live," he says, "I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked. Turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die?"

Said Benjamin Harrison, "Perhaps there would be as much objection to a re-statement of the Third Chapter as

there is to its present form. There are great thoughts of God that far transcend his dealings with men. But this we know, that God does make his love to all men known, and we can write this in."

Judge E. W. C. Humphrey of the Presbytery of Louisville opened the debate in favor of the minority report which he signed with Dr. McKibbin. This credal agitation began long years ago culminating in the revision of 1892 which failed on account of causes lying outside of the merits of the question. The waters have been rising and the building of a dam will not avail. The waters may rise above the dam and sweep it away. The leaven of a new creed is working. The majority report is a double team. There are members of the committee who knew that moderate revision was a sound horse and they thought that it would carry the weaker horse of a new creed over the stream. Dr. McKibbin and I told the Committee that the weak horse would drown both. I hope that this Assembly will cut the harness and let the weaker horse drown and I hope he will go down so deep that not a bubble will come back to tell us where the animal went down.

I do not hanker especially for the new chapters on the Holy Spirit, missions, etc. But if the insertion of these chapters will enable us to cut the ground from under the feet of the New Creed men, let us insert them.

Dr. Kennedy of Pittsburg was the next speaker, according to unwritten law the speeches alternating for and against dismissal. But the whole subject of the revision and the new creed was discussed with some latitude as bearing on the question of dismissal.

The Confession, said Dr. Kennedy, is a scientific treatise. the constitution of the Church, and therefore the bond of unity for the organization. There are some who talk as though it were a treatise on homiletics. It is not. We draw our sermons and our constitution from the same source, the Word of God. We are not supposed to get our sermons from the Confession or material for our pastoral work. It



is not to be subscribed by our people. We say that it contains the system of doctrine taught in the Scripture and as such we ministers and elders have sworn that we receive it and adopt it.

The position has been abandoned that the Confession of Faith does not treat of the love of God. But it is said that it treats only of the love of God to the elect. That position is also false. Chapters XV and XVI deny its truth. The speaker quoted the Catechism question on Repentance unto Life with telling effect.

It is not appreciated that the changes desired are constitutional changes. And we are not living in a constitution-making age. The business of the Presbyterian Church is not to cross fire among ourselves but to go out and apply our present doctrines to the world.

The Westminster Assembly, it has been said, met to remove "aspersions." Did it remove them? No, they have followed the Westminster Confession down through the centuries. Nay, we can go back to Paul and hear him answering an aspersion, "Why doth He yet find fault. For who hath resisted His will?" Nay, we can go back to our Lord, and we hear the multitudes say of his words, "This is an hard saying. Who can hear it?"

If we attempt to bring our creed down to date, down to the thinking of our age in all respects we must start with the chapter on Creation. It is now written in Scripture language which we interpret as we do the Confession. Shall we re-write that chapter on the theory of evolution and have some of the foremost scientists say to us, You have written that which is false? It is impossible to square the Confession with modern metaphysics because that metaphysics does not yet square with itself.

Dr. Moffat of Baltimore: Nevertheless it is a man-made constitution. It is not the revision of the Word of God that we ask. And I believe that if this assembly dismisses the subject, the next will have a flood of overtures demanding re-opening.

I want to answer a point that has been made about the hope of union with the Southern Church. I live on the border. I know the sentiments of its people, especially in the great Synod of Virginia. I am violating no confidence when I say that Dr. Leftwich was asked to join with other Southern brethren in amending the Book of Church Order so as to raise a barrier between our Church and the Southern Church. That was one reason why Dr. Leftwich came to us. The brethren who will be influenced by the hope of union with the Southern Church are hugging a delusion to their breasts.

I believe that not one of our ministers in a hundred are disloyal to Calvinism. I appeal to the brethren in the new creed camp to join us who favor the revision of these few points and thus stop the litigation.

In that last day not only the 144,000 sealed ones are spoken of but a great multitude whom no man can number.

Dr. Dewitt of Princeton Seminary: I have never been more gratified than in this Assembly at the evidence that Commissioners of our Assembly are able to carry on high debate on profound subjects. And in all the diversity of opinion manifest not one speech has been characterized by sarcasm or malignity. And another thing has impressed me, that we have still the intellectual type of the Reformed Churches. We have not changed in this material age, but show to the world that we can interpret in terms of reason, fundamental Christianity.

We are told that the time has come when there is no longer a theological Presbyterian Church. But we have shown that the *Outlook* and the *Independent* have no right to say that religion is divorced from metaphysical thinking. Here is one of the churches of the Reformation, nearly four centuries old. We are Protestants of Protestants. And we regard the Bible as the rule of faith and the supreme judge. We are all agreed in our appeal to the Bible. We are not rationalists. Moreover, we stand solidly upon the

basis of Reformed theology. Nor is this all. We are as one on the Puritan type of theology embodied in the Westminster Confession. Our unity is fundamental. There is not a fissure. Not a crack. We are apt to examine our differences microscopically and they enlarge indefinitely. So I ask you if anything I say seems to deny this statement of our unity, please revise my speech and vindicate it from all "aspersions." There are three elements of our organic life: orthodoxy, unity and liberty. I give the committee credit for endeavoring, earnestly and loyally, to solve the problem of adjusting the balance of these elements which have been disturbed during the past decade.

There are four parties. Those who desire a new summary of the Confession, those who desire specific amendment, those who wish a declaration statement, and those who are content with our present declaration statement, namely, our terms of subscription to the Old Confession.

I am not accusing the new creed brethren of paganism because they are devoted to their idols. Dr. Johnson's idol is a restatement, a summary, a short credal statement, to take its place with the catechism. We have never seen this statement. They ask us to give them or their successors *carte blanche* to tell us what is a summary of these doctrines. This is the most monstrous proposition that has ever been propounded to a church. Let them get one-third of the Presbyteries to agree with them in the request for such a proposition.

Then we have Dr. McKibben's proposal. Whether important or unimportant its recommendations are specific. It has no function so far as the balancing of our orthodoxy, unity and liberty are concerned. Even if it is a good thing it is not half so good a thing as our terms of subscription, which relieve us from subscribing to the *ipssima verba*. Any of these schemes is attended with the danger of distracting the Church until one of them is adopted. Can any of them be adopted? Can one-third be changed to two-thirds? The fear of defeat acted as an environment to

squash together conflicting opinions in the committee into one report.

There are many statements in the Confession that I do not accept. But we are all united on the System of Doctrine, and with a living unity.

Dr. Moffatt, President of Washington and Jefferson: I agree with Dr. DeWitt that we have an admirable form of subscription. But the question before us is the dismissal of the whole matter. What is the whole matter? There is no revision before this Assembly. There is no new creed before this Assembly. I cannot make up my mind in advance. I must see what is proposed before I advocate or oppose it. The Committee simply ask that they be allowed to carry on the work begun. They are not asking us to adopt any amendments. I favor recommendation B. I could wish that the "Summary of the Reformed Faith" had been called a Calvinistic Summary. I am not ashamed of John Calvin. I hope I shall say nothing that would make John Calvin ashamed of me. There is nothing in this recommendation to indicate that the document proposed will have to take any particular course. It may simply be published by order of the Assembly for popular use. It may be sent down to the Presbyteries for adoption by a two-thirds majority of the Presbyteries. If there is any heresy in it, we can take it at the next Assembly and burn it in the public square. Because I am a Calvinist I believe that the Spirit of God is moving upon the Church and is leading it into all truth. But the people themselves are clamoring for some relief and as we have been told that the Confession is not for the people, we ought to have a Calvinistic statement for the people. I have a sympathy with the people and I know how they need help. I shall never forget the light that came to me, a college graduate, son of a Scotch preacher, when at the Seminary I heard Dr. Charles Hodge demonstrate the truth of our system. It is a question whether we can write this creed. It is a sad declaration that has been made in this Assembly, that

we cannot say what we believe. I believe in the aid of the Spirit but never feel like invoking his help to do nothing. I have sometimes indulged in rhetoric before Presbyterian audiences as to our greatness and all our claims about civil and religious liberty but the thought would come back that in this country the Sovereign God has put more of his elect children into the Methodist than into the Presbyterian Church.

Dr. George Stewart, of Auburn Seminary, contended for the majority report. He said that he signed the report and was cordially committed to it, but as a compromise. It was not what many wanted. Something that has not yet been proposed, he said, namely, a new creed made by the church now was what he preferred. There are many Presbyteries that desire a new creed. We must note progress in this direction. In the old revision movement there was no mention made of a new creed. Now the rear guard is camping upon the advanced guard of 1889. So I cheerfully lift my voice to-day in favor of a new creed, but am willing to support the majority report.

The vote was taken on the amendment to strike out the recommendation for a summary statement, which was lost by a vote of 234 to 272. Rev. Joseph R. Vance, D. D., moved the previous question. The moderator expressed the hope that the previous question would not be ordered by the Assembly. It was voted down by a large majority. Dr. Moffat, of Washington and Jefferson College, gave notice of an amendment which he would make to the majority report on Monday morning, claiming the floor for that purpose.

Dr. Moffat's substitute for recommendation B was offered at the Monday morning session of the Assembly. After several addresses from both sides indicating the acceptance of the compromise it was unanimously passed, and is as follows :

"We recommend that this committee be instructed to prepare and submit to the next General Assembly for such disposition as may be judged

to be wise, a brief statement of the reformed faith, expressed as far as possible in untechnical terms, the said statement to be prepared with a view to its being employed to give information and a better understanding of our doctrinal beliefs, and not with a view to its becoming a substitute for or an alternative of our Confession of Faith."

The other recommendation was amended by the insertion of the words, "And so far as possible by declaratory statement," and was passed with practical unanimity. It is as follows :

"We further recommend that this committee be instructed to prepare amendments of Chapter III, Chapter X, Section 3, Chapter XVI, Section 7, Chapter XXII, Section 3, and Chapter XXV, Section 6, of our Confession of Faith by modification of the text or by Declaratory Statement, and so far as possible by Declaratory Statement, so as more clearly to express the mind of the Church, with additional statements, concerning the love of God for all men, Missions and the Holy Spirit. It being understood that the revision shall in no way impair the integrity of the system of doctrine set forth in our Confession and taught in the Holy Scriptures."

Then it was ordered that a new committee be formed with Moderator Minton as Chairman, with the members of the former committee and the addition of seven names, chosen by the Moderator. This action was seen to be the securing of a more representative committee than the former, which represented almost entirely the revision sentiment of the Church.

After finishing the routine business in rapid order the Assembly adjourned, to meet in Fifth Avenue Church, New York, next May.

#### THE LITTLE ROCK ASSEMBLY.

The Southern General Assembly met at Little Rock, May 16, 1901.

Promptly at 11 o'clock Moderator Martin gracefully introduced Rev. Dr. Neander M. Woods, who was to preach the sermon, and Rev. Dr. G. W. Boggs, a member of our first General Assembly, in 1861, who took part in the devotional exercises.

Dr. Woods' sermon was what his old North Carolina friends would naturally expect of him, a faithful, timely ex-

position of Prov. 14:9. "Fools make a mock at sin." The sermon closed as not many set sermons, before our church courts do, with a tender, direct appeal to the unconverted.

As a natural sequence to such a good sermon, Dr. Woods was given the opportunity of opening the next General Assembly with another just like this one—he was made Moderator by acclamation, after a very neat nominating speech from Dr. Kerr.

With the election of Rev. W. R. Dobyms and Rev. W. I. Sinnot as temporary clerks, the Assembly settled down to business, Judge Martin making the motion to continue in session during the afternoon, contrary to the usual practice of adjourning until next day. He suggested that we might profitably use this time to attend to the routine business of hearing the reading of reports from the executive committees, and with this motion the Assembly closed its first morning session.

The routine work of hearing overtures, appointing committees and in general getting ready for work took up the greater part of the two remaining days of the first week.

Two important matters went through without opposition on Monday.

The Ad Interim Committee upon the Hymn-Book made their final report, which was approved and the thanks of the Assembly tendered these brethren for their faithful and acceptable labors.

The ad interim committee for the preparation of a hymn book begs leave to make a brief report for the information of the Assembly.

As is generally known we made to the last Assembly what we thought was our final report. Along with it we presented a prospective of hymns and tunes as the display of uncompleted work. The work as presented was substantially adopted. The Assembly ordered the "Psalms and Hymns" as reported to be published not earlier than January 1, 1901, and continued the ad interim committee for editorial supervision of the same till issued.

After the rising of the Assembly it became manifest that there were some portions of the church desiring still longer delay. There was brought to our attention by the action of several Presbyteries and one or two Synods. In view of this fact, and being greatly desirous of proceeding only in harmony with the wishes of the church at large, your com-

mittee sought a conference with Dr. Hazen as the secretary and representative of the Executive Committee of Publication. It was agreed at this conference that we would not hand the manuscript to the Executive Committee till the 1st of April, 1901; that we would meet January 1st, act on the suggestions and criticisms asked for by the Assembly, and publish all changes and additions, the church papers at the same time calling for additional suggestions and criticisms against the first of April; that we would carefully observe the situation in the meanwhile, and if the church did not seem satisfied with the additional three months' delay, we would then make another full report to the Assembly.

Upon coming together the first of April we were of the unanimous judgment that a further delay was called for by the church. Indeed we had many assurances from many quarters that where there had been a desire for further delay that desire was now satisfied by the concessions and changes made by the committee at its January meeting. We were fortified in this position by the advice of Dr. Hazen, who had taken pains to ascertain the mind of the church at large. Your committee, therefore, completed its work at the April meeting and informed the Executive Committee that the manuscript was ready to turn over to them. That has been done in part as the printer might have immediate need; the ad interim committee continuing to act as editorials supervisors in the course of actual publication.

As reported at the last Assembly the number of hymns was 652. By reason of the change made in deference to suggestions and criticisms the number of hymns has been increased to 715, an addition of some 60 more hymns to the collection. This gives us a book of about 500 pages.

We are happy to report that the Executive Committee has arranged a favorable contract for immediate publication, and it is hoped that by the coming fall the book will be ready for distribution.

Your committee is of the opinion, in which it is encouraged by the judgment of our judicious secretary, Dr. Hazen, that there is a large and growing interest in the book among our churches. Indeed, the committee has been inportuned from very many quarters of the church, by congregations large and small, that are waiting for the book, to make the delay in publishing as short as possible, expressing the hope that the churches in need of a hymn book will wait till the Psalms and Hymns is issued, and that all of our churches as they come to need new books will adopt this, which is now the one book of praise of our great communion, we respectfully submit this our final report.

J. W. WALDEN, Chairman,  
R. C. REED,  
W. L. LOWRANCE,  
A. W. MITZER,  
S. L. MORRIS,  
THERON H. RICE,  
JNO. C. WHITNER, Secretary.



Upon recommendation of the Committee of Foreign Missions (the Standing Committee of this Assembly) the Secretary, Dr. Chester, was instructed to visit the Brazilian Mission, with especial reference to the settlement of the Campinas property, as well as look after other interests of the mission. The interesting statement was made in this connection that one-half of the expenses of this trip would be defrayed by a gentleman warmly interested in missions, (Mr. C. A. Rowland, of Athens, Ga.)

After these matters were disposed of, the Chairman of the Committee of Bills and Overtures got the floor, and the slaughter of the innocents began. Overtures from the Presbyteries of Upper Missouri, New Orleans, Cherokee, Fayetteville, Brownwood, and from the Synod of Arkansas were electrocuted by the Committee of Bills and overtures and buried by the Assembly. In one or two instances the commissioners from the Presbytery concerned, made a feeble effort to resuscitate the criminal, but in vain. The stereotyped phrase from the committee's lips, "We recommend that the Assembly decline to make the change asked for in the overture," has in it a killing effect that few overtures ever recover from.

The afternoon order of business was to take up the report of the Ad Interim Committee on the Law of Commissions, with Dr. Reed's and Judge Martin's reports to choose between.

Judge Martin spoke, advocating his report.

Rev. A. H. Hamilton argued for letting the law stand as it now is.

Rev. W. I. Sinnot advocated a slight change in Judge Martin's report, permitting the reception of candidates for the ministry to be done by commission.

Rev. J. E. Latham spoke in favor of Judge Martin's report.

Then Dr. Reed got the floor in advocacy of his side of the question. After his speech there were amendments and substitutes for substitutes. Out of the parliamentary tangle

thus arising, Judge Martin's paper emerged—slightly disfigured but triumphant—and in its amended form, as given below. This amended paper was then ordered sent down to the Presbyteries for their advice and consent, with the recommendations of this Assembly, with instruction to the Presbyteries to vote yes or no.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE LAW OF COMMISSIONS AS AMENDED BY THE  
ASSEMBLY—SECOND REPORT.

The following is proposed as a substitute for Chap. VI, Sec 7—Form of Government.

*Sec.—7 Of Ecclesiastical Commissions.*

92. I. A commission is a body of Presbyters to which an ecclesiastical court entrusts special powers for the enforcement of specific business. It differs from a committee in that it provisionally stands for and represents the court itself, and is empowered, not only to examine and report, but also to deliberate upon, decide and conclude the business submitted to it, its judgment, on all issues submitted to it, being in force from the time of finding the judgment, and subject to the review of the court appointing it, such review to be confined to errors of law and doctrine, unless by reason of newly discovered evidence it may be manifest that injustice will be done.

To this end full records of its proceedings shall be submitted to the court, and if approved, the judgment shall be entered on the records of that court as its final judgment.

Committees are the executive agencies of the church and its courts, for the transaction of such business, and the performance of such duties as may be entrusted to them.

93. II. Every court of the church has power to act by a commission, and to it may be properly committed the ordination of probationers for the ministry, the visitation of portions of church for the correction of disorders, the organization of churches, including the ordination of officers, the trial of judicial causes requiring the exercise of the authority and judgment of the court.

No judicial case, however, coming up by way of appeal or complaint, from a lower to a higher court, shall be tried by a commission without consent of parties; and in such cases no member of a lower court who took part in the trial below, shall be appointed on the commission.

The ordination of a probationer shall not be committed to a commission, except in cases in which the Presbytery shall have examined him and passed upon his fitness therefor.

94. III. The quorum of a commission shall be the same as that of the court appointing it. The number of members shall constitute a committee, and its quorum is left to the discretion of the court appointing it;

but in all cases where no quorum is provided for a majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

95. IV. In trials of judicial cases the commission shall proceed as far as applicable according to the requirements of the Rules of Discipline in cases on trial before the court itself.

J. P. HOBSON,  
Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Kentucky.  
HENRY G. BUNN,  
Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Arkansas,  
JUDGE JOSEPH W. MARTIN.

#### FOURTH DAY—NIGHT SESSION.

A number of important reports were presented to-night, but went to the docket and will come up later. The only matter of consequence was to make the report of the Committee on Theological Seminaries upon the Kentucky consolidation the first order for to-morrow morning.

#### REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEES ON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

Your Standing Committee on Theological Seminaries would respectfully report to the General Assembly that the following papers came into its hands for consideration: The report of the Board of Directors of Columbia Seminary. The report of the Divinity School of Southwestern Presbyterian University of Clarksville. The report of the Trustees of Union Theological Seminary in Virginia for the current and previous year. The report of the Board of Trustees of Louisville Seminary and a statement of the President of Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Texas, and a Plan of Union for the consolidation of Louisville Seminary and Danville Seminary, Ky.

The encouraging features exhibited by these reports so predominate as to call for devout thankfulness to the Great Head of the Church for his manifest favor and blessings upon these institutions.

The death of one student at Clarksville and of Mr. W. C. Preston, secretary and treasurer of Union Seminary, is the only loss sustained. The only real discouragement causing serious alarm is the general decline in the number of candidates for the Gospel ministry now studying in these institutions. Whilst parents may be called upon to dedicate their children to God and appeals may be made to young men to consider the claims of the ministry upon them, yet we recognize that the great remedy for this distressing condition of affairs now threatening our beloved church is earnest, persevering prayer to "the Lord of the Harvest to send forth more laborers into his harvest."

Columbia Seminary reports the election of Rev. S. C. Byrd, Adjunct Professor of the chair of English Bible and Pastoral Theology, and assigned him to teach the English Bible and to be tutor in Hebrew, whilst

Rev. J. W. Davis will continue in the chair of New Testament Literature and Exegesis for one year, and at the same time give the students valuable instructions in the study of missions. The funds for the erection of a mess hall being now in hand, steps are being taken for its building at once. For the first time in some years the income is now sufficient to meet all the expenses.

Union Seminary has closed a prosperous year. Through the generosity of Mr. Watts the new chapel has been added to the other handsome and commodious buildings at Richmond, Va. In addition to this his gift of \$30,000, together with the funds raised by Dr. W. W. Moore will, with the sale of the Hampden-Sidney building, not only liquidate all the indebtedness of the institution but add at least \$7,000 to the endowment. The library has been increased by more than 1,100 volumes, chiefly through the liberality of Mr. Spence.

The Divinity School of the Southwestern Presbyterian University has been conducted with its usual corps of professors and usual ability, but reports a decrease of ten in the number of its students.

The statement of President Sampson shows that Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Texas, is assuming tangible form, having now succeeded in raising \$40,000 of the proposed \$200,000, and the Assembly expresses the hope of its largest success.

The report of the Theological Seminary of Louisville indicates a degree of prosperity and a probability of an increase in its endowment of nearly \$20,000, due to a legacy which has been finally settled in its favor by the courts, after a period of litigation. All of the elections are approved.

S. L. MORRIS, Chm'n.

#### FIFTH DAY—TUESDAY MORNING.

Previous to the taking up of the order fixed last night, the narrative was read and adopted.

A little breeze sprang up just after this, from a most innocent quarter. The clerk read an invitation from the local camp of the United Confederate Veterans to take part in the exercises of Memorial Day. A good brother moved that the thanks of the Assembly be extended for the invitation, and a committee be appointed to represent this body on that occasion. Another "Old Confed" on the floor of the Assembly, promptly moved that the last part of the above be stricken out, not for lack of sympathy with the occasion on the part of individual members, but because it was a matter not within our province as a church court. The Assembly agreed with the last brother and the

obnoxious clause was stricken out. Whereupon that shrewd diplomatist, Judge Martin, brought in the same idea in another form in a resolution to this effect, that the Assembly express its sympathy with the occasion, and regrets that through press of business we could not adjourn in order to give the members an opportunity to attend the memorial exercises. And this was passed.

And after this little breeze the good gale set in. A majority and minority report on the Kentucky consolidation was presented by the Committee on Theological Seminaries.

The majority report declined to assent to the consolidation.

First, because it would bring the Kentucky brethren into more trouble than it would help them out of.

Second, because the plan of consolidation expressly excludes the teaching of the distinctive principles of our Church.

Third. The basis on which it is proposed to unite the two seminaries naturally and logically leads to organic union between the two churches.

The minority report, after a brief preamble, was in these words :

“Resolved, that this General Assembly gives assent to the execution and delivery of said agreement and will accept the trust therein conferred upon it.”

It was moved to adopt the minority report, and then to adopt the majority report as a substitute for it. After a little parliamentary wrangle the discussion began, with Dr. S. L. Morris, Chairman of the Committee, introducing the discussion. He took up the majority report reason by reason, enforcing them in a most lucid, cogent manner.

His speech was brief, and in this respect contrasted sharply with Col. Bullit's address, the next speaker who lead the minority of the committee and occupied two hours and a half—part of this in the

## AFTERNOON SESSION.

Judge Bullitt resumed his speech, making in all a very telling argument.

He explained the situation in Kentucky, dwelling upon the loss of Danville Seminary and Center College after the Walnut Street decision, (in which suit, by the way, he won his spurs, as counsel for the Southern Church.) Then came the establishment of Central University and Louisville Seminary by our people. He detailed the struggle Central University had passed through until it faced, this year, the certain prospect of closing its doors. Then came the consolidation movement, beginning with Central University and Center College and soon bringing the seminaries into its sweep. He set forth at length the provisions of the articles of agreement on which the seminaries are to unite, showing how the property interests are safeguarded, and especially how the orthodoxy of the new institution is to be achieved for all time, so long, at least, as our own Church continues sound in the faith.

He dwelt also upon the fact that in this Seminary consolidation the Southern Church is simply coming into its own property and endowment to which we have the moral right, which our brethren of the Northern Synod admit, while they have the legal title.

When he came to answer the objections to the consolidation he was not so forcible (in the judgment of your correspondent, who was on the other side of the question). His weak point, as it seemed to me, was in asserting that there are no distinctive principles which separate the Southern from the Northern Church, but that the separation is merely on the ground that we can do our work better by ourselves than if we were united with the Northern Assembly. Col. Bullitt, however, covered this point very skilfully by quoting from the Assembly of 1882 a deliverance taking this very ground which he had taken.

After Col. Bullitt finished his argument, Dr. T. C. Johnson, of Union Theological Seminary, Virginia, took the

floor in advocacy of the majority report. He said he would congratulate Col. Bullitt for the powerful address he had made in favor of organic union, and during the greater part of his address for his skillful evasion of the real point at issue. Dr. Johnson claimed that the separation between the two churches is not a matter of experience, but a question of principle. The legislation of the Northern Church has often violated the principle of the spirituality of the Church, and its attitude towards woman's position in the Church is loose and unscriptural. Though the doctrinal standards of both churches were nominally the same, yet the spirit of interpretation is different. They are loose constructionists, we are strict constructionists. A church's interpretation of her standards is her standards. "If," said he, "they will take the standards in the same sense as we do, I pledge you that I will work for organic union." The Northern Church is infected with rationalism. Dr. Briggs has been turned out, but he left his brood behind him.

Other objections urged by Dr. Johnson were that the proposed union would deprive the church of the power of training her own ministry in her own way, that it was unconstitutional and that the chief argument for it was a mercenary one.

At the close of Dr. Johnson's address, the further consideration of the subject was postponed until 10 a. m. to-morrow.

#### SIXTH DAY—WEDNESDAY 22nd.

This morning's sessions were opened with an hour spent by the Assembly in special prayer for the outpouring of the Spirit of God upon our church; with special reference to the increase of candidates for the ministry. It was felt by all to be a solemn and profitable season, a prelude, it is to be hoped to the descent of the Spirit of prayer upon the entire church. "Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth laborers into his harvest." This was the keynote which the Assembly has sounded.

The unfinished business then came up, which was the

report on Foreign Missions, left over from last night. It was apprehended that the wrangling over the details of the work which marred the last Assembly, might be renewed in this. While there was persistent effort made by several brethren to bring up the question of the Secretary's salary, the Assembly sat down on every such effort promptly and effectually, and the report of the standing committee went through without amendment. The Assembly then resumed the discussion of the Kentucky consolidation.

Judge Shackelford Miller, of Louisville, spoke in favor of the consolidation. He consumed the remainder of the morning hour in making a very fair, earnest speech.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

Before resuming the Kentucky business, the Assembly settled the next place of meeting. After the usual outpouring of eloquence in favor of each of the two places which had invited the Assembly, Jackson, Miss., and Wilmington, N. C., Jackson carried the day by a vote of 81 to 57. I have only to say that Mr. Robinson of Wilmington, Rev. R. M. Williams and Rev. Dr. J. W. Rose battled manfully to take the Assembly to North Carolina; Mr. Robinson firing a parting shot, as the result was announced, that the main reason why the majority voted for Jackson was that these commissioners will not go to the next Assembly.

The discussion was then resumed, Rev. Dr. F. J. Brooke, of Alexandria, Va., speaking in favor of the majority report, followed by Rev. Dr. Beattie, of Louisville Seminary, supporting the minority report. Rev. Dr. Winn of Petersburg, Va., got the floor, at the close of Dr. Beattie's speech and offered a substitute for the majority report pending the consideration of which the Assembly postponed further discussion until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

The speeches to-day necessarily traversed much the same ground which was covered in the discussion yesterday, and I therefore give no synopsis of them.



Dr. Brooke grappled courageously with the two able lawyers, Judge Miller and Col. Bullitt, who had preceded him deserving fully the compliment which Dr. Beattie paid him, that is evident that Dr. Brooke would have made as good a lawyer as he is a preacher.

Dr. Beattie's speech was admirable in its spirit, conciliatory and persuasive—the best presentation of his side yet made. His description of himself as a Scotch-Canadian-Southern-Presbyterian and proud of each of these designations, was especially happy. His statement of the antecedents of the two Northern professors who are to go into the new seminary ought to assure everyone of their soundness and acceptableness. Dr. Martin is a graduate of Columbia Seminary brought up at the feet of Thornwell. Dr. Crawford is a Kentuckian born and bred and a graduate of Princeton. The other four professors will in all likelihood be taken from the present faculty of Louisville Seminary.

Dr. Beattie, however, like Col. Bullitt yesterday, had little or nothing to say of the weak point in the consolidation movement, which is touched by the second point in the majority report. This is the seclusion from the proposed Seminary of the principles of church polity embodied in our new book of church order—so far as these principles are peculiar to our church.

#### SEVENTH DAY—MAY 23rd.

The Kentucky consolidation received the assent of the Assembly by a vote of ayes 120, noes 56.

The final vote came by displacing both the majority and the minority reports with the following paper :

That while the Assembly may not wholly approve the wisdom of the consolidation of the two seminaries, yet in view of the fact that there was practical unanimity in the Synods of Kentucky and Missouri as to the measure, and because of the safeguard thrown about the institutions by the articles of agreement, this court interposes no bar to such consolidation, but gives its assent thereto, leaving the entire responsibility thereof with the Synods of Kentucky and Missouri.

This paper was offered by Rev Dr. S. K. Winn, of Petersburg, Va. The paper as originally offered lacked the last

two clauses. Judge Martin's amendment added the words, "but gives its assent thereto," and Dr. S. M. Smith the words, "leaving the responsibility thereof with the Synods of Missouri and Kentucky." On this paper the ayes and noes were ordered with the result just given.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

Home Missions had the track this afternoon and night. The effort to change the location of the Committee from Atlanta to Little Rock, brought up by overture from the Presbytery of Arkansas, was negated by the Standing Committee and the negative recommendation was sustained by the Assembly *nem con*.

The Standing Committee, however, was turned down in their next recommendation by the Western brethren, who asked for an ad interim committee to make the effort to reconstruct our entire Home Mission machinery. The Standing Committee were against this, but the Western brethren succeeded in introducing what is now the second recommendation of the report as adopted by the Assembly. Your correspondent is this case voted with the West, against the East.

East and West came up yet more distinctly in the great question before the Assembly at its night session. After an impressive devotional service, asking for divine guidance in the important matter before us, the Assembly went into the election of Secretary of Home Missions.

The following excellent brethren were nominated in appropriate speeches: Rev. R. H. Fleming, D. D., of Lynchburg, Va.; Rev. S. G. Miller, of Little Rock, Ark.; Rev. J. E. Jones, D. D., of Meridian, Miss.; Rev. S. L. Morris, D. D., of Macon, Ga.; Rev. W. R. Dobyms, D. D., of St. Joseph, Mo.; Rev. J. D. Leslie, of Paris, Texas.

The vote was taken in accordance with the following resolution offered by Dr. Lawrence.

"That the vote be taken by calling the roll and after the first roll-call the name of the nominee receiving the lowest

number of votes be dropped, and so on, till one nominee receives a majority."

After the first roll-call it was evident that only two of these brethren were in the race. At the final roll-call the vote stood, Dr. Morris 84, Dr. Dobyns 83.

I said above that this vote brought into contrast the Eastern and Western sections of our Church. This is not exactly a fair statement of the case. Dr. Dobyns was voted for very generally by brethren from the Synods of Virginia, North Carolina and South Carolina, while Dr. Morris received votes from all the Western Synods. At the same time Dr. Dobyns was urged in the nominating speeches as living in or near the Western Home Mission Field. Your correspondent voted for Dr. Morris, with a mental reservation looking towards Dr. Dobyns.

#### EIGHTH DAY—FRIDAY, 24th.

The Assembly today struck into a somewhat more rapid gait than heretofore and a good deal of business was gotten through with.

The reports on Systematic Beneficence, on the Bible Cause, on the Quorum of Synod were adopted. The last named paper sends down to the Presbyteries for their advice and consent this amendment, "That there be added to paragraph 82 of the Book of Church Order the following words, 'provided further that in the case of a Synod composed of only three Presbyteries any seven ministers representing any two Presbyteries together with three ruling elders, shall be a quorum.'" So far everything was lovely, but when the next order was taken up, the report on Sunday Schools and Young Peoples' Societies, and the first item was read recommending that the Assembly do now elect a secretary to have special charge of the departments of Sunday School work, the skies clouded over. This item was assailed on all sides.

The committee had stated the fact that fifty-two Presbyteries had approved the creation of this office. The ob-

jectors answered that actions speak louder than words—these Presbyteries had given their vote but not their money in the special collection ordered for his support. It was also said, nobody knows what the duties of this official were to be. To this it was answered that he was to relieve Dr. Hazen of much of the work that now diverts him from the publication business proper, by taking the editorship of the *Earnest Worker* and other Sunday School literature. He was also to attend church courts in the interest of their Sunday School work, organize and take the lead in Sunday School institutes and do what else he may find to do, to stimulate our lagging Sunday School interests.

The main string harped upon by the objectors was the consideration of economy against the creation of a new salaried office. The committee's recommendation was finally set aside for a substitute offered by Rev. B. F. Read :

“While the Assembly does not see its way clear at this time to elect a Superintendent of Sabbath Schools and Young Peoples' Societies, it directs the Executive Committee of Publication to select one and put him in the field as soon as the way is clear for his support.”

The report then went through without further amendment except that Judge Martin tacked on the following “rider” at the end :

“It is distinctly understood that this plan is a provisional one, being dependent on the raising of the money for the Superintendent's salary by the means provided herein for that specific purpose.”

In connection with the report on Sunday Schools, the matter of graded lessons came up. As will be remembered Dr. E. C. Murray, chairman of the Ad Interim committee had with him four obstinate men who could not be made to see things as he did; and so the report came before the Assembly with one minority report signed by the chairman, another minority report signed by Dr. Ghiselin, and a majority report signed by Dr. Hazen and the other two members of the Committee. The Assembly evidently did not want to get into this three-cornered fight for they were about to throw the whole report out, when Judge Martin came to Dr. Murray's assistance and secured a postponement to the next Assembly.

## AFTERNOON SESSION.

This afternoon the Catechism on the Church prepared by Dr. Kerr, under the eye of the Union Seminary professors, came up for consideration. It would seem that this document, which forms no part of the constitution of the Church, and which the Assembly was only asked to affirm "for substance of doctrine," and which Dr. Kerr had already submitted to twenty or thirty leading ministers and elders besides the Seminary professors aforesaid, and received their approval, might have passed through the hands of the Assembly without challenge. But it was evident that somebody else besides the said "leading ministers and elders" wants to have a shy at it, for the Assembly ordered that it be sent down to the Presbyteries for their criticism, the same be reported to the committee which prepared the Catechism, and the Catechism, revised in the light of these criticisms, sent up to the next Assembly.

The Assembly next took up a very important matter presented by overtures from the Synods of Memphis, Mississippi and Nashville on the readjustment of their Synodical boundaries. The proposition was to make the Synodical boundaries follow State lines. The only opposition came from the Presbytery of New Orleans which objected to being separated from its present and ancient alliance with the Synod of Mississippi. The main argument urged by the New Orleans brethren was the feebleness of the two bodies which will result from the division of the Synod of Mississippi. To this it was answered that the larger of the two proposed Synods will be equal to the Synod of Arkansas, and the smaller larger than the Synod of Florida. It was further urged in favor of the motion that this division exists already as an actual fact. When the Synod of Mississippi meets in Louisiana it is, in its attendance, the Synod of Louisiana, when it meets in Mississippi it is the Synod of Mississippi. After considerable discussion, the motion to make the Synodical boundaries follow State lines prevailed only the New Orleans brethren voting against it. We have

therefore two new synodical names in the minutes of the Assembly, Louisiana and Tennessee. The Synod of Memphis is dissolved and of its four Presbyteries Chickasaw and North Mississippi go into the Synod of Mississippi. The Presbyteries of Memphis and Western District go with the Synod of Nashville to make up the new Synod of Tennessee.

Perhaps the most important practical matter before the Assembly was the thing which came up next, and that was the new scheme of ministerial relief, brought before the Assembly by the Ad Interim Committee of which Dr. Beattie and Dr. Kerr were the principle members.

The attention of the readers of the QUARTERLY is called to the action of the Assembly embodied in the report of the standing committee on the Invalid Fund and which was adopted after a discussion that occupied the rest of the afternoon and extended into the night session.

While there was prolonged discussion over the paper it seemed only to bring out more strongly the excellent features of the new scheme.

There are three distinct parts to this new plan. The first is the invalid fund proper, supported as heretofore by the July collection, and in which all beneficiaries will share and share alike. The second feature of the plan is an endowment fund, in the interest of which all beneficiaries will share equally, and which the business men who are in the new committee hope to see brought up to such proportions that it will eventually take the invalid fund out of the list of our collections. The third feature is the benefit fund, a system of ministerial insurance, one-half the proceeds of which will go to all beneficiaries alike; the other half be limited to those beneficiaries who have paid into the fund according to a graduated scale of rates.

If the Assembly of 1901 has no other claim to be remembered, it ought to go down to the gratitude of posterity as having by the adoption of this scheme, that sheds a ray of hope into that dark and earthly prospect which up to this

time has confronted the wornout or dying servant of our church. The thanks of the church are due Rev. F. R. Beattie, who inaugurated this movement, and has embodied in this plan the result of the most studious comparison of the various systems of ministerial relief used by other churches in this country and abroad. Dr. R. P. Kerr also deserves mention in this connection, as having enlisted in the carrying out of this plan the names of the excellent business men who are found among the elders on the new committee.

At this point Dr. Morris came before the Assembly by special invitation, to announce his decision as to the secretaryship of Home Missions. He said in substance that he would be less than human if he had not been profoundly moved by the action of the Assembly. The highest honors this earth could give was to receive the suffrages of his brethren for such an office as this. The office came to him wholly unsought and after he had been told that his name was to be presented to the Assembly, he had made it the subject of special prayer that the Lord would not lay this burden upon him unless he meant him to bear it. He was profoundly impressed with the difficulties in the way of his accepting the office.

There stood in his way his deep sense of his personal unfitness, the care of his family, the needs of the church of which he was pastor, and which while now was self-sustaining and free from debt was not yet a large congregation. He also knew the criticism which must come to this office, growing out of the work itself, particularly the diverse, and to some extent conflicting interests of the different sections of the Home Mission field, as well as brought on himself by the personal infirmities of the Secretary himself. He had spent a sleepless night tossing and thinking and praying and he knew that this was not the last sleepless night this work would cost. At the same time he could not put aside the conviction that this was a direct call from the Lord and as such must be obeyed. In accepting the office he most

earnestly entreated the sympathy, the co-operation and the prayers of his brethren.

If all others felt as your correspondent did, the Assembly was strongly moved by these simple, manly, deeply earnest words, and joined most heartily in the prayer for the new Secretary offered at the moderator's request by the venerable G. W. Boggs.

The next item of business was a very different one. That bone of much contention, the footnote to the elect infant clause in the Confession of Faith, came up in the report of the special committee appointed to answer the numerous overtures upon the subject :

MAJORITY REPORT FROM INFANT CLAUSE COMMITTEE.

Concerning overtures on foot-note, etc. Answer:

1. That this Assembly hereby rescinds the order of last Assembly to print the aforesaid foot-note in future editions of the Confession.

2. That this action is in no way to be taken to modify the answer made to the overture of W. E. Shive and W. M. Kilpatrick by the Assembly of 1900.

Concerning overture asking amendment of Confession of Faith, Chap. X, Sec. III. Answer :

That no action be taken, and for the following reasons :

1. Because it is unwise to initiate at this time the agitation of this question among our people.

Because no modification that does not eliminate scriptural Calvinism from this section of the Confession will obviate the objection which comes from Armenian sources.

3. Because the Westminster Confession of Faith is the first great creed which taught the salvation of infants dying in infancy on truly scriptural grounds.

4. Because the Confession of Faith in this section does not teach the damnation of any infants dying in infancy, for the reason that the contrast used in it is not between elect and non-elect infants dying in infancy, but between elect persons who die in infancy and elect persons who do not die in infancy.

5. Because, while we have a well-grounded hope, founded on Scripture, that all infants dying in infancy are saved, yet the Confession of Faith goes as far as the Scriptures justify a positive credal statement upon this point.

In addition, your committee recommends that this entire report be



published by our Executive Committee of Publication in convenient form for distribution and that it be kept on sale at the Depository.

THOS. C. JOHNSTON,  
THOS. GALLACHER,  
J. ALBERT WALLACE,  
J. D. MCLEAN,  
J. G. ANDARSON,  
E. C. MURRAY,

F. R. BEATTIE,  
J. L. CALDWELL,  
J. B. HUTTON,  
SAML. M. SMITH,  
E. L. EWING,  
D. G. ARMSTRONG,

Committee.

MINORITY REPORT FROM THE ELECT INFANT CLAUSE COMMITTEE.

In answer to the overtures from the Presbyteries of Norfolk, Fort Worth, Chesapeake, and certain individuals asking, in substance, that section 3, chapter 10, of the Confession of Faith be amended.

The General Assembly recommends and sends down to the Presbyteries for their concurrence the following: That section 3, chapter 10, of the Confession of Faith be amended by adding the following words, "Nothing in the section shall be understood as holding or touching the possibility of the damnation of an infant dying in infancy. Our church does not, never has held such doctrines."

Signed,

S. P. GREENE.

It will be seen that there was a minority report signed by Judge Green, of Texas. This venerable and devoted elder was heard patiently, then the Assembly buried his paper under an avalanche of votes.

Following the execution and burial of this disturber of the peace, came what some of the Assembly looked upon in the same light, viz., the protests of Dr. F. J. Brooke and others against the assent of the Assembly to the Kentucky consolidation. This temperate and kindly expressed document, your correspondent would have signed, if he had not considered his own views sufficiently ventilated in the majority report of the committee upon Theological Seminaries, which he had some hand in framing and to which his name is signed (as well as the position of his name in the yea and nay vote on that subject).

This protest, together with a somewhat more vehement one drawn up by Rev. Dr. S. Taylor Martin and signed by three or four other brethren, was admitted to record, and the Assembly adjourned until Saturday morning.

After finishing routine business the Assembly adjourned to meet at Jackson, Miss., next year.

## CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

DISCUSSION OF PHILOSOPHICAL QUESTIONS, by John L. Girardeau, D. D., LL. D.

This work has been favorably noticed in all the Church papers and magazines. It has been ranked with Thornwell's Discourses On Truth and Dabney's Practical Philosophy. No friend of the author would desire to see it in better company. Gladly accepting this verdict on the ability and scholarship displayed in the work, we will proceed at once to the purpose we have in view in preparing this paper. We wish to commend the volume to ministers of the Gospel and educated laymen on the score of its utility. This we hope to do by making the book its own advocate. We will signalize some of its features for this purpose.

Let us begin with the occasion which led to the preparation of the work. In the author's own words, "the writer desired clearly to explicate and enounce the views derived from his own reflections, and that this desire was enhanced by the duty, bound upon him professionally, to deliver a brief course of philosophical lectures, during each session, in the institution to which he is attached." In other words, the Discussions were prepared and issued by Dr. Girardeau in connection with the course he was giving as professor of theology in Columbia Seminary. This is a significant fact; and the first feature of the work we wish to emphasize. Many good Christian people are strongly prejudiced against metaphysics. Some for the reason that the Scriptures utter a caution against "philosophy and vain deceit" and the "oppositions of science falsely so called;" others because of the desolations wrought by rationalism in various periods of the history of the Church. It is easy to say that this prejudice fails to discriminate between the genuine and the spurious, and also confounds the legitimate use of philosophy with its abuse. As, however, it is persistent and potent, we will set over against it the recorded opinions of two Christian men who were capable of judging of such a question. Sir William Hamilton says: "But though mind, considered in itself, be the noblest object of speculation which the created universe presents to the curiosity of man, it is under a certain relation that I would now attempt to illustrate its utility; for mind rises to its highest dignity when viewed as the object through which, and through which alone, our unassisted reason can ascend to the knowledge of God. . . . the class of phenomena which requires that kind of cause we denominate deity is exclusively given in the phenomena of mind—that the phenomena of matter taken by themselves (you will observe the qualification, taken by themselves), so far from warranting any inference to the exist-

ence of a God, would, on the contrary, ground even an argument to his negative—that the study of the external world taken with, and insubordination to, that of the internal, not only lies its atheistic tendency, but, under such subservience, may be rendered conducive to the great conclusion, from which if left to itself it would dissuade us.” The other witness is Hugh Miller. Like Hamilton, he was neither a preacher nor a teacher of theology. His testimony is all the more valuable from the further fact that he was not a metaphysician, but addicted to the physical sciences. Here is what he says: “It seems impossible that the metaphysical province should long exist blank and unoccupied in a highly civilized country, especially in a country of active and acquiring intellects, such as Scotland. If the philosophy of Locke or of Reid fail to occupy the field, we find it occupied instead by that of Comte or Combe. Owens and Martineaus take the place of Browns and Stewarts; and bad metaphysics of the most dangerous tendency, are taught, in the lack of metaphysics wholesome and good. All the more dangerous parties of the present day have their foundation of principle on a basis of bad metaphysics. The same remark applies to well nigh all the religious heresies; and the less metaphysical an age is, all the more superficial usually are the heresies which spring up in it.” We will rest the defence of the law of the Seminary, which bound the duty of Dr. Girardeau to deliver these lectures to his classes, on consideration presented in these extracts. The necessity lies back of the law. It is impossible to master the principles of any religious creed without some acquaintance with metaphysics. But while this is true, it is not the thought which leads me to emphasize this feature of the book. There is a mental drill to be derived from metaphysical studies. Sir William Hamilton defends the study of metaphysics on this ground. The power of attention is severely tested and the habit of discrimination formed. The qualities of mind required in preachers and church officers, who have subscribed to the Westminster Standards, are developed by such studies. This is not a metaphysical age. And here lies a chief source of danger to the Reformed Churches. It is a matter of remark that the character of the preaching in our Southern Presbyterian Church has undergone a great change. The pew made a decree that there should be a lighter tax levied by the pulpit on the attention of hearers, and the pulpit obeyed. The aim of preaching ceased to be to convince. Doctrinal preaching declined. A clamor has been raised for changes in the Confession of Faith. A committee has been appointed by the Northern General Assembly to make and submit a short statement of reformed doctrine in *untechnical language*. We have already a marvel in the way of short statement in the

Shorter Catechism, but it is not in untechnical terms. It contains such phrases as "original sin" and "effectual calling." We refer to this simply to show the trend. The trouble is, we seem to be drifting away from the strong doctrines of our Confession. Our fathers found it necessary to frame a form of sound words in order to embody and preserve them. They require a certain robustness of mind on the part of those who hold and teach them. What is the remedy for the trouble? Not, we verily believe, a restatement in untechnical terms, of the faith; but a toning up, by way of sound instruction, of the minds of our people. Such books as the one under consideration would be a fine tonic if generally studied by our ministers and church rulers. By such a discipline our congregations would come to estimate a preacher by the matter rather than the measure of his discourse. By that discipline the end of preaching would become once more instruction and persuasion. The result would be a higher appreciation of our creed.

The second feature of this work we notice is that it represents the Scotch metaphysics. To use the words of the author, "The Scotch school mainly." Dr. McCosh gives three characteristics which distinguish this school of philosophy. 1. "It proceeds on the method of observation, professedly and rarely. . . . To the Scottish school belongs the merit of being the first, avowedly and knowingly, to follow the inductive method, and to employ it systematically in psychological investigation. As the masters of this school were the first to adopt it, so they, and those who have borrowed from them, are almost the only persons who have studiously adhered to it." 2. "It employs self-consciousness as the instrument of observation." 3. "By the observation of consciousness, principles are reached which are prior to and independent of experience. . . . This is another grand characteristic of the school, distinguishing it, on the one hand, from empiricism and sensationalism; and, on the other hand, from the dogmatism of a priori speculation of all ages and countries. It agrees with the former in holding that we can construct a science of mind only by observation, and out of the facts of experience; but then it separates from the, inasmuch as it resolutely maintains that we can discover principles which are not the product of observation and experience, and which are in the very constitution of the mind, and have thus the sanction of the author of nature. . . . While the Scottish school thus far agrees with the rational and priori systems, it differs from them most essentially, in refusing to admit any philosophic principles as can be shown by self-inspection to be in the very constitution of the mind. It has always looked with doubt, if not suspicion, on all purely abstract and rational discus-

sion, such as that by which Samuel Clarke demonstrated the existence of God; and its adherents have commonly discountenanced or opposed all ambitions a priori systems, such as those which were reared in imposing forms in Germany in the end of the last and the beginning of the present century." Such are the characteristics which distinguish the philosophy which grew up among the Presbyterians of Scotland, as given by one of its most illustrious disciples. Thomas Reid, the founder of it, was a Presbyterian minister. Dr. McCosh says of it: "The Scottish metaphysicians, with the exception of Chalmers, have never identified themselves very deeply with the more earnest spiritual life of the country; but they defended the fundamental truths of natural religion, and they ever spoke respectfully of the Bible. The Scottish philosophy, so far as it is a co-ordination of the facts of consciousness, never can be antagonistic to a true theology." This is the philosophy underlying the volume we are reviewing. The great body of the volume is taken up with the refutation of systems which antagonize the Scottish philosophy. Particularly is this true of the theories which in modern times have tended to undermine both true philosophy and true religion. The busy pastor, who has neither the time nor the means to acquaint himself with the writings of such men as Berkley and Spencer will get an insight into their views in the masterly refutation they receive in this work. An acquaintance with the principles of the Scottish schools may be also gathered from this volume; for while Dr. Girardeau accepts the system as a whole, he is by no means a slave to it. He accepts the great a priori laws and principles contended for by the philosophy of common sense; the doctrine of natural realism; the immediate knowledge of the external world, and other less important tenets. But he does not hesitate to differ from both Reid and Hamilton in many of their speculations. It is a great help to the understanding of the leading principles of the system to follow such a master when he is either using those principles to combat heresy or when he is calling in question their own connection or completeness.

III. The last feature of the work we have time to present is the tabular statement found at the end of the Introduction. It exhibits the theory held by Dr. Girardeau in regard to the development of knowledge; and is the key to the book. In this table he makes consciousness the faculty of immediate knowledge, and faith one of the faculties of mediate knowledge. This gives us reason or intelligence as the generic faculty, under which are included all the cognitive powers, those of both mediate and immediate knowledge. He vindicates Sir William Hamilton against the charge of making consciousness a genius under which feelings

and volitions are to be included as species, but he holds him responsible for including cognitions under it as species. And we confess to an inability to see how his criticisms on Hamilton's position can be answered. Hamilton holds that we know the external world as well as the internal, by consciousness. In this he differs from Reid; and in this he makes perception and consciousness identical. We not only know that we know, as we know that we feel and know that we will, on the testimony of consciousness; but the organ of perception is consciousness—the faculty of immediate knowledge is consciousness. But let us pass to the other characteristics of the table—that faith is a faculty of mediate knowledge. This is more in line with the purpose of this article. The question is argued at length in the chapter on Mr. Herbert Spencer's agnostic doctrine on the relativity of knowledge. Spencer holds that whatever is out of relative to the presentative, representative and thinking faculties is unknowable. Dr. Girardeau considers that this enumeration arbitrarily limits the number of cognitive faculties. Faith is an element of our constitution; and in its simplest form, as assent to truth, it is a cognitive power. It should be regarded as a distinct cognitive faculty because it is a conviction different from the product of any other cognitive faculty. As a cognitive power its chief function is to ground a knowledge of that which is incomprehensible. The word is found in every language, and common sense attests the fact that a large and essential part of knowledge lies in the realm of the unthinkable. Faith also originates knowledge which it is beyond the competency of the other cognitive powers to furnish. This brief sketch is all our space will allow. We see no valid objection to the author's conclusion. In fact, it seems to me that the only definition of faith given in the Bible suggests something of the same sort. Faith is certainly a source of knowledge. Why not call it a cognitive faculty? What is perception but the assent of the mind on the testimony of the senses? The practical consequences in theology would be valuable if we allow the conclusion. Who have not felt—in fact, when has the Church as a whole not felt—that faith is degraded when it is put in contrast with knowledge? There's a sting in those mocking words of Strauss: "The believer should let the knower go his own way in peace, just as the knower does the believer. We leave them to their faith, let them leave us our philosophy." And who has not felt perplexed over the questions growing out of the infinite element in our holy religion? If it cannot be comprehensive, how can it enter into our logical processes? Relief is certainly given in the discussions of this book.

W. T. HALL.

ELEMENTS OF ETHICS, by Noah K. Davis, A. M., Ph. D., LL. D.,  
Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Virginia.  
8 vo., pp. 190. Boston; Silver, Burdett & Co. 1900.

Following such well known and approved works as his "Theory of Thought," "Elements of Inductive Logic," and "Elements of Psychology," this last book of Dr. Davis scarcely needs any commendation. The same lucidity of style, clearness of thought, and simplicity of expression run through it from beginning to end. The same profound learning, too, shows on every page. It is, as the title indicates, a work on the elements of ethics. It is comprehensive, and in very short compass covers an entire system. It is well adapted to the purpose for which the author prepared it, as a hand book for students or readers who are receiving their introduction to the study. At the same time, however, the numerous annotations, found on almost every page, not only illuminate the texts, but in many cases suggest some larger expansion of the thought presented, and in addition furnish incidently a somewhat complete bibliography of the subject.

As to his method, the author in his Prolegomena deals with the psychological and philosophical facts and principles which underlie the subject. Having thus scientifically approached it and laid a correct basis for it, he deals with ethics under the two heads of obligation and organization. Under the former he discusses the principles of rights, in themselves and as they emerge in liberty, implying interference, or suggest trespass; as they necessitate law, with its sanctions; as they work out in the application of justice, duty and virtue, service and charity, closing with a chapter on Deity, a postulate of ethics. Under the second head, Dr. Davis discusses man, the family, the community, the State and the Church. The whole is a most complete and thoroughly philosophical unfolding of the fundamental principles of ethics. There is a noticeable absence of technical terms, while yet the language used is characterized by great precision. Very much more than the majority of such treatises it is practical, but with that constant regard for principles which shows that the author fully understands the fact that the practical duties arise from principles and not principles from practice.

GEORGE SUMMEY.

REPORT OF THE MONETARY COMMISSION OF THE INDIANAPOLIS CONVENTION of Boards of Trade, Chambers of Commerce, Commercial Clubs and other Similar Bodies of the United States. The University of Chicago Press. 1898.

It is somewhat late to notice this book, but its exceptional merit and its special value to our Southern people justifies this tardy

calling of attention to it. The movement, of which this magnificent octavo of 608 pages is the worthy result, was initiated by the Indianapolis board of trade November 18, 1896, in calling a convention of representative business men of the Upper Mississippi Valley to meet in that city December 1, 1896.

This preliminary convention called a non-partisan convention of business men representing all cities of 8,000 inhabitants or more throughout the Union to assemble at Indianapolis January 12, 1897, to concert measures for placing "the currency system of the country upon a sound and permanent basis." Delegates from 26 States and the District of Columbia met and appointed a monetary commission of eleven men: Messrs. T. G. Bush, of Alabama, Geo. E. Leighton, of Mississippi, and J. W. Fries, of North Carolina, represented the South; Geo. F. Edmunds, of Vermont, Chas. S. Fairchild and Stayvesant Fish, New York, and C. Stuart Patterson, of Pennsylvania, the Eastern North; W. B. Dean, of Minnesota, J. Laurence Laughlin, of Illinois, and Rob't S. Taylor, of Indiana, the Central North; while Louis A. Garrett, of California, sat for the Pacific States.

The volume before us contains the reports of that commission, with the proceedings of the convention and valuable appendices giving "Selected Laws of the United States Relating to Coinage, Currency and Banking," and "Statistics of Money and Banking." There are also two indexes.

There were two reports made by the commission. The first, or preliminary is comparatively brief but contains the practical results and recommendations, and is followed by a bill, embodying its views, which was introduced into Congress by Mr. Overstreet January 6, 1898. The substance of this report, pp. 49-57, is found in the "Plan of Currency Reform" which it suggests.

These recommendations pertain first to our metallic currency, and advise the gold standard, the free coinage of gold, no further issue of silver dollars, subsidy silver and minor coins only upon government account; all of which provisions are now the law of the land.

As to the demand of obligations of the government, it suggests the separation of the fiscal and issue departments of the Treasury into distinct divisions; the establishment of a reserve fund for the redemption of all United States and Treasury notes and silver dollars; the issuance of certificates of indebtedness; the introduction of the European system of "inscribed loans," as a savings fund for the masses of the people; and the gradual retirement of all United States and Treasury notes and of all gold and currency certificates.

The inscribed loan is a simple and convenient substitute for the small government bonds, by which credit is given on the books



of the Treasury to any one depositing sums of \$50 as a loan to the government; no bond being issued, principal and interest being paid to the depositor without cost to him.

Its final recommendations were as to banking, advocating the national system; notes to be issued to the equal value of the bonds; banks with a capital of \$25,000 in the smaller towns to be allowed; branch banks to be permitted; and a new system of national banking to be inaugurated under "the guaranty fund" plan.

Much the most valuable part of the book is the Final Report of the Commission, which is really an exceedingly able treatise on the entire currency question, with special reference to the United States. It occupies pp. 75-489, and it may be said that there is hardly a spare word in it. It is known to be the work of Prof. Loughlin, of the University of Chicago, and his intelligent assistants, L. Correll Root and H. Parker Willis; the last named is the professor of economics and political science in the Washington and Lee University.

As it covers so much territory and is so complete in every part, it will be impracticable within the limits assigned to a book notice, to do more than give the most condensed statement of its contents. It divides the subject of Currency into two parts: Metallic Money and Banking, and it supplements this discussion by a full treatment of the Demand Obligations of the Government, used as currency.

Metallic Money is presented under six heads: The Functions of Money, The Standard, Laws of Token Money, Legal Tender, The United States Silver Experiment, and the Movement of Gold.

There are three functions of money: standard of value, medium of exchange, and standard deferred payments. The first and last of these are essentially the same, and the line between them is a shaded one. The standard function is of first importance, and no one can understand money unless he starts with this and makes it fundamental. The report advocates the gold standard.

Token money is defined as coin reduced in weight, issues on government account with limited legal tender power, and subject to direct redemption. A simpler and better definition is metallic money whose bullion value is less than its coin value. The silver dollar is held by the report to be virtually a token coin; it is really so by the broader and more accurate definition.

The report correctly teaches that legal tender should be limited to standard money. Our net loss in the silver experiment of 1878-1893, by which we enriched the silver kings of the Northwest, is shown, p. 145, to have been \$198,505,282.

The report believes that there is no scarcity of gold and no rea-

sonable danger of it; "a country bank can always get gold, if it has marketable assets to offer for it;" "prices in general have little to do with the gold movement;" "gold prices must be uniform the world over, the only difference will be due to the cost of transportation."

The Demand Obligations of the Government, the last subject, is discussed under six heads: Government versus Bank Notes, History of the United States Notes, Effect of Paper Issues on the Cost of the Civil War, Effect of Paper Issues on Wages, Retirement of the United States Notes.

Ground is taken in advocacy of bank issues as preferable to government treasury notes and the gradual withdrawal of all the latter in favor of the former is urged. It is shown that the issue of greenbacks involved the United States government in a net loss up to August 31, 1865, of \$600,000,000, by an increase in the cost of the war.

Banking is a much more complicated and difficult subject than metallic currency, and is treated under nineteen topics: The Nature of a Bank, Deposit Currency, Expansion of Note Issues, Part of Bank Note Issues, History of the National Banking System, Circulation Secured by Bonds, Circulation Secured by Commercial Assets, Guaranty Fund, Insolvency of National Banks, Working of Commission's Plan, Instances of Bank Notes Based on Commercial Assets, Elasticity, Redemption of Notes, Uniformity of Note Issues, Bank Reserves, Inspection and Examination, Taxation of Banks, Loaning and Banking Facilities of the South and West, Branch and Small Banks.

Attention will be called only to the question of bank notes issued as currency. The requisites are security and elasticity. There are three bases to secure these requisites. Our present national banking system uses the bond deposit plan, and is fatally defective in elasticity, though generally safe. Notes secured by the commercial assets of the bank is the ideal plan for an ideal community, giving security and elasticity; its defect in the requisite of security, as conducted by unwise and dishonest bankers. Notes secured by a guaranty fund seems the system which can be made to produce the best practical results, combining both the requisites to the highest attainable degree, and is the plan recommended by the commission. Its essential idea is that the banks shall constitute a union, providing a common guaranty fund for all issues, by the deposit of a reserve in the custody of the government treasury.

We cannot say too much in praise of this work. If every intelligent person in the South would give it a careful and candid reading, we believe that a permanent and substantial benefit would

result to our beloved section. The University of Chicago and the Washington and Lee University, in the work of Profs. Laughlin and Willis, deserve credit for their connection with it. The former institution has shown that it possesses excellent facilities for the manufacturing of books by this creditable specimen of its skill.

JAMES A. QUARLES.

Washington and Lee University.

A HISTORY OF THE LATIN MONETARY UNION: A STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL MONETARY ACTION, By Henry Parker Willis, sometime Fellow in Political Economy and Political Science in Washington and Lee University. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1901.

This octavo of 332 pages is Number V., of the Economic studies of the University of Chicago; it has been preceded by *The Science of Finance*, Gustav Cohn; *History of the Union Pacific Railway*, Henry Kirke White; *The Indian Silver Currency*, Karl Ellstaetter, and *State Aid to Railways in Missouri*, Jno. W. Million. It is dedicated to William Lyne Wilson, the late President of the Washington and Lee University. It is an independent and original work, founded upon a study of the official reports. Its especial object is to present the history of the Latin Union with reference to the light it throws on the silver question and international monetary action. There are twenty chapters, followed by three appendices: *The Treaties of the Latin Monetary Union, 1865 to 189.*; *General Coinage Figures for Countries of the Union*; and a *Bibliography*. There are appended five charts and an index.

The twenty chapters may be arranged and under four heads: I. Preliminary to the Union, 1-4; II. The Formation of the Union, 5 and 6; III. The History of the Union, 7-19; and IV. Condition and Prospects of the Union, 20.

In the preliminary are given the monetary history of France, Belgium and Switzerland prior to the Union, and the coinage difficulties which led to its establishment. The event in France which has colored its subsequent monetary history is the Act XI., *Germinal*, (1803), which made the franc the unit and gave free coinage and unlimited legal tender to both silver and gold at the ratio of 15½ to 1.

This established what is sometimes called the bimetallic standard, but which most economists know as the alternating standard. These names, indeed, are a shibboleth of the two rival monetary schools. Bimetallists affirm the possibility, legal and commercial, and the actuality in the case of France and other countries, of a double contemporaneous standard money; that gold and silver

can be and have been at the same time, and for an indefinite period, at the same ratio, in the same way, to the same degree, and in the same community, the standard of value for the business world. Monometallists admit that the two metals can circulate together as a medium of exchange, and that both can be the legal or nominal standard at the same time, but they deny, because of the inconstant values of the two metals with reference to each other, that they ever have been, or can be for any length of time, at the same ratio, the commercial or actually used standard of value.

France is the favorite example to which the bimetallists refer as the proof of their position. The law of 1803 was allowed full operation until 1873, when the coinage of silver was first subjected to a limit. The facts show, with increasing clearness and force, that, from 1803 to 1848, the business of France was conducted upon the silver basis, because gold was undervalued at the legal rate of  $15\frac{1}{2}$  to 1. The proof is that during this period the export of gold from France was greater than its import, and its coinage as compared with silver from 1830 to 1848 was 10.9 to 89.1 per cent.; while the import of silver largely exceeded its export. Gold went when it was the standard and silver remained as the standard of France.

The facts as certainly show that after 1848 the scale turned, and that France soon changed from the silver to the gold basis, the law remaining the same. The year of 1848 is an epoch in metallic money, because it is the date of the discovery of what is called "the new gold," by which the production of that metal was largely increased. The effect in France is seen in its coinage; prior to 1848 the rate of its mintage had been only 10.9 per cent.; from 1848 to 1857 the rate was 77.6 per cent. of the whole, as compared with 22.4 per cent. for the silver. Moreover, from 1853 to 1857 the import of gold exceeded its export by 1,744,000,000 francs. During this period silver was undervalued at  $15\frac{1}{2}$  to 1, and was not used as a standard.

About 1870 the third metallic monetary period of the nineteenth century began, due to two causes, the increasing dislike for silver as a money metal, and on account of its bulkiness and its excessive production. Coinage of gold almost ceased, while that of silver was so great as to lead to its forcible limitation in 1873, while a deluge of foreign silver inundated the country.

The experience of France corroborates the monometallic contention that legal bimetallism does not secure a double, but an alternating standard. From 1803 to 1848, silver was the standard money and gold went to the sea or to the rock; from 1848 to 1870, gold was the standard, and silver sailed; from 1870 to 1878, silver resumed the throne, and gold was banished.

In 1832, Belgium followed France, in adopting the franc as its money unit and in legalizing the free coinage and unlimited legal tender of both gold and silver. In 1847 the ratio was changed from  $15\frac{1}{2}$  to 15.85, looking to a change from silver to gold; but in 1861 the French ratio was restored. The Swiss Federation became a monetary unit in 1848, and in 1850 adopted the French system, without providing for the coinage of gold. In 1859, there was an official recognition of the gold standard as a fact, which was followed in 1860 by its legal adoption. Italy, 1862, adopted the French coinage system, with the exception that the silver five-franc was .9 fine and the subsidiary silver coins were made .835; Italy thus taking the lead among the countries that formed the Union in debasing the fractional silver.

It is thus seen that Belgium, Switzerland and Italy had separately and independently adopted the French system; it seemed a natural evolution that they should form a monetary federation. This was proposed by Belgium to France in the early part of 1865, and France accordingly invited these powers to meet her in convention at Paris, November 20, of that year. The invitation was accepted by all three, and the delegates met on the day named, and, continuing to meet December 1, 6 and 21, completed their work December 23. The result was the formation of a treaty which constituted these four sovereign States the Latin Monetary Union. A similar union had been formed in the preceding decade by the German States, and this was to be followed later by the Scandinavian Union.

The result of this convention of 1865, besides the formation of the league, may be summarized thus: No standard was adopted; the silver five-franc was retained as a standard coin; the subsidiary silver was debased to .835 fine; a coinage quota of six francs per capita for subsidiary silver was allowed each State; any other State was allowed admission on the terms of the treaty; the treaty was to continue in force fifteen years; the specifications of the recent Italian coinage were to be followed in the manufacture of the pieces, and information on money matters was to be mutually exchanged.

The influence of France was dominant in the formation of the Union and has continued during its history. Dr. Willis asserts that the Emperor Louis Napoleon was largely influenced by political motives in calling the convention, believing that it would add weight to France in Europe and the world. It may be added in this connection that the Bank of France has been and is the financial dictator of that country, often in opposition to the views of its commercial leaders and *doctrinaires*, who have tried in vain to bring their country to the formal adoption of the gold standard.

Greece was the only State which formally joined the Union, and it added only an element of weakness. The French decimal metric system was applied to the coinage by the Union, and its superior excellence led Austria, Roumania and Spain to adopt it in the operations of their mints.

Italy has been next to Greece, financially the weakest member of the Union, owing to what is called the *covers force*, 1866, that is, the suspension of specie payment and the forced circulation of an incontrovertible government paper money. Belgium, next to France, has been the strongest; while Switzerland has depended largely on France and Belgium for its money.

The Franco-Prussian war of 1870 resulted in Germany receiving an indemnity of five thousand millions of francs. It is interesting to know that only about ten per cent. of this was paid in French metallic money, silver or gold, and less than one-fifth in money of any kind. Another result of that war was to give Germany the monetary leadership in Continental Europe, due to her adoption of the gold standard. Her supremacy would have been more complete had she also taken the French decimal franc system.

The convention of the Union in 1874 determined to limit the coinage of silver, to hold annual meetings, and to restrict admission to the Union. So far as silver is concerned, this introduced the period of restriction which continued until 1878. The silver five-franc, having by its depreciation become virtually a token coin, (that is, one whose legal coin value was greater than its commercial bullion value), the expediency of its coin for private parties became an important question. Belgium, Italy and Switzerland all saw and acted at once on the principles that, as the government was responsible for the redemption of these coins, it alone should have the benefit of the signiorage; France joined them in this policy the latter half of 1875.

The restriction of the coinage of silver produced good results, which led France in August 1876, to suspend altogether the minting of the silver five-franc. Belgium followed in December of the same year. The Union in 1878 made this a part of the monetary treaty, and thus introduced the period of suspension of the coinage of unlimited legal tender silver.

J. A. QUARLES.

Lexington, Va.



OCTOBER, 1901.

*~~~~~*

# THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

VOL. XV.

CONTENTS:

No. 4

|       |                                                                                                            |         |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| I     | THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM. Professor William Alexander, D. D. ....                                        | 487-499 |
| II.   | ELECT INFANTS DYING IN INFANCY. Rev. Luther Link                                                           | 450-507 |
| III   | JUSTIN ARISTIDES AND QUADRATUS AS WITNESSES FOR THE NEW TESTAMENT. Rev. P. P. Flournoy, D. D.              | 508-547 |
| IV.   | THE CONQUEST OF FEAR. Rev. J. W. Stagg, D. D..                                                             | 548-557 |
| V.    | PUZZLING QUESTIONS. Prof. L. G. Barbour, D. D...                                                           | 558-570 |
| VI.   | THE INITIATORY RITE. Rev. Edward Everett Smith...                                                          | 571-578 |
| VII.  | REAS NS FOR CHANGING THE SABBATH FROM THE SEVENTH DAY TO THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK. Rev. A. B Taylor ..... | 579-584 |
| VIII. | PARADISE. Rev. W. C. Clark, D. D.....                                                                      | 585-589 |
| IX.   | CRITIC SMS AND REVIEWS. THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIOLOGY Rev W. W. Elwang, D. D.....                            | 591-594 |

CHARLOTTE, N. C.

PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

\$3.00 A YEAR, - - 75 CENTS A COPY.

IN ADVANCE.

Address all communications to A. J. MCKELWAY, Editor, Charlotte, N. C.



# THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY

---

A Theological, Philosophical and Literary Review, conducted by an Association composed of the following Ministers :

|                               |                              |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| W. M. MCPHEETERS, D. D.       | W. W. MOORE D. D., LL. D.    |
| D. J. BRIMM, D. D.            | B. M. PALMER, D. D., LL. D.  |
| JOHN F. CANNON, D. D.         | ROBERT PRICE, D. D.          |
| WM. C. CLARK, D. D.           | J. B. SHEARER, D. D.         |
| J. N. CRAIG, D. D.            | SAMUEL M. SMITH, D. D.       |
| A. B. CURRY, D. D.            | R. K. SMOOT, D. D., LL. D.   |
| C. R. HEMPHILL, D. D., LL. D. | C. C. HERSMAN, D. D., LL. D. |
| T. W. HOOVER, D. D.           | ROBERT A. WEBB, D. D.        |
| C. W. HUMPHREYS, D. D.        |                              |

---

A. J. MCKELWAY, EDITOR.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS: G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D., GEO. SUMMEY, D. D.  
F. R. BEATTIE, D. D.; S. C. BYRD, A. M.

---

CHARLOTTE, N. C.:

THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

\$3.00 Per Annum.

75 Cents Per Single Number.

---

Address all communications and make all remittances to

A. J. MCKELWAY, Charlotte, N. C.

Subscriptions are discontinued only upon written request of subscribers and settlement of account to date.

---

Every Presbyterian Should Read a State Paper.

## The Nashville American,

NASHVILLE, TENN.

DAILY AND WEEKLY, is the only State paper published in the State at the capital. This gives the American advantage over all other papers in the State. Besides giving all the State news, it gives more general news than any paper published in Tennessee.

The price of the Daily is 65 cents a month, or \$7.80 a year. The price of the Weekly is 50 cents a year. Sample copies free. Agents wanted. Address

**THE AMERICAN, Nashville, Tenn.**

THE  
Presbyterian Quarterly.

---

NO. 57--OCTOBER, 1901.

---

I.—THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

The subject of this paper has been a good deal discussed and written about of late years. And yet it is not altogether new. Ever since the great schism in the eighth century between the Greek and Latin Churches repeated attempts have been made to effect a reunion. Since the Reformation several abortive attempts have been made to effect even partial reunion. One of the latest of these was the proposal set forth in the celebrated Lambeth Quadrilateral or the four propositions of the Convocation of English and American Bishops at Lambeth. The Northern Assembly appointed a very respectable committee to meet with a similar committee of the American Episcopal Church, and for two or three years they held a number of very pleasant joint meetings. But no real progress was made, and very few real Presbyterians ever expected any results of any value. None of the proposed articles were entirely satisfactory, but the insuperable difficulty was in the last one. Presbyterians would not object to the truly primitive and scriptural episcopate, which is the parochial episcopate, but it was obvious from the first that the Episcopalians meant the later diocesan or prelatical episcopate, and that is what Presbyterians will never accept, and they would cease to be Presbyterians if they did. It was, therefore, no more than might have been expected when the General Assembly at Saratoga in 1894 dismissed their committee and discontinued further fruitless negotiations.

The subject of union, however, still continues to be dis-

cussed. There is a paper published in New York, edited by a body, with the co-operation of several eminent divines, of which the union of churches is the special object. A conference is held in New York occasionally, I believe, in connection with Union Theological Seminary, on the subject of Church Union, and a volume of their papers was published a year or two ago. The reunion of Christendom was a subject very near to the heart of my friend, the late Dr. Philip Schaff. I thought he was wasting a great deal of valuable time in that way, and once, when I was urging him to let other things lie for awhile and finish his great History of the Church, and to bring it up to the time of the Pan-Presbyterian Council: "Yes," he said, "up to the Pan-Christian Council." I feared very much that he would not be spared long enough to do that.

Now, it goes without saying that the advocates of the reunion of Christendom mean a visible external organic union. And to secure this end they are willing to make large sacrifices of doctrine. In fact, the advocates of such union generally make small account of doctrine, and charge upon theology nearly all the evils of heresy and schism. By schism they mean separation from episcopal authority, and they regard that as worse than error in doctrine.

The reunion of Christendom generally means by its advocates the union of existing religious bodies, or denominations, into one visible organic body, so that there shall be but one Christian Church throughout the world. The difference between the Church as visible and invisible is overlooked or denied, and the bond of union is external. And the evils of denominationalism are often grossly exaggerated. These views, however, do not commend themselves to men of cooler and sounder judgment, and of a more practical turn of mind. It is freely conceded that there are too many denominations, and that a union of the smaller ones with the larger ones of the same faith and order is desirable. The smaller Presbyterian bodies, to mention no others, doubtless seem to themselves to have

good and sufficient reasons for remaining apart. And as long as they thus think we must respect their convictions. Further than this is useless, for no Presbyterian can be forced or coaxed into any sort of union against his convictions. But whether their reasons for maintaining a separate existence, however satisfactory to themselves, are such as will justify them in the mind of the great Head of the Church, may admit of some doubt. But the question is entirely different, whether those who are separated by important doctrinal differences, differences of church polity, nationality, language, history and usages should be combined in one visible organic union. Such a union as this we do not believe to be either desirable or possible.

If all the separate churches were combined in one huge body it would become unwieldy, an inert mass, unless under the control of some one great central power, like that of the Roman Pontiff. And we know what has been the result of that unity. With all its tyranny and infringement upon liberty, it has not answered the end proposed. Not to speak of minor divisions, there have arisen, in spite of of the Roman obedience, no less than three grand divisions of Christendom, the Oriental or Orthodox Greek Church, the Latin or Papal Church, and the Protestant Church, of which the Episcopal is only one of the separate Protestant Communion. Very few Protestants, or even Greeks or Russians, would seriously consider an invitation to return to Rome.

Nor has Episcopacy, apart from Rome, been any more successful in preserving unity of organization. The Episcopal Church has no where had more signal advantages than in England, yet even there, there has always been a large body of dissenters, and at the present time it is an open question whether they do not actually outnumber the Church of England. And in this country, in the original colonies, with the exception of New England and Pennsylvania, the Episcopal Church was favored above all others. They therefore had much the advantage at the start;

and although the Presbyterians were persecuted in some of the colonies, the Episcopalians not only failed to preserve organic union, but actually dropped behind several other churches in progress.

These statements are made not with the purpose of disparaging the excellent people of the Episcopal denomination, but to show the utter futility of any scheme of organic union based upon the diocesan episcopate.

Nor is any other scheme of organic union any more likely to be successful. The early part of this century witnessed an attempt to get rid of the alleged evils of separate denominations by the rejection of creeds, and adherence to the Bible alone. The Rev. Thomas Campbell and his son, Alexander Campbell, undertook the role of reformers. Thomas Campbell was a Presbyterian minister, but had been originally a Roman Catholic, and quite likely retained a prejudice against denominations, which he brought over with him from his early associations. His son, Alexander, also a Presbyterian, was left to finish his studies in Glasgow, and there fell under the influence of the Haldanes. Upon coming to this country he found his father in a state of mind similar to his own. They first rejected infant baptism, then they adopted immersion as the only mode of baptism. But as the Presbyterians of Western Pennsylvania were not disposed to tolerate such irregularities, they went over to the Baptists. But finding themselves not at home with them they withdrew and set up for themselves. Thus their project of doing away with denominations by rejecting all creeds except the Bible, as they themselves understood it, ended in simply adding one more to the denominations already existing. That is to say, the attempt at union by the rejection of creeds proved to be an utter failure.

From very early times there has never been any such thing as an organic union of Christians. The only bond of union between them was fellowship in the same faith, and the indwelling of the same Holy Spirit. Each local church was governed by its own elders. In the apostolic Church,

and in the times following, bishop and presbyter were two words denoting the same class of persons, as even the most learned and candid Episcopal scholars themselves admit. The Apostles were a special and exceptional class of officers, and after them there were no others except elders and deacons, one of whom was recognized by reason of his qualifications or gifts, as the pastor or parochial bishop of each church. In our current Church Histories a great deal of error and confusion has arisen from a failure to discriminate between these earlier and primitive practical bishops, and the later diocesan bishops. Our object, however, is not to discuss this question, and it is only mentioned incidentally, to show that the early churches did not constitute an episcopal hierarchy, but were to a large extent independent of each other. When some question of common interest or importance arose it was referred to a Synod, made up of commissioners chosen by the people to represent them, of which the first Synod at Jerusalem may be taken as an example. And the decisions reached were not merely advice, but "decrees for to keep." These Synods were the only external bond of union known to the early church. The fact that these Synods did not meet statedly, as they do now in the Reformed Churches, is nothing to the purpose. Stated meetings are only a matter of convenience or interest. The essential thing about them is, that in them the principle of representation is recognized, and that their decisions were authoritative. In all else the local church managed its own affairs, without the supervision of a diocesan bishop. The bond of union between them was mainly internal, not external.

And when the term "Catholic" began to be applied to the church, it was not used to designate any particular organic body, but all Christians who adhered to the common faith, as ever against all heresiarchs and heretical and schismatical bodies. And even after the Episcopate had been evolved out of the presbyterate, slowly and gradually,

(*Paulatim*, as St. Jerome said)\* there was no organic union of Christendom, such as the advocates of church union now seek. For a time each bishop of a diocese was supreme within his own jurisdiction. When the archbishops arose they had jurisdiction over the bishops in a limited area. And when the Patriarchates arose, each Patriarch was independent within his own jurisdiction. In process of time the Greek Church separated from the Latin Church, and since then there has not been even the semblance of organic union in Christendom.

The Western or Latin branch has, indeed, by means of the hierarchy, kept up a species of uniformity, but without real union. There are two kinds of union, that which is from within, and that which is external. A living tree, for instance, is constituted a unity by the life or vital force within, but an external unity is like that of a barrel, the parts of which are kept together by the hoops outside. This latter is the kind of unity, or uniformity, which the Roman Church has managed to keep up, and which the Episcopal Church attempted in England; while the former, a living and real union, but not organic, is what we find in the early church. We thus see that the whole scheme of organic unity, such as is advocated now in certain quarters, is chimerical and impracticable, and that no such thing has ever existed in the whole history of the church.

Nor is such an organic unity desirable. The principle denominations of Protestant Christendom enjoy their religion more, and are doing vastly more for the good of mankind, and for the coming kingdom and glory of our divine Redeemer than they would or could if bound together in one organic body. Methodists are freer, happier and more useful as Methodists than they ever could be in any other way, while staid Calvinistic Presbyterians would not feel at home among Methodists, and are vastly more useful by themselves. Pædo-baptists are not ready to give up the

---

\*Jerome reminded the bishops of his day that they were such, not so much by the command of Christ as by the custom of the churches.

baptism of their children, nor to go under the water themselves; while our Baptist brethern could not conscientiously forego immersion, nor administer baptism to infants. And none of us are willing to submit to my lord bishop. These divergences have their ground in the diversities of human nature, and should be recognized as such. Wherever men are free to think and act these differences will exist.

And they are not necessarily an evil, but on the contrary are a source of much good. That there are sometimes unseemly denominational rivalries and controversies is fully admitted; but the remedy for these faults is not organic remedy. In that case parties would still exist, and the party strife would increase in bitterness, as is actually the case in those hierarchical churches which attempt to enforce uniformity. But the true remedy is to be found in the spread of a broader and more catholic charity, such as begins to display itself more and more as men begin to see that the things in which they agree are far more and more important than the things in which they differ.

And the ends of denominationalism are not by any means as great as they have been represented. They have been grossly exaggerated. The writer of this paper has been at the front a great deal in the course of his life and has seen a great deal of the home mission work in our country. It is on the home field that complaints have been loudest of the different denominations crowding and hindering one another. In point of fact there is very little ground of complaint. Occasionally, in a village, there may be two or three churches where one is all that can be supported at present, but in most cases these towns are growing, and soon there will be ample support for all. It is a recognized principle of Presbyterianism that the people have a right to the church of their choice, and we would rather lose our right hand than to deny the Presbyterian people of God a church organization wherever there are enough of them, with a reasonable prospect of self-support. It would be cruel and inhuman to say to such people, 'We can do



nothing for you, and you must abjure the faith and the church in which you were brought up, and go into some other,' just because it was a little smarter than we were in getting there first. Fortunately our home missionaries are not that kind of men. After an observation on the field, covering a period of more than a quarter of a century, we are glad to be able to testify that very little home missionary money has been injudiciously expended. There is room for all, and the denominations have been no appreciable hindrance, but have rather incited one another to an emulation in good works.

We may, however, be confronted with certain passages of Scripture, which, to a superficial reader, may seem to favor organic union. If such be their meaning, why, then, of course that settles the matter against all questions of expediency, denominational preferences, or even a practicability at present. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, to inquire what is the real teaching of Scripture on the subject. As we make no claim, personally, to be an authority on such matters, we propose to give the expositions of some of those who are recognized as masters in exegesis.

In Christ's intercessory prayer, as recorded in the 17th chapter of John's gospel, he prays, v. ii, "that they may be one as we are," v. 21, "that they all may be one as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us." We are persuaded that these words have some times been made to do duty in a way which our Lord never intended. Let us first see what an Anglican scholar, like the late Dean Alford, has to say on these passages. Following Augustine, he says, "the oneness here is by the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ, the gift of the covenant, and ultimately oneness of nature." Then on v. 21 he says, "The subject matter of the prayer is, that they may be kept in God's name, and sanctified in God's truth; and if this be so, their unity with the Son and the Father follows. . . . This unity has its true and only ground in faith in Christ, through the word of God as delivered by the Apostles, and

is, therefore, not mere outward uniformity, nor can such uniformity produce it. At the same time its effects are to be real and visible, such that the world may see them." The Dean's meaning evidently is, that there should be such a manifestation of faith and charity as shall exemplify their oneness in Christ, even though in minor matters they be separated by national and denominational lines.

Let us next see what a German scholar, Meyer, who is still *facile princeps* on the New Testament, has to say on these passages. We purposely leave the Greek Grammar out, as not being interesting to ordinary readers, and as savoring of pedantry to put it in. In John 17:11 he says, "the Lord prays that God would keep them in this his name in order that they, in virtue of the one common faith and confession resting on the name of God, may be one (in the spiritual fellowship, of like mind and love, comp. vs. 22, 23) in conformity with the archetype of the ethical unity of the Father and the Son."

In vs. 20-21, of the same chapter, Meyer says: "In his prayer for the disciples for their preservation and sanctification (vs. 11-19), Jesus now also includes all who (comp. Rom. 10:14) shall believe on him through the apostle's word. The purpose for which he also includes these; that all (all my believing ones, the apostles and the others,) may be one, ethically in likeness of disposition, of endeavor, of love, etc., on the ground of faith. This ethical unity of all believers, to be specifically Christian, must correspond as to its original to the reciprocal fellowship between the Father and the Son, according to which the Father lives and moves in the Son, and the Son in the Father, the object of which, in reference to believers collectively, is that in them also the Father and the Son may be the element in which they (in view of the *union mystica* brought about through the Spirit, 1 Jno. 1:3, 14-13; 1 Pet. 1:4) live and move. This ethical union of all believers in the fellowship with the Father and the Son, however, (comp. xiii:35) shall serve to the unbelieving world as an actual proof and

ground of conviction, that Christ, the grand central point and support of this unity, is none other than the sent of God."

This might be sufficient were not the temptation to offer one or two Presbyterian authorities irresistible. Dr. David Brown, in his Commentary on the Gospels, on John xvii, says: "It is not mere unity—whether in a vast external organization, or even in internal judgment and feeling about religious matters. It is oneness in the unity of the Father and the Son—that they may be one in us—in the matters of grace and salvation. Thus it is a union in spiritual life, a union in faith on a common Saviour, in love to his blessed name, in hope of his glorious appearing; a union brought about by the teaching, quickening and indwelling of the one Spirit of the Father and the Son in all alike; in virtue of which they have all one common character and interest—in freedom from the bondage of sin and Satan, in separation from this present evil world, in consecration to the service of Christ and the glory of God, in witnessing for truth and righteousness on the earth, in participation of all spiritual blessings in Christ Jesus." The whole passage in Dr. Brown's comment, too long for quotation here in full, will repay the reader's careful study.

In Romans 12:4, 5, is another passage referred to by the advocates of external organic union. The apostle there says, "for as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office, so we, being many are one body in Christ, and everyone members one of another." In this passage Dr. Charles Hodge (commentary on Romans) remarks: "The apostle's design is to show that the diversities of offices and gifts among Christians, so far from being inconsistent with their union as one body in Christ, is necessary to the perfection and usefulness of that body. It would be as unreasonable for all Christians to have the same gifts as for all the members of the human frame to have the same office. This confession is peculiarly beautiful and appropriate, because it not only clearly illustrates the partic-

ular point intended, but at the same time brings into view the important truth that the real union of Christians results from the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, as the union of the several members of the body is the result of their all being animated and actuated by one soul. Nothing can present in a clearer light the duty of Christian fellowship, or the sinfulness of divisions and envyings among the members of Christ's body than the apostle's confession."

The Apostle Paul says in Gal. iii, vs. 27-28, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. 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." In the first clause of these verses Meyer well remarks: "After ye have put on Christ, the distinctions of your various relations of life, apart from Christianity, have vanished; from the standpoint of this new condition they have no further validity, any more than if they were not in existence. And on the last clause, "for ye all are one," he says, "ye form a single moral person; so that now those distinctions of individuals outside of Christianity appear as non-existent, completely merged in that higher unity to which ye all are raised in virtue of your fellowship of life with Christ."

We have now examined the principal passages of scripture bearing on the question of unity. We have shown from learned expositors in England, Scotland, Germany and America that these passages do not refer to organic unity in one vast undivided body, but to our oneness in Christ, which is a union arising from the profession of the same faith in Christ and the indwelling of the same Holy Spirit, who is the bond of the only real union that there is or can be among Christians. Jesus Christ is the head, and the only head, of whom all Christians are the members, constituting the one mystical body of Christ. And this oneness in Christ does not require or imply organic union, for it can and has existed in all its fulness without it, and cannot be produced by it. In further support of these

views, see Dr. Hodges fine commentary on Ephesians iv, 3-7 inclusive, which is too long for quotation.

These things being so, it is easy to see who are the real schismatics. They are those who refuse fellowship with their Christian brethren, whether it be on account of baptism or episcopal ordination, or the Roman obedience. Such conduct cannot be other than offensive to the great Head of the Church. To cast out of the church those for whom Christ died, and who profess their faith in him, and in whom the Holy Spirit dwells, is of the very essence of schism. To refuse fellowship and church privileges to any who profess their faith in Christ, and in whom the Spirit dwells who owns and blesses their labors in the cause of Christ, is not only sinful in the sight of God, but is a scandal in the eyes of men. The arrogant claim of any one branch of Christendom to be the Church, excluding all others, and among them some of the greatest and holiest of men, is a mournful exhibition of uncharitableness and bigotry. In contrast to this narrowness, the declaration of the Westminster Confession of Faith, that "the visible church consists of all those throughout the world who profess the true religion, together with their children," is catholic and noble. By the true religion is meant, not any one party of Christians, but Christianity, as over against all other forms of religion. And we are glad that our own branch of the church visible, while it has stood firmly for the truth as it is revealed in the word of God, is truly catholic and charitable in its doctrine of the church.

Instead, therefore, of seeking an undesirable, impracticable and unscriptural organic union of Christendom, in one immense and unwilling body, kept together by mere external organization, without any real spiritual unity, let us endeavor "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," realizing that there is but one faith, one baptism, one Holy Spirit and one divine spiritual life, whereof we all are partakers. We rejoice in the evidence that our different denominations are beginning to understand this more

and more, and to abate much of the party strife, bitterness and hatred that once disfigured them. This realization of their oneness has been greatly promoted by the great Catholic Societies, such as the British and American Bible Societies, the American Tract Society and the American Sunday School Union; the revision of the Bible by scholars of different English speaking churches, and more recently by the great Christian Endeavor movement.

Let the good work go on. Let all the divisions of the great sacramental host, while retaining their denominational peculiarities, feel their real oneness in Christ, and strive to promote more charitable and brotherly feeling toward one another. Let all Christians learn to receive all whom Christ receives.

“Then shall his perfect will be done  
When Christians love and live as one.”

WILLIAM ALEXANDER.

San Anselmo, Cal.



cerning such as die in infancy. This makes a distinction between elect infants who die in infancy and elect infants who do not die in infancy.

Now the conception of elect infants who do not die in infancy seems so harsh and unnatural that it is not surprising that those who have not felt called upon to defend the Confession have usually adopted the other interpretation as the more reasonable. It is not easy to see why people who did not die in infancy should be styled "elect infants" by being embraced in that class. Yet this seems to be the conception which takes "elect infants" as equivalent to "elect persons." But it does not seem natural that "elect persons" and "elect infants" can be the same in extent of meaning. The first—"elect persons who die in infancy"—would naturally mean that of all elect persons the predication of the sentence is confined to those dying in infancy. In the same way "elect infants who die in infancy" would mean that of all elect infants those dying in infancy are under consideration. But does not this seem to be an unnatural use of language?

Now instead of making "dying in infancy" a limiting clause, let it be taken as an explanatory cause, its extent being precisely the same as the first clause. "Elect infants, [viz. those] dying in infancy, are regenerated, etc." The language now tells us that elect infants are precisely those who die in infancy, and they are the only ones properly denominated such; and the sentence goes on to explain how the whole of this class are saved. Instead, then, of having "a well-grounded hope, which is extra-credal, and supposed to be extra-scriptural, that all infants dying in infancy are saved," we have a confessional statement which virtually asserts that they are all saved, because it tells how the class as a whole are saved. This eliminates the idea of implied contrast in the words of the section. The emphasis is on "infant," and not on "elect," and the expression is simply an enumeration of one of the constituent divisions of the elect, the third class enumerated being idiots.



This interpretation is borne out by the analogy of the section itself, for the last sentence alludes to idiots as "all other elect persons" (this being the only remaining division), and then more particularly defines them as those "who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word." The first section tells how elect persons of age and intelligence are saved. The third section provides for the only remaining classes, infants and idiots; and so the much discussed section teaches what all want it to teach, the salvation of all infants dying in infancy.

It would be easy so show that this corresponds with the Calvinistic theology, and is a natural outcome of that theology. This has been already well done by the article on the "Three Maligned Theologians,"\* except that Calvin's position is obscured somewhat by a misinterpretation of the quotations which were supposed to imply the final condemnation of some infants.

#### CALVIN RE-EXAMINED.

Without intending any unkind criticism of the excellent paper above mentioned, let us carefully re-read some of the quotations from Calvin, and it will easily appear that Calvin cannot be justly held accountable for contradictory statements relative to infants, nor be correctly construed as anywhere teaching the damnation of any infants.

The first quotation to be noticed is that in which Calvin boldly states the doctrine of predestination, so boldly, indeed, that in the absence of any corrective of our judgment we should be obliged to set him down as a supralapsarian.

"For they [mankind] are not all created with a similar destiny; but eternal life is foreordained for some, and eternal damnation for others. Every man, therefore, being created for one or the other of these ends, we say he is predestinated either to life or death."

It is difficult to see how the supralapsarian doctrine could

---

\*PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, January 1901.

be more boldly stated than this. But in answering the objections to the doctrine he shows conclusively that his condition is not that of supralapsarianism. Calvin asks objectors "what they suppose God owes to man if he chooses to judge him from his own nature? As we are all corrupted by sin, we must necessarily be odious to God, and that not from tyrannical cruelty, but in the most equitable estimation of justice." This is distinct sublapsarianism.

But for the present purpose it matters not which view Calvin held; it does not touch the question of the final condemnation of any infants. And yet an inference on this question has been improperly drawn from the above statements. It is claimed that Calvin's statement of predestination leaves "no room to except infants dying in infancy or any others," implying that at least some infants are "predestinated to damnation." (p. 3.) Now, this is holding Calvin responsible for something which was never contemplated by him, and it is simply an illogical inference. The inference has been directly stated in these words: "It must be clear that if predestination and election are concerned with men before they are born, then there must be infants predestinated to condemnation, and non-elect infants, *since all must pass through the infant stage* (italics mine) before becoming adults." (P. 5.) This logic rests upon that interpretation which calls grown people infants because they were once infants; but add the defining cause "dying in infancy," which clearly states the point in discussion and the fallacy is perfectly manifest; and this is the argument: That because predestination precedes the actual birth of all men, therefore some infants dying in infancy must be lost. How about this logic? Of course no Calvinist intended to use such an argument, and the difficulty lies in the ambiguous use of "infants." The ambiguity is one for which Calvin is not responsible.

The most plausible passage adduced in support of the charge that Calvin taught infant damnation is as follows:

"I enquire again, how it came to pass that the fall of

Adam, independent of any remedy, should involve so many nations with their infant children in eternal death, but because such was the will of God? It is an awful decree, I confess, but no one can deny that God foreknew the future final fate of man before he created him, and that he did foreknow it because it was appointed by his own decree."

The logic of the last clause may seem harsh, from the fact that he makes the decree to precede foreknowledge of man's fall, but since he argues to the decree from God's foreknowledge of "the future final fate of man before he created him" it would seem that he must have had in mind a permissive decree as regards the lost. The knowledge of the future final fate of man, since it preceded creation (or the decree to create), must have been the knowledge of the possible rather than of the actual; and yet Calvin afterwards uses the word predestination as the equivalent of this decree as regards the fall.

"For what ground," he says, "of accusation is there against the heavenly judge for not being ignorant of futurity. If there is any just or plausible complaint, it lies against predestination; nor should it be thought absurd to affirm that God not only foresaw the fall of the first man, and the ruin of his posterity in him, but also arranged all by the determination of his own will."

It should be carefully noted that in this passage Calvin uses the word predestination in a broader sense than that technical one in which it has come to be used in the Calvinistic Theology. This is commensurate with the decree in the broadest sense. In this sense it is correctly made to precede both the creation and the fall. But predestination or election, which is concerned with the salvation of the elect people of God (and which is contrasted with reprobation or preterition), is supposed to have reference to the actual, and must be placed (logically) subsequent to both the creation and the fall.

Now Calvin, in this passage has, evidently been misconstrued. It is said that "he states the bearing of predesti-

nation on the fall in such boldness as to make it impossible for any escape, infant or adult, and he assigns no reason but the will of God." It is claimed that "it can be proved, not alone from sentences, but from the context . . . that he teaches *infant condemnation*." (P. 4) The italicised words must be taken to mean "infant damnation," for this is the subject under discussion. But here emerges an ambiguity by which the condemnation which follows the fall, and is universal, is confounded with the final condemnation or damnation of the wicked; in other words, original sin, or the guilt in which the fall involved every man, is confounded with the eternal death, or the punishment of the wicked.

But does not Calvin say the fall involved many nations with their infant children in eternal death? Yes, but he simply means the death of original sin; and it should be remembered that the phrase, "eternal death," is appropriate because death is naturally and necessarily eternal unless God intervenes to give life. The life that he gives is an eternal life, of which the saved soul becomes possessed when brought into Christ by faith.

That this is Calvin's meaning becomes very clear when we note in the quotation the clause, "independent of any remedy, which distinctly excludes the question of the damnation of anybody, and limits the discussion to the fall and its relation to the decrees.

With infant damnation eliminated from Calvin's writings, it becomes much more clearly manifest that he did really believe in the final salvation of all infants. It is not necessary to add "dying in infancy," because infant salvation cannot be predicated of any others. It seems certain then that when Calvin argues infant salvation, through immediate regeneration, he does not include any grown up people in the class; and he uniformly speaks of them as if they were certainly saved. He argues that they must be regenerated in order to be saved, because they are all involved in the general ruin of the fall. They must be brought into Christ in

order to have life. It is no objection to their regeneration to say that it is "not observed or understood by us." He argues the certainty of their regeneration from the certain fact of infant salvation. Because we know assuredly that "some infants are saved" (on the authority of Scripture), we know that they must have been regenerated. He argues that this must take place in the case of all who are saved, saying: "If they are born in a state of corruption, [speaking of the whole class] it is necessary for them to be purified before they are admitted to the kingdom of God."

He repels as frivolous the objection that it will not do to draw a general conclusion from the case of John the Baptist teaching "that the Lord generally acts in this manner with infants." He escapes this by denying that he drew such a conclusion. "For we use no such arguments," he says. He was only arguing the possibility of infant regeneration in connection with the discussion of infant baptism, and he must mean that he had never claimed the regeneration and salvation of all baptized infants.

A little further along, in arguing the possibility of infant regeneration, he uses language which seems very clearly to imply the salvation of all infants dying in infancy. The passage is valuable also for its analogy to our section of the Confession. He argues the possibility of regeneration for infants in general, saying :

"But as they think it would be such a great absurdity for any knowledge of God to be given to infants, to whom Moses denies the knowledge of good and evil, I would beg them to inform me what danger can result from our affirming that they already receive some portion of that grace of which they will ere long enjoy the full abundance."

In the next sentence he argues the point from the salvation and consequent regeneration of those infants who die in infancy:

"For if the plenitude of life consists in the perfect knowledge of God when some of them, whom death removes from the present state in their earliest infancy, pass into



### III. JUSTIN, ARISTIDES AND QUADRATUS AS WITNESSES FOR THE NEW TESTAMENT.

#### I. HAECKEL AND THE GOSPELS.

In Richmond, Virginia, for many years before the Civil War, there stood, or more properly, sat, a rather strange-looking, one-storied, wooden building, with a little sign over the door, on which were inscribed, if I remember aright, the words, "Select Classical School." In it was to be found during the day, except at meal times, and even before day and late into the night, an indefatigable worker—a rather short, muscular man of peculiar appearance and manners. He was one of that army of teachers from New England that invaded the South long before the cry "On to Richmond" was raised by an army of a very different kind. The South owes a great debt of gratitude to these teachers, who side by side with those educated in Southern colleges and universities, did the great work of dispensing the priceless benefits of preparatory education in advance of the organization of a public school system.

He was a good, earnest, Christian man. He had his faults, no doubt (and who of us has not some of his own?), but, except for some infirmities—or the opposite—of temper, David Turner lived for thirty or forty years in Richmond an unusually blameless and eminently useful life. The scholars who went from his school to the University of Virginia, there to attain to the degree of A. M., and thence to Germany, whence they returned with Ph. D. added to their names, were his pride; and he never failed to keep the eyes of those under his ferule on the noble heights which these heroes had gained. There must be many elderly men reared in Richmond during those years who remember with gratitude the earnest exhortations and careful training of this faithful teacher.

In the modern language department of this school there

presided, during certain hours of the day, an old Frenchman, Monsieur Michard, no less remarkable in appearance and other characteristics than his chief. He was a wizened, wrinkled, mite of a man, looking, as he went out of the door on a March day, wrapping his old surtout about his emaciated form, as if the wind would actually take him up and blow him away like the last leaf of autumn. He had been a lawyer, long ago, in Lyons, he told us; and for political reasons, had found it convenient, if not absolutely necessary, to leave his native land. Conversation was by no means forbidden in the modern language room when the lesson was through with before the hour was out, and M. Michard did not disdain to regale the inquiring minds of his pupils with other things besides the French and Spanish languages which he had to teach them. He was a Roman Catholic, and as often happens in the case of educated men in that communion, there was in him the strange combination of a certain kind of devoutness with skepticism.

One day he astonished at least one of his pupils by saying, in effect, that the New Testament could hardly be a divine revelation, because, as he asserted, besides the writings of which it was composed, there were perhaps a hundred others about as good as those which had been collected and made into the New Testament.

Providentially, an antidote was at hand. Richmond was favored with the ministry of the gifted and devoted Dr. Thomas Verner Moore at that time, and the troubled pupil found, under his ministry, a great deliverance from a terrible fate through the Gospel contained in that very New Testament on which the old teacher had cast these aspersions. He felt that it must be of God, as it brought that help in dire extremity which nothing else could furnish, and which nothing else had the slightest tendency to furnish. The conviction he had was like that of the starving man when food had been brought to save his life and he had felt its reviving and sustaining power from the first morsel he had taken. Finding, by his own experience, this Gospel



to be "The power of God unto salvation," he could not help believing that the book containing it was of God.

This incident, however, has caused that pupil of the old Frenchman to take a deep interest in several recent discoveries which have shown very clearly the falsity of the old man's assertion and of the implication contained in it.

His feeling, on coming to know, in later life, of the evidence from early Christian literature that this assertion had only a specious basis in the existence from an earlier or later time of a large number of "pious frauds" going under the general name of New Testament Apocrypha, which were never universally received by the church as inspired, was one of relief. When, in more recent years, discoveries were made which completely vindicated the genuineness of the New Testament writings, and especially the four Gospels, his feeling was like what that of a son might be whose father had died under false accusations—which he could not disprove, though absolutely sure from his knowledge of his father's character that they were false—when, among that father's papers he has found the full proof of his innocence and could publish it to the world.

The assertion of M. Michard about the selection of the New Testament books from a large number of similar writings was probably based on a story which has long been a favorite article of the stock-in-trade of infidels who make pretensions to learning, and which has been repeated in various forms in a large number of publications. A version of it may be found in the *American Review of Reviews* of only a few years ago, in an article entitled "How the Bible Came Down to Us," and one meets with it in the most unexpected places. Opening the recent work of Professor Haeckel, of Berlin, the coryphaeus of the host of atheistic evolutionists who have made so much unmelodious noise in the world—and about the world—for the last half century and more, I was surprised to find the great scientist repeating the absurd story in the pages of his *Riddle of the Universe*. This is his version of it (p. 311): "As to the four

canonical Gospels, we now know that they were selected from a host of contradictory and forged manuscripts of the first three centuries by the three hundred and eighteen bishops who assembled at the council of Nicaea in 327 [sic]. The entire list of Gospels numbered forty, and the canonical list contains four. As the contending and mutually abusive bishops could not agree about the choice, they determined to leave the selection to a miracle. They put all the books, (according to the Synodicon of Pappus), together underneath the altar, and prayed that the uncanonical books, of human origin, might remain there, and the genuine inspired books might be miraculously placed on the table of the Lord. And that, says tradition, occurred! The three synoptic Gospels, Matthew, Mark and Luke—all written after them, and not by them, at the beginning of the second century, and the very different fourth Gospel (ostensibly "after" John, written about the middle of the second century) leaped upon the table and were thenceforth recognized as the inspired (with their thousand mutual contradictions) foundations of Christian doctrine." He then goes on with sarcastic and violent raillery at Christians who could be so senseless as to believe in the uncouth miracle.

Now if before printing this nonsense, Haeckel had been prudent enough to go to Professor Adolf Harnack, in the Theological department of the great Berlin University, and tell him of it, Harnack would probably have said, had politeness allowed, something like this:

"My venerable friend, it would be wisest for us to confine ourselves to our own departments of investigation, as it is best for the shoemaker to stick to his last. Had I gone to you and told you that through scientific discoveries in this universe, of which you seem to have solved the riddle, 'we now know' that the moon is made of green cheese, and must, therefore, of course, be inhabited, I should not have made myself more ridiculous than you would make yourself by publishing this. For, in the first place, there is no evidence

that the Council of Nice did anything at all in the way of settling the canon of Scripture. The story you repeat is a baseless medieval legend.\* In the second place, abundant quotations in Irenaeus from the four Gospels as well as distinct statements on the subject, show that the four Gospels were as fully accepted in the year two hundred, as the only inspired accounts of our Saviour's life on earth, as they are now, while Justin Martyr shows by his quotations from these "memoirs of the apostles" as he calls them, that the case was just the same, more than fifty years earlier. Besides this, we now have, by recent discovery, the four Gospels wrought into a continuous account in Tatian's Diatessaron (i. e. through four), the very name of which shows that there are but four Gospels recognized, fifty years after the death of the apostle John; and by necessary implication, there had been no others thus recognized by the Christian Church. Besides all this, we now have the four Gospels in Syriac, complete, with the exception of a few pages lost out of the manuscript, earlier still than this Diatessaron, as is thought, because the Diatessaron contains many of its peculiar readings. It would be best, dear friend, for you to go on solving universe riddles and leave these matters to persons who have some information about early Christianity."

It would be well in our day to recall Beza's words to

---

\* "There is not the slightest evidence that the Council of Nice had anything whatever to do with settling the Canon of the New Testament. It was not called for any such purpose; nothing relating to the subject appears in the canons or acts of the council; no writer of the fourth, or fifth, or sixth, or seventh, or eighth century has even hinted that the matter came before the Council in any way."—*Dr. Ezra Abbott.*

The story was published by John Pappus, of Strasburg, at the beginning of the 17th century, from an anonymous manuscript which mentioned events occurring in 869 A. D., "500 years after the members of the Nicene council were dead and buried," as one has well said, and is a companion piece of many such monkish stories of uncouth miracles. It may be found republished in Fabricius' *Bibliotheca Graeca*, Vol. XI, p. 198.

Henry IV., in which he compares Christ's Church to an anvil, often struck, indeed, but wearing out many hammers.

Professor Haeckel's mistake is due to his ignorance of the fact that the positions of the famous Tübingen school,\* so boldly maintained by unbelieving scholars till twenty-five years ago and later, have been made absolutely untenable by recent discoveries; and now, no one who is informed on the subject can believe either in the late origin of any of the four Gospels, or in the universal acceptance, at any time, of any of the many heretical Gospels so-called. The *Gospel of Peter*†, so-called, fragments of which were discovered a few years ago at Achmin, in Egypt, seems to be a Docetic document, dependent on, and, in its main structure, patterned after, our Gospels. The Apocryphal *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which, perhaps, originated still earlier than that of Peter, was used by the heretical sect of the Elionites, and shows plainly, in the twenty-three quotations from it which are extant, dependence on all four of our Gospels.‡ So it comes about that these, the two oldest, apparently, of all the false Gospels that are known, when closely examined, become witnesses for the four Gospels instead of competitors with them.

It is instructive to look back over the course through which the Tübingen school has passed to its downfall, leaving so much spiritual wreck and ruin behind it in the overturning of the faith of many, during the past half century. The founder of this school of theological speculation was Frederick Christian Baur. Baur was withdrawn from the orthodox position, which his earliest productions indicated that he held, by the powerful influence of Schleiermacher, and then by that of Strauss, his own pupil, whose "Life of Jesus" seems to have been one of the means by which poor

---

\*Haeckel, while modifying Baur's dates, emphasizes his conclusions.

†See Ante-Nicene Fathers, IX. Vol., p. 3-31. Harnack assigns it to the first quarter of the second century. Other scholars place it later.

‡See Dr. B. Weiss' Manual of Introd. to N. T., Vol. II., § 45, 5.

George Eliot was robbed of her faith. But the chief influence which drew him aside was Hegel's philosophy. We need not examine at length the course of his reasoning. Little more is necessary than the mention of his conclusions about the time when the different books of the New Testament were written. He held that Paul wrote the four epistles, to the Romans, Corinthians and Galatians, and that John, the beloved disciple, wrote the Apocalypse ; but that the other books of the New Testament are spurious productions, and especially that the four Gospels containing the facts which are the basis of Christianity were written long after their reputed authors, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, were dead, and that they, therefore, could not have been written by them. This conclusion was founded, not upon facts, but upon *a priori* theories. Taking the opposite course from that of the Baconian method of deducing general conclusions from an induction of particular facts, he assumed certain general conclusions as true, and then proceeded to gather and arrange facts to sustain these conclusions. Assuming the impossibility of miracles, and of the supernatural in all its phases, and then adopting the Hegelian theory of the progress of every set of opinions, as going through the three stages of affirmation, contradiction and reconciliation (thesis, anti-thesis, and synthesis), he endeavored to account for the origin of the Christian Scriptures by supposing that they developed in a merely natural way by this rule.

The process, however, is of small importance. What we are concerned with is his conclusions as to the dates of these books, and especially of the four Gospels. Placing these four epistles of Paul in this first period of "affirmation," he pronounced them genuine and their traditional dates substantially correct. But, according to his theory, the so-called Synoptic Gospels, Matthew, Mark and Luke, must have originated in the second period—that of discussion and difference. So he concluded that while Matthew may have been written about 130 A. D., in the interest of

the Judaizing party, and Luke about 150 in advocacy of universality, Mark could not have originated earlier than the decade from 150 to 160, and that John must have been written in the period of synthesis or reconciliation of opposing parties, in the decade extending from 160 to 170 A. D.

## II. "SUPERNATURAL RELIGION."

Now, it would not have been necessary to detain the reader with the mention of these opinions of Baur if they had been held by him alone. But this was by no means the case. His views spread rapidly among German scholars, and the very influential Tubingen school was the result. Baur died in 1860, and his influence has long since waned in Germany, as its radical unsoundness has been demonstrated, not only by reasoning, but by unexpected events. But, as its sun was going down in Germany, it was rising on England. About twenty-five years ago there appeared in England a book dealing with these questions in an apparently learned way under the title of *Supernatural Religion*.

The aim of the book was to destroy belief in the supernatural, and especially to discredit the four Gospels. It was a popular presentation in English of the Tubingen theories of Baur and his school. The author withheld his name and seems never to have revealed it, though a prominent English review writer has been suspected of the authorship. The book was ushered in with a chorus of praise from reviews, extolling its great learning and fairness in discussion. It was at a time when the Darwinian theories were most zealously propagated, and a large proportion of the most cultivated Englishmen were under the spell of the skepticism which accompanied the reception of these theories. The result was that the book had an enormous sale, passing rapidly from one edition to another, and influenced a very large number of writers and readers in such a way as to lead them, at least, to question the divine origin of the Christian religion and the sacred character of

the Holy Scriptures. One thing, which, without doubt, added greatly to the popularity of this book with its skeptical readers was the fact that it, somehow, came to be understood that the anonymous author was one of the most eminent prelates of the Church of England, a man noted for his profound and accurate scholarship and unswerving faithfulness to his sacred duties during a long life of usefulness. Whether this fiction was given out by the unknown author or by some literary Mephistopheles among his admirers will probably never be known. But the result may, perhaps, be better imagined than described. This more than "dash of heresy" in the supposed production of a bishop long venerated for his learning and piety, gave the dish a piquancy whose charm was irresistible to the palate of the skeptical public, ready at all times, and more than ready at that time, of the beginning of the Darwinian ascendancy, to break away from all the old restraints of religion. The fact that a man of such character, standing and ability, who had so long been one of the church's guides and defenders, had now, as it seemed, joined the sappers and miners who were trying to destroy her foundations, and that this whilom eminent defender had, in this work, set off a blast which made the whole edifice tremble, filled the free-thinking literati with an excitement from whose intoxication they have hardly yet recovered. The sadly wronged prelate did indeed most emphatically disclaim the authorship, but this seemed of no avail. The book is said to have passed through six editions in as many months. This is probably an exaggeration, but the fact that the assertion is made is an indication that the circulation of the book must have been rapid beyond precedent in the case of a work devoted to learned argument on such a subject.

The book which was lauded by four reviews for its fairness and directness in argument was very soon found, on examination by competent scholars, to conceal, under the guise of vaunted fairness, almost every kind of indirection and unfair dealing. Dr. Lightfoot (afterwards Bishop

of Durham) convicted the author of so misrepresenting and warping the facts with which he dealt as to show an unmistakably dishonest intention to "make the worse the better reason seem." The utter misrepresentation of the meaning of authorities quoted, whether made from ignorance or design, indicated a prejudice against the Christian religion which made the author blind to whatever was evidential of its truth and lynx-eyed to the minutest fact that could be construed as unfavorable to it. Dr. Sanday, of Oxford, showed so conclusively the fallaciousness of the writer's argument designed to prove that the Gospel of Luke was derived from the mutilated Gospel which Marcion used in propagating his heresy, that he was forced to acknowledge that the Gospel of Luke was the original which, on the other hand, Marcion trimmed and treated to make it appear to support his heresy.

Dr. Lightfoot, in a remarkable set of articles in the *Contemporary Review*, proved that the supposedly learned and fair author of *Supernatural Religion*, either from the lack of even a school-boy knowledge of Greek, or from design, mistranslated passage after passage, from Irenaeus especially, so as to make it appear that the author intended to teach exactly the reverse of that which on a proper translation and construction of his words was shown to be his real meaning.

### III. TATIAN'S DIATESSARON.

The main position around which this great battle raged was The Diatessaron of Tatian, an account of which may be found in this review, Vol. XII., Nos. I. and II.

The author of *Supernatural Religion* ventured to assert that "No one seems to have seen Tatian's Harmony, probably for the reason that there was no such work." Could he have foreknown the events of the near future, he would have withheld this sarcasm.

During the very next year, 1876, there appeared a translation of Ephraem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron,



made at the request of the Mechitarist Fathers of San Lazaro, Venice, by Dr. Georgius Moesinger, of the University of Salzburg.\* The author of *Supernatural Religion*, in spite of this, which was a very clear proof of the existence of Tatian's Harmony, said in desperation: "It is obvious that there is no evidence of any value connecting Tatian's Gospel with those of our canon."

This he did in 1879, and he most certainly would not have said it if he could have foreseen what was to occur two years later. In 1881 Professor Zahn, of Erlangen, published a reconstruction of the Diatessaron of Tatian from Moesinger's translation of the commentary on it, and from the Homilies of Aphraates which were, also, based upon it. This made it clear that the Diatessaron was not another of the Apocryphal Gospels, nor a reproduction of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as had been conjectured, but was a harmony made up of our four Gospels.

This work of Zahn drew attention to an Arabic manuscript marked No. XIV., in the Vatican library, which purported to be a translation of the Diatessaron itself.

Ciasca, a "lector" of the library, was urged to translate this manuscript and publish it, but was delayed by other duties in doing so, and this providential delay was overruled, like many another, for the best result in the end. There was in the library one day an ecclesiastic, the Visitor Apostolic of the Catholic Copts in Egypt. He was invited to examine the manuscript, and as a result, informed Ciasca that he knew of another like it in Egypt, and that he would have it sent to him. In due time this was done, and thus Ciasca had two Arabic copies from which to make his translation. He completed and published his translation in 1888, in time to present it to the Pope on the occasion of his jubilee in that year. Now we have it in English in a translation with notes by the Rev. Hope W. Hogg, B. D., and his wife, who gave him much assistance in the undertaking, as

---

\*This translation was based on an earlier Latin version of the Mechitarist monk, Aucher.

well as an earlier by B. Hamlyn Hill, B. D., called *The Earliest Life of Christ*.

Two facts make it of great importance as a witness for the four Gospels. One is that it contains the whole account given of our Saviour's life and teachings contained in the Gospels, in the very words of the Gospels, woven together so as to make a continuous narrative, and is therefore appropriately named the Diatessaron, i. e., through four.

The second fact is that there is no trace of any Apocryphal Gospel in it, showing that the only Gospels recognized by the Christians of that early day, fifty or sixty years after the death of the last of the apostles, were those of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. The preparation of a life of our Saviour out of these Gospels, and these alone, without a word of his own (as Ebed Jesu puts it, "and of his own he did not add a single saying") indicates the universal acceptance of these Gospels long before, as well as the reverential awe entertained of them, as "The memoirs of the apostles," as Tatian's teacher, Justin Martyr, called them. This is too evident to need amplification or argument.

The Diatessaron, according to the careful estimate made by Professor G. F. Moore, contains 50 per cent. of Mark, 66 per cent. of Luke, 76 5 per cent. of Matthew and 96 per cent. of John. Before the discovery of the Diatessaron, the Rev. W. M. Taylor, D. D., of New York, composed a harmony of the same character, which he named *The Life of Our Lord in the Words of the Four Evangelists*, a book which was constantly used for daily reading by one whose memory is more precious to the writer than that of any other human being; and it would be as irrational to deny that Dr. Taylor had our four Gospels before him when he arranged that harmony, as to say that Tatian did not have them when he wove them together to make his. Duplicate expressions and narratives in the different Gospels were, of course, omitted by both in a work of such a character.

The composition of the Diatessaron implies that the four

Gospels were the *only* Gospels of the Christians for a long time before it came into existence, in spite of the efforts of Basilides, Marcion and other heretics to corrupt or supplant them.

But an interesting question is, are there traces of the existence of these Gospels during the period which lies between the death of John and the composition of the Diatesaron? This period, as every student of church history is aware, lies in great obscurity. Whether from the destruction of libraries, the prevalence of persecutions or whatever cause, the distinct Christian memorials of that time are few. Indeed this may be said of the time from the close of the Acts of the apostles to the death of the Apostle John, also. Yet there are lights here and there in this dark morass where the paths are so indistinct and our footing so uncertain. I need not speak of the clear evidence of the existence of the four Gospels and other books of the New Testament furnished by the fragments of the writings of apostolic fathers which have been preserved to our time. For these testimonies the reader will turn to such textbooks on Christian evidences as that of Paley, or to the much fuller and fresher presentation of them in the almost phenomenal production of the great German scholar, Dr. Bernhard Weiss, *Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*. My purpose is to direct attention to a bridge of light which spans the dark period, and especially to three piers in it which recent discovery has brought into new prominence. Irenaeus, who quotes our four Gospels 500 times in those of his writings which have been preserved, and the Gospel of John 100 times, was a contemporary, for perhaps 25 years, of Polycarp, whose memory as his teacher he ever held in most affectionate reverence. Polycarp was the contemporary of the Apostle John for 30 years at the least. Irenaeus regarded the four Gospels just as the orthodox Christian of our day does. Now, Irenaeus has much to say of Justin and his child in the Gospel, Tatian. They lived for 30 years in one case, and perhaps 40 in the other

as his contemporaries. Tatian and Justin were contemporaries of Polycarp for the first 40 or 45 years of their lives.\* The Diatessaron of Tatian frees the testimony of Justin Martyr of all possible doubt, and to that testimony our attention will now be directed. The Diatessaron has been well named "the key to Justin."

#### IV. JUSTIN, THE APOLOGIST AND MARTYR.

Somewhere about the time when the Apostle John died at Ephesus, there was born at the village of Sychar, by Jacob's well, where our Saviour told the Samaritan woman of the water of life, a child who was to be known through all coming ages as a martyr for his cause. But, Justin Martyr, though a native of Sychar, was not of Samaritan blood. Had we no information to the contrary, we should be likely to think that he was probably a descendant of some one of those with whom our Lord spent two days on his journey northward—two days of surpassing interest they must have been—when, after hearing his wonderful words, they said to the woman of Samaria: "Now we believe, not because of thy word, for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is the Christ." But it is evident from all that he says that he was not of Samaritan or of Jewish blood, and that he was reared in the study of philosophy and Greek literature, and without any knowledge of the Old Testament. Philosophy was his pursuit from his youth, and he early won the right to wear the philosopher's cloak. He seems to have been in the habit of retiring to some solitude to do what almost every great thinker has done—meditate, and commune with nature. It

---

\* "Polycarp was 86 years old at the time of his death (from his words it would seem that he had been 86 years a Christian) and Irenaeus speaks of him as a disciple of John, and as appointed Bishop of Smyrna by apostles, and again speaks of 'successors of Polycarp at the present time,' that is, from A. D. 177 to A. D. 190. . . . Living from A. D. 70 to 155, his life and work link together St. John and Irenaeus, and they became an argument for the authenticity of the fourth Gospel, the force of which it is impossible to deny." Watkins' Bampton Lectures, p. 391-2.

was such an excursion that was made, in God's providence, the occasion of his coming to the knowledge of the truth. The place was probably in the vicinity of Ephesus, as he seems to have studied there; but this is immaterial. Let us hear him tell of it: "And while I was thus disposed, when I wished at one period to be filled with great quietness, and to shun the path of men, I used to go into a certain field not far from the sea, and when I was near that spot one day, which having reached, I proposed to be by myself, a certain old man, by no means contemptible in appearance, exhibiting meek and venerable manners, followed me at a little distance."

After salutations, the venerable stranger told Justin that he had come to this place to look for friends who were absent and who might be returning. As it was in view of the sea, he was probably looking for the vessel by which they were expected.

Justin having told him that he delighted in solitary walks to meditate on the great questions of philosophy, the stranger began to discourse of the vanity of mere human speculations about the great subject of religion (for this was the field of philosophy in which Justin was most interested), and then dwelt on the need of a divine revelation such as existed in The Prophets, or Old Testament Scriptures, and of the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit, to give us a satisfactory and saving view of the truth in these great matters. Then, Justin tells us:

"When he had spoked these and many other things, he went away, bidding me attend to them, and I have not seen him since; but straightway a flame was kindled in my soul, and a love of the prophets and of those men who are the friends of Christ possessed me, and whilst revolving his words in my mind, I found this philosophy alone to be safe and profitable." (Dialogue Ch. 8.)\*

---

\* Justin seems to have been influenced, too, as we know Calvin was, by the conduct of those whom he observed under persecution. He tells us: "While I still found delight in the doctrines of Plato, and heard the Christians calumniated, but yet saw them fearless towards death, and all that men account fearful, I learned that it was impossible that they should live in sin and lust."

Thus we see how it was that Justin Martyr, though he became a Christian, never ceased to wear his philosopher's cloak. He found Christianity to be the truest and highest of all philosophy, and did not cease to be a philosopher by becoming a Christian.\* \* His life seems to have been one of the most fearless and straightforward of all the witnesses for Christ in that brave age. Any one who will read his two defences of Christianity will see and feel this as he cannot otherwise do.

Some years later, probably in 163, there was a thrilling scene in the court of the Roman prefect, Rusticus. The noble life was crowned with the noblest of deaths, that of a martyr for Christ.

Rusticus, the prefect of Rome, before whom Justin and other Christians were arraigned, demanded that they should deny their faith and salute the emperor as divine. "Unless," said he, "ye obey ye shall be mercilessly punished." Justin said, "Through prayer we can be saved on account of our Lord Jesus Christ, even when we have been punished, because this shall become to us salvation and confidence at the more awful judgment seat of our Lord and Saviour." Thus also said the other martyrs: "Do what you will, for we are Christians and do not sacrifice to idols."

Thus, like Moses, they endured, as "seeing Him who is invisible."

Let us now turn to the utterances of Justin Martyr addressed, in his two *Apologies*, to Antoninus Pius, the Emperor of Rome.

Dr. Basil Gildersleeve in the introduction to his edition of Justin's *Apologies*, says :

"If Justin was acquainted with the Fourth Gospel, the whole fabric of a great historical school falls to the ground."

This must be clear to all ; for if the first *Apology* was not written till as late as 147 A. D., the date which Professor

---

\* \* "The torch of Aristotle and Plato faded when he became familiar with the light of Christ."—*Watkins' Bampton Lectures*.

Gildersleeve favors, it was written several years before the date assigned to the Gospel of John by the Tübingen school, i. e., 160–170 A. D. Neander thinks the first *Apology* should be dated 139 A. D. He says: "After the death of the Emperor Hadrian, persecutions arose against the Christians, in the beginning of the reign of Antoninus Pius. Thereby Justin, who was then resident at Rome, was induced to address a writing in defence of the interests of the Christians to the emperor. Since, however, in the superscription of this work, he does not give the title of Caesar to M. Aurelius, it is probably to be inferred that it was written before his adoption into that dignity, which took place in 139 A. D."

But, taking the late date, there can be no doubt that Justin quotes it, and he surely could not have quoted it from 13 to 23 years before it was written, or one minute before it was written, for that matter.

That Justin did know John's Gospel, must be clear to any open-minded person who will read in first *Apology*, chap. 61, these words:

"Except ye be born again, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." In addition to this he goes on to mention other words spoken in this conversation of Christ with Nicodemus, recorded in the third chapter of John's Gospel.

In his dialogue with Trypho, chap. 91, we find Justin giving a comment on John 3:14, and several times he refers to the name which John gives to Christ—the Logos—"the Word."\* It seems plain enough then that Justin, the successor of Aristides and Quadratus as a defender of the faith did have the Gospel of John in his hands, and therefore, "the whole fabric of a great historical school falls to the ground." Baur may hold the theory according to which the Gospel of John could not have been written till from 160 to 170 A. D.; but we find as a fact that it is quoted by

---

Hart and Volkmar date the first *Apology* 145-148 A. D.; Caspari and Krüger earlier.—*Watkins' Bampton Lectures*.

\*Not in Philo's sense.—*Gildersleeve*.

Justin in his *Apology* addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, and the theory must yield to the fact, and "fall to the ground." How is it with the three synoptic Gospels ?

See how Justin speaks of all the Gospels together under a name which may be unfamiliar to some of us, but which seems a very natural designation for them. He draws, in a few words, a picture of the worship of the Christians on Sunday. He tells the emperor :

"On the day called the day of the Sun (Sunday)\*\* there is a gathering together of all who dwell in city and country, with one accord (or in one place), and the memoirs of the apostles and the writings of the prophets are read." He continues with a further description of their worship including the administration of the Lord's supper. The significant thing for us here is that *The Memoirs of the Apostles* are read in public worship and are evidently regarded as sacred scriptures, as they are read along with Old Testament Scriptures. But a question has been raised as to whether these Memoirs of the Apostles were our Gospels, which contain apostolic memoirs of our blessed Lord. The controversy has been an earnest and prolonged one ; but it is hard to see how there can be any room for a difference of opinion about the matter. We need not go outside of the writings of Justin himself to determine without a shadow of doubt about what were the Memoirs of the Apostles. We need only cast our eyes up to the preceding chapter of the first *Apology* on the same page (1st *Apology* Ch. 66) and we read "The apostles in the memoirs drawn up by them, which are called Gospels,\* thus enjoined on them, that Jesus taking bread, having blessed it, said, This do in remembrance of me ; this is my body, and taking the

---

\*\* τῆ τῶν ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρα

\* Hostile critics have alleged that this last expression is an interpolation. But, there is no manuscript evidence to support this allegation, and the only reason they have made it seems to be that the words are so plainly fatal to their contention. The text is, so far as is known, as found here as elsewhere.



cup, and having given thanks, said this is my blood, etc.”

Surely this is conclusive as to what the Memoirs of the Apostles are. Justin calls them “Gospels” and we find in them what we find to-day in our Gospels. Now if there could be any lingering doubt that this general name—memoirs of the Apostles—means our four Gospels, we may turn to another work of Justin where it is used and see proofs which must immediately scatter these doubts to the winds. In the Dialogue with Typho, Ch. 100, we read “But also, in the Gospel it is written “All things are delivered me of my Father,” and “No man knoweth the Father but the Son; nor the Son but the Father, and they to whom the Son will reveal Him” We know, of course that this is from our Gospel of Matthew XI. 27. and so, what Justin states is written in the Gospel,\* we find in our Gospel of Matthew. But he continues: Christ called one of his disciples, previously known as Simon, Peter, since he recognized Him to be the Christ, the Son of God, by the revelation of His Father; and since we find it recorded in the Memoirs of the Apostles, etc.” All will recognize this as from the 16 Chapter of Matthew, and this he says is “recorded in the Memoirs of the Apostles.” So our Matthew must be a part of these Memoirs of the Apostles. Look in a little further, and in Chapter 103 we read:

“For, if the Memoirs which I say were drawn up by the Apostles and those who followed them it is recorded that his sweat fell down like blood while he was praying and saying, If it be possible let this cup pass, etc.”

Here we find a quotation combining Luke 22. 41 and 42, and Matthew 26. 39. and he speaks of it as being “recorded in the Memoirs which were drawn up by the Apostles, and those who followed them.” Now, Matthew and John whom he quoted were Apostles and Mark

---

\* “Gospel” is often used to mean the four Gospels, as Watkins puts it, “to express the unity of a collected plurality” Justin so uses it. See Watkins’ Bampton Lectures.

and Luke were their followers, Mark of Peter and Luke of Paul, for he quotes both of these extensively also.

If we had space, I should like to transcribe the 15th Chapter of the 1st Apology, and show how, in it he quotes, Matthew seven times, Mark 8 times, and Luke 5 times, so that in the short Chapter of less than two 12mo pages we have a mosaic of selections from the three synoptic Gospels with only a few words of his own to hold together the jewels gathered from these "Memoirs of the Apostles." I think we would be very unreasonable to demand plainer proof that Justin Martyr had just the Gospels we have and no others—and refers to them as Memoirs of the Apostles.

Prof. James Drummond, Unitarian critic, and follower of Martineau, says of the foolish charge that John was copied from Justin:

"It does seem to me surprising that any one in comparing the passages in Justin and John should doubt for one moment that the dependence is on the side of the former."

This sufficiently "Liberal" critic concludes: "I must conclude, therefore, as best satisfying, on the whole, the facts of the case, not only that Justin regarded the Fourth Gospel as one of the historical "memoirs" of Christ, but that it is not improbable that he believed in its Johannean authorship. This is a very old-fashioned conclusion, but I have endeavored simply to follow the evidence without any ulterior object and must leave the result to the judgment of the reader."

How remarkably this "old-fashioned conclusion" for which he felt bound to apologize, has been confirmed by the discovery of *The Diatessaron*. Since this discovery, no self-respecting critic, however great his prejudices, can, if fully informed, either assert the dependence of John's Gospel on Justin or deny that Justin knew our four Gospels, and them alone, as the authoritative Christian records of Christ's life and teachings.

It is very hard to see how any honest reader of Justin's Apologies and Dialogue could have any doubt of this fact,

since quotations from the Synoptic Gospels occupy a large proportion of the space these writings cover, and besides evident references to, and quotations from, the Gospel of John, the whole of these writings are permeated with the unique thought of this Gospel which stands apart from all that has ever been written by the hand of man.

The destructive critic Thoma, even, says of Justin: "He cites the Synoptics; he thinks and argues according to John."

All this was evident before the discovery of *The Diatesaron*. Now, the case is settled; for we find Tatian, who became a Christian under the instruction of Justin about 150 A. D., making a harmony out of the four Gospels, and using 96 per cent. of the Gospel of John in doing so, only 4 per cent. being omitted because duplicated by statements in the other Gospels.

"It is certain," says Dr. B. Weiss, "that Justin is also acquainted with Pauline Epistles and is influenced by them. It is characteristic throughout that what he has chiefly adopted from the Epistle to the Romans is the application of the Old Testament in the Christian sense, as appears from the many citations common to both in their form, connection and application (comp. Rom. iii. 11-17 and Dial. 27; ix. 27 ff. and Dial. 55; xi. 16 and Dial. 42; xi. 2 ff. and Dial. 39-46; xiv. 11 and Dial. 52), and the repeated statements respecting the justification of Abraham as the father of believing Gentiles, taken from Rom. iv. (Dial. 11; 23-119)"

For proof of Justin's use of other Pauline epistles see Weiss' Introduction §7. 4.

Weiss shows with equal clearness Justin's use of the Fourth Gospel. Lack of space prevents the presentation of the evidence in his words; but his conclusion is that "the opinion that Justin was not yet acquainted with the Fourth Gospel, once so obstinately adhered to by the Tübingen school, must be regarded as definitely set aside."

Justin sometimes quotes the Gospels with the formula, "It is written," indicating that he regards them as Scripture.

The use of the Epistle of James (Dial. 1.16), of 1 Peter (Dial. 72), and of Acts (1 Apology, 39, 40, 50), is clearly shown. His knowledge of the Revelation and the fact that it was written by the Apostle John, is indicated by such words as these: (Dial. 81.)

“There was a certain man with us [Christians] whose name was John, one of the apostles of Christ, who prophesied by a revelation that was made to him.” Then follows a reference to the “thousand years, the general, and, in short, eternal resurrection and judgment of all men.” Rev. xx.

It is true that Justin does not always use the precise words of our received text. He evidently wrote with a rapidly running pen, and in the case of the second Apology, written, probably, on the eve of his execution, he evidently did not turn to each passage to verify his quotations. He joins together the words of two or three of the Gospels in relating an incident or stating a truth. Yet I think no one can point out a single expression which belongs to any of the apocryphal Gospels. Evidently none of them had been produced at the time of his writing.

The apocryphal “Gospel of Peter,” discovered a few years ago at Akhmin in Egypt, which was in all probability the oldest of all the apocryphal Gospels, is not quoted once. It doubtless originated later than Justin’s time. Justin’s quotations are just such as would naturally be made by a man of great earnestness who had his memory well stored with the Scriptures, and had a vast number of quotations at his command, but did not turn to the chapter and verse, and copy every word accurately. We should remember that there were no chapters and verses then, and that Alexander Cruden was not yet born.

But, lest any should think me liable to mistake on this point, I will, before concluding, quote the words of Westcott (Canon, p. 151). Says he: “It is enough to repeat in the presence of these facts that differences from the present text of the Gospels such as are found in the present text of Justin are wholly inadequate to prove that passages so dif-

fering could not have been taken from copies of our Gospels." And this was written before the discovery of the apocryphal so-called "Gospel of Peter."

It is proper to remark that almost certainly there were some differences between the text of the Gospels used by Justin and our Received text, or that of Westcott & Hort; but the main differences between his quotations and our New Testament are due (as is plainly the case in his Old Testament quotations) to the fact that he quoted freely from memory and not with Bible and Concordance in his hands.

Dr. Purves has rendered a great service to the cause of truth and sound criticism by his L. P. Stone lectures on Justin Martyr, delivered at Princeton, and no one, unless dominated by prejudice; can rise from the perusal of his fifth lecture, in which he brings a great mass of evidence from the two Apologies and the Dialogue to show Justin's use of the writings which we now call the New Testament, without agreeing in his conclusion that Justin had "reference to a distinct Christian literature, which, while nothing definite is said of its authority in the Church, was evidently regulative of the Church's faith."

The fact that Justin speaks of the Gospels as read in the public worship of Christians along with the writings of the Prophets, that he quotes the Gospels with the formula, "It is written," together with his reverent use of what he calls "our writings" (— scriptures), indicate that, having the New Testament almost, if not quite, in its entirety\*, he regarded it, though not yet "canonized" by any ecclesiastical council, as invested with the authority of Apostles who had received the Holy Spirit according to Christ's promise, and "the promise of the Father."

---

\*Dr. Eberhard Nestle, in his work, *Introduction to Textual Criticism of New Testament*, though once a professor of Tübingen, moots the question (following Zahn), "Whether the entire New Testament, as the Doctrine of Addai says, was not a present which Tatian brought with him from Rome to his fellow-countrymen," etc.

Referring to the peculiarities of the text which Justin had before him, Dr. Purves says. (p. 218):

“ We do not mean that Justin’s text is now represented in its entirety by any one MS. or class of MSS., but that he gives evidence of that corruption of the canonical texts which, according to abundant testimony, took place even in the century immediately succeeding that in which they were written, and which most plainly appears in those MSS. which textual critics have classified as ‘Western.’ If, however, this be so, then Justin testifies, not only that our Synoptic Gospels existed in his day and were used by the Church as public documents, and were regarded as apostolic and authoritative records of the life of Christ, but he also proves, by the incidental character of his quotations and by their very variations from the text of our Gospels, that these latter were, in the middle of the second century, already ancient books, handed down from the apostolic age. No more explicit testimony to our Synoptic Gospels could well be asked of him; and the very difficulties which at first present themselves in his quotations, in the end confirm his evidence for their apostolic authority.”

Further on (p. 248) he declares, “It is clear that at least the Gospels had been formed into a sacred collection called “the Gospel” which ranked on an equality with the Old Testament, and that other apostolic books were used to regulate the faith of the Church.”

The strange mistake of Eusebius in interpreting the words of Papias seems to be responsible for the figment of a second John,\* and so to have helped to fashion one feature of that persistent ghost, the “Johannean problem,” though Eusebius himself had not a shadow of a doubt that the Fourth Gospel was written by the Apostle John.

It is to be hoped that the phantom of false authorship, at least, is laid now, since *Tatian’s Diatessaron* has risen from the dust of long oblivion to show unmistakably that Tatian’s

---

\* See Farrar’s *Early Days of Christianity*, Appendix, Eursus x 14, and Weiss’ *Introd. New Test.*, § 332.

teacher, Justin, had the Gospel of that John whom Justin describes as "one of the disciples of Christ," and the writer of the Revelation. This new light on the old monument has made its inscriptions clear to all—but the blind.

In the presence of evidence so incontrovertible, it is a strange thing to find a professor in a Congregational Theological Seminary speaking, in a late work,\*\* of the Gospel of John as "a writing about the middle of the second century." But then, when we find that this theological professor does not believe in Christ, except as a mere man, and remember how clearly the Gospel of John teaches His divinity, we see the explanation. Something had to be done to get this Gospel out of the way; and so in the face of all the overwhelming evidence of the falsity of the Tubingen theory, he still adheres to it.

It may be true that German theological theories go to England when they die, but they do not stop there. America is receiving a full share of these unquiet and disquieting spirits to haunt her halls of Theological learning, while their carcasses pollute the religious atmosphere of Germany.

#### V. ARISTIDES AND QUADRATUS, THE COMPANION APOLOGISTS.

Justin Martyr had stood in the church's view, for ages, at the head of the brave band of defenders of the faith, the apologists of the second century; but the discovery of the *Apology of Aristides* in the St. Catherine convent in 1889 has given to its author the first place. Aristides now takes precedence.

But another, perhaps still more eminent Christian, Quadratus, presented a defence of the Christians at the same time with Aristides.

Of this event Eusebius gives the following account:

"But Trajan," [who became emperor of Rome before the death of the Apostle John], "having held the sovereignty

---

\*\*Evolution of Trinitarianism, Prof. Paine, Bangor Theol. Sem.

twenty years wanting six months, is succeeded in the imperial office by Aelius Hadrian. To him Quadratus addressed a discourse as an apology for the religion which we profess, because certain malicious persons attempted to harass the brethren."

"The work is *still in the hands of some of the brethren, as also in our own*, from which any one may see evident proof of the understanding of the man and of his *apostolic* faith." [Italics mine] Indicating the early date at which Quadratus began his work, Eusebius continues: "This writer shows the antiquity of the age in which he lived, in these passages:

'The deeds of our Saviour,' says he, 'were always before you, for they were true miracles; those that were healed, those that were raised from the dead, who were seen, not only when healed and when raised, but were always present. They remained living a long time, not only whilst our Lord was on earth, but likewise when he had left the earth, so that some of them have also lived to our own times.' Such was Quadratus." Eusebius continues:

"Aristides, also, a man faithfully devoted to the religion we profess, like Quadratus, has left to posterity a defence of the faith addressed to Adrian. This work is, also, preserved by a great number, even to the present day."

Thus, twenty-five years after the death of the Apostle John, there occurred this event of thrilling interest. At Athens, and, possibly, on that very Mars' Hill where Paul preached, and where the court of the Areopagus held its sessions, or it may be, on the adjacent summit of the acropolis, crowned with that paragon of architecture, the Parthenon, with its frieze of Phidias, its inimitable ivory and gold Athena, within, and its colossal Athena, without, these two brave men, Aristides, the Athenian philosopher, who had become a Christian, and Quadratus, the evangelist,—the first, possibly a young man filled with enthusiasm at finding in the Gospel a philosophy infinitely transcending the noblest product even of the



Greek intellect—the other almost certainly an old man, with a life of loving labors chiefly behind him, came to acknowledge in the most public way their allegiance to their Lord. This they did by presenting to Hadrian, the Emperor of Rome, a plea for their persecuted brethren and their much-misrepresented faith.

The brave deed was not destined to be fruitless. Not only was the "Rescript of Hadrian" by which the severity of the persecution was greatly mitigated, in all probability, a result of it, but it must have served to cheer and strengthen the persecuted Christian host that stood trembling behind them, its leaders, by its high example of Christian heroism.

The Martyrologies of the middle ages, even, presented the tradition of the brave and brilliant deed, and now the Apology of Aristides has come forth from its concealment of many centuries as one of the witnesses to encourage faith, in an age of doubt.

Eusebius tells us that the Apology of Quadratus "was in his hands and in those of some of the brethren." He gives us a specimen which makes us long to see the whole of it. The extract from it which we have indicates how early he had lived. Irenaeus tells of Polycarp at whose feet he had sat in his youth, and Quadratus could probably tell of John and possibly, even of Paul and Peter, as he was of those who, in the words of Eusebius, "held the first rank in the apostolic succession," and who had seen those who were the subjects of our Saviour's miracles.

What a chasm this Apology of Quadratus, if recovered, would bridge! The half century from 75 to 125 A. D. is almost a blank to us. We have scarcely any particulars about it, and yet, in this fifty years there took place the greatest movement of all church history since the days of the apostles. The letter of a heathen, written about twelve years after John's body was laid to rest at Ephesus, throws an interesting side-light on it. Trajan's governor of Bithynia, Pliny, writing to his master, speaks of the heathen

temples "almost deserted," of "great numbers involved in the dangers of these persecutions," which were then in progress, while he asserts that "this contagious superstition is not confined to the cities only, but has spread its infection among the country villages." He tells Trajan of "this inquiry having already extended, and being still likely to extend to persons of all ages and ranks, and of both sexes. Such is the view of the results of this period of evangelization which a Roman governor has from the outside of the Christian community, and with eyes hostile to it. It is the view of a contemporary and one who is a very competent witness as far as intelligence is concerned.

Eusebius gives, at a much later time, the inside view of the agencies—the human agencies at least—which brought about these wonderful results. But he had before him the words of earlier writers who were not only witnesses within the Christian circle, but agents in the glorious work. Eusebius knew of others, but he makes a more honorable mention of none than of Quadratus. He says :

"Of those who flourished in these times, Quadratus is said to have been distinguished for prophetic gifts. There were many others, also, noted in these times, who held the first rank in the apostolic succession. These, as the holy disciples of such men, also built up the churches where foundations had been laid in every place by the apostles. They augmented the means of promulgating the Gospel more and more, and spread the seeds of salvation and of the heavenly kingdom throughout the world far and wide. For the most of the disciples at that time, animated with a more ardent love of the divine word, had first fulfilled the Saviour's precept by distributing their substance to the needy. Afterwards, leaving their country, they performed the office of evangelists to those who had not yet heard the faith; whilst with a noble ambition, they delivered to them the books of the holy Gospel. After laying the foundation of the Gospel in foreign parts, as the particular object of their mission, and after appointing

others as shepherds of the flocks, and committing to these the care of those that had been recently introduced, they went again to other regions and nations, with the grace and co-operation of God. The Holy Spirit also wrought many wonders, as yet, through them, so that as soon as the Gospel was heard, men voluntarily, and in crowds, eagerly embraced the true faith with their whole minds."

O glorious, golden age of Christianity, prophecy and promise, we trust, of a still more glorious golden age to come, when, after these times of worldliness and dearth, God will pour out His spirit upon all flesh. *Quadratus* had been, perhaps, for 50 years among these scenes so blessed and yet so full at times of suffering. Now is a time of suffering, and the old hero comes with his defence, and along with the philosopher *Aristides*, appeals to the emperor in behalf of the Christians. God seems to have blessed the brave deed. The "rescript of Hadrian" to *Fundanus*, the pro-consul of Asia, was issued after it, commanding that no Christian should be punished without examination and proof.

Now, what a boon would the full account of this glorious and yet terrible half century, written by a contemporary and thoroughly competent witness, be! For one reason one would like to live fifty years more. It is to be hoped that within that time the long lost *Apology of Quadratus* will be discovered, as that of *Aristides* has been already. *Eusebius* had it before him when he wrote his history, and gives us a very appetizing and very tantalizing morsel. What a flood of light would the re-discovered *Apology* shed on this glorious and yet almost wholly unknown half century!

Before this period we have the simplicity of apostolic Christianity. Soon after it we find the beginnings, at least of that intricate and artificial ecclesiasticism, which so sadly transformed and deformed the pure religion of Christ, The multiform errors of Gnosticism, that "hydra-headed monster," as *Hippolytus* calls it, that with the many forms

of heathen philosophies and religions, served to adulterate and ruin so much of the nominal Christianity of the time, soon came upon the scene. The influences which wrought the sad change were working, doubtless, in secret, through all this long period, but we cannot trace them. All is dim and indistinct, and to some extent uncertain, through all this tract of time. We know something of some characters in it, but they are to us at this distance like men seen through a mist, across wide gorges among mountain heights—magnified, shadowy forms, standing, we cannot tell just where, and moving, we scarcely know whither.

What a boon a flood of clear light on this period would be! That light the Apology of Quadratus, if discovered, will probably give in such a way as no other known writing does. He was a man qualified to tell of these times intelligently and reliably; and from the quotations of Eusebius from his Apology and from what Eusebius says of him, we see that he must have told much that would be intensely interesting to us after 1776 years.

Let us now turn to the Apology which Aristides addressed to Hadrian.

#### VI. THE APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES, AND ITS EVIDENCE FOR THE NEW TESTAMENT.

We can only indulge hopes of the discovery of the *Apology of Quadratus*; that of his companion apologist is now in our hands, coming to us in two languages, and in two different forms, in one of which we have it in its entirety, while, in the other, we possess far the greater part of it.

The *Apology of Aristides* was, for ages, supposed to have finally perished, with a vast mass of the writings of antiquity.

Jerome, about the year 420, mentions the *Apology of Aristides*, and says that it was presented to the Emperor Hadrian at the same time with the apology of Quadratus; that it was extant in his day, and was afterwards imitated by Justin Martyr. There is no later mention of its exis-

tence; but what has been called "a faint reflection" of the earlier testimony is found in the medieval martyrologies as, in, them, the 31st of August is given as the saints' day of "The blessed Aristides [to use the words of the old record] most renowned for faith and wisdom, who presented books on the Christian religion to the Prince Hadrian, and most brilliantly proclaimed in the presence of the Emperor himself how that Christ Jesus is the only God."\*

In the 17th century there was a rumor that the *Apology* was in some monastic libraries in Greece, but the search made for it was fruitless.

In the spring of the year 1889 Prof. J. Rendel Harris, the distinguished scholar and lecturer of Clare College, Cambridge, found, in the library of the St. Catharine Convent on Mount Siani, where Tischendorf had thirty years before discovered the *Codex Sinaiticus*, the long lost *Apology of Aristides*. It was in the Syriac language, in a manuscript which Dr. Harris refers to the seventh century. Eleven years before this, the Mechitarist scholars in their convent of S. Lazaro, near Venice, had published a Latin translation of what was thought to be (and afterwards proved to be) the first two chapters of the *Apology* in the Armenian language. This fragment had been declared spurious by Renan and other scholars, because it contained a term describing the virgin as the "God-bearer"—a term which belonged to a much later age than that in which the *Apology of Aristides* was written. The original fragment was in the Armenian language, as has been said, and after fuller examination, the use of this term was found to have been due to a mistake of the Latin translator, and when Harris discovered the whole *Apology* in Syriac, this Armenian fragment was found to correspond with it, and its genuineness was vindicated. After the happy discovery of the *Apology* it was found, almost entire, in a slightly modified form, but in the original Greek, imbedded and concealed, like a jewel

---

\* We find the *Apology* to be a powerful argument against polytheism and for the unity-in-trinity of God.

in common earth, in a strange story of the Middle Ages, entitled *Barlaam and Josaphat*—a tale of such interest, in the absence of anything like the modern novel, that it was translated into some twenty languages, Hebrew and Icelandic being of the number. So seriously was the romance taken by the Church of Rome that Barlaam and Josaphat, were accorded a place in the calendar of saints—a calendar, however, where much else equally as fictitious may be found.

The brilliant coryphaeus of the Ritschlians, Prof. Adolf Harnack, in a notable article in the *Prussische Jahrbucher*, said: "The discovery of this Apology is a find of the first importance." A glance at its contents will convince you that this is true. The *Apology of Aristides* is a witness not only for the Gospels, but for the whole New Testament. The name New Testament occurs a little later, as we see from a quotation in Eusebius (H. E. v. 17.)

#### DATE OF THE APOLOGY.

Prof. J. Rendel Harris assigns a later date than Eusebius, on account of the address of the Syriac copy which he discovered, and of the sign of the plural with the word "Majesty" in the Syriac. But, the evidence that has come in since the discovery of the MS. seems clearly to indicate that his conjecture was mistaken, founded as it was, on what now appears to be a false duplicate address on his MS. To accept this conclusion of Prof. Harris, in the words of the *Introduction to the Apology of Aristides*, in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, "requires us to suppose that Eusebius was wrong; that Jerome copied his error; that the Armenian version curiously fell into the same mistake; and that the Syriac translation is, at this point, exceptionally faithful." \*

---

\**Die Reinsender Kaiser Hadrian*, (Julius Durr), "shows that Hadrian visited, and lived at, Athens in 125."

Coins, inscriptions, etc., show this. The book was published ten years before the discovery of the *Apology of Aristides* at the St. Catherine convent in 1889. Expositor for Nov., 1900, p. 324.

Antonius Pius protected the Christians as far as he was able, and a not

It is extremely improbable that Eusebius should have been mistaken. Not only did he have the accounts of those who preceded him, but he had in his hands, as he tells us, the *Apology of Quadratus*, the companion of Aristides, and gives us an extract from it. He must have known to whom that was addressed. This is conclusive. Then, in the *Apology of Aristides*, the words "O King," occur a great number of times showing that it must have been addressed to only one monarch—to Hadrian alone and not to Antonius Pius also.

The Armenian Fragment, which has the address in its superscription to Hadrian alone, is now thoroughly accredited as genuine. "To the Emperor Hadrian from Aristides," is the address in the Armenian fragment.

Besides all this, the great age which the later date would require for Quadratus adds to the great improbability that it is the true one.

Yet, even if the apology had been presented to the *two* emperors, at the only possible time, the few months in 138 A. D., when they were colleagues; it would be still a very valuable witness for the genuineness of the New Testament.

#### VII. THE APOLOGY AND THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In examining the *Apology of Aristides* as to its dependence on the *New Testament*, there are several things to be considered. One is that it is brief, the translations of the Syriac and of the Greek, printed side by side in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Vol. IX) occupying only 17 pages. The translation of the Greek, if complete, would occupy about 7 pages. Of this 7 pages, more than three-fourths of the space is occupied with arguments against the most prominent systems of polytheism, and for the unity-in-trinity of God. The arguments are chiefly philosophical, and are

---

improbable explanation of the duplicate address in the Syriac is that the apology may have been presented a second time on behalf of the suffering Syrian Christians when Antonius Pius became the colleague of Hadrian in A. D. 138.

simply an appeal to reason. The emperor addressed was a heathen, supposed, as is shown, to know nothing of the writings of the Christians, which he is importuned again and again to read. Hence we should not expect quotations from these writings or any mention of the names of the writers—names which would be meaningless to Hadrian.

It will be in the interest of brevity and probably more satisfactory to the reader to refrain from a lengthened discussion, and present a sample of the Apology, the whole of which may not be accessible to some. Let us take the XV section in which Aristides speaks of the origin of the Christians, and refutes the heathen charges of immorality against them. We will take the translation from the Greek fragment as being probably more literal and briefer than the translation of the Syriac, which is itself a translation, and seemingly somewhat paraphrastic. The first part—that about Christ—occurs earlier in the Syriac XV. “Now the Christians trace their origin from the Lord Jesus Christ, And He is acknowledged by the Holy Spirit to be the Son of the Most High God, who came down from heaven for the salvation of men, and being born of a pure virgin, unbegotten and immaculate, He assumed flesh and revealed Himself among men that He might recall them to himself from their wandering after many gods. And having accomplished His wonderful dispensation, by a voluntary choice, He tasted death on the cross, fulfilling an august dispensation. And after three days He came to life again and ascended into heaven. And, if you would read, O King, you may judge the glory of His presence [brightness of His coming?] from the holy gospel writing, as it is called among themselves. He had twelve disciples who, after His ascension, went forth into the provinces of the whole world, and declared His greatness. As for instance, one of them traversed the countries about us, proclaiming the doctrine of the truth. From this it is that they who still observe the righteousness enjoined by their preaching are called Christians.



And these are they who more than all the nations on the earth have found the truth. For they know God the Creator and Fashioner of all things, through the only begotten Son and the Holy Spirit; and besides Him they worship no other God. They have the commands of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself graven upon their hearts; and they observe them, looking forward to the resurrection of the dead, and life in the world to come. They do not commit adultery nor fornication, nor bear false witness, nor covet the things of others; they honor father and mother, and love their neighbors; they judge justly, and they never do to others what they would not wish to happen to themselves,\* they appeal to those who injure them, and try to win them as friends; they are eager to do good to their enemies; they are gentle and easy to be entreated; they abstain from all unlawful conversation and from all impurity; they despise not the widow nor oppress the orphan; and he that has, gives ungrudgingly for the maintenance of him who has not. If they see a stranger they take him under their roof, and rejoice over him as over a very brother; for they call themselves brethren not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

When he tells the emperor that one of the apostles "traversed the countries about us," we can hardly help believing that he refers to Paul, the Apostle who first brought

---

\* The Syric has, also, "and the food which is consecrated to idols they do not eat."

Dr. Purves has kindly drawn my attention to the indication in this *Apology* that the text of *The Acts* which Aristides used had at that time suffered correction. The negative form of the "golden rule" here seen is noted by Seeberg, of Berlin, as an instance of "Western" corruption of Acts XV 20 and 29, and Prof. Harris, as is seen in his *Four Lectures on the Western Text*, agrees with him. As this is found in connection with the statement that "they abstain from εἰδωλοθυτα," Seeberg concluded that the interpretation was in the copy of *The Acts* used by Aristides. This would seem to indicate that *The Acts* was, as Seeberg says, "in ecclesiastical use," and that it was, even at that time, an "ancient book, handed down from the apostolic age."

My thanks are due to the Rev. T. W. Lingle, who kindly furnished me references from the *Four Lectures* to which I did not have access.

the gospel to Greece. Surely, too, it does not require a vivid imagination to hear, in the utterances of Aristides, echoes of Paul's address on Mars Hill. While there are contrasts between the *Apology of Aristides* and this address, which we may call the *Apology of Paul*—contrasts in which Prof Stokes, of Dublin; has seen a proof that *The Acts* was written in the first century—at the same time there are striking resemblances. Let us look at some of them:

Paul strove earnestly to make known to his heathen hearers "the unknown God." This we see Aristides tried to do for Hadrian, and in doing it, presented the theology—even the trinitarianism—of Paul's epistles.

Paul spoke of the folly of idolatry, and so does Aristides, with force and at length.

Paul spoke of the creation of "the world and all things therein," and so does Aristides.

Paul spoke of the resurrection, and so does Aristides. Paul spoke of the judgment, and of Christ as the Judge, and so does Aristides, in such words as these:

"So shall they appear before the awful judgment, which through Jesus the Messiah, is destined to come upon the whole human race."

Paul speaks of the great mistakes of the Athenians in their worship, and declares of God that "He is Lord of heaven and earth" and that He "dwelleth not in temples made with hands, neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though He needed anything, seeing He giveth to all life and breath and all things." Paul was speaking to philosophers in Athens. In the same Athens Aristides speaks of the writers and philosophers among them, thus:

"Herein, too, (they err) in asserting of deity that any such thing as deficiency can be present to it, as when they say that He receives sacrifice and requires burnt offering and libation and immolations of men, and temples. But God is not in need, and none of these things are necessary to Him."

When we remember that Paul's address to the Epicurean and the Stoic philosophers occupied only ten verses of the

XVII chapter of Acts, and when we see such correspondences in thought and even in diction between the two "apologies," can we resist the conviction that this passage of the Acts was in the mind of Aristides, just as we have seen that the XV chapter was?

It is clear that the thought of Aristides moved in the sphere of the Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles and the Revelation, which constitute the New Testament. How could this have been so, if what he calls "the holy gospel writing" and "their other writings" which he exhorts the emperor to read, and from which he says he derived his information, had not been the same New Testament which we now have? It is perfectly safe to say that no objector can answer the question.

But besides this general mark of the identity of the truths proclaimed by Aristides with those of the New Testament, there is a remarkable coincidence in forms of expression, as for instance:

Paul says, (Col. i. 17,) "By Him all things consist."

Aristides says, "Through Him all things consist."

Paul says the heathen "Served the creature more than the Creator."

Aristides says they "began to worship the creation more than their Creator."

James exhorts Christians to be "gentle and easy to be entreated."

Aristides says, "They are gentle and easy to be entreated."

Paul speaks of the Jews as (Ro. IX. 3) "My brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh."

And (Ro. viii. 5) uses the expression "not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

Aristides says, "Brethren, not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

Peter (2 Pet. III. 16), speaking of the epistles of Paul, says: "As also in all his Epistles \* \* \* in which are some things hard to be understood."

Aristides having told the emperor of "the holy gospel writing," says: "There are found in their other writings things

which are hard to utter and difficult for one to narrate."

In Hebrews (ii.5 vi.5) we find the phrase, "the world to come."

Aristides speaks of those who seek "the world to come."

John in the Revelation (iii.1) speaks of "the things which must come to pass (R. V.) hereafter," having already (i.19) received the command from the Saviour, "Write \* \* \* the things which shall come to pass hereafter."

Aristides says, "Since I read in their writings, I was fully assured of these things as also of things which are to come."

Paul repeats God's promise, "I will put my laws into their hearts and in their minds will I write them."

Aristides says the Christians "have the commands of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself graven upon their hearts."

Paul exhorts Christians to give "not grudgingly."

Aristides says the Christian gives "ungrudgingly."

Peter (1 Pet. i.25) speaks of the regenerated as "born not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God which liveth and abideth forever."

Aristides says, "Let all that are without the knowledge of God, draw near there (i. e. to "their doctrine"—"the gateway of light") and they will receive incorruptible words."

John, the beloved, says, "Let us love one another."

Aristides says, "And they love one another."

Further quotation would be wearisome, and, surely, is unnecessary. No one, unless under the influence of invincible prepossessions, could doubt that what Aristides had read in what he refers to as "the Gospel," "the Holy Gospel writing, as it is called among themselves," "their writings," "their other writings," just what we read in our New Testament. These writings were not called the New Testament, as is well known, at first. But a writer against Montanism quoted by Eusebius (H. E. v. 17) speaks of them in a way which shows that they were regarded as just as sacred as the most orthodox Christian considers them now. It seems clear, too, from his language that the Book of Revelation concluded

the body of writings then, just as it does now. Speaking of opposing the doctrines of Montanus by arguments, he expresses himself as "apprehensive, lest, perhaps, I should appear to give any new injunctions, or to superadd anything to the doctrine of the New Testament, to which it is impossible that anything should be added or diminished by one who has resolved to live according to the Gospel." "The Gospel" and "their other writings" of Aristides must be the same body of writings called by this writer "the Gospel" and "the New Testament," and the quotations given indicate that it was practically identical with the New Testament in our hands to-day.

Common sense demands an answer to this question:

If these writings, evidently the same with our New Testament, were universally regarded by Christians in A. D. 125, as inspired and authoritative, and had been circulated all over the Roman world long before this and accepted everywhere as the sacred records of Christianity, how did they attain this universal acceptance in this character?

The only rational answer is that they went forth under apostolic authority. These writings, thus accepted by the great body of Christians, many thousands of whom were living at the time of this distribution, must have had apostolic authority or authorization. Any other explanation of their universal acceptance is irrational and incredible.

We have already found Justin Martyn imitating the illustrious example of his brother philosopher Aristides and presenting a more extended defence of the Christians to Antonine, the Pious, and his colleagues; and in this and the other writings of Justin we find him speaking also of "the Gospel," giving it, or rather a part of it, another name, "The Memoirs of the Apostles." We have found that these contained what our four Gospels do. Then we have seen standing by the side of Aristides at Athens in 125 a brave old man, presenting to Hadrian his defence of a somewhat different kind. This man had labored for Christ for a long term of service. He is of "the first immediate succession of the apostles," and had, not improbably, heard Paul preach, for he seems to have been a

Roman; had the gift of prophecy, and is ranked with Agabus and the daughters of Philip; had seen some of those whom our blessed Lord had healed and raised from the dead; and this man had been one of those who had not only preached the Gospel orally in many lands, but had distributed the written "Gospel" or New Testament including these "Memoirs of the Apostles and those that followed them." For, we know him as the fellow-apologist of Aristides, who, as we have seen, had these writings which Justin quotes so freely. We surely will not be asked to believe that Quadratus spent his life in distributing, as the authentic records of Christianity, Gospels which were unauthorized by the Apostles whom he immediately succeeded and whose work he, in company with others, took up. On the other hand he could not be supposed to have had a different set of Christian writings from those with which his companion apologist shows himself so familiar, and which bear so many marks of identity with those we have in our hands to-day.

In such witnesses as Justin, who sealed his testimony with his heart's blood, Aristides as courageous and faithful as his namesake who was surnamed "the Just," and Quadratus, who, true to his name, "stood four square to all the winds that blew," we have men whose evidence cannot lightly be brushed aside. As Prof. Gildersleeve has said of the first, so we may say of all of them, "They were no holiday Christians."

Aristides told Hadrian that if he would read this "Gospel," he would "perceive the power that belongs to it." All Christians experience this power; the history of the world clearly shows it too, and we could not but believe it to be true and divine, even if we knew nothing of its history; but it is a great gratification to be able to trace its utterances, by this and other lines, back to Christ and His Apostles.

Bethseda, Md.

P. P. FLOURNOY.

#### IV. THE CONQUEST OF FEAR.

A line of observers stationed along some hundreds of miles of distance, having at their command the most costly and perfect aggregation of scientific apparatus brought together, for astronomical purposes—is in marked contrast to our forefathers, shivering in limb and benumbed in mind, as they gazed upon the harmless and yet sublimely impressive effect of the moon and sun passing each other as they turn upon their soft axles.

There are conquests of this world other than those made by arms; conquests that conquer the sword, that muffle the drum, that hush the cannon.

##### PHILOSOPHY OF FEAR.

Accepting the dictum that all things are phenomena antecedent to explanation, it is easy for us to understand that the most friendly and benign forces of nature should have been regarded by man as monster powers allied together for his destruction. The sun drinking up, in his thirst, from the bosom of the sea, the waters which he will gather in his cistern, in the sky, and pour down again in the early and the latter rain, unexplained, is a something for ignorance to worship rather than a light pointing the way God works for the good of creature life. The moan of the wind as it breathed its dirge in the forest, the wrath of the sea as it dashed itself against the rock-bound coast; the sublimity of the flash of fire, as the electric current played between the heavens and the earth, were either terrible deities to be pacified, or hideous demons to be dreaded. The powers of fear and love are antithetical in the human soul. In between these powers all other powers work as subordinate, and beyond them there is none but God, who made us capable of fearing and loving. The sword kills, and the harmless comet moves silently in its undefined path in the heavens; while both, to the ignorant mind, are concerned with death, the knowing how death comes by the sword, makes of it a less dreaded enemy than that whose power has no known limits and whose method of procedure is without explanation.

The fire that consumes and dies in its own work of destruction has no terrors comparable to those of the fire that is not destroyed and the worm that never dies. We are confronted with the strange fact, that those things able to accomplish our destruction, whose methods are understood, have lost their control over us in comparison with those powers which certainly cannot do more than destroy us, but whose ways of destruction we do not understand.

The power of fear may be traced from the first explanations of natural phenomena, in the descent of the rain, in the flash of the lightning and in the reverberating of the thunder, to the adjustment, by the law of attraction, the law of cohesion, the law of gravitation, of the movements and operations that silently are driving forward to their ultimate results; and may be traced yet further; when the conscience stricken soul, without revelation of God in the person of his Son, feels the sting of fear that gives itself expression in the acknowledgement that dwelling alone with itself is more intolerable than making a bed where the "fires are not quenched and the worm dieth not." The excruciating agony of the human race in its journey from the world unexplained to a world made beautiful and friendly, under the magnificent achievements of this splendid century, is a journey that makes the soul shiver at the recollection of the past and causes it to rejoice in the knowledge of that love that "casteth out fear" and makes the future so inviting.

#### MAJESTY OF LAW.

I undertake to point out some of the benefits and some of the evils that have accrued to us during this century's effort to conquer fear and to cultivate love.

It has not been so long ago since man conjejiured that there was a sequence from the forming of a tear to the building of a world. When he conceived that:

"The law that forms a tear,  
And bids it trickle from its source;  
That law preserves the earth a sphere,  
And guides the planets in their course,"

the bow of promise was stretched across the intellectual



heavens. It is only in this century that books on the "Reign of Law" have been written, and Argyll ventured the explanation that the flight of the sparrow was accomplished under the operation of law; and it is only in our day that men have ventured, and perhaps ventured too far in affirming the extension of natural law to the spiritual world. There is a majesty in the control of law that has caused man to reverence it too highly, as an explanation of cause, and rendered him content to feel after no higher. The dominion of law, while not justifying, certainly accounts for the arrogance and self-sufficiency of man in these last days. A catalogue of achievements reads like a fairy tale.

"In the last fifteen years, by means of spectrum-analysis, science has made disclosures in the constitution of the most distant heavenly bodies, their component matter, their degree of heat, the speed and direction of their motions; it has firmly established the essential unity of all modes of force, and has made highly probable the unity of all matter; it is on the track of the formation and development of chemical elements, and it has learned to understand the building up of extremely intricate organic combinations; it shows us the relation of atoms in molecules, and the position of molecules in space; it has thrown wonderful light on the conditions of the action of electricity, and placed this force at the service of mankind; it has renewed geology and palaeontology, and disentangled the concatenation of animal and vegetable forms of life; it has newly created biology and embryology, and has explained in a surprising manner, through the discovery and investigation of germs, some of the most disquieting mysteries of perpetual metamorphosis, illness and death; it has found or perfected methods which, like chronography and instantaneous photography permit of the analysis and registration of the most fleeting phenomena, not immediately apprehensible by human sense, and which promise to become extremely fruitful for the knowledge of nature." Mr. Alfred Wallace has been so impressed with what has been accomplished that he has given his impressions in a book which he says is in no sense a history but "may perhaps be termed an appreciation of the century."

“Going backward, we can find nothing of the first rank except Euclid’s wonderful system of Geometry, derived from earlier Greek and Egyptian sources, and perhaps the most remarkable mental product of the earliest civilizations; to which we may add the introduction of Arabic numerals, and the use of the Alphabet. Thus in all past history we find only eight theories or principles antecedent to the nineteenth century.” It may give a more impressive idea of our accomplishing by a comparative list of the great inventions and discoveries of the two eras:

## OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

1. Railways.
2. Steamships.
3. Electrical Telegraphs.
4. The Telephone.
5. Lucifer Matches.
6. Gas Illumination.
7. Electric Lighting.
8. Photography.
9. Roentgen Rays.
10. Spectrum Analysis.
11. Anaesthetics.
12. Antiseptic Surgery.
13. Conservation of Energy.
14. Molecular Theory of Gases.
15. Velocity of Light Directly Measured, and Earth’s Rotation Experimentally Shown.
16. The Use of Dust.
17. Chemistry, Definite Proportions.
18. Meteors and the Meteoric Theory.
19. The Glacial Epoch.
20. The Antiquity of Man.
21. Organic Evolution Established.
22. Cell Theory and Embryology.
23. Theory of Disease and the Foundation of the Leucocytes.

## OF ALL PRECEDING AGES.

1. The Mariner’s Compass.
2. The Steam Engine.
3. The Telescope.
4. The Barometer and Thermometer.
5. Printing.
6. Arabic Numerals.
7. Alphabetical Writing.
8. Modern Chemistry. Founded.
9. Electric Science. Founded.
10. Gravitation Established.
11. Kepler’s Laws.
12. Differential Calculus.
13. The Circulation of the Blood.
14. Light proved to have Finite Velocity.
15. The Development of Geometry.

The genius of Shakespeare has described the universal wreck, in the destruction of universal law. “The bounded waters

shall lift their bosoms higher than their shores, and make a sop of all this solid globe. Strength shall be lord of imbecility, and the rude son would strike his father dead. Force shall be right; or rather right and wrong, (between whose endless jar Justice resides), shall lose their names, and so would Justice too. Then every thing includes itself in power, power into will, will into appetite; and appetite, an universal wolf, so doubly seconded with will and power, must make perforce an universal prey, and, last, eat up himself." It is not to be wondered that the increase of men's knowledge of second causes has interfered with and overclouded their belief in first causes, in principles, in providences; it would be strange if even the young were not asking, "Can we keep our faith, and hold our facts?" Ours is an age full of contradictions. "It has disowned the old forms of authority and at the same time has become so conscious of the largeness of truth that it is willing to listen to almost any confident charlatan who claims to be its teacher—the most practical and the most visionary, the most hard-headed and the most soft-hearted, the most positive and the most perplexed, the most desponding and the most eager, the most independent and the most credulous of all the ages that the world has seen." One of its most subtle thinkers tells the story of the time:

"Wandering between two worlds, one dead,  
The other powerless to be born,  
With no where yet to rest my head,  
Like these on earth I wait forlorn."

"We are ancients of the earth and in the morning of the times;" that we appear contemptuous of the past is due to our not fully understanding the present. The largeness of knowledge has made us tolerant of every variety of teaching and school of opinion, and we are told that "ages of ignorance are ages of faith," the inference being that explanation is now sufficient for us to walk by sight and not by faith. There remain, however, the same great questions and the same deep mysteries touching your life and mine that characterized the times when our fathers walked in dread of nature which God had ordained to work to man's interest. When we come to

consider such propositions as 'there is a God,' or 'there is a world of material things,' both statements might be, and are accepted by the rudest savage and the most advanced philosopher. They will, so far as we can tell, continue to be accepted by men in all stages of culture till the last inhabitant of a perishing world is frozen into unconsciousness. Yet plainly the meaning in the propositions is not the same to the different characters. From 'the tribal deity to the Christian God, there is a vast interval. So wide are they apart that to those who hold the earlier view the latter would be meaningless. "Can we, in the face of the wide divergence frequently conveyed by the same formula at different times, assert that what endures in such cases is anything more than a mere husk or shell?" We have conquered fear of natural phenomena so as to come close enough to examine, and by analysis and synthesis, are enabled to say we know what things are and how they come to be as they are. We laugh at the idea of a belief that thought God was directly concerned in dipping the water from the sea and pouring it out upon the ground; and flatter ourselves that the knowledge of worlds beyond, in space, with which the planet on which we dwell is as nothing, puts so much business into the hands of God as to destroy the possibility of man's being a special object of care. To which reply is made that you may put a world in a soul and it will be there as idle as a bead in a baby's rattle. The rock-ribbed earth and the starry heavens may find partial explanation in largeness of knowledge, but the needs of the soul will never lie satisfied without a God. "The very sense of the place occupied in the material universe by man the intelligent animal, creates in man the moral being, a new need for Christianity, which before science measured out the heavens for us, can hardly be said to have existed."

We are driven to take a new view point on values, wherein material grandeur sinks to nothingness along side of moral grandeur. The world and all material creation becomes nothing, and what we call soul becomes all. It is no saying of a religious fanatic, but a stern fact, that a soul is better and worth more than the world. For its interest suns rise and

set; seasons come and go. The mysteries of natural phenomena are lost sight of in the deeper mysteries of a thing that never dies. The perpetual progress of the soul towards its perfection without the slightest probability of ever attaining it, is a more satisfying reason for things being as they are, than all explanations of how they are as science finds them. If this brings the knowledge of how to place all things in proportion, then life will not be lived in vain. The conquest of fear, like all other conquests, relieves you of service in one connection, and brings you into servitude to the fear of Him who hath power to destroy both soul and body. It is emancipation from this fear to which I now wish to direct your attention.

All scientific progress is based on the conquest of fear; and all progress of the race is based on the cultivation of love. "From the world as presented to us by science we might conjecture a God of power and a God of reason; but we never could infer a God who was wholly loving and wholly just. So that what religion proclaims aloud to be His most essential attributes are precisely those respecting which the oracles of Science are doubtful or are dumb."

This old world has been loved into being saved, and if any hope to be helpful to their race, it is necessary to understand that love must be the animating principle by which to project themselves upon the world.

Since the days the sons of Japheth came into Europe the world has been learning that the emancipation of man must come through love. The Greek and Roman, noble as were their conceptions and great as were their achievements, were inconsiderate of man. The highest cultivation of all innate powers belongs to the idea of a free-born Greek, yet these powers were never to be developed for personal ends; every man belonged wholly to the common public life, and individual power and talents were valued only in their relation to the State. The State was all, the man was nothing. While the Greek manifested national pride in art, the Roman, on the other hand, manifested it in power. The Roman believed that the army was the powerful instrument upon which the safety

of the State depended, and the Roman idea of a great State followed hard upon the Roman sword. In both alike the man was nothing.

The Celtic wave of life passed over the valleys of the Volga, Ural and Danube, went as far as the Rhine, pressed on beyond and reached the furthest bounds of the continent. The general characteristic is that of the clan, and while Greece and Rome had given the idea of a glorious, mighty and law-enforcing nation, the Celt gives the idea of organization under proper leadership and the reverential recognition of worthy superiors, and has thereby made an advance upon the first race idea, but the failure to value man led to despotism, and to check this evil the Teutonic races began a life that filled up the middle of Europe, whose chief object was the introduction of representative government of family rights and relations. At the moment history discovers the tribes composing this people they are bound together by common ties and a common interests, having common desires and common aspirations. Their one idea is representative government, as is seen in England and Germany where they emphasize the State idea and the king idea, yet the representative body is a check on both; united under one head, but united by the common consent of various parts. Finally feudalism drifted into supercilious aristocracy and the influences of new ideas made for its destruction. The feudal system had developed the individual will in all its power and energy. The Reformation aroused the spirit of liberty—these being smothered by the hand of power, the nation rested on a volcano, whose pent up fires only slumbered to burst forth in a loud and continued roar for the rights of the individual; and here begins a new development which urges forward society towards the free and lofty unity, the glorious object of the efforts and wishes of mankind.

Thus the thought of man has worked through the life of nations that no form of government or theory of life is right which builds itself on the destruction of the individual. Every man on earth has a lawful heritage in the earth due for his faithful labor, and he must be allowed to get at this heritage of comfort, liberty and education. The rights of the

individual must not be overridden by states, kings or parliament; by rank, wealth or corporations. All the life of man has worked to this common centre. John Bright's attack on the House of Lords and Mr. Gladstone's bill for an extension of the franchise, illustrate that: "Through the ages one increasing purpose runs, And the thoughts of men are widened with the process of suns."

#### THE HIGHER LAW.

The attempt has been to legislate man into his rightful place of dignity and worth, and success has been only partially attained. Trusts and corporations cannot be controlled by law. The safety of the individual is in changing the idea of values. When man is so taught as to recognize that he cannot afford to jeopardize his own soul for money, and that the fellowman, who works for him, is more valuable than the product of his labor, and his soul more lovable than gold is desirable, when he asks the question, "What shall it profit me if I gain the whole world and lose my own soul," or, "What account shall I give of the selfish greed that drives me to strip from my fellowman that inheritance that leaves him a helpless thing, then a fear more wholesome and sensible than a fear of the darkening sun, or eclipse of moon or stars, will take hold of man,—the fear of wrong-doing to man, in whom eternal destiny is wrapped. When love, that sees beneath the muscle and brawn, that which is like God, shall emancipate man from the shackles of unrighteous greed, then the clash of class with class, of labor with capital, and the will of the ruler with the will of the ruled, will be at an end. There is a perfect love for God that casteth out fear; there is a love for man that deals justly and acts righteously, so valuing him that when the world shall stand before God to give account, it shall stand in love, and not in fear, as one brotherhood.

Only when man shall be looked upon, by his fellows, as the standard of value for all things else, will the world be really united in justice and peace. "The attempt has been to bind together the fragments of the world from without; the only certain bond is a union from within. The power that controls

is that which stoops to the uttermost, nelhermost. It must come down to those common wants which lie at the base of all life, and which because they lie at the base of all life, are alone fitted to be the binding chain of humanity. At no other point can men be united, because at every other point wants are artificial." This thought put in] the minds of men two thousand years ago, has germinated and grown, and has woven a conception of empire that has captivated and dominated the human mind; which was destined to strike the first blow at dominions, and principalities, and powers—at every form of government in which the will of the individual had aspired to obliterate the will of the community. In the realization of this new thought heaven and earth are again met together. To take this attitude is to have communion with man on the ground of his being a creature; it is to become affected with want because it is want; it is to take into your sympathy the great fact of sorrow, irrespective of its origin and independent of its cause; it is to incorporate suffering which perhaps even now is the fruit of sin. The doctrine that man is too valuable to injure, creates fear of heaping up riches at the price of his advancement and obtaining power through his servitude; at the same time it destroys fear of all else. In the language of the great statesman, Alexander Stephens, you can say, "I am afraid of nothing on earth, or above the earth, or under the earth, but to do wrong. The path of duty I shall endeavor to travel, fearing no evil and dreading no consequences."

They are blest who live for this, who let love to God and man be the animating principle of their being, confident that death, come when it will, and carry them where it will, shall not find them unprepared for it, knowing that the rending of the veil which hides the secrets of the unseen world, the summons that will call them into regions unknown, need awaken in their breast no perturbation or dismay, for they cannot in God's universe, go where love and truth and self-devotion are things of naught, or where a soul filled with undying faith in the progress, and identifying its own happiness with the final triumph of goodness, shall find itself forsaken.

J. W. STAGG.



#### IV. PUZZLING QUESTIONS.

1. My pupils in mathematics once and again brought me an old algebraic puzzle, with which some of my readers are doubtless familiar. It is universally held and taught that if  $A$  square minus  $B$  square be divided by  $A$  minus  $B$ , the quotient will be  $A$  plus  $B$ . This is true arithmetically as well. For instance, if  $A$  equals 6, and  $B$  equals 4, we have 36 minus 16, or 20, divided by 6 minus 4, or 2, equal to 10, which is equal to 6 plus 4. Any number of similar examples could be given, all as simple as this. The trouble arises when we make  $A$  and  $B$  equal. Thus if each equals 6, we have 36 minus 36, or 0, divided by 6 minus 6, or 0, equal 6 plus 6. Hence zero divided by zero equals 12. If we suppose  $A$  and  $B$  each equal to 4, then we get zero divided by zero equal to 8. Hence again 12 must equal 8; and so, in fine, all finite numbers must equal one another. This has puzzled many a freshman.

The solution is easy enough. The premises are true with a tacit exception, "provided  $A$  and  $B$  are not equal." In other words, if they are equal,  $A$  square minus  $B$  square is nothing at all, and we are not reasoning about nothing; for nothing is not a quantity, has no mathematical relations, and cannot be divided by anything, much less by nothing.

This sophism of suppressed conditions in premises is very common in this world, and one aim of that useful, true, yet much maligned science, logic, is to insist that everything material to the argument shall be expressed.

This illustration is purposely simple, being intended to show that more knowledge and more mental development may effectually dispose of a fallacy.

II. For our second illustrations we cannot find a better one than that celebrated jest of the old Greek sophists, which goes by the name of Achilles and the Tortoise. The tortoise has one hundred yards the start of Achilles, but Achilles runs ten times as fast. When Achilles reaches the point where the tortoise was, the tortoise has moved forward ten yards.

When Achilles has reached this point the tortoise has advanced one yard. So, in fine, whenever the "Swift-footed" has reached the point where the tortoise was, the tortoise is no longer there. Hence Achilles will never overtake him.

ARCHBISHOP WHATELY'S VIEW.

Archbishop Whately was a very able man and an acute thinker. In our judgment he held his own in the discussion with John Stuart Mill, and moreover he had the good sense and the good taste not to attempt to belittle his opponent, which cannot be said of Mill.

In Whately's *Logic* over a hundred examples of fallacies are given. This one is No. 86, and is taken from Aldrich's old work. Whately merely substitutes the hour-hand of a clock at any distance, say one foot before the minute-hand, the latter moving twelve times as fast as the former—which is the actual relative speed. We note the following points:

(a) Whately justly criticises Aldrich's solution. "He proposes to remove the difficulty by demonstrating that in a certain given time Achilles would overtake the tortoise, as if anyone had ever doubted that. The very problem proposed is to surmount the difficulty of a seeming demonstration of a thing palpably impossible; to show that it is palpably impossible is no solution of the problem." It certainly is no solution of the problem; yet it is questionable whether the palpable impossibility, referred to, may not do some service by throwing the burden of proof where it manifestly belongs.

(b) "The example before us furnishes a confirmation of the utility of an acquaintance with the syllogistic form; *in which form the pretended demonstration in question cannot possibly be exhibited.*" The italics are Dr. Whateley's. With deference to the opinion of so distinguished a man, we think the italicised clause above given wholly incorrect. The statement must be unwarrantable; and we intend farther on to give the best possible proof of this by quoting a regular syllogism, in Barbara too, which shall exhibit the pretended demonstration in question.

"An attempt to do so," continues Dr. Whatley, "will evince

the utter want of connection between the premises and the conclusion."

We shall see in due time. In his Formal Logic Dr. Morgan states that some valid arguments cannot be presented in a syllogistic form. So too in language, some vigorous idioms refuse to be passed.

#### SIR ISAAC NEWTON'S VIEW.

We may say of this remarkable man in mathematics, what was said of Oliver Goldsmith in literature, "He touched nothing that he did not adorn."

If the first Lemma of Newton's Principia be true, it settles the whole question, and plays havoc with Dr. Whatley. But if, to borrow an adjective from Edmund Burke, it be not "impious" to call in question a mathematical proposition of that remarkable genius, whose very name we venerate, it must be confessed that the first Lemma of the immortal Principia is inexact, and is not sustained by the mathematical world. This is one of the most extraordinary facts in the history of the science. A loose stone at the base and corner of a pyramid that shall stand when all our words and works shall have been sunk in oblivion! The very first Lemma! The worthy Dr. Davies, the translator of so many French works, and the compiler, and to some extent, the author of so many good text books, maintained that the Lemma was true, and followed it out logically and relentlessly into error.

We should hardly know what to think on this line, if it were not that Newton's Corpuscular Theory of Light has entirely given way to Huyghen's previous Undulatory Theory. So that even Newton could make a mistake.

#### PRESIDENT BEATTY.

Our old teacher, Dr. Beatty, of Centre College, used to say, "This is a mathematical question; and the fallacy lies in supposing that the sum of an infinite number of terms of a converging series is an infinite quantity."

We formerly regarded this as the solution. For instance, the sum of one plus one-half, plus one-fourth, plus one-eighth, and so on out to an infinite number of terms is usually said to

be two; or, in recent works, two is said to be the limit toward which the sum of any number of terms of the series approaches, but which it can never reach, though it may approach indefinitely near that limit. Thus if a locomotive on a railroad track runs one mile in a minute, it will at the same speed, which is a necessary item in the discussion, run one-half a mile in the next half a minute, one-fourth of a mile in the next fourth of a minute and so on. This argument seems to prove, if it proves anything, that the locomotive never can run more than two miles, if that.

Call this locomotive A, and another one B, on a parallel track, and one mile ahead of A at the start. At the end of the first minute A reaches the point where B was in the beginning. Suppose now that B runs just half as fast as A, B being the tortoise in the race. It will, at the end of that first minute, be one-half a mile ahead of A. At the end of the succeeding half minute B will be one-fourth of a mile ahead, and so on. It would seem to follow that B can never run quite one mile, one being the limit of the sum of the series. As the time and the distance involved go *pari passu*, we are confronted with the astounding result that time itself would come to an end, to the delectation of the Sophists and the horror of all sober-minded men.

## COLERIDGE.

Coleridge, it is said, held that this fallacy was insoluble by the intellectual powers of man; but that the introduction of the element of time threw some light on the subject. We think that he was in the right. For, as has been intimated already in the general, if locomotive A should run one mile in one minute, and then half a mile in one minute, then one-fourth of a mile in one minute, it would take forever to run two miles, or a little less than two, if you prefer. As mathematicians say, the series of minutes is not converging.

But if a converging series be employed in time as well as distance, the sum of the terms can not be an infinite quantity, whatever else it may be. So we think that Dr. Beatty's suggestion does throw some light on the case.

Possibly some additional light may be gained by the follow-

ing process: In two minutes' time the locomotive B will run one mile, and the pursuing locomotive, A, will run two miles and overtake B. Now divide either of these distances, say the two miles, into finite parts, into infinitesimal parts, or into parts of both kinds, as we please; then, inverting the old axiom, the sum of the parts must equal the whole. That is, dividing any specific distance or portion of time into parts has no tendency to increase or to diminish the amount of distance or time.

Is this a perfect solution? We fear not. But it may throw some light on this dark subject.

Now why is there so much difficulty in solving this problem? Because it conducts us into the realm of the infinitely small, and the infinite, either great or small, is beyond our reach.

PROFESSOR STEPHEN ALEXANDER.

We once heard this able man lecture in Mercer Hall, Princeton, N. J., and well do we remember his lithe, active figure as he held up the tip of his fore-finger and said, "Produce a straight line through this point in both directions to infinity. The two parts will be equal to each other." Then stepping nimbly over to his left, and holding up a finger tip again, he said, "Repeat the process at this point; again the two parts of the line will be equal. Hence compared with infinity, the intervening space between these two points is nothing."

Could anything be more ingenious, more bewildering, or (*sit venia verbo*) more sophistical? It was worthy of an old Greek Sophist; and it sorely perplexed our youthful mind. The only solution that has ever occurred to us, from that day to this, is that the relations of equal, greater, and less do not subsist between infinitely great quantities. For how do we get our first knowledge of these relations? In part by the sense of touch. Place two yard sticks one on the other, so that an end of the one shall coincide with an end of the other. Of course the other two ends will coincide. But if a yard stick be laid simply on a two-foot rule, the yard stick will project a foot beyond the rule. By some such simpleness we acquire, very early in life, the ideas of equal, greater, and less.

Now lay one infinitely long line on another. They cannot

be laid end upon end, for the obvious reason that neither of them has any end. Then, adopting Professor Alexander's method, let us cut an infinite line into two parts. Each will have one end, and we place the two parts one on the other so that the ends shall coincide. Will the others coincide too? No; for by our supposition they have no other ends. Nor can one piece overlap the other. Hence one of the pieces can neither be equal to the other, nor greater, nor less; while it will extend beyond, and longer than, any finite line.

If there is a flaw in this reasoning, we have never detected it during all these years. Nor do we know whether or not Professor Alexander was in earnest.

The case is not so plain in regard to infinitesimals. Does an infinitely short line have two ends? Very probably it has, one of them being infinitely near the other. Is such a line shorter than any finite line? Manifestly so. May one infinitesimal be smaller than another? The great French mathematicians with one accord affirm that it may; yea, infinitely smaller than that, and so on endlessly. For those brilliant Kelts are fond of saying, as well as doing, startling things.

As to our humble selves we confess that, after many considerations of this subject, darkness still rests upon the face of the abyss. We must learn again the old, not wholly welcome, yet salutary lesson of our human limitations. The infinite perpetually solicits us, yet perpetually transcends or eludes us. We need the infinite. God the Infinite One is our greatest need. With eternity before us we can rest in Him and in Him only. Better be annihilated than be without Him. But do we comprehend Him? Let those who think they do, first grapple successfully with the infinitely small that meets us at every turn in our daily life.

### III.

We are thus conducted to the main subject of this article; and our readers may notice that our first illustration prepares the way for the second, and now the second prepares us for the third part of the whole discussion.

We meet with the same kinds of difficulties in the higher themes of Holy Scripture. We say higher not without a mo-

mentary hesitation; for if the contention of the Sophists were well founded, it would upset the solar system, and indeed the entire material universe.

On former occasions we have discussed in our Southern Presbyterian Quarterlies some questions in apologetics. In this present writing we do not intend to take up any individual case for discussion, but to offer some general thoughts which, it is hoped, will be useful to our theological students, young ministers and thoughtful laymen in the churches. Such men ask, and cannot but ask how we are to reconcile the unquestionable existence of so much misery in this world with the precious truth that an Almighty and Most Merciful God lives in Heaven, and that nothing can escape His knowledge; that under the dominion of a Holy and All-powerful ruler this part of His universe to which our knowledge extends it so full of sin; how explain man's freedom and moral responsibility inconsistent with God's foreordination, and His perfectly certain foreknowledge; how justify our responsibility for an act of disobedience on the part of our first parents, which "Brought sin into the world and all our woe." These are some of the knotty questions which many able and godly men have striven to answer. Instead of taking up any one of these, we remark, in line with what we have said above, that we may have a most rational and unshaken conviction of the wisdom and goodness of God notwithstanding the hitherto unanswered objections made by skeptics. We are inclined to regard as reason, or at least a reason why the All-wise God permitted those Sophists to arise and flourish in Athens. For their own amusement they would hatch up difficulties in the way of believing the most undeniable truths, would contend that Achilles, the swift-footed hero of Homer, could never overtake the slow tortoise, or again that all motion was impossible, and the like. Very well. We are much obliged to those acute triflers for teaching mankind that we may be absolutely sure of truths on positive evidence, yet be unable to answer all the objections that may be alleged. So our faith need not be shaken, and we do not need to cherish, or to feel uncomfortable under, misgivings, merely because we cannot

at once rebut any plausible objections to carefully ascertained truth. In very many cases all that we want is a little more knowledge. We have often thought of that passage in the last part of the 7th chapter of John's gospel, "Many of the people therefore, when they heard this saying, said, 'Of a truth this is the prophet. Others said, This is the Christ. But some said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the Scripture said, That Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem where David was? So there was a division among the people because of him.'"

What a pity that some one in the crowd did not speak up, and inform everybody that Jesus was born in Bethlehem, of the house and lineage of David!

Isaac Taylor, that profound English philosopher, speaks of it as a very interesting state of mind in which a man is placed when the arguments on the opposite sides of a question seem incontrovertible. Sometimes, as in this case from the gospel, the missing link of truth is at once accessible. Christ, or any one of his apostles then present, could have supplied it. Our Saviour announced a very broad principle when He said, He that seeketh findeth. Nicodemus sought and found. How wonderful, too, have been the discoveries of our modern explorers! Think of Egypt, Assyria, Troy. And this is one of the functions of all science, to find, to reconcile, and then to build. Yea, once rejected stones become most precious to us and are built into the walls of the august temple of Truth, and some of them even are made the heads of corners.

It is not superstitious, or fanatical, or unwise to believe that God may by His Spirit be acting in consonance with revelation, convince us so deeply of the truth of Christ's claims that we cannot doubt thereof, as the old organ-builders, guided by the ear, constructed their instruments aright, though in apparent contravention of the laws of harmony, until Helmholtz came and rectified the whole matter. The builders were right all the while. And so are God's saints.

#### THROW SOME LIGHT.

This phase has occurred several times already, and we now



proceed to see that the same grand principle applies on a large scale to the great unsolved problems of existence. It is believed that this line of thought will be very helpful to the classes] for which we are writing. Very beautiful is the way in which the All-wise One has aided our finite minds. For instance in the whole process of Induction, to which we can only point, but into which our limits forbid us to enter. As germane to our present purpose, we may instance the doctrine of the Incarnation of Christ. If it had been announced, as indeed it may have been, to holy angels before our earth had any sort of inhabitants, say in its molten or chaotic-abysmal, or primordial-granitic state, that the Eternal Creator would one day take matter into a personal union with Himself, there would have been silence in heaven. Nothing less than a sublime faith could have received the statement. Reference is not made to the moral necessities and extraordinary effects involved, which are stupendous. No lesser word, perhaps no other word than that, can so well express the thought. For surely it is one of God's own greatest revealed thoughts.

But the reference is to the union and communion of the Infinite with the Finite, and of Mind with Matter.

When tiny protozoans made their appearance, however, and rudimental intelligence, desire and will were seen in connection with material forms, a ray of light shot into the ancient darkness of the sky overhanging the intellectual abyss. "It is; though we know not how." In the fulness of time man came, in the image of God; and holiness as well as intelligence could in some inscrutable way dwell within a material form. It could for it did. Forty centuries or more of familiarity with this phenomenon on its immense scale of uncounted millions, and withal the special favor granted to certain ones of the holy angels of being temporarily incarnated, prepared the way for the miraculous conception and birth of the Son of God. They threw some light upon the mystery of mysteries. The heavenly choir, aloft above the plains of Bethlehem, believed and rejoiced with great joy.

This, of course, is given as one of many, possible illustrations. The throwing of some light on a dark subject is as old

as the science of Apologetics, as old indeed as all science. Our special points are two: First, large use has been made of this type of argument in other sciences, and even in the science of mathematics. Second, it is susceptible of very advantageous employment in Theology proper, and in Philosophy in general. For instance: The visiting of the iniquities of the fathers upon the children is a matter of present, daily occurrence, as visible as the overtaking of the hour hand of a clock by the minute hand. And it throws light upon the question of our unique relation to Adam and his first sin.

#### OUR HOPE OF INCREASED KNOWLEDGE IN THE FUTURE.

1. Further knowledge of physical science in its various departments may enable us more fully to understand those subjects of which both nature and revelation treat. For instance the cosmogony of Moses. This has already been to a considerable extent cleared up, and we may hope that every vestige of doubt or hesitation will be removed. Unfulfilled prophecy will come in for its share. As in the case of Christ's first coming, the event interpreted the Scripture; so in the vexed questions concerning His second coming, whether Pre- or Postmillennial, and the first resurrection of the martyrs. An absolutely satisfactory exegesis of the passages bearing on these points can hardly be expected in the 20th century.

The nature of the union of our souls with our bodies, and hence of Christ's soul with His body will, we judge, never be better understood in this world; perhaps never at all. The Irreducible Case in Cubic Equations and the Problem of the Three Bodies, which glowered at the world half a century ago, may be put to rest by genius or by accident before the year 2,000, but not the mystery of our dual being. Yet is it dual only? Have we a body and a soul, and a spirit? Or is this merely a rhetorical amplification? The writer accepts the latter view as, on the whole, the most satisfactory. Dichotomy, we think, accounts for all the phenomena; but who can decide the question?

So with regard to our connection with Adam, Creationism and Traducianism. In what sense did we sin in Adam? Is

Anselm's pronounced Realism true? Has Dr. Landis settled the questions of Original Sin and Imputation? We are afraid not. We wish he had. Or that some original and profound thinker would do so. There must be some relation between us and Adam that, so to speak, compels God to treat us as if we had either in some inscrutable way participated in Adam's first sin, or at least were responsible for its commission. It cannot have been just an arbitrary appointment. No angel could justly have been our federal head. So we think after half a century's puzzling over it we have not solved this question—nor the Irreducible case in Cubics.

O for one hour in heaven at the feet of Paul!

3. In cases wherein the Infinite enters as an element, we can never hope to comprehend what we may, however, apprehend. We can only cast ourselves

"Upon the altar stairs of faith,  
That slope through darkness up to God;"

and cry with the three archangels in the Prologue of Faust,

"Fathom Thee none may."

If we cannot climb even to the summits of the Himalayas, how can we hope to ascend to the stars that look calmly down upon us from their inaccessible heights?

WHY ARE SO MANY INCOMPREHENSIBLE MATTERS BROUGHT  
FORWARD IN THE SCRIPTURES.

1. The truths exist. We might ask why is God so much greater and wiser than we are? Then as to His works it is probably true that He has planned the best possible universe, that is, the one best fitted to accomplish His purposes; and we must never forget that His thoughts and ways are as high above ours as the heavens are above the earth.

2. Of these thoughts, which should be communicated to man? And who could wisely determine the sundry times and the divers manners, and also the substance of the communications, so well as God Himself? No doubt there was in Old Testament times a certain reticence on the part of the Holy Ghost, a silence gradually yielding to speech, a darkness re-

treating before light; and a large amount of exercise was given to the faith of the Elders who thereby obtained a good report. Nothing is better known than that the progress of science has been remarkably similar to that of Revelation.

3. In New Testament times a new method is pursued. God explains the deep matters of revelation to us not simply so far as it is best for us to know them, but as fully as we can understand them. I had almost said, as fully as he can explain them to human intellects. That is, in many instances. Thus we need to understand the plan of salvation, but that is inexplicable without the doctrine of the Trinity. We may be unable to comprehend the doctrine of the Trinity; but our knowledge must stop somewhere; even our knowledge of ourselves, much more of God. Our belief is that in all the universe, no being, except God, knows himself to the bottom. Certainly man does not. Thus "we are surrounded still with God." Midway His grand temple, from whence, like Anna the prophetess, we go not forth by day or by night, evermore midway, we stand on this Altar-world and worship the everywhere present One. Midway His eternity, evermore midway, we glorify Him, who was, and who is, and who is to come. We give thanks to Him for His great glory, even unto God our exceeding joy.

4. This leads to our last thought. In order that we may be benefited by a truth, it is not necessary for us to comprehend it wholly. We may appreciate the solemn massiveness, silence and antiquity of the pyramid of Cheops, although we cannot encompass its huge bulk with our arms. Or to give an illustration from literature: In Goethe's prologue to Faust, already referred to, Raphael first says of the sun as quiring his rival song among his brother-spheres, after the ancient way, and completing his predestined course with thunder-step.

"The sight of him gives the angels strength,  
Though none can fathom him."

Then Gabriel tells of the Earth-Pomp wheeling with inconceivable rapidity from Paradisal brightness into the appalling darkness of night, of the sea dashing upon the rocks, and of

rocks and sea whirling on swiftly in their everlasting sphere-course. Then Michael, of tempests rushing "from sea to land, from land to sea," and of thunderbolts flaming destruction along their routes.

But here, if we understand the great poet, Michael strikes a higher note:

"Yet thy messengers, Lord, worship  
The mild on-going of Thy day."

Above the storms and tempests, and in vivid contrast with the uproar of earth and sea, God's Day, that knows no night, goes quietly and gently on; and as Raphael had said that the sight of the Sun and his brother spheres gave strength to the angels, so now, lited up by the song of Michael, the chief archangel, the three rise to a loftier height of praise:

"The sight," ie of God's eternal calm,  
"Gives the Angels strength,  
While none may fathom Thee."

Only a little of His glory can we ever see; but this will give His children, as well as the Archangels, strength. Only a little; for much would blind, consume, destroy.

L. G. BARBOUR,

Richmond, Ky.

## V. THE INITIATORY RITE.

The visible church is, or ought to be, modeled after the invisible church. The visible is a type of the invisible and should, of course, conform to the thing typified. It is the purpose of this article to inquire whether it does thus conform in the one particular of its initiatory rite—whether the two in this agree in one—and to point out some things involved.

It is generally agreed that water baptism is, and should be, the initiatory rite of the visible church. Whatever difference of opinion we may have as to the proper mode of water baptism, or as to the proper subjects; however we may differ as to its order, whether before or after faith, we are generally agreed that it should be the initiatory rite, admitting the subjects of its operation to membership in the visible church. And whatever may be our difference of opinion as to the purpose and results of water baptism, we are generally agreed on this point, both in faith and practice.

Now the question arises, does the visible church, in this use of (water) baptism as initiatory, correspond with the invisible? Is there a corresponding initiatory operation in the invisible or spiritual church? Not so much are we concerned with the mode or method of this operation at present, though that is incidentally involved, as in the fact of its existence. Is there a definite operation which initiates in the invisible church? If so, is it called baptism?

We shall in this discussion assume that the expressions of the Scriptures, "Kingdom of Heaven," "Kingdom of God," "Kingdom of Christ," etc., mean the same thing; that when John the Baptist preached, "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," and Christ said, "Thy kingdom is come nigh unto you," "My kingdom is not of this world," and in many parables explained the nature of "The kingdom of heaven," taught us to pray, "Thy kingdom come," taught

Nicodemus, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God," and in all these we shall assume, without fear of contradiction, the same thing is meant as when we speak of the spiritual or invisible church.

In that interview with Nicodemus Christ laid down a requirement for admittance into the invisible church, saying, "Except a man be born of water and (or even) of the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God." We need not here notice the discussion as to this new birth being of water as well as of the Spirit. That is foreign to the matter now in hand. We will simply take the point on which we are all agreed, that, whatever else may be involved, this much at least is necessary: that a man be born of the Spirit. This new birth of the Spirit or Regeneration, as it is commonly called, is thus not only necessary for admittance but the operation does actually admit. For we read, "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit." That is, the man who is born of the Spirit is a spiritual being, and is therefore become alive in the spiritual kingdom or church.

Thus the operation of the Spirit in Regeneration is initiatory. But what is this operation called? Regeneration, or new birth is manifestly the name of the thing accomplished by the operation, and is therefore not the operation itself. It is the effect of the Spirit's operation, and leaves as yet unnamed the operation itself.

It would indeed be strange if the Spirit in the Scriptures had left unnamed an operation whose effect is of such importance. Since the initiatory rite of the visible church is called baptism, and since it is a symbol of the initiatory operation of the invisible church, whose effect is Regeneration, we would expect this operation to be called a baptism. And since this operation is of the Spirit, we would expect to find it called Spirit Baptism, in distinction from water baptism, its symbol. And this we hold to be the fact—that the very important and much emphasized spiritual operation called in Scriptures, Spirit Baptism, is indeed this very

operation which initiates into the invisible church and whose effect is the new birth or Regeneration.

In maintaining such a view I insist that I am not teaching a new doctrine, but a belief as old as Christendom. That this was the belief of the primitive church is clearly seen in the fact that baptism was made the initiatory rite of the visible church. The idea that water baptism is to be practiced as initiatory cannot be accounted for except on the assumption that the apostles and fathers believed the initiatory operation of the spiritual church, which is to be symbolized in the visible, was a baptism. The whole visible church from primitive times to the present has been practicing the idea that the initiatory operation of the spiritual kingdom is the Spirit Baptism, in the making the corresponding initiatory rite of the visible kingdom a baptism. Where else did we get our present practice of water baptism as initiatory? Is there any Scripture for it except in the fact that baptism is the corresponding initiatory of the spiritual kingdom?

But this primitive belief, and our present practice of it, is not in accord with a now very prevalent teaching which, I believe, originated with the Keswick and Northfield evangelists, that the Spirit Baptism is an operation only for those who are already regenerated by the Spirit, and is to be sought with much prayer by all Christians, some of whom may never receive it, though members of the invisible kingdom. This new teaching clearly does not regard the Spirit Baptism as initiatory, and it is therefore with them distinct from regeneration. This new theology, if indeed it can be called a theology, whatever may be its pretensions, is revolutionary. But if it be right, and the belief of the past wrong, let us have the revolution and discard the practice of baptism as an initiatory rite. But we should be very careful before we side with revolution. These Keswick and Northfield evangelists have no claim to profound scholarship. They scorn "theology." They are good evangelists, but poor theologians. They are not the sort of men who give the world profound and scholarly systems



of truth, learnedly worked out with logical and scriptural exactness of statement. But if in this case they have discovered a great truth overlooked by the past centuries, let us accept it and made our practice conform to it. Let us not however commit the error, so often fatal, of taking a thing simply because it is new.

If we have been wrong, if the Spirit Baptism be not the operation of initiation, and if therefore the Spirit Regeneration, which is unquestionably initiatory, be not the Spirit Baptism, and if, as is undeniably true, the initiatory rite of the visible church should symbolize that of the invisible, we are face to face with the painful necessity of symbolizing a spiritual operation of whose method we know nothing, and may well ask with Nicodemus, "Can a man enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born?" With such ignorance of the method of the operation to be symbolized, consequent upon the ignorance of what the operation is, there must arise many different opinions as to the mode of symbolizing it; and with this idea that in the visible rite we are not symbolizing the Spirit Baptism, but an entirely different operation or effect called Regeneration, we have committed a most illogical and unaccountable blunder in calling the visible symbolical operation baptism. It should evidently be called birth or some other name indicative of the thing symbolized. The Northfield evangelists and the Immersionists are together in this inconsistency. They both call the visible initiatory rite, baptism, and are at the same time trying to make it symbolize a spiritual operation or effect which, according to them, is not called baptism. Immersionists, in their attempted revelation in the mode of water baptism to make it conform to their ideas of the Spirit's operation in the initiatory act of Regeneration distinct from the Spirit Baptism, failed to carry their revolution far enough to include the change of name of their operation so as to make it consistent with, and indicative of, the thing they mean to symbolize. The difference between the Immersionists and Northfield evangelists in this partic-

ular is that the former emphasize the initiatory rite as distinct from Spirit Baptism, to the extent of minimizing that baptism while the latter emphasize the Spirit Baptism, as distinct from the initiatory rite, to the extent of minimizing that rite. But the practice yet remains unchanged despite, these changes in belief, an unspeakable and incontestable witness to the primitive doctrine, and now raises its head, hitherto unobserved, a conspicuous testimony to the inconsistency and comparatively recent origin of Immersionist doctrine as well as that of the Northfield evangelists.

That the Spirit Baptism is the operation of the Spirit in Regeneration is set forth not only in the fact that in the original doctrine of the church it was made the initiatory operation, but also in the fact that the Scriptures assign to that baptism the very effects that they also assign to Regeneration.

It is universally admitted that the Scriptures teach that all true Christians are members of the invisible church and are therefore regenerated (John 3:3, 5). This same truth is also taught concerning Spirit Baptism, for Peter said concerning it, "The promise is unto you and your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." (Acts 2:39). Paul wrote to the Corinthians in accord with this truth, "By one Spirit are ye all baptized into one body." Thus the Holy Spirit teaches, through Peter and Paul, that His Baptism is for all Christians, and not only for all, but all, as in the case of the Corinthians do actually receive that baptism, the Northfield evangelists to the contrary notwithstanding. Thus in this point, Spirit Baptism and Regeneration agree in one.

It is everywhere agreed that the effect of the operation of the Spirit in Regeneration is set forth in the following expressions of Scripture: "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature;" "Ye are quickened together with Christ," "Made alive in Christ," "Created in Christ," "Crucified with Christ," "Dead with Christ," "Buried with Christ," "Risen with Christ," "Hid with Christ," "Put on Christ," "Christ in

you the hope of glory," etc., etc. It is by this being in Christ and he in us that we become "Heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus Christ" and sit with him upon his throne even as he sits with the Father on his throne. It is by this union with Christ that we are placed in our relation to the Father as sons of God, and are enabled to say "Abba Father." (Rom 8:14-17; Gal. 3:5-7.) All this is accomplished in Regeneration or the new birth of the Spirit. This will not be denied by any thoughtful Bible student. Notice in the above quotations how often the expression "In Christ" occurs, or words expressing oneness with Christ. Now we find that this same effect is accomplished by Spirit Baptism. Paul tells the Corinthians, as above quoted, "By one Spirit are ye all baptized into one body." That is, that their being in Christ was the effect of the Spirit Baptism. He teaches the same great truth in Rom 6:3, where he tells us we are baptized into Christ's death by being baptized into Christ. Again, in the epistle to the Galatians we are taught, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." (Gal. 3:27) Thus throughout the Scriptures when oneness with Christ is spoken of, where the operation is given it is always baptism, and where the agency is given it is always the Spirit. But oneness with Christ, as we have seen, is the effect produced by the Spirit's operation in Regeneration. Therefore the two are one and the same, and Regeneration is accomplished by the Spirit Baptism. Therefore the Spirit Baptism is the initiatory operation of the invisible church, and we are right in so symbolizing it, in accord with the primitive belief and practice.

But our Northfield evangelists teach, we are, or may be, baptized many times with the Spirit. If this is true, evidently since water baptism is to symbolize that of the Spirit, we should be baptized often with water, which is clearly not in accord with apostolic practice. They must eventually baptize with water many times, if at all, when their teaching is old enough to force its logical consequences, or

they must shift to the Immersionist view that water baptism does not symbolize that of the Spirit. To such conclusions their teaching of repeated Spirit Baptism is tending. To avoid it they are now evidently striving, unconsciously perhaps, by ignoring water baptism altogether and treating it as though it were of little importance whether it be practiced at all.

But even with our view, the old belief of the church, that there is but one Baptism, that of the Spirit, (that with water being a symbol of it) and that one baptism is to be performed but once, why do we not symbolize it often, as we do Christ's sacrificial death which was also performed but once? Why have we Christ's authority for observing the sacrament of the Lord's Supper often and not his authority for observing the sacrament of water baptism more than once in the same person? The reason for this teaching of Christ is plain: The former was not to be a commemoration of an initiatory operation, while the latter was, and hence to be in keeping with the thing symbolized can be rightly observed but once. But if it should be that a true Christian might "fall from grace," as the Arminians put it, or in some way effect his exit from the spiritual church, and could then come back and be re-initiated many times perhaps, after many fallings away, then the Spirit Baptism in re-initiation having been performed many times, I see no reason why that man should not receive the symbolical rite of initiation into the visible church every time he is again received into membership after having been dismissed therefrom. I can see no other logical course. A man can be admitted to the invisible church only by the Spirit Baptism effecting Regeneration. Then if he is re-admitted, having fallen away, it must be by re-baptism or re-regeneration. Therefore in such cases, the invisible initiatory operation having been performed more than once, its symbol, water baptism, ought to conform to it and be applied every time he is re-admitted into the visible church. But the Arminian churches do not practice this idea, why? It is the logical

consequence of their doctrine. The reason they are thus inconsistent and do not practice many water baptisms is that they, like the Immersionists, obtain their practice from one source and their belief from another. Their practice came from a time when the whole church believed in the precious old doctrine of "Perseverance of the saints", and the Arminian revolution went only so far as to effect the doctrine, and left the practice of water baptism as initiatory, applied but once, in symbolical significance of the Spirit Baptism, only once applied to each believer. Thus this most potent witness again raises its head, and this time in the midst of Arminianism, bearing indisputable testimony to the fact that the Apostles believed and practiced the doctrine of interminable membership in the spiritual church. We are thus contending in this paper for no small truth.

EDWARD EVERETT SMITH.

Owensboro, Ky.

## VI. REASONS FOR CHANGING THE SABBATH FROM THE SEVENTH TO THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK.

A seven-fold division of time was recognized among men from the beginning. Hesiod tells us that the seventh day was sacred because of the birth of Apollo on that day. This was, no doubt, a remnant of the worship of the true God upon that day. Many ancient nations are known to have had this institution of the week, and none of them have as yet been shown to have been without it. We are justified, therefore, in concluding that its observance was universal. During the patriarchal age not much is said in regard to the Sabbath. But it must have been a well-known institution, for when the commandment was given in regard to it, the people were told to "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy."

The number seven is used in the Scrip'ures as peculiarly a ritual number. As instances of its use, the Passover feast continued seven days, and the blood of the sin offering was sprinkled seven times before the Lord. The observance of the seventh day, as commanded by God, was ceremonial, for it was to be observed in remembrance of their deliverance out of Egypt. (Deut. 5:15). It is not held that the observance of the seventh day was ceremonial only; it had moral and abiding elements as well. In the first place the Sabbath is necessary for rest, and, in the second place, it was to be set apart for worship. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." What is held and contended for at present is, that the Jewish Sabbath was so interlined with the complex Jewish ceremonials that it would not well answer the purpose of a day of worship for the spiritual Christian dispensation.

From a study of the writings of the period, it is evident that in the early Christian mind the Jewish Sabbath was entangled among the other ordinances of that people. Paul

warned his converts time and again to beware of the Jewish yoke, and beside he classed the Jewish Sabbath along with other Jewish ceremonials. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Justin Martyr, who lived in the first half of the second century, in his dialogue with Trypho, expressed a like opinion in regard to the Sabbath. He says in the course of the argument: "Is there any other matter in which we are blamed than this, that we live not after the law, and are not circumcised in the flesh as your forefathers were, and do not observe Sabbaths as you do?" Further on he says: "For the first day after the Sabbath, remaining the first of all the days, is called, however, the eighth, according to all the days of the cycle, and remains the first. Sabbaths and circumcision alike have an end in Him who was born of a virgin; \* \* \* in Christ the Son of God who was proclaimed to be the everlasting law and the everlasting covenant."

It is evident from these quotations that, in the mind of Justin, the Sabbath was linked with circumcision and the other Jewish rites. For him the question of the Sabbath was resolved into the ever-living question of salvation by faith in Christ, on the one hand, and on the other hand, of salvation by works.

Since the observance of any particular day of the seven was a ceremonial matter, its obligation would continue so long as the ceremonial system continued in force and no longer. The institution of a day to be kept holy has never been abrogated, but its ceremonial features were abrogated in Christ who came as the fulfilment of the law. The change from the observation of the seventh to the first day of the week was intended to do away with the abuses which the Pharisees had bound upon the day. But the chief purpose of the change was to commemorate the day of our Lord's resurrection, which signified the completion of the work of redemption. The seventh day of the week had been ob-

served to commemorate the goodness of God in creation, and also His kind providence in freeing His people from Egyptian bondage. But the great mass of those who were to be the true followers of God had never been released from slavery, nor had their fathers. Starting with the work of the Redeemer a new day was to be observed which commemorated the freeing of the human race, not from Egyptian bondage, but from the harder bondage of sin and death. We are told that there is no command authorizing the observance of the first day of the week, but the revelations of God's will in His acts are no less authoritative. The resurrection of Christ was a divine act which is of transcendent significance to God's people for all time. Redemption is a greater work than creation, and the divine purpose and love by which it was accomplished is celebrated by the Church on the Lord's Day.

Another of the divine acts which will never be forgotten nor undervalued by God's willing servants was the bestowment of the Pentecostal Spirit which occurred on the first of the week. Since this memorable event a new spiritual dispensation has prevailed in the world, in which God's children do "not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, \* \* \* but to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant." An event which, like this, assures to all who will receive it, the immediate presence and strength and light and peace and comfort of God, may well indicate the day to be held in perpetual remembrance by exercises of mercy and devotion.

But it may be asked, Is there no more direct authority for setting aside the first day of the week instead of the seventh? Yes, the practical observance of the first day of the week by Christ and His apostles gives divine sanction of the change. On the first day Christ rose and appeared to His disciples. After eight days He appeared to them again. Cyril of Alexandria, commenting on this passage says, "This eighth day was without doubt the Lord's Day and so ought to be so kept because it is likely that Christ Himself



kept it." The apostles began at once to observe the first day of the week as their day of special meeting. We are told that on the day of Pentecost, which was the first day of the week, they were all with one accord in one place. And, from this on, whenever a day is named on which the disciples met for worship, it is always the first day of the week and never the seventh. An instance of this observance is recorded in Acts xx:7: "Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight. Not to consume space by quoting all the passages which bear upon the subject, let one other suffice. "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God has prospered him. I Cor. 16:2."

It is not claimed that the first day of the week was substituted for the seventh immediately by the disciples of Christ. Possibly such a statement could not be proven. Probably the seventh day continued to be observed for some time by Christians who came from Judaism, but Sunday, or the first day of the week, was also observed from the time of our Lord's resurrection. This state of things continued until the first generation had disappeared. But "there is positive proof by writers of the first century, of the early substitution of the first for the seventh day."

The assertion that the Christian Sabbath was instituted centuries afterwards by Constantine or by the Church of Rome, is simply an assertion, and without evidence. On the other hand, it can be shown by the almost continuous testimony of writers that Sunday has been observed from the days of the apostles.

Ignatius, who died at the beginning of the second century, speaks in this wise in his letter to the Magnesians, "If, therefore, those who are brought up in the ancient order of things have come into possession of a new hope, no longer observing the Sabbath but observing the Lord's Day, on which also our life has sprung up again by Him,

\* \* \* how shall we be able to live apart from Him?" Tertullian about A. D. 200, mentions the observance of the Lord's Day, and says that its observance was common to all Christians. Origen, who died about A. D. 250, in his controversy with Celsus, says: "If it be objected to us on this subject that we ourselves are accustomed to observe certain days, as, for example, the Lord's Day, the Preparation, the Passover, or Pentecost." From these quotations it is evident that, in the minds of the early Christians, the Sabbath was involved with those things which Christianity had superseded, and that the old Sabbath idea was repugnant to them.

In regard to opinions held since the early centuries of the Church it will, of course, not be considered necessary to inquire. In the mind of the writer, the reasoning presented above should be convincing to all. But there are various minor considerations which may add weight to the argument.

We are interested to know, not only what the divine thought was in establishing the day of worship, but how He regards it to-day. If it is inquired what people God has most prospered, whether those who observe the first or the seventh day, it is evident that God has given blessing and influence to the keepers of the first day more than to others. No one will dare to say that God meets with His people more on any other day than on the Lord's Day. The Lord honored this day by coming again from the grave, and also by the gift of His Spirit, and seems ever since to have been pleased to especially bless His followers on every recurrence of the day.

Again, as "the voice of the people is the voice of God," especially when the people in question compose the Church of God, there is weight in the fact that there is nearly universal agreement on the day to be observed. Christians are more united on this than on any other point. It is a lamentable fact that they are not universally united in regard to it. The Sabbath is to be kept holy. If anything is holy it

is devoted to God, and is kept inviolate. As for the great majority of Christian people, the Sabbath is thus kept holy because they unitedly devoted it to rest and worship. But a few who insist upon keeping Saturday, thus introduce discord. An essential thing in keeping a day holy is that all shall agree upon the day. The prayer of our Lord for us was "that they all may be one." Aside from the discordant seventh-day people, God's children sanctify His Day. In civil statutes there is almost universal recognition given to the Christian Sunday. Thus Church and State are practically united upon the day, and it is the part of Christian charity, as well as of worldly wisdom, for the hostile minority to submit to the great majority.

Having examined the foundations of the Sabbath, one is moved with thankfulness to the Father for His loving care in perpetually assuring to us a day for worship, and one is inclined to expatiate upon the benefits and delights of the day. There is danger also of diverging from the subject in hand, and proceeding to defend the day against the enemies which threaten it. I cannot refrain from expressing the regret that a few Christians called the Seventh Day Adventists and Baptists unite with the ante-Christian and Sabbath-breaking elements in opposing the Christian's day of rest. These people did all in their power to open the gates of the world's Fair on Sunday. They are constantly doing all they can to secure the repeal of those beneficent laws which were enacted to secure the establishment of a weekly day of rest. Let all lovers of their country, as well as lovers of the Lord Jesus, unite their labors and their prayers that we may be delivered from this hypercritical legalism, which would bind upon Christians the ancient Judaistic yoke, as well as from the intemperate multitude, who more grossly sin by desecrating the holy Sabbath Day.

A. B. TAYLOR.

East Elba, N. Y.

## VII. PARADISE.

The word Paradise is said to be of Persian origin. It signifies a park or flower garden. It presents to the mind the image of a beautiful enclosure, protected by a wall, filled with trees and flowers and watered with an ever flowing stream. In the Bible the place which God prepared for a habitation for Adam and Eve is called a garden. The Greek translators of the Scriptures use the word *paradeises*, paradise to express the idea contained in the word *gan*, garden. That was the home of joy and delight in which man lived at first and which he lost when he sinned. Hence we speak of that as Paradise lost. The word is also used to designate the home which man is at last to enjoy through the work of Christ—the Paradise Regained. It is only another term for Heaven, a place of holiness, a Paradise more beautiful, more secure and more joyous than any earthly garden could be. That Paradise and Heaven are one and the same place seems clear from the use of the word in the only three passages in the New Testament where it is used. In Luke 23:43 the penitent thief appealed to Christ as a king and prayed that he might be remembered by the king when he should come into his kingdom. Jesus answered as a king and promised more than was asked, to-wit: that on that very day he should be with him in Paradise—in his kingdom. In 2 Cor. 12:2, Paul tells us how he “was caught up to the third heaven,” and then in the 4th verse how he was “caught up into Paradise.” Here he evidently means for us to understand that Paradise and the “third heaven” are one and the same place. But the third heaven with the Jews meant the highest heaven. There was first the region of the clouds which was called heaven, then the region of the sky, where the sun and moon and stars shone, and then the third or highest heaven where God has his dwelling place, where his glory shines.

The other passage in which the word occurs is Rev. 2:7,

where the promise is made "to him that overcometh" that it shall be given unto him "to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God." Then in the closing chapters of the same book we find a description of Heaven, the New Jerusalem. In that city of God is the river of life, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. On the bank of this river of life is the tree of life and they are pronounced blessed who have a right to eat of the tree of life and to enter the holy city. The tree of life is in the midst of the Paradise of God. It is on the river of life that flows from beneath the throne of God. It is in the New Jerusalem where God's throne is and where there is no more night and where God's people shall reign eternally. This then must be Heaven itself. Christ promised the dying believer that on that very day he should be with Him in His kingdom, in Heaven, in Paradise. Lazarus was carried by angels to the bosom of Abraham, in the kingdom of God, for "Many shall come from the east and from the west and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of Heaven."

To be in Paradise then is to be in Heaven. To be with Abraham in the kingdom of Heaven is to be with God in His kingdom of glory, is to be in the highest Heaven with all of its honors and rewards, with all of its blessings and privileges. Paradise is Heaven and Heaven is Paradise. He who eats of the tree of life in the midst of the Paradise of God eats of the tree of life in the kingdom of Heaven. He who is with Christ in Paradise is with Christ in His kingdom—in Heaven. To all the penitent sinners to whom Christ shall at last give the privilege of being with Him in Paradise He will say, "Come ye blessed of my Father inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

If this interpretation be correct then it follows that at death the souls of believers, having been made perfect in holiness "pass immediately into glory." They go to Heaven on the very day of their death. "To-day shalt thou be with

me in Paradise." The very day, the very evening of the day on which the promise was made it was fulfilled, amid the glories of the Heavenly Paradise. Hence we find, on turning to the 14th chapter and 13th verse of Revelation that the voice from Heaven pronounced "blessed" those who die in the Lord "from henceforth," that is from the very instant of their deaths. They could not be pronounced blessed if they were to continue, after death, in a state of sinfulness until by a long process they had been purified and prepared for admission into the presence of God. This change is wrought for and upon the man at death so that they can at once enter into the immediate presence of their Lord and Redeemer. To be "absent from the body" is to be "present with the Lord." Their souls have no sooner left the home in the body than they set out on the short journey to the home with the Lord. They at once go to join the company of "the spirits of just men made perfect." They ascend to the multitude of those who have "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Hence there is no Purgatory into which the souls of believers must enter at death, that there they may be purified but this work is wrought upon them just at the time of their departure for the other world. The work which was begun when they were born into the kingdom and carried on throughout their entire earthly pilgrimage, is at death brought to completion. The image of God is restored to the soul so that it may awake satisfied because it shall awake with the likeness of God made perfect. The believer is blessed from the moment of his death because purified from all sin and welcomed into the joys of the highest Heaven. In the light of the same truth we see that the soul does not enter into a state of sleep and inactivity at death, but that having been delivered from all sin and infirmity, it at once enters upon the joys which come from the study of God's truth, the love of His character and the service of His kingdom. The mind is essentially active so that to cease to think would be no blessedness; his heart must love so that

to be required to cease that exercise would be a calamity rather than a boon; his will must exert itself in or to its highest happiness so that to be compelled to suspend its activities would be a misfortune. But Paul declares that he was in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and be with Christ, though he felt that it was more needful that he remain and continue his work in the Church, and yet he said that to depart would be far better for them. This could not have been true if he was to enter upon a state of sleep and insensibility till the morning of the resurrection. On that supposition it would have been far better for Paul to have continued his life of zeal and earnest activity in the service of Christ. Neither is there any intermediate state since going at once to Paradise, which is Heaven, believers would not and could not turn aside for some place inferior to Heaven. To be away from home from the body is to be at home with the Lord, and to be at home with the Lord is to be in His presence, to enjoy His favor and see Him in all of His beauty and glory. All this implies that the soul has been delivered from sin and has been welcomed into the presence of God in Heaven. While therefore there may be a sense in which the believer's redemption will not be completed until his body has been raised up, glorified and reunited to his soul, yet it is still true that there is no delay after death in the soul's purification nor in its entrance into glory. "The souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness and do immediately pass into glory."

This teaching of Scripture, concerning the transition which takes place on the death of Christians, should be of great comfort to us concerning our friends who die in the Lord. While here they were exposed to suffering and sorrow and temptation and had going on in their souls a constant conflict with sin and Satan. At death they are at rest from all of these conflicts and secure against all of their enemies. They are at home with the Saviour and with all of His redeemed people. Our loss is their gain. At the very moment we bent with anguish over the couches where their

souls separated from their bodies their spirits were being conducted by ministering angels to Paradise. They were on their way to Heaven. They were departing to be with Christ.

The same truth should bring us comfort in view of our own departure. If at death we are to sink into a dismal purgatory or to pass into a state of unconsciousness or into any intermediate state short of Heaven then this life might be far better than that and death would still have untold horrors for the child of God. But if, at death, we are to be admitted into the holiness and happiness of Heaven, there to dwell forever in the presence and under the protection of the King of Glory, then we can look forward to death with less dread. Though we may shrink from death, feel a deep concern for the welfare of those we must leave behind, long for more time in which to set our houses in order and wish for a longer time in which to do the work to which we seem called, yet if we know that all that is trying and distressing will come to us on this side of death, that the Savior will be with us as we pass through the valley of the shadow of death and welcome us into the home on the other side, we can with more readiness and joy answer the call when it comes to us. At that time of weakness, suffering and sin we may each hear the Savior say, "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise."

W. C. CLARK.

Augusta, Ky.



#### NOTE BY THE EDITOR.

By a series of unforeseen mishaps this issue of the Quarterly has been delayed almost to the time for issuing the next. To prevent further delay the editorial matter has been crowded out, and with this apology the magazine is sent forth to an indulgent constituency.

## CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIOLOGY—AN ANALYSIS OF THE PHENOMENA OF ASSOCIATION AND OF SOCIAL ORGANIZATION. By Franklin Henry Giddings, M. A. The Macmillan Co. 3rd ed. Pp. 476. \$3 00.

This handsome volume, by one of the foremost social thinkers of America, ought to be carefully read and studied by every minister at all ambitious to be abreast of the times. Much of its content, the line of thought pursued, the tendency of that thought, are symptomatic of much against which many pulpits are more or less arrayed. The church, the theology which she holds, and the gospel which she preaches from an old, old Book, have not nearly so much to fear from the side of physical science with its baldly materialistic corollaries, as from books like this one, built upon the assumption of facts still in dispute.

That Mr. Giddings is a brilliant man is evident on almost every page of a book peculiarly fascinating. That he has been a laborious student of the problems he discusses is also evident. But that he lacks the scientific training, the scientific spirit, and that he suffers from a poverty of logic in his application of the facts he has here brought together, it may as well be plainly said, is still more in evidence. It is unpardonable, in a book that deals with fundamental principles, as this one professes to do, to be guilty of conclusions that go far and away beyond the limits justified by premises, by present facts. Time and again is Professor Giddings betrayed into an arbitrariness quite at variance with the scientific spirit. We note, by way of illustration, his futile attempt to coordinate the sciences; his dogmatic statement that "the consciousness of kind is the primordial subjective fact in social phenomena," when the alleged proof for it is no proof at all; his statement, in a half-dozen lines, of a "complete philosophy of history;" and the interesting information that "adoption was practiced by animals long before human life began."

Professor Giddings's choice of a title for his book was an unfortunate one, to say the least. There is absolutely nothing in the book that can be regarded, properly, as a collection or discussion of elements or principles, which, reduced to law, could establish sociology upon the firm basis of a science. And this in spite of Professor Giddings' very obvious and frankly avowed purpose to place the content of his work upon a severely scientific footing. Here is a book of some 475 pages, traversing the domain of an investigation well-nigh limitless, and yet there is not a single great discovery of fact or demonstration of law recorded in it, unless, indeed, we indulge Professor Giddings and except his fundamental principle of "the consciousness of kind," which is not a fundamental principle at all! But that, of course, would be too whimsical. Judged by the

results here set forth, sociology has very little to say for itself as a science. It seems to be simply another futile effort to secure, without the needful drudgery of collecting and collating data, a knowledge of the workings and results of human association in all times and under any circumstances. It is another effort to do what the older philosophies of history tried to do, to formulate the everlasting laws of sequence without first reaching the assurance that they are everlasting! History tells us what men have done. According to Professor Giddings, sociology is to tell us why they did it. And this he claims to have accomplished in his book. If so, he has worked a miracle of multiplication with a few sociological loaves and fishes. He has made a very limited knowledge of by no means an overplus of facts go a long way. Prompted by the zeal for universals, to comprehend causes into the unity of a first cause, Professor Giddings actually interprets all the phenomena of human history as the result of a single influence, "the consciousness of kind," just as Gumpowicz depends on "conflict," or Tarde on "imitation." Now, "the consciousness of kind" is, of course, a social fact. But is it really a social force, such as conflict or contrast or imitation? Hardly. And if it were, the complexity of human things is entirely too great for such a single solution. And yet, through page after page Professor Giddings labors not only to make all history, but even prehistoric man, bend to his theory.

In the preparation of this volume Professor Giddings has been laborious, but not careful. Take, by way of illustration, the immemorable definition of sociology. On page 8 we are told that it "is an attempt to account for the origin, growth, structure, and activities of society by the operation of physical, vital, and psychical causes." On page 25 it "is the science of the association of minds." On page 26 it "is the science of mental phenomena in their higher complications and reactions, etc." On page 33 it "is the science of social elements and first principles." On page 419 it "is an interpretation of social phenomena in terms of physical activity, organic adjustment, natural selection, and the conservation of energy." What, now, really is sociology?

Professor Giddings' use of terms is very annoying. Every author owes it to his readers to be at once precise and perspicuous in his use of words. Familiar words ought always to stand for a definite concept. They ought never to mean one thing to the author, and quite another thing to the average reader. Professor Giddings is guilty in this respect in his use of the word "social," used necessarily with the greatest liberality in his pages. The same thing is true of that slippery word "subjective." What does he mean, on page 11, when he tells us that though "the objective explanation of social phenomena has been systematically carried out" by reducing it "to its lowest terms in the formula of physical evolution," the *subjective* explanation has not in like manner been carried through—evidently overlooking Hegel? It is not till the reader comes to page 36

that he learns that "subjective interpretations" are "explanations of social phenomena in terms of motive." And even then it remains unsaid whose motive, what motive is referred to. "Association" is another term with a variety of meanings in these pages. Professor Giddings says that association, appearing with and determined by "the consciousness of kind, is a later development than aggregation in the social process. But in this book it sometimes cannot be distinguished from it. We are told, on page 109, that aggregation is a process that "exhausts the resources of speech," and "extends to a comparison of genealogies, of personal experiences, tastes, beliefs, and ambitions." But on page 38 we were given to understand that all these things were the results of "association, comradeship, and co-operation." On page 376 again Professor Giddings asserts that "association may be mainly of presence." That is to say, it may be simple aggregation.

Passing from such minor defects, we notice, in the chapter on "Anthropogenic Association," our author's theory of the origin of religion. According to Professor Giddings, primitive man must have been a considerable philosopher. He knew perfectly how to make up for his ignorance by means of metaphysics. The eternal "why?" was constantly on his lips. He was everlastingly analyzing himself, and bothering about "ideas of ideas; ideas of volition, life, and cause; ideas of the sources of those manifestations of power that had awakened wonder and fear." And all this by the selfsame primitive man who "had no greater intelligence than modern savages have, and . . . the same ideas that savages have, although they were possibly in many ways more distinctly animal than savages are." But, primitive man, being "relatively well nourished," probably had spells of indigestion, for he dreamed about "wandering far into the forest, while his body lay motionless in sleep." And in that way the apperceptive faculty of those primitive philosophers got "the idea of self, or personality, as a conscious soul, or spirit, dwelling in the body but distinct and separate from it." But more. This philosophical primitive man, this systematic theologian of the jungle, even managed to reason it out that "death was but a prolonged . . . departure of the soul from its material home." In other words, quarterary man of the Terrace epoch had a creed, and the resurrection of the body was a conspicuous feature of it. It is Herbert Spencer's "dream theory," with addenda unauthorized by its original sponsor. It is marvelous how credulous incredulity can be.

But our main objection to this book is against the entire philosophy that underlies its thought from the first page to the last, striking through and vitiating the whole work. That philosophy is a curious compound of Comte and Spencer, and is as purely materialistic as it can well be. Book III is, in fact, simply a counterfeit of Spencer's 'Principles of Sociology,' and Book IV a servile imitation of that philosopher's 'First Principles.' In spite of the fact that we have, in Book IV a chapter on

"The Social Process: Psychological," Professor Geddings in the main interprets human society in terms of natural causation. He boldly reduces the phenomenally psychic to the purely physical. The collective phenomena of the universe, all of them without exception, are simply the results of the redistribution of physical energy. Humanity, and the social forces working in it, are not to be looked upon as in anyway outside of the cosmic process, as a materialistic philosophy understands that process.

The human will, personality, knows no laws that do not equally apply to the non-human. Organic life, with its high psychic manifestations, is simply a refinement of the inorganic, a further development, a finer evolution. Note how boldly the psychical is ruled out except as a phenomenon of the physical: "Social evolution is but a phase of cosmic evolution. All social energy is transmuted physical energy." "All that is done in society, or by society, whether consciously or otherwise, is accomplished by physical energy. Neither in society nor elsewhere is there any other kind of energy." In other words, there is no such thing as the psychical strictly so-called. That being so the Ego is simply a biological product, the result of a co-ordination of a number of more or less clear states of consciousness, states which are themselves, of course, only so many differentiations of motive and force. Self-determination is, therefore, a term to be detested by every scientific psychologist until—we learn to speak of it as "psychical determination," "the free exercise of will—not the exercise of free will," a neat discrimination, indeed. This "psychical determination," this "free exercise of will," says Professor Geddings, is the result of internal necessity as distinguished from external necessity. A free exercise of will compelled by the grim necessity of cosmic law! It is, certainly, a hopeless tangle, but in this way, with his usual cock-sureness, Professor Geddings puts a quietus upon moral freedom. And yet on page 383 we are told, with a delightful unconsciousness of the stupendous paradox involved, that "mental life has the distinguishing characteristic that, as it expands it acquires control over its own destiny and over the physical organism in which it exists." If that be not the purest self-determination, or free-will, we do not know where to go for a definition of it!

But we must stop. In doing so we earnestly renew our recommendation that our ministers read this book. It will provide abundant food for thought and suggest a number of delightful side lines of research. It will tell them what the youth of our land are being taught in the great universities. It will set them to thinking of means to counteract the latest infidelity that lurks around us in the intellectual atmosphere. It will show them that mere denunciation is not enough. We must be able to grapple with it mentally, in order to over throw it morally.

W. W. ELWANG.

Columbia, Mo.