

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN  
QUARTERLY.

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

MANAGER: GEORGE SUMMEY.

VOL. IV.

1890.

JANUARY—APRIL—JULY—OCTOBER.

**Chester, S. C. :**

MANAGER PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NEW YORK: ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & Co.

RICHMOND, VA. : WHITTET & SHEPPERSON.

COPYRIGHT, 1890,  
BY GEORGE SUMMEY, MANAGER.

PRINTERS:  
WHITTET & SHEPPERSON,  
RICHMOND, VA.

9/22/30  
Budget fund  
\$4.00

X  
Pw  
P928A  
N.4

## CONTENTS.

### VOLUME IV.

	PAGES.
Apocryphal Scriptures, The .....	<i>J. A. Quarles</i> ..... 370-388
Argyll's What is Truth .....	<i>J. B. Shearer</i> ..... 151-152
Baptism under the Two Dispensations .....	<i>Jas. F. Latimer</i> ..... 169-187
Bixby's Religion and Science as Allies .....	<i>F. R. Beattie</i> ..... 322-324
Board of Publication, The .....	<i>H. E. Simmons</i> ..... 626-628
Board of Publication : Reply to Mr. Simmons, <i>T. A. Hoyt</i> .....	628
Briggs' Whither? .....	<i>W. W. Moore</i> ..... 124-132
Canada, The Jesuits in .....	<i>William Cavan</i> ..... 443-447
Century of Christian Progress .....	<i>R. B. Woodworth</i> ..... 639-640
Chambers' ( <i>et al.</i> ) Moses and his Recent Critics, <i>G. R. Brackett</i> .....	319-320
Christ and His Miracles .....	<i>Francis L. Ferguson</i> ..... 497-519
Christian Apologetics .....	<i>Francis R. Beattie</i> ..... 337-370
Church and State : their Relations .....	<i>Alfred Jones</i> ..... 203-219
Civil Government and the Sabbath .....	<i>E. C. Gordon</i> ..... 389-402
Cobbe's Scientific Spirit of the Age .....	<i>F. R. Beattie</i> ..... 324-325
Covenant with Man, God's .....	<i>L. Tenney</i> ..... 403-413
Current Discussions in Theology .....	<i>W. M. McPheeters</i> ..... 301-302
Dawson's Modern Science in Bible Lands .....	<i>F. R. Beattie</i> ..... 155-156
Directory for Worship, The Revised .....	<i>R. P. Kerr</i> ..... 94-98
Dods-Bruce Decision, The .....	<i>W. W. Moore</i> ..... 621-626
Dods' Introduction to the New Testament .....	<i>H. C. Alexander</i> ..... 136-138
Education, Our Church and .....	<i>Thornton C. Whaling</i> ..... 534-560
Egypt, Length of the Sojourn in .....	<i>H. B. Pratt</i> ..... 433-442
Elliott's Old Testament Prophecy .....	<i>W. M. McPheeters</i> ..... 477-487
Examination of Ministers .....	<i>Ferdinand Jacobs</i> ..... 289-294
Expositor's Bible : Exodus, Matthew .....	637-639
Fellowship .....	<i>J. W. Primrose</i> ..... 220-337
Gilbert's Poetry of Job .....	<i>W. W. Moore</i> ..... 634-637
Girardeau's Calvinism and Evangelical Arminianism, <i>T. E. Peck</i> .....	629-634
Hawes' Doubts .....	<i>H. C. Alexander</i> ..... 316-319
Hays' May Women Speak? .....	<i>Samuel M. Smith</i> ..... 152-154
Hogue's Irregular Attic Verbs .....	<i>W. H. Boccock</i> ..... 327-328
Hutson's French Literature .....	<i>W. S. Currell</i> ..... 156-157
Ideal Man, the Product of the Divine Spirit, <i>W. L. Nourse</i> .....	520-533
Imagination, Uses of in Historical Science .....	<i>George C. Yeisley</i> ..... 414-423

	PAGES.
Infidelity, The Latest .....	<i>R. L. Dabney</i> .....
Ingersollism, A Reply to .....	<i>R. L. Dabney</i> .....
Inspiration, General Doctrine of .....	<i>H. C. Alexander</i> .....
Inter-professional Responsibilities .....	<i>B. M. Palmer</i> .....
Jesuits in Canada .....	<i>William Cavan</i> .....
Language Teaching .....	<i>Addison Hogue</i> .....
McGiffert's Dialogue, etc. ....	<i>Jas. F. Latimer</i> .....
Mead's Supernatural Revelation .....	<i>J. L. Girardeau</i> .....
Miracles, Christ and his .....	<i>Francis L. Ferguson</i> .....
Missionary Societies in the Church .....	<i>M. H. Houston</i> .....
Mob Law .....	<i>D. E. Jordan</i> .....
Momerie on Inspiration .....	<i>Robert Watts</i> .....
Northern General Assembly of 1890 .....	<i>Thomas A. Hoyt</i> .....
Notes .....	94-121, 278-300, 433-468, 614-628
Pratt's Given to Christ, etc. ....	<i>Samuel M. Smith</i> .....
Psaln LXVIII., The Origin of .....	<i>Peyton H. Hoge</i> .....
Recent Publications .....	158-168, 329-336, 491-496, 641-648
Representative Government in the Church .....	<i>C. R. Vaughan</i> .....
Reviews, .....	122-157, 301-328, 469-490, 629-640
Ross' The Church Kingdom .....	<i>J. D. Tadlock</i> .....
Sabbath, The, and the Civil Government .....	<i>E. C. Gordon</i> .....
Sacred Song and Sabbath Worship .....	<i>R. Q. Mallard</i> .....
Satan, his Character and Operations .....	<i>E. C. Murray</i> .....
Sayce's Hittites .....	<i>W. W. Moore</i> .....
Shields' Philosophia Ultima .....	<i>Francis R. Beattie</i> .....
Six Days, The Famous .....	<i>D. E. Frierson</i> .....
Smith's Commentary on Revelation .....	<i>W. W. Harsha</i> .....
Southern General Assembly of 1890 .....	<i>C. R. Hemphill</i> .....
Steele's Outlines of Bible Study .....	<i>J. B. Shearer</i> .....
Strong's Systematic Theology .....	<i>J. L. Girardeau</i> .....
Terry's Commentary on Genesis and Exodus, .....	<i>W. W. Moore</i> .....
Tithe System, The .....	<i>R. A. Webb</i> .....
Tithe System, its Practical Working .....	<i>G. A. Blackburn</i> .....
Tithe, The Law of the .....	<i>D. O. Davies</i> .....
Tithe, The Presbyteries on the .....	<i>J. B. Shearer</i> .....
Tompkins' Through David's Realm .....	<i>W. W. Moore</i> .....
Voluntary and Missionary Societies .....	<i>R. L. Beall</i> .....
Wace's ( <i>et al</i> ) Christianity and Agnosticism .....	<i>Geo. D. Armstrong</i> .....
Wallace's Repose in Egypt .....	<i>W. W. Moore</i> .....
Weir's Nature and Means of Revelation .....	<i>H. C. Alexander</i> .....
Weiss' Manual of Introduction .....	<i>H. C. Alexander</i> .....
Willard's Woman in the Pulpit .....	<i>Samuel M. Smith</i> .....

# THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 11. — JANUARY, 1890.

---

## I. THE LATEST INFIDELITY.

### A REPLY TO INGERSOLL'S POSITIONS.

THE phase of infidelity most current among those who do not profess to accept the gospel is marked by two qualities: It is aggressive, and it is extreme. It refuses to stop short of that last result, blank atheism, or, at least, blank agnosticism, from which even the skepticism of previous ages recoiled with abhorrence. This ultraism of the present adversaries is in one aspect very shocking; but in another it is promising. They are practically teaching the world that conclusion, on which James Mills justified his atheism, that when once a man's sense rejects the gospel theory, he finds no stopping place between that rejection and atheism; because, as Bishop Butler has forever established, every difficulty which besets the old gospel plan equally embarrasses the deistic plan. This disclosure is useful. Our atheists are teaching people that there is no decent middle ground for them to stand on; but the voice of nature and conscience never permits decent people to stand long on the ground of atheism. This outrages both head and heart too horribly. Were a son to insist, contrary to sufficient evidence of the fact, upon denying and discarding the very existence of his father, we see plainly enough how his position involves every phase of filial transgression, because it involves the absolute neglect of every filial duty. The position may involve, in the form of a sin of omission, the crime of parricide. The atheist discards the very existence of his heavenly Father; so, unless he has justified his denial by sound evidence, he includes in that

act every sin of impiety. We see here the simple reason why the good sense of mankind has always regarded atheism with moral abhorrence. But this is the creed which the assailants of our day prefer to urge upon us, and that with boundless audacity. Col. Robert Ingersoll seems to be the leader who holds this "bad eminence" amidst this host; he seems ambitious of a large share of this dreadful responsibility. This fact justifies my occasional reference to his name as representing the code of opinions I propose to discuss.

His various essays and speeches—especially his recent large essay in the *North American Review*—appear to build his opposition to Christianity upon four grounds: One is composed of specific objections to points in Bible history and precept, which, he intimates, intuitively appear to him immoral. Another is his assertion of moral irresponsibility for opinions even upon ethical subjects. This he claims for himself, and of course for everybody else, as the only adequate basis for freedom of thought, which we all regard as an inalienable right. A third ground is his total denial of all punitive aspect and quality in the evil consequences of free human actions. He absolutely denies the element of rewards and punishments in the experienced course of human existence. He says that the evils which follow the mistakes of our free agency are nothing but natural consequences, following from the natural laws of the universe, which are necessary and invariable; so that these experiences give no evidence whatever of a moral providence over men. His fourth and chief ground is the old cavil, how God, if there were a God, could even permissively ordain natural and moral evil in his kingdom.

I. The first class of assaults I propose to follow to a very short distance. They could be all disposed of by pointing to the dense ignorance of their authors concerning the Bible, its real facts and its real doctrines. They are such criticisms as their authors would never have made had they read their Bibles with attention and candor. They are all absolutely exploded by simple explanations which the teachers of the church have been accustomed for generations to give even to the children of their Bible classes. It would be wearisome and useless to go over all of this thoroughly-

trodden ground. One or two points will serve for illustration. In general I would only remark, that it would be well for the critics to get some little knowledge of the Christian literature before exposing themselves in a way both ludicrous and pitiable, by attacking subjects about which they have been too proud to learn anything.

For instance, we are hotly told by one that Joshua must have been a very wicked man, because he not only punished Achan capitally for disobeying a police regulation, but murdered his wife and children along with him. But the Old Testament makes Joshua a very pious hero; wherefore it also is a very wicked and foolish book. The simple and sufficient reply is, that the execution of Achan's family was none of Joshua's doings. He had no more discretion about it than about Noah's flood. God was the agent, and Joshua his merely involuntary instrument. So that the moral question in the given case resolves itself into this: Has Almighty God a right to punish a contumacious and immoral family of his creatures with death for a special wise end, death being the final just penalty of all sin? No man, after provisionally admitting the condition of this question, even for argument's sake, is silly enough to assert that, if there is such a God, such retribution from him would be necessarily unjust. Or, do they reinforce their cavil by saying there is no evidence that Achan's wife and children were accomplices in his theft? The simple reply is, that undoubtedly God knew them to be a bad family, worthy on general grounds of his eternal displeasure. For the principle of imputation on which this case proceeds is that God righteously imputes part of the guilt of wicked parents to children, but only to wicked children.<sup>1</sup> So that we are certain the family also was vicious and disobedient. Had God punished them some years after with death by fever, or rheumatism, or cholera, nobody, who admits that there is a God, would have dreamed of impugning the justice of that providential dispensation. Who, then, can blame the Sovereign Judge if, for the sake of an important and wise object, he anticipated the deserved punishment and connected it with that of the criminal head of the family? But I also deny the as-

---

<sup>1</sup> Ex. xx. 5; Ezek. xviii.

served ground of the cavil, that persons were punished along with Achan who, however otherwise sinful, were innocent of his particular breach of military orders. No doubt they were implicated with him by receiving and concealing the plunder. The receiver is as bad as the thief. If there were infants in the family, death removed them to the bliss of heaven.

Or, they object to Joshua's invasion of Palestine, and charge that his war of extermination there showed him no better than a land pirate and a murderer; and that, as the Old Testament represents God as sanctioning these horrors, they feel intuitively it is a very wicked book. I reply, that here a very large sophism is foisted in under a very small jugglery of words. This shallow little trick consists in the phrase "God sanctioned," instead of "God ordained." Thus it injects into the mind this conception of the transaction: that after Joshua, a human sinner, who had no right to dispose of other people's property and lives, had conceived his murderous project, God granted it his approval. Of course that would be exceedingly ugly. But the actual fact is that Joshua never conceived the plan at all. The war of extermination against the Amorites was no plan of Joshua's. There is not a particle of proof that he ever thought he as a mere man had any right to dispose of other people's property and lives. The plan of extermination was God's alone. He dictated it to Joshua. And again we say this general had no more discretion about it than he had about God's infliction of the deluge. God's purpose employed Joshua as a mere executioner; and if the Sovereign Judge had a right to pass the decree, it is nonsense to blame the mere servant who was compelled to execute it. The logic of this accusation is just as silly as that of a man who, after admitting the righteousness of the laws of New York, should call Mr. Cleveland a murderer, because when he was sheriff of Buffalo he hung some convicted assassins. Now, then, the only question involved in this piece of history is, whether Almighty God has the right to punish a tribe of his own creatures, whose iniquity was now full, with the death penalty. We can get a pretty accurate conception of what the morals of these gross idolaters had become. Their habits, like those of other advanced idolaters, were doubtless defiled by



every vile excess of lust, avarice, cruelty, unnatural affections, human sacrifice, infanticide. If God has any title at all to judge the world in righteousness, he certainly had a right to rid the world of this plague spot in his own way. He had adopted another instrumentality to burn out a similar plague-spot, Sodom, and he was justified for that by Jesus, by the apostles, and every honest man that ever read the history. In the case of the Amorites there was also this wise administrative reason for God's dealing: that he was planning to preserve a pure religion and morality in Israel, which required their effectual protection from the contamination of this pagan example.

Third, Colonel Ingersoll himself has been in the habit of attacking the Bible passionately, because he found that, when candidly explained, it countenanced slavery—the Old Testament actually ordaining it, and the New Testament allowing it. But inasmuch as slavery appears very abominable to his moral intuitions, this compels him to regard them as wicked books. Here, again, the critic's whole difficulty arises out of a sheer misconception. Let me ask him what that thing is which appears so evil; he defines it substantially thus: the usurpation by a stronger individual at his own violent will over the being of his weaker fellow-man, whereby the victim is reduced from a human personality, with a moral responsibility and destiny, to a mere chattel, a brute possession, whose labor, happiness and very existence may then be exhausted by the usurper for his own selfish behoof. I am happy to be able to console the critic by assuring him, first, that everybody else would abhor such a relation just as he does; and, second, that the two Testaments, instead of ordaining or allowing it, even judged it just as he and I do. And here is the triumphant proof that this very conception of the usurpation which Colonel Ingersoll erroneously supposes to be the conception of slavery, is precisely the crime which both Testaments condemn. [As in N. T. the act of the *andrapodistes*, and in O. T. *nogebh-ish*.] The Bible abhorred it so much that whilst Moses made only a few crimes capital he made this one of them; and the New Testament usually recites it along with the enormous wickednesses that incur the damnation of hell. What, then, was that relation of human

bondage which Moses ordained and the apostles allowed? Not the usurpation of a personal will over a fellow-creature, not the reduction of the bondman from a responsible human person to a chattel (which injustice is nowhere countenanced or excused by holy Scripture, or by any modern Christian that ever I heard of), but it was wholly another thing, to-wit: the regular institution, by the legislative sovereignty of the commonwealth, of a personal and domestic authority for life over the involuntary labor of the bondman, who was deemed by the law unfitted for his own safe control, in the hands of a citizen supposed by the law to be more competent, and this authority to be exercised by the master under the restraints of statute law, which also treated the bondman as a responsible agent, and guaranteed to him his life, limbs and subsistence against the aggression even of the master. Now, it is apparent that he would be a very bold man who would undertake to argue that this relation is essentially unjust, and the code which established it under any possible circumstances a wicked one. When arguing thus he would have to attack the righteousness of the parental authority over minors, and indeed every form of governmental restraint of magistrates over individuals not grounded in conviction of crime.

I have shown in these three specimens how completely they are exploded by a little tincture of Bible knowledge and common sense. I assert that all the other objections of this class can be shown to be equally worthless, but they are too numerous and trivial to detain the reader.

II. The second general ground for rejecting Christianity is the doctrine so dear to skeptics, that no man is morally responsible for any of the opinions which he sincerely holds. They assert that this position is the only basis for true intellectual freedom. They argue from it that our charge of sinfulness, or possibly impiety, or even our manifestation of moral disapproval against their most extreme speculations, is unjust, and is of the nature of wicked persecution of the free-thinkers. They also argue that the Christian system is absurd, in that it makes faith its cardinal condition for enjoying God's favor, inasmuch as no man's faith has any moral character, and cannot be a subject of moral responsibility, or ap-

proval or disapproval. Colonel Ingersoll is certain that to whatever extremes of atheism, or even of what appears to other people blasphemy, he is really led (not feignedly) by his thinking, he is as innocent therein as a man is for the color of his hair or the height of his stature. And here is his proof: that if the evidence appears before the mind, intellectual credence is purely involuntary, being the logical result of the evidence, and metaphysically necessitated; that such credence is exclusively the result of intellectual activities of the mind, with which neither emotion nor will has anything to do; that our responsibility is limited to those acts of the spirit which have a voluntary source. So, he thinks, it would be as unjust to blame him for his atheistic conclusions to which his thought has led him, as to blame a man for being wet when he has been thrown into the water.

If he were not extremely ignorant of philosophy and theology he would be aware that this is but the old sophism in psychology, which has been a thousand times refuted. When we hear Colonel Ingersoll assert that his anti-Christian convictions are the fruit of his pure intellection, without any element of emotion or will, we picture to ourselves the huge laughter of his own votaries at so vast and obvious an irony; for their own eyes and ears tell them that his agnosticism is all passion. What means that labored torrent of fiery and vindictive eloquence with which he assails the theologians and the Bible? Do not his auditors hear him ascribe his opposition to the Scriptures in part to his passionate abhorrence of slavery? Do they not see hatred of Christianity and its restraints blazing amidst the whole frame-work of his pretended logic? His unbelief pure passionless intellection indeed! Why, he is incarnate passion! It is supremely ludicrous! And we surmise that every applauder of his atheism who does any thinking is conscious of this; every one sees that there is really no logic at all in this agnostic eloquence, but it is all feeling, and it is acceptable simply because it harmonizes with the conscious hatred of his hearers against the holiness of the Bible and its restraints on their proud self-will. We have only to remember that the object of every moral judgment is a moral object which unavoidably engages and interests the disposition, affections and will of every

rational moral agent, and all who can reason see that no moral conclusion can be a pure intellection, but that some voluntary element must enter for good or for evil into the sources of every such judgment. No man on earth reasons towards objects which he either likes or dislikes strongly, with the same complete intellectual impartiality with which he reasons about pure mathematics. If he claims that he does, it is because "a deceived heart hath turned him aside." This is the analysis of common sense. This is the philosophy on which every sensible man in the world accounts for the multitude of these familiar facts, to-wit: that all people, while agreeing perfectly upon the truths of mathematics and numbers, differ more or less upon questions of property rights, law-suits, character, politics, medicine, and religion. It is because all these objects of thought involve elements which appeal to the feelings and the will. Now the false argument itself concedes that where a voluntary element is involved in the sources of any spiritual action, it is to that extent responsible. This is all I claim. Here is a man who has reached true conclusions on moral subjects. He is virtuous and approvable for them just to the extent to which a right heart has coöperated in his reaching them. Here is another man who holds erroneous opinions on a moral subject, and he is responsible and blamable therefor just to the extent in which a proud and evil heart has helped to bring them about.

So absurd is Colonel Ingersoll's position that he clearly discloses the fact that he does not believe it himself. He claims not to be responsible or blamable for his anti-religious conclusions; then, of course, all the rest of us should be equally irresponsible for our conclusions held with similar honesty. Now here is a man whose thinking has honestly led him to this conclusion, which he really believes from the bottom of his heart he has fairly reached, to-wit: that Colonel Ingersoll's agnosticism is erroneous, that it is morally blamable, that he is consequently responsible for it, (not indeed to man but to his God, and this is the vital distinction which guarantees to all of us all the mental and religious liberty to which we are entitled,) and consequently that the reproaches suggested by this evil creed which he hurls against his God, and his fatal misleading of his immortal fellow-men, are extremely

sinful. Now, does Colonel Ingersoll view this honest conviction of mine with any of that philosophic nonchalance which he requires me to use towards his? Not he! He blames me for it extremely, as unjust to him, as tyrannical, tending towards the wickedness of persecution for opinion's sake. He fulminates his indignant rhetoric against the wrong I am doing him. He fills the atmosphere with his complaints of me. Now this excites our huge laughter. The unbeliever himself demonstrates the absurdity of his own position, and refuses to stand on it at the first change of the case. So he teaches us he does not believe his own philosophy.

It is in fact impossible to be believed by anybody, because it involves us in absolute contradictions. If honesty in error were all that is needed to hold us innocent, truth would have no practical value above that of error. But truth has its eternal intrinsic value. Again, our decisive conclusions according to the necessary laws of our spirits direct us in our actions. It is proper that they should, or otherwise our actions might always be irrational, aimless, and worthless. Now if we allow the man to hold himself irresponsible for his moral opinions, of course we must hold him irresponsible for all the actions which they logically direct. After you have justified the tree in being the species of fruit-tree it is, you cannot blame it for bearing that species of fruit. So that this philosophy requires us to justify some of the most mischievous and abominable crimes that are done on earth. Let us see again whither it carries its advocate. Colonel Ingersoll knows that the slave-holders were generally sincere in their belief of their right; therefore he would have to justify the slavery he so abhors. He knows that Messrs. Davis, Lee and Jackson were perfectly sincere in their convictions; so he must justify them in all those blows at "the life of the nation" which his patriotism abhors. Supposing the magistrates of the old-fashioned State of Delaware, honest and sincere in the advocacy of that antiquated statute which, we are told, still makes atheistic utterances a misdemeanor punishable at the whipping-post, and supposing the gallant Colonel's zeal for his truth to have led him to that Pauline grade of heroism which makes men glory in stripes for the truth's sake, his philosophy would require

him to justify those magistrates, even at the moment the constable's scourge was descending on his back. But would it? We trow not. Again he provokes the inextinguishable laughter of the on-lookers. His theory of free thought is "unworkable."

Again, the position leads to a consequence yet worse. It is entirely possible that two sincere reasoners may reach opposite conclusions concerning the same moral object. If each is irresponsible and innocent in his conclusion, he must be equally so in the action to which it directs him. So our philosopher has on his hands this strange case: A has a logical right to execute an action touching the disputed object, which B, the other party, has an equally logical and moral right to resist as a wrong to himself! "The force of nature could no further go."

In conclusion of this head, we remind the "free-thinkers" (whom the above argument proves to be not free-thinkers, but crazy-thinkers), that their doctrine is refuted by every analogy of nature and every experimental fact of their own observation. The natural laws which regulate the results of our free actions invariably hold us responsible for our erroneous opinions. When we make honest mistakes as to the state of facts, nature makes no allowance for us, but inexorably holds us to the results of the real facts. The youth who goes sailing in a rotten boat, really supposing it to be sound, gets his ducking just the same. The farmer who exposes his grain, honestly thinking the fair weather will hold, if he proves mistaken in the weather, has his grain mildewed just as though he had wilfully neglected it. The sick man who swallows three grains of morphia, really supposing it to be quinine, dies just as the intentional suicide. But why multiply instances? We thus see universal nature repudiates this shallow philosophy. And so we return to our conclusion, that men are and ought to be responsible for their moral opinions; that the psychological reason why, is this: erroneous moral opinions cannot be adopted by the rational creature except there be some voluntary element at work amidst these sources of the wrong judgment; and to this voluntary element blame justly attaches; that, therefore, men are justly held responsible for their wrong actions, though logically dictated by their own opinions; that all penal responsibility for wrong

opinions is reserved to God alone, and is never to be usurped by human beings unless those opinions be embodied in criminal actions; that the resistance of the errorist's fellow-men must be limited to disapprobation and argumentative refutation; and thus the truth is established without opening the door to the hateful doctrine of penal persecution for opinion's sake.

III. The third ground of objection, as given above, is his total denial of all punitive aspect and quality in the evil consequences of free human actions. He absolutely denies the element of rewards and punishments in the experienced course of human existence. He says that the evils which follow the mistakes of our free agency are nothing but natural consequences, following from the natural laws of the universe, which are necessary and invariable; so that these experiences give no evidence whatever of a moral providence over men. Colonel Ingersoll roundly asserts that in the course of nature and experience there are no punishments, but only natural consequences. He also admits that the laws which dispense these consequences are invariable. The only possible method by which evil can be averted is to reform the mistakes which incurred it. The object of this strange doctrine is manifestly to escape that argument for the being and the moral providence of a God, which is written so plainly all over human events. We have two points here: First, his denial is abortive. Had he read, or read dispassionately, the second chapter of Part I. in Bishop Butler's Analogy, he would never have written those paragraphs in which he stated his doctrine. Bishop Butler shows by arguments which no man can refute, that the happy consequences of good conduct are of the nature of rewards, and evil consequences of misconduct have every trait and characteristic of true penalties, even down to the most minute; that this general law of nature is therefore a moral law as well as a natural one; that it is a disclosure of a righteous personal will above nature, and that it holds men under a moral probation for their conduct. And since this is universally true of man's mortal estate, as soon as we learn his continued rational existence after death, the utmost probability arises, that we must meet the consequences of our probation in a future world as well as the present. All this follows without the

light of Scripture. It is scarcely necessary to weary the reader by repeating the points of that masterly argument. It is a shame for any educated man, especially an English-speaking man, to handle this doctrine without informing himself of Bishop Butler's argument. No man who ever informs himself candidly of it will ever dispute its conclusions. I will, only for confirmation, make these two remarks: Every suffering transgressor in the world intuitively recognizes in his own consciousness the conceptions of guilt and punishment as soon as he recognizes the causal connection between his own error and the natural evil consequences. Let any such case be taken at random. Let it be, for instance, the case of a man who, by sensual excesses in the use of stimulants (alcohol, opium, tobacco), has ruined his digestion. His reason has admitted this proposition—that his own excesses have caused his own sufferings. Has there ever been such a man in the world whose consciousness contained only the physical feelings of pain, nausea, lassitude, and so-forth, and the self-calculated personal feelings of fear, sorrow, and so-forth? Is this all that is in his consciousness? Never. There is always the additional element of self-blame. There is always self-reproach for having done what he *ought not*. The man knows intuitively that he has been guilty in the case, and not merely mistaken; and that these sufferings are penal, and not merely painful. Men not seldom incur severe physical sufferings in the magnanimous performance of duties, as, for instance, the faithful fireman who is burnt in rescuing human life. Now the burn hurts him just as badly as the drunkard's gastritis hurts him; but is it possible for the consciousness of these two men under the sufferings to be the same? Never. This brave, honest man suffers, but cannot reproach himself. This guilty sensualist also suffers, and is compelled to reproach himself. According to Colonel Ingersoll's theory, the two men ought to have the same consciousness. Such test-cases show that the human mind intuitively, and necessarily, recognizes those very moral elements of blameworthiness and punishment which are so rashly denied. My other remark is, that all men, when spectators of the natural penalties of transgression, intuitively recognize the penal relation. What they say is always something like this: "We are sorry for



him, but it serves him right"; or, "Well, the fellow has got what he deserves." Now, what does the common sense of mankind mean by these words "right," "desert"? We thus see that the world is against that doctrine. Colonel Ingersoll is a lawyer. We would request him to attempt an explanation upon his philosophy of the penalties which civil society visits upon secular crimes. If there is any logic in his composition, a half-hour's meditation on that problem will convince him that his philosophy lands him in a Serbonian bog. For instance, would the conscience of mankind have universally justified such inflictions by civil society if it had not been instructed and supported by the analogy of these penalties of nature? Is not civil society itself one of the inevitable results of this constitution of human nature? Yes. Must it not follow, then, that the evils which civil society visits on secular crimes are also natural consequences of these natural laws, as truly so as the drunkard's gastritis? But those are avowedly penal. Once more, Colonel Ingersoll on his theory would have to explain the imprisonment which he visits on a felon, as precisely parallel to the detention in a quarantine ship of a virtuous citizen who has just had the bad luck to sail recently from a yellow-fever port. Are the two inflictions precisely the same expediences for the public good, equally unfounded on an imputation of guilt to the sufferers? That is the explanation to which his philosophy would lead him; but he dare not accept it. He knows that the virtuous traveller is detained in spite of his innocence; but the felon is detained because of his guilt. He who says that the natural evils incurred by misconduct are not penalties, but mere consequences, ought also to say that evils which society, itself a natural institution, inflicts on criminals are also mere consequences, and not just penalties. But against this every conscience revolts.

Our second point of objection is: that Colonel Ingersoll's doctrine about natural evils, if true, would be unspeakably harsher and more repulsive than the Christian doctrine, which he thinks too harsh to be endured. For, first, it places us erring mortals not under the dominion of a righteous personal will, which is also wise, benevolent, and merciful, but under the rule of invariable natural laws. Under these, the evils which men experience, saith

he, are not penalties, but mere consequences. Now a code which has no penalties of course has no pardons. There is no room in it for the conception of forgiveness. It tells a suffering transgressor that, when once his mistake is made, his suffering must be as inevitable as the attraction of gravitation or the rotation of the earth. Can mere natural law hear a prayer? Does it understand repentance? Can it feel pity? Ask the ocean storm or the devouring fire these questions. Here truly we have humanity with a vengeance! The skeptic is too humane to endure the conception of penal chastisement directed by a personal God, who is both just and merciful; and to help matters, he proposes to consign his fellow-creatures to the iron and remorseless dominion of natural law, which is equally ignorant of repentance, mercy, and forgiveness. But, he says, let the erring man reform his mistake, and thereby he will emerge from the painful consequences. Is this true? Does he not know that the constant tendency of natural evil is to proceed to the irreparable stage? This drunkard's gastritis, for instance, even if he reforms early, is only palliated, not wholly eradicated. At best he goes the rest of his life a crippled man, and death, the supreme natural evil, falls upon him at last; but in a multitude of instances the gastritis retains its virulence in spite of the reform. For all these innumerable sufferers the skeptic has only a gospel of despair. He tells his fellow, "You are in the clutches of inexorable physical law; you have transgressed it; you perish."

Next, it is impossible for Colonel Ingersoll to rid either himself or his fellow-creatures of the sentiment of moral desert in their conduct. It is at once the deepest and the keenest of human sentiments. There is no craving of the human soul so profound as the demand for justice to its merits, and a righting for the wrongs done to it. There is no anguish so keen, so inconsolable, as that inflicted by their refusal. Now the skeptic's theory proposes to take these moral creatures, with these exquisite sensibilities, and subject them to a system of laws which neither knows nor cares anything about moral deserts. Which is about as humane as to consign the feeding, nursing, and consolation of all the orphan, the sick, and the sorrowing children in the world to a huge

steam engine. For our part, we would rather leave our orphans to an all-wise parent, who would whip them well when they deserved it, but who could also hear their prayers, understand their penitence, and forgive their waywardness.

Once more, our skeptic confesses that he cannot tell us whether we shall live beyond bodily death or not. Then, for all he knows, we may. And if we do, it follows of course from his theory, that we must pass our immortal existence also under this blind natural code of laws, which, knowing nothing of penalties, can know nothing of pardons. When we observe the system of nature, as expounded by him, the clearest and most ominous feature about it is, that these evil consequences of human error are continually tending to pass, under our own eyes, into the irreparable. The longer the career of error is continued, the more certainly is this result reached. Thus the only inference from his scheme of naturalism is this, that if we should not have the luck to die like the pig or the dog, we must face the violent probability, that these "mere consequences" of human error will, in every case, become irreparable and eternal. And this is the sort of comfort gravely offered to his sinning and sorrowing fellow-men, by one who professes to be too humane and tender-hearted to endure the Christian system, with its divine equities, and divinely wrought grace and pardon, offered to the whole world without money and without price.

IV. But the chief ground of objection which seems to prevail with the modern impugners of Christianity is the old one of God's permission of evil in his kingdom. It is as old as human literature, having been discussed by Job, by the Psalmist, by the Greek philosophers, by Seneca, and by a multitude of divines of subsequent ages. The theodicy, or vindication, of God from this cavil, makes a part of almost every book on natural theology, and has engaged the greatest intellects of the world—as a Leibnitz, a Chalmers. Of course I profess to advance nothing new. Neither is there need of doing it; for the recent school of cavillers advance nothing which has not been pondered and rejected a thousand times before. And they differ from the more thoughtful and decent skeptics of previous days only in the superficiality and insolence of their objections. But I will use in dealing with them a candor

they do not employ in opposing us. I will state the difficulties which attend God's permission of evil frankly, and with all the force which even the ablest objector can claim for them.

The theistic scheme professes to demonstrate the existence, attributes, and providence of God. It says that he is self-existent and the creator of all temporal beings; that he is absolutely supreme in authority; that he is of infinite knowledge and power; that he is perfectly holy, and must therefore prefer holiness to sin in all rational creatures; and that he is infinitely benevolent as well as just. The argument is, that it is incredible such a divine sovereign should freely choose the prevalence of evil in the kingdom which he made and absolutely governs, and especially that dreadful aggregate of remediless evil embodied in his hell. But if he is incapable of freely choosing such horrors they should have no place in his kingdom; since his knowledge and prescience are infinite, and his will efficacious and sovereign in his whole providence. Amidst this circle of attributes, it is urged, it ought to be impossible that hell should find a place, not to speak of the lesser evils of our mortal state. The Christian apologists have been wont to offer these palliations: That while all these are real evils, and so repugnant in themselves to the divine nature, we actually see them made in his providence the occasions of excellent results and beautiful virtues. Evil evokes the virtue of fortitude, which would be otherwise not energized. Evil trains the soul to patience, submission, and heavenly-mindedness. Suffering is necessary to evoke the lovely virtue of sympathy. Hence we may hold that a benevolent God permissively ordains the evil, not for its own sake, but for the sake of those results which it occasions. This palliation our opponents sweep aside with disdain. They say if your God is omnipotent, he is certainly able to work all these admirable results by painless means. If he is benevolent, as you say, he must have chosen the easy means instead of the bitter, because he would thus have realized the whole aggregate of good and virtue for his kingdom, minus the miseries of the present plan. They confirm this point by reminding the Christians that, according to them, there actually is a splendid order of moral creatures for whom God has done this very thing. The virtue and bliss of Gabriel are certainly

not inferior to those promised redeemed men; for their prototype "was made a little lower than the angels." And the utmost the Christian's Jesus dares to promise is that his redeemed shall be as *angelloi*. Here, then, they urge, is a whole world of happy and holy creatures, endowed with every desirable virtue, including sympathy and fortitude, and yet without any discipline of evil. Here, then, God has actually done the thing for them without the permission of evil; why does he not do the same thing for human creatures in the same way? Thus the caviller "refuses to be comforted" by any such palliation as this. Let us pause here and weigh this reply carefully. To what extent does it really damage the theodicy advanced? I candidly admit, that it does prove this class of palliations to be insufficient as a full solution of the difficulty. But I assert that the skeptic's position here is overweening and sophistical in this: when he so ingeniously cites to us the fact that God does cultivate in the elect angels, as free agents, a complete bliss and purity without the discipline of evil, he cunningly begs the question, whether God could succeed in this, not only without evil among them, but without evil anywhere in the universe. What mortal can certainly know but that one of the means which God found necessary in the training of the elect angels, was some wholesome example of suffering for sin among some other order of free agents? But unless the skeptic can certify us about this, his instance remains inconclusive. It is more important to remark, that the facts cited in the above theodicy do give us a pleasing probability, which points in the direction of God's consistency in the permission of evil. For the beautiful feature which is common in the results cited is that we here see providence bringing good out of the evil. That fact is undeniable. Does the skeptic rejoin, "Yes, but why didn't your God bring about the whole good, minus the evil?" I grant that this solemn question is not answered. But let it be allowed for a moment, and for argument's sake, that God may see a good reason, then the fact that he does bring good out of the permitted evil will be of invaluable force to reinstate our confidence in his infinite benevolence in the midst of the unsolved mystery.

We proceed now to the next advance in the argument of the theodicy. The theologians set up these unquestionable premises.

There is no natural evil in the universe which is not the result and penalty of moral evil, that is to say, of sin. God's higher glory is to be a moral governor of rational free agents. If the creatures are to remain such they must be governed by moral inducements. Should God depart from that method he would derationalize them and reduce them to the grade of brutes. Does any skeptic desire to see that done, and the creation stripped of its noblest order? Surely not. It follows, then, that God, in leaving men their free agency, must follow out punctually this plan of moral sanctions; and if his creatures choose to sin, he must needs allow the penalty to follow with the same regularity with which his rewards follow their virtues. Moreover, God's distributive righteousness not only justifies, but requires this course from him as a moral ruler; as the chief magistrate of the universe he is actually under moral obligations to his own perfections to be impartial, even if wilful transgressors do incur deserved miseries which his benevolence would fain see them escape. And this view is powerfully reinforced by the further fact, that the larger part of the penal evils that follow transgression have not only a judicial connection, but a necessary natural connection with their sins, that, namely, of effects with their efficient causes. There is a true sense in which it is not God that volunteers to punish sin, but it is sin which punishes itself. "He that soweth to his flesh shall *of the flesh* reap corruption" (literally *perdition*). "Sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." To sum up, then, God's permission of natural evil in the world is all accounted for by the presence of moral evil, that is to say, voluntary transgression, and the entrance of the moral evil is an incident liable to emerge under any moral government of free agents.

Still our skeptics "refuse to be comforted." They retort, that the Christian scheme ascribes to God regenerative power; and that it holds that he can, and does, exercise it in a multitude of cases, without infringing the free agency of its subjects, or making any disruption in his general plan of governing them by rational and moral means. If the Christian's scheme relinquished this claim it would commit logical suicide. For it holds that the natural heart of men fallen in Adam is invariably determined to self-will

and ungodliness ; hence if God did not exercise a sovereign power of regeneration, he could never get one of them converted. They would all continue with absolute certainty to prefer the unconverted state. The scheme also claims that God has pledged himself to keep all redeemed men and elect angels in their heaven forever. But the voluntary apostasy of any of them must result in their exclusion from heaven. Now, therefore, if God had not the power of efficaciously determining their holiness without subverting their free agency, he has promised what he cannot be sure of performing, which would be dishonest. Once more ; the Christian scheme says, that the promises of grace in answer to prayer are all yea and amen. So that if God had not this power these promises would also be uncandid. Now, then, since God has this power of preserving the sanctity of the unfallen, and of sovereignly regenerating the fallen (a power which they say he frequently exercises), and if he foresaw that whenever a free agent perverted himself, his own high judicial obligations would require him to bring misery on that creature, if he is infinitely benevolent, and truly prefers holiness to sinfulness in his creatures, why did he not preserve them all in holiness as he is said to have preserved Gabriel ? Or why does he not regenerate them at once instead of coming under this painful necessity of employing penal miseries, which he foresees, moreover, to be futile for curing their sinfulness ? Why does he not regenerate Satan instead of chastising him endlessly, and that without bettering him ? Here is a parent who has a delicate child ; he foresees that this child is liable to eat a certain rich but unwholesome viand with a morbid appetite ; he foresees also that the consequences will be a colic. Now, this parent may be entirely unable to break the pathological connection between a surfeit and a colic ; but of course he will use his superior physical strength to remove that dish beyond the child's reach. If God is a parent, why does he not act in a similar way ? I take the ablest skeptics to witness that I have extenuated nothing, but have stated their difficulty as strongly as they ever state it.

There is here solemn difficulty arising from our contemplation of the divine providence, and the thoughtful and benevolent mind

will recognize it most impressively. I expressly admit also that its exhaustive solution is beyond human reach. The dread mystery which remains after all the efforts of human explanation is doubtless one instance of the exercise of that high prerogative of God in which he claims that secret things belong to him, but the things which are revealed belong to us and our children that *we may do* all the words of this law. If once the existence and attributes of God are granted, then every mind not wickedly and insanely arrogant will instantly admit that it is reasonable such a sovereign should have counsels of his own, a part of which it is his just prerogative to reserve to himself. There is not an inferior chief magistrate on earth that does not claim a right to the same. Moreover, it is impossible that God should impart a full comprehension of his whole counsel to any mind that is finite and sinful, even if we supposed him to make the effort. Omnipotence itself could not put an ocean of water into a quart pitcher. But because God has not succeeded in working this impossibility in the agnostic's little clouded mind he flies off in a pet, and says he will not have any God at all! If theism is true, the plan of God's administration is universal and everlasting. It must, therefore, be literally infinite. Manifestly even he cannot put another mind in full possession of it without making that mind also infinite. Whence it strictly follows that if these questioners could be gratified by giving them a religion without a mystery, verily they "should be as gods." (The Bible reader knows the satanic origin of that ambition.) This simple argument for modesty of thought in our theology is powerfully reinforced by another great fact, which is, that our acquaintance with all other sciences is conditioned and limited in precisely the same way. And every intelligent man knows that this is especially true of those physical sciences which the agnostics love to put in contrast with theology for superior clearness and certitude. I would like to know how it is that they are all perfectly willing to believe in the sciences of physics, chemistry, botany, zoölogy, astronomy, notwithstanding the insoluble mysteries involved in each, and refuse theism because of its mystery, when they ought to know that this is the very science in which the largest mysteries must reasonably be expected. Is it



because they have a special dislike to the God whom theism discloses, sharpened by the apprehension that he has a just dislike for them? Let it be settled, then, that the real question in debate is not whether anybody can clear up the whole mystery of God's permission of evil, but whether that mystery justifies anybody in repudiating his heavenly Father, and all the duties he owes to him, which are the highest and holiest duties of his being.

Next, it must be settled which party is logically bound to assume the burden of proof on this question. I shall now show that it is the agnostic's. For why? Because the theist is in possession of all the rightful presumptive probabilities on the other side. The law gives every indicted man the right to assume his presumptive innocency, and throws the burden of the proof of his guilt upon the accuser. So here the facts previously demonstrated, or at least rendered presumably probable in this theistic inquiry, all give the theist the right to the initial presumptive. For instance, "the earth is full of the goodness of the Lord," that is, the *a posteriori* marks or signs of the divine benevolence appear in every department of creation and human experience. The whole structure of the human faculties presents the most beautiful evidences of the benevolence of "the Father of our spirits." Here is one point among many: The psychologist finds in the human spirit a class of affections called the malevolent affections, that is, their practical objective impulse is to hurt somebody; but they all have this invariable trait in addition—even the few among them which are sometimes justifiable—that they are also painful to the person that feels them. There is a large opposite class called the benevolent affections; their objective impulse is to do good to somebody, and these have this invariable trait, that they are pleasant in their exercise to the persons who feel them. He is wilfully blind who cannot see the design of this pair of general facts. It is obviously to discourage and limit all hurtful human actions, and to stimulate and reward all beneficent human actions. In other words, the framer of our spirits is benevolent. But the most extensive and grandest disclosure theism makes about God is of his righteousness, and that both in natural and revealed theology. The ways of providence are always so devised that virtue

is practical beneficence, and vice practical maleficence. Therefore when theology tell us that God likes the former and hates the latter more than he likes or hates anything else, it is but saying he is supremely benevolent. But we must not pursue this delightful line of argument.

Another great class of facts which authorizes us to throw the burden of proof upon the accusers of God's providence, is that while he mysteriously permits evils, it is his dearest prerogative to bring good out of those evils. Are we to hold, then, that God's mysterious permission of evil has in his mind some sufficient ground, both just and benevolent, though above the reach of human comprehension? I say, Yes. Colonel Ingersoll says, No. Here is the issue clearly made up by the pleadings. Now I say I am entitled to hold my side as presumptively true until it is positively disproved. I say the burden of proof lies on him. He must assume it or the court will properly dismiss the case. The court says to him: "Mr. Prosecutor, you undertake to prove that an infinite God cannot have a conscious ground for his voluntary permission of evil in his kingdom which satisfies him as both just and benevolent. You must do all that, sir, or we will put you out of court. Your opponent, the theist, is under no more obligation to prove what that ground is than a citizen indicted for horse-stealing is bound to prove affirmatively that he did not steal the horse. He is entitled to stand on the defensive; the prosecutor must prove that he did steal the horse or he has no case. Sir, your duty here is similar."

But what sort of testimony will this accuser need in order to prove that affirmative? Manifestly it must be a testimony which explores the whole extent of God's omniscience, and his whole eternal providence toward the universe; otherwise it will be a dead failure; for the defence will rejoin, that it is supposable always that God has seen his sufficient reason for his permission of evil in that portion of his infinite counsel and providence left unexplored by the witness. The accuser has as yet done nothing effectual to exclude the presumptive hypothesis that God may be justifiable; but this is what he undertook to do. He will say, perhaps, that his witnesses have proved so much, namely: that God

has full physical power to make and keep all his creatures holy and happy, so that he cannot justify himself in his permission of evil (as the Pelagian proposes he shall), by the plea of inability. Let the accuser say that God did not find the obstacle in the way of making his universe all holy and happy in a lack of personal power. Granted. But may not his infinite mind have seen a proper obstacle in some other quarter? That is the question. The man who undertakes to deny that ought to be omniscient himself. In other words, the accuser has undertaken an impossible task. He has rashly undertaken to establish affirmatively a proposition which none but infinite beings would be competent to discuss. The decree of the court therefore is, "The indictment is not proved."

To this extent, then, the providence of God is not convicted of wrong. I again admit candidly that its solemn mystery remains, and a questioning mind is not yet furnished with an exhaustive solution.

There is a species of *argumentum ad hominem*, which, the books on logic tell us, is unfair. It consists in attempting to transfer some odium attaching to the adversary from his person to his proposition and argument. I shall not use that form. There is another kind which consists in holding the opponent bound to any inconvenient or absurd consequences which proceed logically out of his positions, though we ourselves do not concede those positions. This kind is perfectly fair. The Saviour himself used it against the Pharisees. I am entitled to use it in this debate.

In this direction my first point is the following: The practical point of the cavil against God's permission of evil is, that, if there is a God, he is culpable for it. He is exceedingly blamable for all this misery which should have been prevented by him. That is to say, the caviller is altogether in sympathy with these creature sufferers as against their hard master. Of course, then, this humane and sympathising caviller is doing everything in his power to minimize the hardships so blamably inflicted upon his fellow-creatures. Of course he is steadily devoting his best energies, his time, talents, and money, to repairing the cruelties which this bad God has let loose upon poor fellow-mortals, to comforting the sor-

rowful, to supplying their destitutions, and especially to removing their ignorance and vices and irreligion, which he knows to be the practical proximate cause of so much of these pitiable sorrows. Of course this just accuser thinks he has no money to waste upon the pomps and luxuries of life, no time for any needless amusements, no time or talent to expend upon personal ambitions or any selfish aim. Of course he husbands all conscientiously for the sacred object of minimizing these evils of human existence, and mending so much as may be mended of the neglects of this cruel God. If he does not, is he not himself like the cruel God? Is not this accusation of God, coming from such as he, too much like "Satan reproving sin"? Does this agnostic waste any money upon Havana cigars and costly wines, which he would be better without; upon expensive architecture and furniture, where he sees more honored men than himself do with plainer; upon partisan political campaigns, which, whichever way they go, only leave the country more corrupt—sacred money which might have been used to ease the sick of their agonies, to feed the starving, to wipe the tears from the face of the orphan, to make the desolate widow's heart sing for joy, to dissipate the ignorance and vice and ungodliness from the heart of the youth who must otherwise reap the harvest of temporal perdition from these seeds? I bring no charge; but I submit that, unless the agnostic is truly acting in this philanthropic way, decency should close his mouth. For shame's sake let him not blame God for the results of a neglect which he himself practices.

The most probable rejoinder of the agnostic will be, that he sees the majority of the professed Christians also practicing this unphilanthropic neglect. My answer is, that I admit with sorrow that it is partly true. It is also true that nearly all the great and blessed charities of this poor world come from these imperfect Christians. How much of them comes from agnostics? I do not know. But let that pass. My word to the agnostic is this: suppose we let this good exalted God alone, and turn all the blows of our criticisms on these inconsistent Christians. I say to the agnostic, with all my heart, "Lay it on them well; but let alone the heavenly Father whom they misrepresent."

My second point is this: When we showed in defence of the divine providence that, supposing free agents choose to sin, their suffering ought to follow, and must follow, because judicial fidelity requires it, and because sin *is* suffering; the reply of the agnostic was this: that if there is a God, he must have foreseen that, and he ought to have felt bound to protect his moral creatures from sinning by making their souls holy, or else regenerating them when they made themselves unholy. And we saw that this is really the agnostic's final stand in this contest. I will now ask a typical agnostic, say Colonel Ingersoll, "Sir, how would you like God to regenerate you?" Perhaps he will seek to evade me by answering, "But I do not now believe there is any God or regeneration." "Yes; but supposing you did believe them, how would you like to be regenerated yourself? Stay, do not answer till I tell you what this means. Regeneration means a complete revolution of the principles and ends of life. It means surrendering ambition and worldliness for spiritual good. It means the absolute subjugation of self-will under a superior and sovereign will, which will order you to obey and ask no questions. It means a thoroughgoing crucifixion of natural pride. It means the instant surrender of all cherished sins. It means the honest assumption for the whole remaining life of a career of new duties, many of which are known to be repugnant, and all arduous. It means praying, and Bible-reading, and watching one's self. It means, in a word, taking up for life the yoke of a complete self-denial and self-surrender. Regenerate persons will tell you that still they have found a new species of spiritual happiness in this arduous cross-bearing. But that pleasure is to you purely visionary, as you never felt anything like it. The Bible also tells you that this regeneration will finally bring you, after a severe discipline, the happiness of heaven. But that is all out of sight to you, lying beyond the boundaries of this world, which now enclose all your wishes and aspirations—so completely enclose them that you remain in doubt whether it would not be better for you to die like a pig than to have any future world. Now, Sir, you told us there was a time when you had a speculative belief in God and his gospel. At that time how would you have liked this regeneration for

yourself? You know very well that you disliked and resisted it with every fibre of your heart. Sometimes when conscience seemed to be leading you towards it, you recalcitrated, silently perhaps, but with the stubbornness of a wild bull in a net. You jealously cherished your self-will, your pride, your worldliness. You would have blushed to have been caught praying. One chief source of that secret but inveterate enmity which your heart cherished toward the gospel was just this: that it required of you such a regeneration and also offered it to you as a boon. Well, you are the same man yet in heart. The child has been father to the man. Could I re-convince your speculative intellect that this gospel which you have discarded is true, the desperate repugnance to its regeneration would doubtless revive in you. Remember, now, that we have agreed that there was one final method feasible for God, by using which he could have rescued all his creatures effectually from all moral and physical evil, namely, the regeneration I have described; and the very *gravamen* of your accusation against God is that he ought to employ that method in every case, but does not. But, lo! when this kind God comes to *you* and says, 'Ingersoll, let me take you at your word; let me regenerate you, here and now, and thus bestow on you this glorious and eternal security,' you are violently opposed to his doing it. Here is the one and only way which remained to God for avoiding the permission of any evil in his kingdom, and to this way you have as to yourself a violent objection. There is one medicine with which God could have cured the whole matter. You have been blaming him vehemently because he has not administered it to everybody; but when he offers the cup to you, you repel it with abhorrence. Do not you think, Sir, that for shame's sake it is time for you to stop blaming him?"

I have just asserted the innate enmity of the human heart to God's law. Here is a consideration which has a vital influence on this discussion, but for which agnostics never make allowance. Yet, "whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear," it is the right of the Christian pursuing this discussion, and his high duty, to bear his serious testimony to this indisputable fact of human nature. The point it contains is very plain, that a person

who has a fixed and wrongful hatred to a government cannot be a just and correct critic of it. What man endued with common sense will gainsay that? And the agnostics stubbornly refuse this caution and protest their impartiality, when to everybody else but themselves their inveterate hostility to the holiness of God's law is apparent! But I claim more. We are all voluntary culprits. We are all obnoxious to the displeasure of the divine Judge. If his grace does not arrest us we all continue pertinacious transgressors, and this justifies his continued retributions. Now, every item of that aggregate of misery which presents the pretext of the cavil, is the just judicial consequence of the creature's own voluntary sin. There is not a pang of natural evil in the moral universe which is not the appropriate fruit of transgression. Hence, however hard to bear that natural evil may be, the culprits are certainly not the parties that are entitled to accuse the government. As soon as they appreciate their own guilt they always learn that this is outrageously unseemly. If any criticism of the divine management is to be made by any finite intellect, it ought to be at least an un-fallen intellect, without sin of its own. The effectual way, then, of terminating these indictments of God would be for the agnostics to learn the real quality and aggravations of their own sins of heart, nature, and life. And could I teach them this, I should be conferring on them the most inestimable blessing. Not only would this sinful debate end absolutely, but this righteous humiliation of their own spirits would prove to them the beginning of everlasting good. Job was tempted to be an agnostic, and to make tedious efforts to argue himself into the assertion of God's harshness. His effectual cure came only when he was compelled to say: "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee; wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes." The best wish I can offer to all the agnostics is, that they may become honest enough with themselves to look fairly at God until they appreciate his infinite sovereignty, wisdom, justice, and benevolence, and learn in the light of his holiness to see the exceeding sinfulness of their own sin. All this debate will then be happily ended for them as well as for us.

One more point remains of this branch of my reply. I make

it by asking them what will be gained for them and their fellow-men if they establish their indictment? What will they have proved? This: that the theistic scheme of the universe is incredible, because of the prevalence in it of this dreadful mass of natural and moral evil. That is, the doctrine of a personal, rational God is abolished. What hypothesis of the universe is left us? Only the materialistic and mechanical one. The flow of events in the universe is not directed by any personal or moral will at all. (Certainly our wills are impotent to control it.) All is governed by natural laws, which can mean nothing more than the irrevocable methods of blind natural forces. These forces are unknowing and reasonless; they are resistless; they are eternal; they are unchangeable. They can no more be prayed to than the whirlwind can. Thus the agnostic, in rejecting theism, unavoidably gives us the scheme of a universal mechanical fate. His universe is but an immense machine.

Now, I solemnly ask him: By forcing upon us this ghastly doctrine, has he diminished one iota of this volume of miseries, the conception of which so distresses us all? Does he stop the flow of a single tear? Does he arrest a single pang of disease? Does he diminish by one unit the awful catalogue of deaths? Does he take anything from the reality of any single human bereavement? Is there one particle of agency in this doctrine to check in any soul that sinfulness which is the spring of all our woes? None. Even agnostic arrogance does not dare to claim it. On his scheme every evil which he so bitterly objects against God's scheme remains. All that he has done is to rob suffering humanity of its sole true consolation, which is found in that fact the gospel alone shows us, that it is the darling prerogative of the Father of mercies to bring good out of this sore evil for all who will accept his grace and make it work out, bitter as it may be now, "a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." Thus their doctrine can take nothing from the miseries of mankind; all it can do is to rob men of the only possible solace, and to tell them while they suffer that their woes are as futile of better results as they are inevitable. In a word, they give us as the true conception of our existence this sombre picture, which F. D. Strauss substantially avows at the



end of his great agnostic argument. Our world is a huge and terrible machine of stone and iron; its motive power eternal, resistless, and blind; its revolutions impossible to be ever arrested or changed in the least, and the corn between its upper and nether millstones is an ever-flowing stream of human hearts, with all their precious affections and hopes and keen sensibilities, bleeding and crushed under the remorseless grind. And to the yawning jaws of this hellish mill each one of us knows he is travelling, and must be caught by them sooner or later.

And this is the scheme pressed upon us by gentlemen who affect too much humane sensibility to endure the harsh injustice of God's gospel! What, is this scheme rejected for this doctrine of despair? I repeat, it is the one which, while it recognizes God's holy sovereignty and right to punish sin, and to keep in his own breast the dread secrets of his infinite purpose, teaches us his wise, merciful, and holy control over this terrible blind machine of nature, and offers to all who do not contumaciously reject his goodness an almighty redemption which terminates these sufferings of time into eternal blessings. May God save us all from such humanity as that of the agnostics!

Proceeding now to a more independent line of attack, I request the reader to inspect the process of the agnostic's logic at its cardinal place. It is simply this: the line of argument for the being, attributes, and providence of God leads him up to a great mystery, which cannot be fully resolved for him. What then? He will summarily reject the whole argument without condescending to stop and weigh the amount of validity it may contain, notwithstanding the mystery in its conclusion. Now, all men would deem this mere logical lunacy if applied to any other line of evidence. We know very well that evidence apparently valid which leads to an inevitable self-contradiction is defeated by its own result, whether we can put our finger upon its flaw or not. We justly claim that it cannot be correct. This, in fact, is the quality of the disproof of an argument by the *reductio ad absurdum*. But manifestly the case which the agnostic has made against theism is wholly different. A mystery in our conclusion is not a necessary self-contradiction; that it cannot be shown to be such, follows from

the very fact that it is a mystery. Since we cannot comprehend it, we cannot assert its contradictoriness. And this I confirm by the assertion that every other line of scientific evidence, in every department of human knowledge, leads sooner or later to some such insoluble mystery. So that, if the agnostic's method of procedure against theism were proper, he ought to reject every science known to man and announce himself an absolute ignoramus.

For instance, what physicist can answer this question: What is electricity? There is good and sufficient empirical evidence that this mysterious energy exists; but what is it? Why does it imbue some material bodies and not others? Why do only a few conduct it fully? If it is ponderable matter, why cannot the chemist weigh it in his most delicate scales? If it is not, how does it hit hard enough to rive the knarled oak? Every good physicist knows he cannot answer these questions. Every agnostic, then, ought to say, if he will be consistent, and proceed in physics as he does in theology, "I will have none of this science of electricity. I will not avail myself of its conveniences, lightning-rod, telegraph, electric light, electric motors. I will not believe in electricity; even if the lightning strikes me I will not believe in it." The intelligent reader knows that if I cared to detain him, I could cite instances equally pungent from every one of those physical sciences which agnostics love to place in contrast with theology for their superior clearness. Now my point is, that no man can proceed upon this wilful method, which the agnostics would have us apply to the theistic argument, without incurring the charge of lunacy. But they ought to be more willing to apply that wanton method in physics than in theology; because in the latter we have more ground to expect mysteries from the infinitude of the Being whom we study. When a line of evidence leads a sensible man to a startling and mysterious conclusion, what does he do? He would be prompted to revise the evidence carefully. That is all. If he finds it valid, he admits the conclusion in spite of the mystery. The sensible man bestows credence upon any proposition in any science, not because he comprehends the predicate, but because he apprehends perspicuous evidence supporting the copula. Now the several lines of evidence, rational and scrip-

tural, for the being, attributes, and providence of God, are of invincible force; they cannot be resisted in their own appropriate spheres. Every successive attempt to weaken them in that way perishes under the light of true philosophy. I conclude this point by firmly asserting that agnostics have no right thus to discount the whole force of this evidence, treating it as non-existent, when it has so substantial an existence, not because they can refute it, but simply because they do not like its result. The process is utterly illicit.

Superficial opponents of God's retributive justice frequently argue that this is a different attribute from his love, and indeed so antithetic that they cannot find a place for it in a nature declared to be infinite love. A little correct thinking will show that this reasoning is not only groundless, but absurd. In fact, the principle of righteousness in every moral being is not dual, but single. The plurality of its actions arises solely from the contrast of the objects to which the principle directs itself. The magnetic needle in the compass is endued with one energy or magnetic principle, not two. This single energy will cause either end of the needle to act in opposite ways to the two opposite poles of the earth; and because the upper end is attracted towards the north pole, for that very reason it is repelled from the south pole. I prove it by this fact, that it is impossible to make a needle such that its upper end would be attracted to the north pole and not repelled from the south pole. Should any sailor tell you that he had such a needle, nobody would believe him. This instance presents us with a correct parallel to the action of the moral principle in a moral agent. The principle is and can be only one. It acts in opposite ways towards virtuous and vicious objects, because it is one, and because it rationally apprehends the objects as opposites. Hence it follows, that this central principle would not be capable of acting in the amiable way of approbation, complacency and reward towards a virtuous object, unless it were certain from its own nature to act in the opposite and severer way of reprehension towards a vicious and repulsive object. I repeat, that unless this principle is so constituted as to repel the repulsive action, it cannot be so constituted as to be attracted to the attractive action.

One might as well talk of a yard-stick with only one end, or of a house with its south side, and no north side. Every man when he thinks knows that this is the condition upon which all correct moral principle exists, and he is incredulous about any other. Let me construct a little parable. I ask the agnostic, or the universalist, to come with me and watch the proceedings of a certain stranger, of whom all we know as yet is that he claims a high reputation for amiability, philanthropy, equity and charity. He tells us that it is a perennial pleasure to him to witness and reward all benevolent and generous actions. I say to him, "Stranger, so far, well. I must now point you an opposite object. There stands a young reprobate, the son of a devoted widowed mother, who is known to have robbed her of her little property, to neglect her wants in her destitution, to heap reproaches and curses upon her, and even to strike her venerable face. What are your feelings towards that object?" We suppose the stranger to answer, "Oh, sir, I assure you I am too thoroughly amiable to have any feeling about it. True, I see nothing in it to admire, but I am too affectionate to detest anything. I have no feeling at all towards that reprobate." I ask, would any body believe him? Or, if we believe his statement that he felt no reprehension for so detestable a son, must we not set him down also as a cold-blooded villain, whose pretended charity was all sheer hypocrisy? Such is the judgment of every man's common sense.

Let us pass now from the virtuous principle in man to God. I assert that my argument only becomes the stronger. The perfectness of God's virtues only renders it more conclusive, because the purity, the equity, the truth, the love of God are infinite. It is therefore only the more certain that the central principle which makes him approve and love the virtuous must prompt him to reprehend the vicious. Men vainly imagine that it would be a delightful theology to have a God so amiable as to be sure to reward all good things, but also too amiable to be capable of punishing any evil thing. They demand an impossibility. The only way to reach it would be to have a God without any moral qualities at all. Who would wish to live under an omniscient and omnipotent Ruler who was not capable of knowing or caring whether he was

rewarding the wicked and punishing the good? If we must desire such moral principle in our Supreme Ruler as will be always certain of acting amiably and justly towards the good, then we must be willing that he shall be equally certain to reprehend the wicked. If they would have a God too amiable to maintain a hell, they must accept one who is also too careless and heartless to provide any heaven.

Does one say that still the mystery of God's permission of evil is not fully explained? I did not promise to explain it fully, which I believe will never be done in this world. What I promised was to satisfy the just and humble mind that God has his sufficient explanation, which we are sure is consistent with his wisdom, benevolence, and holiness, without knowing what it is. Natural theology gives sufficient ground for this consoling conclusion from its splendid evidences that he is all-wise, righteous, and benevolent, which have their preponderating force notwithstanding the unanswered question, and especially from this important trait, which runs through the whole mystery, that the plan of his providence is to bring good out of the evil.

But revealed theology gives us a crowning and all-sufficient satisfaction. It is found in the fact that God is so infinite in benevolence and mercy, that at his own mere option he has made the supreme sacrifice for the redemption of his enemies. He provides this infinite blessing for them at the cost of the humiliation and death of his eternally begotten and co-equal Son, whom he knows to outrank, in the dimensions of his infinite being and in his moral desert, all his rational creatures combined together. The gospel tells us that this transcendent sacrifice will not redeem the apostate angels, and will not receive full application to all human beings. These are awful truths. But, be the cause of this limitation found where it may, it cannot be sought in any lack or stint of goodness in God. For had there been any such stint in his nature, one fibre of neglect, or injustice, or cruelty, this would inevitably have prevented the supreme sacrifice for the behoof of any one. There is the triumphant theodicy in the infinite love which prompted redemption—redemption as apprehended by the evangelical trinitarian. There, no doubt, is the supreme glory of

this gospel by which the apostle tells us God is making known to all worlds his manifold wisdom through the church of ransomed men. I will set forth the point of this argument in a closing parable. We see a surgeon enter a dwelling. A mother calls to her her pallid, limping child, and seizes her in her arms. The surgeon produces one of those treacherous cases—so beautiful without with their ornamented woods and gilded clasps, so terrible within with the cold glitter of forceps, bistouries, amputating-knives, and bone-saws. The child beholds with wide-eyed wonder and then with terror, ere she perceives that these instruments are to be employed on her body. As the surgeon approaches she appeals to her mother with agonizing screams and tears: "Oh, mother, mother, save me!" But we see the woman, with stern eye, compressed lips, and pallid cheek, bare the child's swollen joint, and hold her struggling in her relentless arms, while the cruel knife cuts the tender skin, carves the bleeding flesh, and pierces even to the very marrow of the diseased joint. Is this a mother or a tigress? The simple explanation is, that she is a true mother, wise and tender, who knows that this severe remedy is needed to save the precious life of her child, who would otherwise be the victim of a slow, loathsome, and torturing death. Has she not shown the truest love? and has not her fidelity cost her inward pangs of sympathy more cruel than the bodily smart of the surgery, which she has heroically borne for love's sake? But now steps forward the caviller, and says: "Stop, this woman is herself a wondrous leech. She knows all healing lotions, and all the herbs of virtue, some of which would have cured the diseased limb without a pang while the child slept; or, at least, she could have secured for her child the unconsciousness which chloroform gives during the operation. Why, then, did she not use the gentler means to save this life, when she had them at her option? No, she must be intrinsically cruel and heartless. She must find pleasure in the gratuitous suffering of her own child." I am compelled to reply: "I do not know her reasons. Her social station is far above mine. She has never taken me into her domestic confidence. I had no right to demand that she should. But I can testify to another fact. A few months ago the cry of fire drew

me to a dwelling not far from this place which was wrapped in flames, and evidently near the final crash. The parents had been busy rescuing their children, and, for the moment, supposed they had saved them all. But a cry issued from another window. A little white-robed figure was seen at it through the eddying smoke, crying: 'Father, mother! O save me.' All declared that it was too late. Even the father, amidst his bitter tears, acquiesced. But I saw the mother tear herself from the restraining hands of the firemen, who told her that any effort at rescue was madness and suicide, leaving the shreds of her raiment in their clutches, and dart up the fuming stairway. The stern men turned their faces away from the horror and stood wringing their hands. But in a minute the woman returned, her silken tresses blazing, her garments on fire, one of her fair cheeks scorched, shrivelled by the blast, one eye blistered in the socket, but with her child in her arms wrapped safely in a blanket. After only pausing to extinguish the flames that were threatening her life, I saw her fall on her knees, and say: 'Thank God; I have saved my child.' Pass around this lady's chair, Mr. Caviller, you will see upon the other side of her face the scars of that rescue which, in one moment, blighted the beauty of her young motherhood for life. This is that mother; and this is the same child. Now, sir, I cannot satisfy your curiosity about the disuse of the chloroform, but I know this heroic mother's heart has its reason. For why? Because I saw her make the supreme sacrifice for this child. After such a demonstration of boundless love, your cavil is impertinent, if not brutal."

R. L. DABNEY.

## II. THE GENERAL DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION.

PLAIN men do not, to make use of a familiar phrase, take the Bible upon trust. It is true they have to rely upon testimony, but they do not accept the Scriptures without warrant. We all have to rely upon testimony in this as in other matters. But the humble reader of God's word may have, and often does have, the most overwhelming and conclusive evidence of its truth. The Bible contains within itself a self-evidencing power that cannot be gainsaid. When this power has once been exerted on any mind, no formal argument, no process of ratiocination whatever, is called for in order to convince that mind of its divine origin and inspiration. It is no mere outburst of poetic enthusiasm that "a glory gilds the sacred page" of which it is declared that it is "majestic as the sun." Theologians, and sound theologians, have differed widely among themselves as to the value of this internal evidence in the case of the unregenerate; but all sound theologians, it is to be presumed, are agreed that, when the eyes of the soul have been opened by the supernatural operation of the Holy Ghost, that evidence becomes not only valid, but irresistibly cogent. It must be conceded that the precise *limits* of the word of God might still, nay, must still, be open to intelligent question. Whether, for example, the book of Esther should be included, and the book of Ecclesiasticus excluded, could not be certainly determined by the internal evidence alone. Here the plain reader is manifestly under the necessity of accepting the testimony of the experts as to what constitutes the metes and bounds of the sacred canon. In this age, when so many have been sufficiently instructed for the purpose, there are few who have received any schooling at all who cannot ascertain for themselves the real force of the considerations so clearly presented in accurate and at the same time popular works on this subject. Do the majority of general scholars, or even of ministers, do any more than this? Circumstances, it is true, often deter good honest folk, and highly intelligent and



thoroughly educated persons as well, from the prosecution of such studies in any degree of detail. What is the recourse in such a case? Precisely as before, reliance on the unanswerable assertions of the witnesses who have pursued the studies, and especially those who have pursued them at first hand. It cannot be denied that the independent scrutiny on the part of a sufficient number of competent scholars of the sources of our knowledge on this head is imperatively demanded on another ground, which will be mentioned somewhat further on in the discussion.

To say that the orderly and progressive proofs of inspiration may in certain cases be dispensed with, is a very different thing from saying that the orderly and progressive proof of inspiration is impossible, or in all cases unnecessary. It behooves the guardian of these holy oracles to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," and to neglect no legitimate methods which have been or which can be used in its defence. That great champion of the truth, Christlieb, spoke unadvisedly when he declared, some years ago, before the Evangelical Alliance, that, like the soldier of this world, the defender of Christianity, upon finding things too hot along the line of the outworks, should evacuate them, and make his determined stand at the citadel. Your true soldier, in either contest, will shed his life's blood before he will surrender to the enemy the most remote redoubt or seemingly most insignificant lunette or salient. He will make a determined stand at the outworks, and so, in all ordinary cases, best defend the citadel.

But assent must be equally withheld from the dictum of another master in Israel. Dr. Fisher, of Yale College, in his masterly "Essays on Supernatural Religion," says that, important as we may justly regard inspiration, it is not so important as revelation. Professor Fisher's obvious motive for this rather dangerous statement is the desire to homologate as against the out and out enemies of our religion with those who qualify or even reject the doctrine of the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, but who are ready to acquiesce in the assertion of a supernatural revelation of some sort, and one of divine and Christian truth. That antagonist who yields half the ground to us is, where not taking us

with guile, after the example of the men of Ai, of course less to be dreaded than the one who yields us nothing; the denial of inspiration alone is certainly less alarming than the denial of inspiration and revelation too. But inspiration, as a tenet of the apologist, is vital no less than revelation. Indeed, the denial of the one leads on remorselessly to the denial of the other. This is impressively and yet laughably illustrated by Henry Rogers. A choleric old gentleman imagined in his sleep that he arose one morning to find all the leaves of his Bible blank. Attributing this mischievous alteration (as he regarded it) to the devices of a waggish neighbor, he went to him in a towering rage, but only to find his neighbor's Bible mutilated like his own. What astonished him yet more, every Bible had been treated in the same way. Every printed word had in some unaccountable manner been obliterated from every page. What was to be done in this emergency? How were the lost verses and chapters to be restored? A bright thought struck him—from quotations! But the entire mass of English literature was ransacked in vain for this purpose. Not a quotation, not a reference, not an allusion, not a passage or a line that had been influenced in any way, however unconsciously, by the Bible remained. The effect of this havoc upon the integrity of the works of the several authors was amazing. Milton was nearly all blank from beginning to end. Shakspeare was in hardly better case. Even Byron and Wordsworth, and Tennyson, even Thackeray and Dickens, had been cut to pieces and effectually gutted. At length it occurred to the dreamer that large portions of the Scriptures had been committed to memory, and these, it was happily found, could be recovered. It appeared that no one person knew all or any considerable part of the Bible; one had got one text or context by heart, and another another. A young woman promptly remembered the words, "there is a time *to dance*," and a venerable Quaker was so fortunate as to call to mind the kindred averment that "there is a time *to keep silence*." And so the laborious work of reconstruction went on, but with the result that the measure of success thus slowly attained was provokingly inadequate and tantalizing. Could there well be a more striking, as well as amusing, exhibi-

tion of the state of affairs the world would be in to-day if there had been a purely oral (though supernatural) impartation of truth in the first instance to mankind, and no divinely inspired volume to preserve intact to the latest generations the oracle which had thus fallen once for all like lightning from the firmament!

There is another reason for zealous ardor in this contention, and one that has a special bearing on the time in which we live. It is the historian Froude who remarks that there is more skepticism in the world to-day than there has been since the death of Constantine. This might be literally true, without being significant to the degree a majority of careless readers would suppose. There may have been, there probably was, more skepticism in the world at the time of the Reformation than there was in the time of Berengarius or of Otho the Great. Skepticism is but the backward swing of the pendulum of which the forward swing is intelligent faith. There is more thought of every kind diffused throughout the earth in this the latter part of the nineteenth century than there was when Constantine or either one of his successors for a thousand years was crowned.

Yet a certain measure of baleful significance cannot be denied to the statement of the rationalistic essayist. After such a lapse of ages the final success of Christianity would appear, at first sight, to be incompatible with so wide a prevalence of doubt. It is true this is not the whole case. If we should give heed to Mr. Froude when with Hamlet he cries, "look upon this picture," we may, and we do, continue to exclaim with Hamlet, "and on *this*," pointing at the same time to the unexampled triumphs of Christianity in heathen lands, as well as to the gratifying and steady progress of the church at home. But beyond all question the scowling front of contemporary infidelity to-day is a portentous fact which it is impossible and undesirable for the apologist to blink. And how does the picturesque chronicler of English annals attempt to account for the fact to which he thus calls attention? He does so, not upon the obvious, but even to him unproven, hypothesis of the failure of Christ's religion; but by referring it in part to the recent growth of rationalistic philosophy, criticism and science; still more largely to the shuffling defences made by so many represen-

tative apologists. We quite agree with Mr. Froude that it will not do to belittle certain well-known and formidable difficulties, as is sometimes done by Alford and that school, by calling them "trivial." We keenly regret, too, that not only English and American writers who have been tinctured in various degrees with the insidious poison of German rationalism, but that even so admirable a theologian, as he is in so many respects, as Professor Bruce of Glasgow, should have expressed himself so vaguely, albeit, we trust, only for the sake of argument, concerning a doctrine of an importance so great that we may say, without fear of victorious contradiction, that it is paramount. It is equally, not to say more to be lamented, that the old exploded heresy of Fichte, Schleiermacher, Coleridge and Morell, not to mention William Rathbone Greg and Francis William Newman, should have been lately revived in a more influential form by certain scholars in Germany and in a very specious guise, if we understand his position, by Professor Ladd in this country.

Some of these writers go farther than others. Fichte, for instance, denied the possibility of a supernatural infallible revelation or inspiration of any sort, whether from without or from within; whereas Morell only denied the possibility of an external, and at the same time supernatural and infallible, revelation and inspiration, and Newman only the possibility of an "authoritative supernatural book-revelation of spiritual and religious truth." These views may be more properly considered under the head of objections to the doctrine. But in these days, when the fight is at its thickest, and heavy reinforcements are daily pouring into the enemy's ranks, it is no time for the trumpet in the hands of those who have in custody the ark of Jehovah to give a faint or an uncertain, much less an erroneous or misleading, sound.

Let us now approach the merits of this controversy. There are those who deny the inspiration of the Scriptures outright. For such antagonists, as antagonists, we entertain respect, whatever we may think of them as men, or as theologians, or as logicians; but from this quarter we apprehend no considerable danger. To deny the inspiration of the Scriptures outright is palpably to give the lie to its many respectable, widely separated, independent

and concurrent authors; and that is something which the easy credulity of mankind has never yet been able to stomach. The adversaries to be held in wholesome fear are those who admit the inspiration of the Bible in terms, but deny it in fact; who affirm the doctrine of inspiration, but explain, define and qualify it *ad libitum* until everything worthy of the name of inspiration has evaporated.

Amongst those who admit the doctrine in some sense or other, there are, or have been, two main theories in vogue, the mechanical and the dynamical. Some good and sound men, such as the younger Hetherington, have protested against the propriety of any attempts whatever at theorizing on this subject, and have denied the very possibility of affirming the truth either of the mechanical or the dynamical view. Those who simply deny the truth of the dynamical view are for the most part advocates of the mechanical. It is one of the misfortunes of theological controversy that such "ill-starred distinctions," as Dr. Dabney happily dubs them, and as many of them certainly are, in some cases cannot well, in other cases cannot at all, be avoided. This is abundantly evinced by the history of the formulation of church creeds and church symbols from the beginning, and especially from the history of every one of the great œcumenical councils. The logic of the objection would carry us to the extreme position of Alexander Campbell and the adherents to his unacknowledged system. Without doubt, unnecessary and hazardous, if not clearly unauthorized, precision and refinement may have been given in this way to certain uninspired statements of doctrine on the part of the recognized champions of orthodoxy. But whenever a considerable error is formulated and obtains currency, even when the error is not of the nature or in the direction of heresy, it is incumbent on the advocates of truth to formulate a distinction that shall exclude that error. Where palpable heresy is involved the course of duty becomes still clearer and the obligation yet more imperative.

The mechanical theory of inspiration has this prime advantage over its rival, that it is held, and from the nature of the case can be held, only by the orthodox. It would not be exactly fair to say that, according to this theory, the sacred speakers and writers

were mere *automata*, machines, or speaking-trumpets, in short, nothing but *funnels*. They were rather mere secretaries or copying-clerks, whose function was exhausted when they had transcribed a series of dictated words. And yet so far as the exercise of their own peculiar mental powers is concerned, beyond what was required to retain and repeat the words given them, they were after all, to every intent and purpose, veritably machines; and this fact will explain the application of the term by which those who hold this view are denominated.

The mechanical theory of inspiration was advocated by one or more of the Swiss theologians, and in this country, in an interesting but extreme book, by the late Eleazar Lord. Dr. Thornwell, too, in his grand rejoinder to Morell, from his silence as to the real, rather than merely apparent, employment on the part of God of the individual powers of the human scribes in full and active exercise, might be supposed by some to maintain the same position. We are ourselves by no means prepared to admit this; and the less so, as the language of the great theologian in question is otherwise altogether reconcilable with the dynamical view. The arguments *against* the mechanical theory appear to be decisive, and have been urged with signal force by such writers as Dr. Charles Hodge, Lee, Tayler Lewis, and Gaussen. It has to be granted that the mechanical view is, upon a close examination of the subject, by no means wholly destitute of plausibility. Take, by way of example, the Decalogue. The Decalogue, we know, was written on tables of stone by the finger of God. A literal interpretation of the account in the Pentateuch would therefore seem to preclude the possibility of dynamical coöperation on the part of man or angel. This is a more persuasive instance than that of the old prophets, in whom was "the Spirit of Christ," or that of Daniel, or Caiaphas, or Balaam. The old prophets, and also Daniel and the rest, were not ever, or not always, apprised of the full sense of their messages: in some cases the meaning of their own words may have been wholly hidden from them, as sometimes appears to have happened in the case of Daniel. Caiaphas does not seem to have been aware that he was himself uttering prophecy at all; and, in his own view of the matter, was in that event merely giv-

ing expression to a sagacious worldly maxim. Balaam was undoubtedly in a state of prophetic ecstasy, though, like the other prophets when in that state, he was, so far as we are able to determine, entirely conscious of the divine afflatus; but the differentiating peculiarity in the case of Balaam, as also in that of King Saul, is that he was an involuntary, and reluctant, engine (shall we say, or agent?) of the divine will. Yet each one of these inspired persons, of whom we have any definite information, was left while prophesying to the free exercise of his own individual genius, as is evident from the fact that each of them has expressed himself, notably Balaam, in his own individual style.

And now, to return to the example first adduced, it is pertinent to surmise that the case of the Decalogue itself may not have been essentially dissimilar. The Decalogue, it is stated, came directly from the hand of the Almighty, and yet there are portions of the Decalogue, as, for instance, in the second, fourth, and tenth commandments, where the literary style presents a marked resemblance to the literary style of the Jewish law-giver. Now, one of two things must be true. The first alternative is, that the language which attributes the Decalogue to the finger of God must be taken with sufficient latitude to allow of the subordinate coöperation of Moses. If this interpretation, so far from the one that has been usually accepted, could be sustained, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to make out a single case of mechanical inspiration in the whole Bible, unless, indeed, it was all inspired in a mechanical way. The remaining alternative is that the language in Exodus must be taken with sufficient strictness to render certain the averment that not only in its subject-matter, but also in its literary form, the Decalogue is to be attributed wholly and exclusively to God. This appears to be the only view left that is exegetically tenable. The resemblance between the style of the Decalogue and that of Moses must then either be regarded as a mistaken one, or as accidental, or as exceptional, or as due to subsequent enlargement or redaction on the part of Moses, or as the effect of imitation, or rather as the result of his unequalled intimacy with Jehovah; or must else be considered as part and parcel of an inspiration that was at the same time universally and

strictly mechanical, and yet one which made use of the very same vesture of language and style which Moses himself would naturally have employed. The alleged resemblance in style can hardly be a purely imaginary one, and can hardly be referred to accident. If it be argued that it is an exceptional and solitary instance of a mechanical inspiration, it may be rejoined that Moses in this case was not even a copying-clerk, and that the only inspiration involved in the case was the inspiration of the stone tablets. The office of Moses in this business began and ended with the work of transmission. It would, then, be singular indeed if Jehovah chose to write in the language of the human mediator. It would be far simpler to explain it as the result of the intimate companionship subsisting between the divine and human agents, or, better still, to resolve the apparent resemblance into real identity, and to accept the conclusion that is favored by the varied forms in which the Decalogue appears in the Pentateuch, that Moses either enlarged, by inspiration, on the divine words, or else expressed part at least of the divine thought in his own phraseology.

The hypothesis that the Almighty, for obviously wise and important reasons, saw fit in each instance to communicate precisely such a series of connected words to the human instrument as the man himself would have made use of had he been left to the untrammelled exercise of his own individual faculties, is the only hypothesis on which the mechanical theory, as a general system, is for a moment tenable. This is undoubtedly the form in which Dr. Thornwell held the mechanical theory, if Dr. Thornwell held the mechanical theory at all. The opinion has already been expressed in this essay that there is nothing in what Dr. Thornwell has said and that has been published on this subject that is inconsistent with the dynamical theory as properly qualified and expounded. There is, beyond question, every reason for adopting and maintaining, with or without certain possible exceptions,\* the dynamical as contradistinguished from the mechanical view of in-

---

\* Certain short, plain messages of God, and the Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia, *in extenso*, have by some, been regarded as furnishing examples of such exceptions.



piration. According to the dynamical theory the Bible is not simply a divine, but a divine-human phenomenon and product. This fact is brought out and elucidated with great force and impressiveness by Dr. William Lee, in his admirable work on inspiration, and still more eloquently, if somewhat mystically, by that rare scholar and singularly gifted thinker and writer, the late Prof. Tayler Lewis, in his remarkable little volume entitled "The Divine-Human in the Scriptures." Professor Lewis discourses profoundly and strikingly upon the analogy subsisting between the written and the personal Word, between the scriptural Logos incarnated, so to say, through the medium of the sacred oracles, in the *language*, and the self-existent Logos incarnate in the historic Christ, in the *nature* of man.

It is quite obvious, at the first glance, that this general view is liable to indefinite perversion; and it must be promptly admitted that it has been held in common by the adversaries and the friends of true religion. The teaching of those who abet the dynamical theory is uniformly this, that the sacred writers and spokesmen were left to the free use of their own powers, just as much so indeed as though there were no higher and supernatural influence brought to bear upon them. Now this general theory naturally admits of, and has received, a two-fold exposition, and it has accordingly been presented in a heterodox as well as in an orthodox form. The heterodox exhibition of the doctrine makes everything of the human and little or nothing of the divine side of the matter. In its extremest statement no essential difference is made between the inspiration of Socrates or Shakspeare and that of Moses. Such was the view of Foxton and of the late Theodore Parker. Morell, repeating Schleiermacher, rose immeasurably higher than this, and with Greg and Newman, and apparently Coleridge, protested that there was a radical distinction between a merely literary and intellectual and a spiritual inspiration, but allowed only a difference of degree between the inspiration of such a man as Thomas à Kempis or John Bunyan, and the inspiration of an Isaiah or a John. In other words, while unwilling with Parker to resolve the inspiration of the sacred penmen into the mere inspiration or afflatus of human genius, they did confound

it with the illumination of believers under the ordinary gracious influences of the Holy Spirit.

It is with regret that we are unable to attach a substantially divergent sense to the captivating words on this subject of that very able and scholar-like writer, Dr. Ladd. All these men, and a host like them, deny that there can be such a thing as an infallibly inspired *volume*, and define inspiration in such a way as to make the term applicable only to the *men* who wrote, and not to the documents which are attributed to their authorship. Agreeably to this view Morell held that inspiration was simply a quite unwonted elevation of the intuitional and religious consciousness. Of course all these men denied, and were bound in consistency to deny, what that eminent scholar and teacher in the church, Professor Briggs, has happily styled "the absolute inerrancy of the Scriptures." So does Dr. Briggs himself, and multitudes who yet with him refuse to go all lengths with the others. So of course does Dr. Ladd. His view, which is equally the favorite view just now of the heterodox defenders of inspiration in Germany, seems to be, that the Bible *is* not, but merely *contains*, a revelation from God, and that this revelation is not conveyed in infallible terms. In dealing with the idiosyncrasies and aberrations of human minds and human language, God, upon this view, was dealing with material that was intractable even to his own omnipotence; he could not help himself; he did the best he could.

Over against this, which is the heterodox statement of the dynamical view, we set the orthodox exhibition of the same general theory. The orthodox statement differs from its rival in just one point, viz., in the assertion it makes, and upon which it lays momentous emphasis, that the men thus left to the unfettered exercise of their own powers, were nevertheless absolutely controlled, and restrained within the limits of unerring accuracy, not only as respects the substance, but also as respects the language in which, as God's spokesmen, they have conveyed to us God's message.

This is the only hypothesis which, so far from being contradicted by the phenomena, accounts for them and explains them, and is therefore the true one. There is no more difficulty here than in the analogous case of ordinary conversion. The men were

free, and as such worked; but God worked in them, to think, feel, and write, of his own good pleasure.

The only sound doctrine on this whole subject is well set forth in the old-fashioned but precious phrase, the "divine plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures." What is here opposed is the doctrine of a partial inspiration. There can be then, of course, as Lee and Gaussen and Dr. Manly point out, no "sliding scale of degrees" in inspiration. This flows inevitably from the definition and from the main facts. If the inspired men were the infallible spokesmen of Jehovah, they must have been equally and fully inspired for the purpose, since there are no degrees in infallibility; and if it is God who speaks through them, they must be infallible, since God is omniscient and faithful, and incapable of error or mistake. *In hęc nuce* lies the necessity and truth of the doctrine contended for in this essay.

H. C. ALEXANDER.

### III. THE FAMOUS SIX DAYS.

It is now the predominant theory of most theologians and Christian geologists that the six creative days of the Mosaic record represent long periods, or geologic æons of the world's gradual development up to its present condition; and that this theory furnishes the only solution yet proposed of the seemingly contradictory chronologies of the Bible and geology. We do not admit that these chronologies are contradictory, and therefore the theory which proposes to reconcile them mistakes the nature of the record and the facts of which it speaks. The creation of man on the sixth day is the *golden text* of the record, and the several creative acts of the first five days are a *prolepsis* of the work of that day, and consists of a series of adaptations of the world to the use of that wonderful being made in the image of God on the sixth day. And the making of this being, for whose use and occupancy the world was furnished, must be interpreted in the light of a design to introduce that more wonderful man, Jesus Christ, of whom the first man was a prototype and prophecy. For this man mainly the world was fitted up, as subsequent history shows. Moses had no interest in detailing a geological order of creations, but as preparatory steps toward furnishing a theatre of action and a home for the great man of the human race. To this end it will be noticed that the acts of the first five days are not so much creative or productive as adaptative. Thus, when God is represented as creating light on the first day, the preterite acts of creating and "dividing the light from the darkness" are coupled in speech with the present adaptation of it to man, by naming the parts of that division, day and night, with special reference to the new occupant who was to be distinguished by the use of articulate language. It was a preterite act of creation, contained in the comprehensive summary, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth"; but stated anew as a reformative act, bearing upon the new being who was soon to be introduced. The creation of the

second day "was called heaven." That region existed before, but no anterior creature had looked up to it with thought and admiration. And the very remarkable expression: "And God saw that it was good," was proleptic chiefly as *adapted* to the use and sustentation of that being to whom all other creatures were meant to be subservient. This encomium upon each day's work was omitted when man was created, because he was the terminal concept to which each previous creation looked as preparatory to its completion. Thus also the making of "great lights" to rule the day and the night, considered under this ruling idea of the narrative, was simply that they were now being adapted to a new order of beings, who should become intelligent observers of the passing history, and the days of twenty-four hours by which they had marked time through any number of preceding ages were now, for the first time, honored with a new office, the division of work and rest for intellectual beings. The creative work of the five days was nothing more than lifting old phenomena into a new and higher use. Days of twenty-four hours are indeed astronomical, and not geological doctrines. Geology knows no days. But if, to reconcile the biblical record to geology, the six days be made to represent ages of slow and natural sedimentation, with far more aptness may they be made to stand for a brief epoch of formative work, and our record be held as accounting for one of those transitional seams or divisions which separate one geologic age from another.

Now it is at this place in geological history that the biblical record plants itself: the point of transition from age to age—the seam that divides æon from æon. It was of no consequence to Moses to speak of the long ages of the world. He skips over them all after stating the fact of the primitive creation of all things in his opening sentences. It was of importance to him to state the steps by which the present age was introduced. It was a *geological transition*. Whether it was a paroxysmal or cataclysmic juncture or not, it was one of those changes which interrupted, by revolutionary action, the slow development of the preceding age—the natural and orderly growth of the world arrested by one of those extraordinary agitations, more or less general, which mark the different orders of stratified being. Geologists claim that

whole species and orders of creatures have been swept into extinction by flood-drifts and paroxysmal agitations. There is, therefore, no violence done to geology to suppose that the present age, with its improved orders of beings, was introduced during one of those revolutionary points of time, and that the whole six days of creation, *i. e.*, reformatory work, was the measure of that revolutionary juncture. Revolutions may, indeed, be slow or sudden. But if geology admits any interruptions of her slow and silent march—any which effected an extensive destruction of living beings—we may claim that our biblical six days of twenty-four hours each is the history of one of them. And this will save the miraculous quality of our record. For even if these revolutions are thus put upon the basis of natural events, they would still be palpable and impressive acts of divine power, as compared with regularly progressive and slow creations by the same power. All that would make the difference between these two forms of asserting power would be the elimination of the element of time. They would not be different in their nature and end. For physical revolution renews former types and forms of being with improvement, and reaches suddenly an improved development which it would have required ages to accomplish. There may have been no more of natural order violated in the change of water into wine at Cana of Galilee than the extraction of *time*—*i. e.*, recognized succession. All that the Mosaic record claims over natural order is the elimination of time. To assert, therefore, that the creative work of the days occupied ages, and to attempt to prove it from the record of that work, is to assume simply what the record implicitly denies. What was the use of a record on revelation, which meant only to rehearse the usual order of nature? How could religion as a communication from heaven be advanced by a geological treatise?

That the record of the six days' creative work was a revolutionary juncture, speaking geologically, but a revolution "renewing the face of the earth" by rehabilitating old types in improved forms, we have confirmatory evidence in the sense given to terms elsewhere used, and meant to express the reformatory work described in Genesis. "Through faith we understand that the

worlds (æons) were framed by the word of God." There were no other worlds, considered as great, solid, habitable bodies, known to mankind in ancient times than this one on which we dwell, and the *αιωνα* (æons) were the successive re-formations of this world, or "renewing the face of the earth" by great and sudden epochal changes.

Our six days' formative work was one in which the *βλεπομενα*, "the things seen," were not made of the *φαινομενα*, "the things which do appear." The moulds were thrown away, the types remained in the mind of the Omnipotent Operator, and the new furniture of the globe was a more splendid production on the base of original types, but a more splendid production which interrupted the natural order. For if the record is a geological treatise of the natural order of slow sedimentations, faith is excluded by a natural explanation, since it is not an act of faith which believes, but an act of reason which perceives philosophical causation and progressive creations. On the contrary, there was no such *nexus* or continuation as would make reason usurp the place of faith and nature conceal divinity. God appears in that work, "appointing the moon for seasons." The sun, moon and stars, which had divided time into days and seasons before, had never divided it for the use of intelligent observers on the earth. But now they become ordinances, created originally for that purpose, and now inducted into this grander service and made *testimonies* to rational beings. The current theory which elongates the creative days and makes the biblical record a geological treatise or mythical story of the world's natural development labors under the following insuperable difficulties:

1. It requires the miraculous quality of the creative work to disappear, by representing it as the slow movement of natural law. This theory is indeed sufficiently careful to magnify that slow work of natural law as divine work. But it disowns any palpable and distinct interposition in the great cosmical changes which have taken place on the surface of our globe. While it asserts divinity everywhere, it locates it nowhere. It distributes divine energy through long interminable ages, but deprives that energy of the power of making itself palpable. It erects a new

theology, the mere synonym of science, and begs the question of our record, the very design of which is to show that the divine energy asserts itself at times independently of natural order, to give mankind assurance of its existence.

2. And as this theory demands the displacement of miracle, so it unquestionably does violence to the record, which, by the very terms which it employs, supposes the immediate effects of the divine power. "Let there be light;" "let the dry land appear;" "and it was so." The record may at once be impeached as false to the expectation of the reader and a false presentation of the sublime in divine power, if this is meant to picture the slow emergence of luminous matter through long ages. Sublimity in language can only exist when it is supposed to be a faithful presentment of sublimity in fact. It makes no difference *when* these acts of divine power were put forth, they unquestionably suppose an *immediate succession* of cause and effect as the very substance of what it proposes to tell us. They may have been acts of divine power long prior to the day when divine power was lifting these facts into new and important positions as ordinances for new and intelligent beings; they are not less sublime as past acts of power now associated with new and sublime offices appointed them. Even if the first chapter of Genesis is a pictorial presentation, its value as a picture of truth depends upon the facts recorded as preternatural. If this record is held at all to be a divinely authorized communication, what advantage could a pictorial scene have over a direct narrative? Who could honestly think that a communication from heaven, put in the fabulous form as a plaything for the imagination, would not impair the credibility of the facts contained, and defeat any serious design it might have? We seriously believe that the mythical theory of Genesis is a profane jocularly and an actual abandonment of the record as a divine authority.

3. It imposes upon the term "day" a second and argued sense, which displaces its primitive, natural and spontaneous sense. A second or figurative sense is always inadmissible without some notification in the composition that figures of speech are meant. Here in the very first use of the term, in direct narrative of facts, as in any other composition, a secondary or figurative sense was



impossible without falsity in the record. If its meaning here is any other than its name imports it has misled mankind until now. No appeal can be made to the secondary sense in which the term may be elsewhere employed. Thus "as thy day is, so shall thy strength be," the term being put for a period of afflictive experience, the reader is sufficiently notified by the sense itself that the term has taken a secondary meaning and cannot mislead.

4. It supposes a numerical correspondence between the number of days and the number of ages which they represent. The number of days is six, but the number of ages has never been determined. Geology professes only to have attained a glimpse into the internal structure of the globe, and from what it has ascertained hypothecates the existence of a great many more strata that mark ages than those already named, as known. Is it not premature to represent them as six in number before they are all registered? But there is confusion also among geologists as to the order in which they are found. Thus, Prof. Dana says: "The proofs from science of the existence of plants *before* animal life is inferential." Distinct fossils (*i. e.*, of plants) have not been found. All that ever existed in the azoic rocks (rocks without vestiges of animal life) have been obliterated. It is only inferred that, as plants are an inferior order of beings to animals, they existed before animals existed. And Principal Dawson says: "To those who are familiar with the vast lapse of time required by the geologic history of the earth, it may be startling to ascribe the whole of the palæozoic period to three or four creative days." How can the days of the creation be made to represent geologic ages when three or four of them are thus doubtfully made to stand for one age? Certainly no sufficiently definite information respecting the number of the geologic ages, nor any such approximation to the duration of them, or the order in which they exist, has yet been reached as to warrant the opinion that they are represented by the six days of the creative work.

5. The theory which make these days representative of long ages must invest the seventh day with a symbolic character, and the six days' work as succeeded by a very long rest. But a geologic sabbatism contradicts the theory of very long days, which must be days of continuous natural law (*i. e.*, continuous work),

and cannot be suspended without giving all we ask for divine interposition. The natural providential work of God goes on uninterruptibly. This is natural law. But what shall we understand his resting on the Sabbath day to be, if not to distinguish his work in nature from his work in the six days' creation? It is described as a *καταπαυσίν*, a cessation from work, expressly to denote the supernatural character of that work; *i. e.*, it interrupted the slow order of the ages, and by revolutionary agencies closed the preceding and introduced the succeeding age. It could only be from a juncture of extraordinary work that he could be said to have ceased at all, and the day which marked that juncture must have marked a brief point of time. The seventh day, therefore, from the circumstances of its origin cannot represent an æon past or to come; not an age past, for the six days are asked to represent the past; not an age now or to come, since days geologic expressly exclude cessation from work. But as it is appended to the category of days, neither can *they* represent ages past or to come. On the other hand, if we suppose that God was now adapting the world to a new order of beings, who were to be intelligent observers of its passing history, we can easily understand how the days of twenty-four hours, which had marked time through previous ages, were now honored with a new office, the division of work and rest for intellectual beings. The seventh, therefore, the last one of the series, was not symbolical, but exemplary, a lesson to the new race of beings to cultivate those intellectual and moral faculties which constituted them superior to preceding races, and to whom this age became a revelation.

There is, therefore, no necessity arising from geological science itself for the current theory of long days, and none for a strained interpretation of the Mosaic record. It was seized upon at first as a probable solution of the apparent contradiction between the Mosaic and geological chronologies. It has made no advancement in solving that problem. On the other hand, it has imposed a strained and unnatural meaning upon the sacred text, it has dishonored a record purporting to be divine with the profane association of mythical and legendary stories, it has attempted to tie together the past geological ages and the age of man with a continuous and unbroken chain of natural causation, and finally, has led to

an almost articulate demand that natural law be considered as holding supreme control over heaven and earth. But an unbroken catenation of sequences in nature admits no palpable evidence of a personal God distinct from nature—none that such a being has ever spoken or ever will speak. It puts God and the Bible between the millstones of inexorable fate and interminable law, and introduces the soul of man into the gloomiest chambers of atheism. The theory which, less than a hundred years ago, ventured to debauch an honest exegesis of the sublime text of Genesis, now ventures to demand, with a vaulting confidence, that the whole Bible be understood as a natural development of history and of religious thought; that religious thought and the soul itself are simply more sublimated evolutions springing from the inexorable trend of nature. Why not? If God may be imprisoned so profoundly at the mill of creation as never to have an opportunity of speaking to men or of interrupting the interminable order of nature, why hesitate to imbrute the soul beneath the domination of insensate law? Why hesitate to bribe and then dethrone the human conscience, the last lingering monitor on earth of human responsibility and of a judgment to come?

We believe in an earnest, thorough, and indefatigable investigation of the secrets of nature. Let science go forward untrammelled. We believe in an equally earnest, thorough, and indefatigable research into the secrets of Revelation. There are no mysteries there save such as the limits of our faculties have made. It is thoroughly and absolutely a *revelation* in itself *without secrets*, except such as invite scrutiny and await solution. But we believe that an honest, earnest, and prayerful investigation becomes beings as small as we are. If the Bible be an adequately accredited revelation from heaven, that great fact must rein in a wanton imagination and control a beautiful theory.

If the Bible comes before us in an antique literature, let us reverently inquire what was due to mankind when that literature was the only possible vessel in which a heavenly message could be deposited, remembering that our own literature may yet be still more antique to coming ages, and that in whatever age or country God may have spoken, the same or even greater difficulties might have surrounded it.

D. E. FRIERSON.

#### IV. VOLUNTARY AND MISSIONARY SOCIETIES.

AN overture touching voluntary missionary associations, and having several names affixed thereto, was presented to the General Assembly at Chattanooga. The Assembly made no deliverance concerning said overture, but adopted the recommendation of the Committee of Bills and Overtures, "that the Assembly, without expressing any opinion on the subject involved, send down this overture to the Presbyteries, with the direction that they patiently consider the whole subject of societies within and without the church, together with the subject of tithing as a means of raising the funds of the church, and return carefully formulated papers upon these points to the next Assembly." (Minutes, 1889, pp. 605-607.) All the signers of the overture cannot conveniently meet in one body, but some of them offer to their brethren the following views and thoughts touching subjects involved in the recommendation of the Assembly, which opens a wider field than the overture contemplates. The overture says:

"In the year 1866 our General Assembly affirmed as follows: 'The doctrine that the church, in its organized capacity, with its officers and courts, is the sole agency which Christ hath ordained for its own edification and government, and for the propagation of the faith and the evangelization of the world, as set forth in that formulary (*i. e.*, Form of Government), clearly teaches that the church is God's Bible and Missionary Society.' (Minutes, 1866, pp. 37, 38.)

"In 1888 our General Assembly issued the following recommendation, viz.: 'Your committee recommend that this General Assembly commend the formation, wherever practicable, of *Men's Missionary Associations*, as also *Women's Missionary Associations* (to be under the direction and control of the sessions), wherever they do not now exist.' (Minutes, 1888, p. 430.)

"As explanatory of this overture, we beg leave to say that it does not contemplate *inorganic* associations, or *committees* of members, formed with reference to such work as pertains to the church in its organized capacity, and intended for the distribution of such labor as devolves on our members as members of Christ's body, and which, from first to last, recognize them in *this* capacity, and which, by virtue of being thus constituted, are so under the immediate direction and control of the sessions as to be entirely subject to their official rule, and so also as to be perpetuated, modified and dissolved at the option of these courts of the church; but it contemplates such voluntary missionary associations, or societies of human origin, as

are organic bodies, and which are either visibly distinct in organization and existence from the organized church, or seek, through the direction and control of sessions, to be associated with the church, and to be recognized as agencies for doing its work, and which may, by their own choice and act, be combined in presbyterial unions."

The General Assembly having issued the direction to consider the whole subject of societies, *within* and *without* the church, we do not feel ourselves to be restricted to a consideration of such societies as the overture contemplates.

I. If it be asked, what right has any one to challenge or condemn or exclude voluntary societies of human origin which are formed to carry forward the work of the church, we reply, what right has any one to institute and introduce them to a place alongside Christ's own agencies? Human reason, apart from the Bible, should not be allowed to determine the church's work. These agencies of human origin must be tried by the standard of God's infallible Word, and the verdict rendered accordingly.

The visible church, over which the Lord Jesus presides as sole Ruler, "consists of all those who make profession of the true religion, together with their children." "Unto this catholic visible church Christ hath given the ministry, oracles and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints, in this life, to the end of the world, and doth, by his own presence and Spirit, according to his promise, make them effectual thereunto." (*Confession of Faith*.) Our Form of Government declares that "the church, with its ordinances, officers and courts, is the agency which Christ has ordained for the edification and government of his people, for the propagation of the faith, and for the evangelization of the world." It teaches also, that Christ as King, has ordained in his church his "system of doctrine, government, discipline and worship, all which are either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced therefrom; and to which things he commands that nothing be added, and that from them naught be taken away."

To all who are dying in sin outside her pale, whether in heathen or Christian lands, the church of Christ is sent as the great redemptive agency. She is Christ's *missionary society*, (a), By virtue of her peculiar organization and equipment for her

work; (b), By her law or commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature"; (c), And by the indwelling presence and power of the Spirit, and promise of ultimate victory. She is competent to do the work which Christ has for her to do. She contains within herself a "simple, symmetrical system of compacted organization." The idea of this complete organization is beautifully illustrated by that of a perfect body, which has no surplus limb or part, and needs no addition; all the members of which, each moving in its own place, combine as one whole to the same end. Christ is the Head of the body, his church; and his people are the members. (Rom. xii.; 1 Cor. xii.; Eph. iv.) Says one: "God's works are simple; the organization of his church is sublimely simple; her worship is simple; and just as we seek after complexity of schemes we depart from his example."

As it appears to us, the servants of Christ are in but little danger of erring in their work, as a whole or in detail, if they will grasp and realize in practice the true theory of the church. For illustration, we take the case of one poor benighted soul that has "turned from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God." "The Lord Jesus first established his kingdom in the individual soul, and sits enthroned upon the affections through the renewing and sanctifying power of the indwelling Spirit." His next step is to confess Christ before men, and this, not in forms of man's devising, but in the divinely appointed ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper. His faith has brought him into union with Christ, and now his open confession of Christ brings him into a state of public allegiance to him. The command now is, "Go, work in my vineyard." Henceforth, as a servant of Christ and member of his visible church, he "must postpone his wisdom to the authority which has ordained and equipped the church," and within whose domain Christ is absolute and supreme King and Ruler. "His covenant is her only charter, his Word her only constitution, his will her only law. She has no officers whom he does not ordain, no functions which he does not assign, no work which he does not appoint, no success which he does not decree. No authority is possessed by her ex-

cept that which is delegated from him who, in granting to the church the commission upon which she acts, claims 'all power as given to him in heaven and in earth.'" (*The Church a Spiritual Kingdom*, by Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D.)

Dr. Thornwell says:

"The church is a very peculiar society, *voluntary* in the sense that its members become so, not by constraint, but willingly; but not in the sense that its doctrines, discipline and order are the creatures of human will, deriving their authority and obligation from the consent of its members. On the contrary, it has a fixed and unalterable constitution, and that constitution is the Word of God. It is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. He is enthroned in it as a sovereign. It can hear no voice but his, obey no commands but his, pursue no ends but his. Its officers are his servants, bound to execute only his will; its doctrines are his teachings, which he, as a prophet, has given from God; its discipline his law, which he, as king, has ordained. The power of the church accordingly is only ministerial and declarative. The Bible, and the Bible alone, is her rule of faith and practice. She can announce what it teaches, enjoin what it commands, prohibit what it condemns, and enforce her testimonies by spiritual sanctions. Beyond the Bible she can never go, and apart from the Bible she can never speak. To the law and to the testimony, and to them alone, she must always appeal; and when they are silent it is our duty to put her hand upon her lips." (*Collected Writings*, Vol. IV., pp. 383, 384.)

The church is a kingdom not of this world. It is a spiritual institute, designed for spiritual ends. She must not only avoid entangling herself with the affairs of the state, but she must not compromise her spirituality by lending herself to any scheme, secular, moral, benevolent, or otherwise, that is not in accord with her high commission and allegiance to her Head and King.

If we have stated the true, scriptural theory of Christ's church, we submit it, whether not *one* soul only, but *all* souls in which Christ is enthroned in absolute dominion and which adopt this theory as a rule of faith and practice, will not, in the great majority of cases, if not in every case, be led to work with and for Christ in the use of means of his own appointment, and will neither desire nor seek for others.

Let us now set over against the theory above enunciated another which reduces the church to an institute for every work and purpose of a religious, philanthropic and moral kind; which subjects her plans of operation to human reason and caprice; which proposes expediency as a basis and guide in doing Christ's work;

which mingles the human and the divine, and which makes the church, not Christ's unquestioning servant, but his *confidential agent* and *counsellor*, having certain ends proposed, but left to herself to determine the means for accomplishing them; and which teaches, as Dr. Hodge held, "that such societies of *man's devising* as are designed and wisely adapted, either directly or indirectly, either primarily or incidentally, to prepare the way of the Lord, are to be taken under the patronage of the church, and to be by her, in the exercise of her ministerial and declarative power, stamped with Christ's approval." (*The Spirituality of the Church*, p. 9.) The former theory is the basis of the church's life, stability and success, and binds her to the immovable Rock of Ages. The latter commits her to the guidance of human reason and to an endless multiplication of machinery, and sets her adrift on a sea of uncertainty.

If it be said that the devices of human origin for doing God's work are authorized by the freedom and liberty of the Christian dispensation, and may be determined by the general laws and great fundamental principles of the gospel, we reply that the freedom of the church is her deliverance from the bondage of the Jewish ritual and ceremonies; her liberty is a liberty which is determined and restrained by the laws of God and the will of Christ as sole Ruler in Zion. It is liberty to worship and serve a new Master, freed from the slavish subjection of her faith and practice to the doctrines and commandments of men. The church is not free in the sense that she is left to herself to adopt whatever objects and measures a "romantic benevolence" may suggest, and to employ the devices of her own imagination. Her's is the freedom of a conscience divinely enlightened and of unswerving loyalty to Christ. This freedom has respect to the *ends* she is called to accomplish and to the *means* to be employed. In the one as well as in the other, the church must be subject to the Word of God.

II. Again, if it be said that this is a day of organization, and that the church must organize her forces to meet the assaults of Satan and to rescue a lost and guilty world, we reply, that the church is already a divine organization, equipped for these very ends. Can



any human organization be more complete and effective? Did the Lord Jesus omit from the divine model of his church any parts or details, to be afterwards supplied by the wisdom of man? Is erring, blinded man competent to speak where God is silent? We do not object to assemblages of God's people which are limited to prayer and religious conference concerning the interests of the church. But we hold that no self-constituted body of men has the right to assume to itself the peculiar functions, authority and work which Christ has committed to his church; nor has the church, on the other hand, the right to entrust her functions and work, nor surrender her authority to these self-appointed agents. The duties of the church are duties which God has imposed on her, and are not to be done, in whole or in part, by substitutes and proxies. "He has given her," says Dr. Thornwell, "the organization which she possesses, for the very purpose of discharging these duties. . . . If our form of church government is such as God prescribes it is adequate to all emergencies: if our church courts are based upon the platform of the Bible, God requires from *them* the discharge of their peculiar duties, and not from *another*." One of the great issues of the Reform of 1837, was that of "ecclesiastical responsibility"—that the church was to do her own work, *in her organized capacity, through her courts and her own executive agencies*. Is the church preparing for another battle in defence of her principles?

Dr. T. V. Moore has left on record the following testimony:

"The church is the divine corporation for all the ends of its institution, and, if properly worked, needs no supplementary expedients to complete its equipment. Every such human device, however plausible, is a wen or a parasite on the church corporate, and draws away some of its vital force, and sometimes becomes a serious disease. . . . Hence no associations, corporations or expedients besides this simple, symmetrical system of compacted organization found in the church itself, are needed to do its work, if that organization is instinct with divine life. This we have seen was true in the primitive church, and it is equally true now."

Who that looks around and abroad over the church can fail to be impressed with the fact that there is among our members by far too much of pliant, blind credulity—a readiness to take it as granted that every enterprise is good and will do good, if it but come clothed in the livery of the church, and offering to her its aid in

the redemption of the world? Need we wonder, therefore, that so many are led astray? "Try the spirits whether they be of God." "Many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ, and shall deceive many." If men have come, and may yet come, as *false prophets*, is it to be thought strange if human inventions for doing good spring from the same principles, and promise what they are unable to fulfil? But, if it is claimed for them that they do accomplish good, even much good, we reply, that the plea is not only alluring, but illusive. In the places which they occupy they are not *good*, unless they are divinely approved expressions of obedience and loyalty to Christ; nor can it be predicated of them that they do good without summing up their results.

An unknown writer says:

"A correct judgment of no policy can be formed which does not take into account the remote as well as the proximate results. A scheme may originate in the purest of motives and be advocated by the best of men, which is proved in the end to be neither wise nor beneficent. Hence expediency can never become the rule of human conduct. Finite wisdom is unable to see the end from the beginning; and unless the entire line be covered by our vision, it is impossible to foretell the disasters which may flow from measures the most approved."

If the whole field of the operation, influence and results of these outside religious associations be assumed as a basis of inference, what good are they accomplishing? They take from the church, but when or where, in a single instance, have they returned an equivalent? Which individual church has been aroused to greater zeal and activity and usefulness by their influence? If the members of these self-constituted religious societies seem to show a higher spirit of consecration in their meetings and exercises, *why is it that equal zeal and consecration is not aroused by the ordinances and vows and obligations of Christ's church?* Starting under a new impulse and with a grand ideal, how soon the fine gold begins to grow dim, and the downward tendency to manifest itself! Admitting that these human voluntary associations have been made to do good by him who separates the gold from the dross and brings light out of darkness, it is still true that the end does not justify the means; and this good would have been better done, and more to the glory of God and the honor of the church, if all the Christian men who composed them had been employed in

their own appropriate spheres as members of the church of Christ.

All the devices and schemes and inventions of man for the worship and service of God which oppose the truth and authority of Christ must disappear. "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up." What bitter fruit may be ripening for the church in coming days! Mark the solemn words of warning of a prominent minister in our church: "Whatever association of men, except the church of Christ, undertakes to wield that power of teaching the truth revealed by Christ, sets itself up as a church, made by man, becomes a counterfeit church, and robs the church of her trust and her rights. The results of any and all such steps will be infidelity, unless God in mercy overrule the evil with the good. The *logical*, if not the *actual*, termination of them all is infidelity, because they set up human wisdom against the wisdom of God." Do these words testify truly? Then let the church pause on the threshold, and view with alarm the spirit of human license that is abroad in the land, and the remarkable tendency to multiply societies of human origin to do the work of the church. If these agencies should ultimately spread far and wide the spirit of skepticism, and lure thousands of our members into an avowed rejection of Christianity, it will but aggravate the shame and guilt of the church of Christ to know that by *her* silence or apathy, her encouragement and patronage, this direful result was attained. Let the church ponder the testimonies and examples thereof which the Bible records, and thence learn the lesson that the subordination of God's authority to man's purposes and preferences, even when these wear the garb of religion, brings disaster.

The church does not need more, or better, or wiser agencies than her Divine Head has equipped her with; but she needs more life, faith, zeal and consecration. The abundance of her machinery and the tendency to add more are not, to us, signs of health and vigorous life. It is indicative of the weakness of independency, that, as is said of it, it is compelled, from the incompleteness of its organization, to work through agencies outside of itself. If the outside agencies which our branch of the church

employs are suggestive of an element of weakness in her organization, what is that element? If our system be incomplete, then let us seek completeness and relief from the evils of our weakness. We are far removed from Independency in our ecclesiastical organization; but we suggest whether there may not be within our pale a latent spirit of congregationalism which moves our members towards these outside organizations, and which, if unchecked, may one day demand more emphatic recognition.

The church of Christ needs no outside, foreign agencies to complete her divine equipment, and thus add to her efficiency, because she herself is the appointed agency for all the objects of her peculiar mission. She can claim the promises; human devices for doing her work cannot. If she will bend herself to the faithful accomplishment of her mission, her experience and success will prove the needlessness of foreign agencies, and she will cease to desire them. In order to success she must accommodate her machinery to the Word of God. We fear that she is making an experiment in the opposite direction, and is seeking in a limited but lamentable degree, and unwittingly it may be, to accommodate the Bible to her machinery, and to do her work by human wisdom and human policy. God's machinery needs no mending; but the machinery of man is ever subject to derangement. It is remarkable how church courts attempt, year after year, to amend plans and methods of work, but never inquire whether they do not involve some radical or fatal defect. A faithful church will perpetuate herself in a living ministry and a consecrated membership, and with her machinery accommodated to the word of God, her life may be depended upon to respond to the doctrine and duty of worshipping God with her worldly substance. It was so in apostolic times, and would be so now if the church were content with primitive purity and simplicity.

The views and positions set forth thus far apply to all human societies which usurp to themselves the distinctive functions and work of the church. We have not indicated any of them by the names which they bear. We leave the recognition of them to our readers, and the approval or condemnation of them to the sound judgment and religious instinct of God's people.

III. We have already stated the answer of the General Assembly to the overture above referred to. We do not propose to notice in this paper every point in the overture touching which a deliverance was asked for, especially one or two constitutional points. The overture has, in short, reference to missionary societies which have a distinct organic existence, and which may be combined in presbyterial unions.

To bring the subject down to a practical test, we suppose that a petition is presented to a session, praying the formation of a society for a specific object of church work, as foreign missions, with a view to the mutual good and improvement of its members, the diffusion of missionary information, and the increase of funds to carry forward the proposed work. The reasons which sustain the petition are, that, owing to hindering causes, the church is not up to the full measure of her duty in her offerings, zeal, consecration and efforts, and that some new agency like the one proposed will place its members in a position more favorable to efficient action. The phrase "hindering causes" may imply indolence and unfaithfulness on the part of church officers, and inadequacy or inefficiency of the divine ordinances. The petition contemplates the reduction of the particular church from a whole to parts, and the official direction and control of the session, and naturally suggests the idea of the superior wisdom, adaptation and efficiency of the new arrangement. The society is organized, with its president, officers, laws, regulations, and everything needful to its distinct organic existence. Now, this society is necessary to the end proposed, or unnecessary. If necessary as an additional agency to the church in its divinely organized capacity, then the latter organization must be incomplete and inadequate, or inefficient. If unnecessary, it is a presumptuous reflection on the wisdom of Christ and the faithfulness of church officers. If the new arrangement is superior to Christ's plan of evangelism, why not, therefore, turn over all church work to similar individual societies, and retain the church as an apology or excuse for their existence?

If we have stated the case fairly, we submit whether these missionary organizations do not logically tend to the following results:

1. *To interrupt the unity of the visible church as the divine corporation for all the ends of its institution.* As we have seen, Christ is the Head of his body, the church, and his people are the members. These missionary societies, as we contemplate them, are not simply working committees, wielding a power which the church as a whole possesses, and of which it may, therefore, be said, that when *they* work it is the church at work; but they are parts of the whole set apart, and combined in organizations which, by virtue of their peculiar construction, laws, officers, etc., have distinct individual existence. Two distinct bodies are not one. The members who compose these societies do not lose their union with and membership in the body of Christ, the church; and when they work and give, each one in his own sphere, as members of the church, they work in unison with the whole. But when they work as members of a distinct organization, the harmony is destroyed; they occupy two relations, one to the church, and the other to the society. They do not work with the church as a whole, nor the church as a whole with them, but each in a distinct sphere, and therefore visible unity of coöperation is destroyed. If these societies would take to themselves the government, worship, and ordinances of Christ's church, they would each constitute an individual church, and perpetuate the divine organization; but with the environment of human arrangement and wisdom, they assume the work which Christ committed to his own organized institute. Let any pastor, in whose congregation one of these societies is found, test this want of unity of coöperation between the society and the organized church by an answer to the question, How much is your church doing for missions? Will he not instinctively grasp the conception of two distinct bodies, and be ready to assign two distinct results, one to the church, the other to the society?

Unity in coöperation has respect to both the object and the means, and implies that Christ's servants, who should know no law but his, should pursue the great object which he has ordained and sanctioned. Departure from this principle destroys this unity, and involves failure. God's people do not work independently of him. "Lo, I am with you always;" "they went forth and preached

everywhere, the Lord working with them;" "we are laborers together with God." God works with his people by his power and truth; they work with him in the wisdom and strength which he gives. Here unity in coöperation includes the object and the means. God's glory is the grand object; the means are those with which Christ has equipped his church. "Unto him be glory *in the church* by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen." The church of Christ is not what men make it by additions of human wisdom, but it is what Christ has made it by divine organization and equipment for the work which he has for it to do. The mission of the church is to redeem—to save souls. The Spirit of God convinces, renews and sanctifies. Is the church left to herself to invent and propose means for accomplishing the eternal purpose of God to save? Infinite wisdom alone could devise the plan; infinite wisdom alone can provide the means. Has the church any more authority to amend the plan than to amend the means? She must work *for* Christ and *as* he appoints, and then there will be unity of coöperation; without this unity, who is authorized to predict success? When or where have we been taught that he has promised to bless, with the power and presence of his Spirit, the inventions of men and the devices of human policy?

2. *To absorb, or displace the church of Christ, as an agency for doing his work, in so far as concerns the exercise of their assumed functions.* Two distinct bodies cannot be one and the same body, although their interest and aim may be identical; and these two bodies cannot occupy the same space at the same time. Let the reader bear in mind that these societies are organic bodies with a definite individuality. They are voluntary, being the creatures of human will arranging their own offices and laws, and perpetuating their existence. Now, if it be right to form one organization that proposes to assume and carry forward one religious object, as Foreign Missions, it is equally so to form another for Home Missions, a third for Education, and so on to the absorption of all the objects of church work. To this we are advancing, for in 1888 the Assembly recommended the formation of Foreign, and in 1889, of Home Missionary Societies in our churches. Suppose that this

high court had recommended the formation of societies, not for Foreign and Home Missions alone, but for Publication, Education, Colored Evangelistic work, Invalid Fund, Church Election, Temperance, Sabbath Observance, and, in short, for all the objects of church work, what impression would have been made on the church and on the outside world? If a society for one object be best, why not for all? If the principle is right, the extension cannot be wrong. What a complexity of machinery this arrangement would furnish to the church which Christ in his wisdom has organized to accomplish his work, and in the inspired history of which we see no hint or trace of such complicated machinery. If it be right and for the best interests of the congregation and for the cause of religion for us to combine our members in each one of these societies, why not combine them in one having in view all the objects of the several societies, or else leave them to work in that *one* organization which Christ organized? If they can work effectively in societies of *human origin*, what shall hinder equally effective work in a society of divine origin? Which of the two is the better? which has the promise of Christ's presence and blessing?

But, suppose that these societies for specific objects are formed; they have then absorbed the objects and members of Christ's church and displaced her as his own divine agency.

3. *To alienate or estrange our members from the church.* Especially would this be painful in the case of the children of the covenant—the hope of the church—who should be trained as members of the church, rather than as members of outside organizations.

“No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other.” If two claims conflict, one must yield. These societies give two organizations, one human the other divine. Both claim the time, zeal, offerings, and affection of their members who belong to one and both. Will not the irresistible bent of human nature determine in favor of the one or the other, and a corresponding alienation ensue?

4. *To give undue prominence to one object of church work to the injury of others, by diverting from them the sympathy and*



*offerings of the members.* We suggest to our brethren to learn from *The Missionary* which of our churches have foreign missionary societies, then refer to the Minutes of the Assembly, and learn still further whether statistics do not show, in many places, a striking disproportion between the amounts contributed to Foreign Missions and to other objects of beneficence. We do not intimate that any one object receives more than it needs. But if one or two are disproportionately absorbing the funds of the church, what will ultimately be the fate of the others?

IV. The Assembly of 1888 recommended the formation of missionary societies, to be under the direction and control of the sessions. If the recommendation contemplates such organic associations as we are considering, we suggest whether a *constitutional* difficulty would not arise, inasmuch as the members of sessions have the official care of *churches*. The functions of their office terminate on members *as members*, and they have no official control over them in any other relation. The point of difficulty is, How could they constitutionally assume direction and control of outside organizations? If they may direct and control one society having a religious object in view, then they may control a multiplicity, each claiming a specific object of church work. But what would be gained, since they are already ordained to rule in an organization which exhausts all the objects of the church's mission?

One of the dangers which may be suggested as attending these human organizations, is that they will, in the end, fall short of their original object and defeat the purpose of their formation. Can the reader point to one human organization for reform or benevolence which, after sufficient trial, has not proved to be a failure, to a greater or less degree? It will be in keeping with the bent and weakness of human nature that these societies should, in process of time, decline ecclesiastical supervision and claim the right to appropriate their funds to any object of their own choice. In connection with this thought or suggestion, we refer our readers to the following striking language which may be found in *The Missionary*, July number, 1889, pp. 247 and 248:

“We observe with much regret that the contributions of the Presbyterian Church North to the Foreign Mission work last year fell short \$65,000. The secre-

taries say that this is not because of any general decline in the aggressive movements of the church. On the contrary, there has been an advance in other directions. . . . While they find it difficult, therefore, to assign a complete reason for a decline in the gifts of Foreign Missions, they state *one fact which should arrest the serious attention of our own church.* 'There has been an increasing tendency,' they say, 'to *divert* even that which is given for foreign work to *other* channels of an undenominational and often of a merely individual character. This diversion has a tendency to leave the organized work of established boards and societies unsupported, and in the end it must *inevitably* work *harm* to the cause of missions as a whole.' The secretaries express concern that in some cases missionary societies of young people should not have yielded themselves 'to the methods and counsels of a church session or the recommendations of a Presbytery.'<sup>1</sup>

To this we add that this spirit of independent action has already begun to crop out among some who are members of a missionary society in one of our churches. We are not prophets, yet we hazard the prediction that, if present societies continue and others follow, the day will come when, if causes are left to their logical results, they will bring disaster to the church.

God has graciously guarded his people against the sin of presumption and will worship. "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it. Thou shalt not add thereto nor diminish from it." Says Dr. Thornwell, "The great error of the church in all ages, the fruitful source of her apostasy and crime, has been a presumptuous reliance upon her own understanding." This restraint which God has thrown around his people—this unquestioning, silent submission to his authority—this keeping within his prescribed bounds of worship and service is a part of the *discipline* which tends to the perfecting of the saints, and no scheme should be adopted that tends to relax this discipline. Accommodating to these missionary societies words which Dr. Thornwell used with reference to the Boards, we commend them to the consideration of our brethren. "It certainly rests on those who maintain and uphold them to produce the warrant by which they have been formed. No system of measures so important in its results, so solemn in its bearings upon the kingdom of Christ, should be adopted by any denomination of Christians without the clear and unambiguous sanction of him who alone is King upon the holy hill of Zion." (*Col. Writings*, Vol. iv., p. 164.) If these missionary societies

<sup>1</sup> The italics in the above quotations are ours.

are the most effective agencies for promoting the cause of missions among our people, it is indeed remarkable that the fact is of but recent discovery, since our Saviour constituted his church with a special reference to missionary work more than eighteen centuries ago.

If it be said by way of apology for human expedients in the worship and work of God, that the church must keep pace with the spirit and progress of the age, we reply—she needs not to go to the world for impulse and instruction. She herself is the grand educator. Her principles are not born of the wisdom and unbelief of an apostate race, but take their rise in the eternal truth of God. Her mission is to redeem and elevate, and to assimilate to her own spirit and institutions. Her divine organization changes not. She is constituted for all time, and for all the changes of society and government. She is expansive, but not flexible. She grows and spreads, but bends not, like a shaken reed, to the opinions and praise of men. Those who are to be redeemed are the same in every age, and the redemptive agency is ever the same.

We quote once more from that great expounder of the church's principles, Dr. Thornwell:

“I wish every church member to feel that, by the fact of his being a member of the church, he is a member of a missionary society, and that the privilege of membership is bought with Christ's blood, not with money, and that he owes the duty of a member. The Presbyterian Church is a *Board of Missions, of Education*, and of every other effort that the church ought to undertake; and to lose sight of that idea, or hide it from the people, is to diminish in their minds the sense of responsibility to labor. It is clear, therefore, that to the extent to which we recognize the propriety of organizing missionary societies without the church, we propagate the notion amongst the people, that a man may be a Christian, and yet not a member of a missionary society.” (*Col. Writings*, Vol. iv., p. 237.)

The natural and logical trend of these missionary societies is to combine in Presbyterian Unions. We ask brethren to pause before committing the church to an arrangement which may produce evil that no human foresight can now determine, and no human skill can remedy.

A Presbyterian Union has already been formed in each of two of our Presbyteries. For information touching them, we refer our readers to *The Missionary*, (March and April, 1889.)

Without entering here into a discussion of constitutional questions, which might embarrass Presbyteries in accommodating

themselves to the proposals of a body thus constituted, so far as to assume "the care and direction thereof," approve or disapprove alterations in its constitution, receive from it "an annual report" and "account," we suggest, whether in the execution of its "object," "purpose," and "endeavor," this Presbyterial Union is not presumptuously intruding on the domain of the organized church. It proposes also "to carry on its work through the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions of the Southern Presbyterian Church," and provides that "the treasurer shall receive all money sent by the *several societies*, and *transmit* [italics ours], the same to the Treasurer of the Committee of Foreign Missions."

The President of this East Hanover Union says, "I do not see that the time has yet come, if, indeed, it ever does, for us to extend to general, or even Synodical organizations." What will hinder? Will not the motives, aims, and principles which combine individuals in Presbyterial Unions, logically press them into Synodical and Ecumenic conventions? We have no promise nor assurance that these organizations will not, as their territory expands and their numbers increase, assume to themselves other aims and objects than the original one, and in time establish religious periodicals, and executive committees, send forth missionary laborers and female lecturers at their own expense and under their exclusive control, and resolve themselves into religious bodies independent of all ecclesiastical care and direction. Who, that will not shut his eyes to the shadows which coming events cast before, can fail to see *our* women occupying before the church and the world positions of public prominence far removed from the modest sphere which God and nature have assigned them! If along with the women's missionary societies, the men's missionary societies combine in still larger and widely extended bodies, assuming churchly functions and work, no one can estimate beforehand the evils and disasters which await the church.

If the church has adopted, and is inclined to continue to adopt, a false and perilous system of work, if she is called to protect herself against impending dangers, wherein lies her remedy? Let us suggest that our church courts must act. As faithful shepherds they must care for and defend the flock. They should condemn

and discountenance any movement that would rob Christ of his kingly authority and alienate his people from the church. By the faithful and diligent use of Christ's own divine ordinances and agencies let them *educate their people to see and feel that none others are needed for doing the church's work.*

In our remarks thus far, we have not antagonized some of the widely extended associations of the day. In presenting the testimony of a prominent pastor in one of our town churches, it will be necessary to refer to the Young Men's Christian Association. The pastor just referred to, having carefully studied the workings of the Young Men's Christian Association, came to the deliberate conclusion that the duties performed by it were the very same that the church in her organized capacity ought to perform. He therefore began to study out a plan by which the *church* could perform those duties. After much thought and prayer, he elaborated a "plan of church work," which was adopted by the session, and put into operation at a joint meeting of the elders and deacons. This plan has been in operation for a year and a half, and is becoming more and more efficiently worked as the months go by. This "plan" divides the territory and membership into wards, each with its committee, proposes a multiplicity of objects of church work, and contemplates that all the members shall be workers.

The Lord Jesus will honor and bless his own ordinances and agencies. Let us emphasize the great truth that the gospel of God is his own grand instrumentality for the redemption of a lost world; it is truly the power of God. The simple, unpretentious ordinances which embody its spirit may seem foolishness to the unbelieving, but they are mighty through God to the conquest of a lost world. It has been said, "nothing is more certain than if the pulpit supports its true character and answers its peculiar ends every other beneficent institution will flourish. The first and main thing is to keep the pulpit in its right place and at its right work. Other instrumentalities will take its tone and diffuse its spirit. The pulpit is God's chosen means to communicate religious thought and impulse to the world. To it we must look for the life of all divine benevolence; it is the fountain, and all other agencies are but reservoirs."

B. L. BEALL.

## V. THE TITHE SYSTEM.

THE methods of supporting the Christian church have been reduced to three: (1), Voluntary offerings; (2), Competent maintenance; and (3), Tithes and offerings.

The theory of *voluntary offerings* apparently construes the church of Christ as a dependent, and conditions its existence and prosperity upon the largeheartedness and benevolence of its friends. But the church of Christ is the most magnificent creation of God in the earth. It is a spiritual kingdom, which is in the world, but not of the world. It has Jesus Christ, "the Wonderful, the Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace," as its crowned and sceptred Potentate. It has a mediatorial throne, which can command, for ecclesiastical purposes, the throne of nature and the throne of grace. It has the honest promise of the Almighty God that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. Upon its stability, progress, and final triumph depend the salvation of the elect, the honor of Christ, and the glory of God. Now, to condition these guaranteed results, which are to both God and man of such vast significance, upon the caprices of popular charity, demands the clearest proof to save it from being preposterous. Is the church of Christ, as dear to him as the apple of his eye, in the establishment of which the Triune God took formal counsel, and which is solemnly charged with the evangelization of the world, to be viewed as a penniless beggar, sitting by the wayside, asking an alms of the passer-by, and thankfully receiving every pittance that may be cast into its empty palm? If its Divine Lord has created it under these humiliating conditions and required it thus to plead for its life, we shall humbly bow to his most holy will, while we wonder that the successor to *David's* throne should make fickle charity the financial principle of his magnificent government; and our wonder will be the more increased when we understand that the very Head of this glorious kingdom has announced this as one of the principles of his admin-

istration, "The laborer is worthy of his hire." The theory of almsgiving changes this maxim of Christ into, "The laborer is worthy of *charity*." To our view, the change dooms the theory, and with the pernicious theory goes all of that offensive phraseology which stigmatizes and embarrasses ministers and church workers with the epithet of *beggars* as often as they are compelled to appeal for money. Nor will this representation of this voluntary system be affected by the consideration that the church is superlatively deserving of all it receives, for in that case the contributions would be but a charity worthily bestowed. Nor will this representation of the free-will system be affected by the consideration that Christ has commanded these offerings, for in that case the offerings are but a charity commanded.

The theory of *competent maintenance* is the theory of the Church of Rome, and is to be seriously suspected on account of its friend. According to it, the church does not depend upon charity for its necessary revenue, but possesses a divine right to so much of the people's property as is needed to afford the church a competent maintenance while it is fulfilling its mission in the world. Rome itself is the judge of the amount required to make a competent maintenance, and if this amount is not voluntarily surrendered, ecclesiastical authority may collect it by anathema or civil power. But this theory puts the people's property where the Romish system puts the people themselves—in the hands of Rome—and right faithfully has the apostasy applied the theory to fleece the people! Under this system, to corrupt the church, is to make it an organized power of extortion. It is biblically obvious that God never thus placed his people's property at the mercy of ecclesiastics.

The other theory is that of *tithes and offerings*, which we know, beyond all doubt, at least once had God's approval. This theory, on the one hand, insures the church of Christ against the contingencies of a pauper's support, and, on the other, it protects the people against the exorbitance of a selfish priesthood.

These are the three initial methods of church support. Under the first, Protestants are *begging*; under the second, Romanists are *extorting*; under the third, the church once *thrived*.

That the church of Christ has a divine right to a support, and that every individual is bound to contribute to that support, all men admit. But the vexatious question is, *How much?* Tender consciences ask the question. Men who desire to come up to the full measure of duty ask it. Men who hear burning appeals from the pulpit—appeals that are made to their love for God and man, to their consciences, to the languishing causes of benevolence—ask it. The theory of voluntary contributions refers it to the judgment of the *individual* alone, and answers, As much as you feel inclined to bestow upon your Lord. The theory of competent maintenance refers it to the judgment of the *church*, and answers, As much as the ecclesiastics exact. The theory of tithes refers it to the judgment of *God*, and answers, At least one-tenth of the increase. The tithe system has at least the safest tribunal.

Under Moses the tithe system received three special modifications to adapt it to the peculiar features of that economy of which he was, under God, the instrumentary founder. To advocate any of these special features of the system would be to Judaize. But to advocate that *substantial* part of the system which is adapted to the essential and permanent features of all ecclesiasticism, and which is older than Mosaism, and which survives the accidental modifications of all dispensations, is not to Judaize, but to advocate that which is not distinctively Judaic. *We contend for no distinctive Mosaic features of the system.*

Moses ordained three tithes. (1), The Levitical tithe, which was designed to support the tribe of Levi.<sup>1</sup> (2), The Sanctuary tithe, which was laid up at home, and designed to defray the expenses of the family in attending the three annual feasts of the Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. Having ordained the feasts, God further ordained this second tithe as expense-money, that all might be left without excuse in this matter.<sup>2</sup> (3), The Poor tithe, which was laid up at home twice in seven years, and disbursed at discretion as charity.<sup>3</sup> The *third* was a special Mosaic arrangement, and has disappeared with the temporary elements of that dispensation; the principle of charitableness remains, but we do

---

<sup>1</sup> Num. xviii. 20-24. <sup>2</sup> Deut. xiv. 23-27; xii. 5-22. <sup>3</sup> Deut. xiv. 28, 29; xxvi. 12-15.



not find that any other biblical writers besides Moses prescribed this method of practicing this grace, and so we make no contention for it. The *second* was the festival tithe, and as the gospel has dispensed with these festivals, the very reason for its existence has disappeared. The special Mosaic feature in the *first* tithe was *its exclusive assignation to the tribe of Levi*; and, as the gospel has dispensed with the Levitical priesthood, this feature of the first tithe has also passed away. All the duties of public religion were assigned to the tribe of Levi, hence the propriety of assigning all the ecclesiastical revenue to this tribe. But under the gospel, ministers have not succeeded to all the functions of this tribe, that is, they are not exclusively charged with *all* the duties of religion; hence they cannot properly succeed to all the revenue raised by tithing. The comparison fully drawn up is as follows: Under the Old Testament all tithes were designed as a revenue to support God's kingdom, and as under Moses the Levites were the only officers of that spiritual kingdom, they received the tithes and disbursed them in the discharge of their duties; so under the New Testament all tithes are designed as a revenue to defray the expenses of God's kingdom in the world, but, as preachers are not the only workers entitled to remuneration, they do not receive all the tithes. Under both Testaments the purpose of tithes is the same, namely, to defray the legitimate expenses of God's kingdom in this world. But if at any time, and for any reason, tithes should be inadequate to meet the expenses of this kingdom, economically administered, God's people are required to make free-will offerings, measuring these offerings by the emergency of the cause, their ability to make contributions, and their love for their Master. The amount of such offerings is to be defined by the discretion and love of the individual.

But the inherent justice of the tithe system has been assailed in these words: "The tithe, or any other fixed, arbitrary proportion or percentage, *would be unequal*, and, therefore, *unjust in its operation* on different individuals, *and on the same individual at different times.*"<sup>1</sup> If this allegation be true, we are estopped from writing another word in favor of a system which is inherently against

<sup>1</sup> *Christian Observer*, Sept. 4, 1889.

God's nature, and by the prescription of which the church would wrong its members. We lay down the following propositions as proof of the fact that the tithe system does not intrinsically and necessarily contravene the principles of unchangeable righteousness:

1. God is the absolute owner of the land, and as such is fairly entitled to exact rent of all its occupants. Man, on the other hand, is, under God, a tenant of the soil (all men directly or indirectly draw their living from the land), and as such is under a righteous obligation to pay rent if the land-owner charges it.

2. God is the absolute ruler of the world and all them that dwell therein, and as such he has a right to levy and collect a tax for the support of that government which he has founded and administers in the interest of his subjects. Men, on the other hand, are not sovereigns, but subjects and beneficiaries of God's government, and as such they are under a righteous obligation to pay the tax which the throne assesses. At least this must be admitted as long as men administer their civil governments.

3. Since God is the owner of "the world and the fulness thereof," it follows that all that men call their own is theirs by divine gift, or by divine loan. If property is man's by divine gift, the giver had the right to impose conditions and make reservations; if a loan, he had the right to require interest of the borrowers. The equity of this proposition will endure as long as the present views of the world may last.

4. As a matter of fact, God was the author of this system under the Mosaic economy; but if it had been inherently unjust and unequal, *God* could not have been its author under any economy.

5. The tithe law and the Sabbath law are analogues. If one is unequal and unjust because it fixes a definite proportion of one's substance, the other must be unequal and unjust because it fixes a definite proportion of one's time. No other conclusion can follow.

Now, with a feeling that the tithe system is not barred by its intrinsic nature, we turn away from all preliminary questions to the argument for the perpetuity of the *substantial part* of the system; and that argument will endeavor to show that this has been God's system under all dispensations and at all periods of

the church's history—that it has been in all ages God's uniform method of raising the revenue necessary for the administration of his kingdom on earth.

I. *The tithe system was in force under the Patriarchal dispensation, and dates back in antiquity to the flood, and probably to Adam himself.*

When Abraham returned from the slaughter of Chedorlaomer and his allies at Shaveh, "Melchizedek, King of Salem, brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most high God. And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth; and blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand. And he gave him tithes of all."<sup>1</sup> We invite attention to the following comments upon this case:

1. Abraham recognized an old custom, and did not initiate a new one. This is seen "between the lines" in the whole record of the case, and in the very form of the language. "And he (Abraham) gave him (Melchizedek) tithes of all." From a literary point of view, such a statement would be shockingly abrupt if there had been no precedent custom of tithe paying.

2. Whoever this Melchizedek was, historically considered, he was unmistakably a "priest of the most high God," and Abraham was a worshipper of the God whose priest Melchizedek was. Abraham having taken spoils in his conquest of the kings of the valley, gave a tithe of them to Melchizedek. Why? Was it because Melchizedek had been engaged in the battle, and the tenth was his earned proportion of the booty? The record does not remotely hint such a thing. Was it because Abraham and Melchizedek were personal friends, and the tenth was a present from friend to friend? There is no intimation that the two had ever met before. Was it because Melchizedek was the priest of the most high God, upon whose altar Abraham laid the tenth as an offering in obedience to a recognized and standing custom of the religion of the day? One cannot read Genesis and Hebrews without feeling the need of ingenious argument to deliver his mind from this impression.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xiv. 17-24; Heb. vii. 1-10.

3. Melchizedek was not only a priest, but he was also a type of Christ;<sup>1</sup> and at the time of this tithing Abraham had the Israelitish race in his loins. If the church under the typical dispensation paid tithes to the typical priest, the church under the antitypical dispensation ought to pay tithes to the antitypical priest, unless divine authority has changed the economy; and the *onus probandi* of such a change devolves upon those who deny the present binding force of tithes. At any rate, the church under the economy of types recognized the tithe system four centuries before Moses was born.

Again, the antiquity of the tithe system is proved by the fact that Jacob, centuries before Israel ever camped at the base of Sinai, vowed that he would give God the tenth if he would prosper him; a duty which he seems to have been neglecting in his greed for wealth. "Of all thou shalt give me, I will surely give the tenth unto thee."<sup>2</sup> "The question has been raised, to whom Jacob, when making his vow, meant to *pay tithes* from all those things which he owed to the protection and blessing of God. By the law tithes were given to the priests, and through them to God. But as in the family of the patriarchs there was no special priesthood, but themselves discharged such duties, this circumstance has been deemed an objection to the authenticity of the narrative. . . We rather suppose that the words imply that he meant therewith to erect the promised house of God, to preserve and maintain it, and to discharge the expenses of the worship connected with the worship there."<sup>3</sup> The incident at least proves this much: There was a worship in those early days, and it was sustained by tithes.

Again, the testimonies may be multiplied almost indefinitely to prove the antiquity and universality of this custom of sustaining religion by tithes.

Keil and Delitzsch: "Giving the tenth was the practical acknowledgment of the divine priesthood of Melchizedek; for the tenth was, *according to the general custom*, the offering presented to the Deity."<sup>4</sup>

Hengstenberg: "The offering of tithes belonged to the external

<sup>1</sup> Heb. vii. 1-11.    <sup>2</sup> Gen. xxviii. 22.    <sup>3</sup> Kurtz: *Hist. Old Cov.*, Vol. I., p. 311.

<sup>4</sup> On Gen. xiv. 17-24.

worship of God. That these, if not prevailing before the Mosaic time, did at least exist, is evident not merely from the circumstance that Jacob made a vow to give them to God, but also because Moses, in his regulations respecting the second tithes, speaks of them as already customary before his time. . . . Clearly, therefore, they were not established by Moses, but only recognized. . . . What had originally been a voluntary act of love to individuals, had by degrees become an established custom.”<sup>1</sup>

Encyclopedia Britannica: “This precept, written down in the seventh century B. C., is plainly no innovation, but rests on older usage. (Gen. xxviii. 22; Amos iv. 4.) . . . But however inexactly it may often have been paid, the proportion of one part in ten seems to have been accepted in many ancient nations as the normal measure of sacred tribute paid from the gains of husbandry, trade, or even war.”<sup>2</sup>

American Cyclopaedia: “This tax seems to have been of patriarchal origin, and existed in many of the nations of antiquity.”<sup>3</sup>

Cruden: “The most barbarous nations, and the heathen Greeks and Romans, out of a principle of religion common to all men, have often dedicated their tithes to their gods. Some have made it a standing obligation, others have done it upon particular occasions, and by the impulse of a transient devotion. Laertius says, that when Pisistratus, tyrant of Athens, wrote to Solon, to persuade him to return to Athens, he tells him, ‘that every one there pays the tithe of his goods for the offering of sacrifices to the gods.’ Pliny says, that the Arabian merchants who trade in spices durst not sell any till they had paid the tenth to their god Sabis. And Plutarch, in more places than one, mentions a custom of the Romans, of offering to Hercules the tithe of what they took from their enemies.”<sup>4</sup>

The Presbytery of Charleston at its spring session, in 1889, had a report on the subject of tithes from a committee which it had previously appointed to investigate the subject. It cites a great many authorities for the position that the tithe system was far older than Moses, and was practiced by almost every nation of antiquity in support of their religions. We quote the conclusion

<sup>1</sup> *Kingdom of God*, Vol. I., p. 231.    <sup>2</sup> *Art. Tithes*.    <sup>3</sup> *Art. on Tithes*.

<sup>4</sup> *Concordance: Tithe*.

of that report, which was written by Rev. G. A. Blackburn, of Columbia, S. C., with regret that our lack of space compels us to condense what it says:

“From the citations above, it appears that tithes were anciently paid by nearly all the world. In considering these proofs, several things worthy of consideration are presented:

“1. That all the nations of the earth gave to their gods according to a fixed proportion, and that, too, when there seems to be no reason why men should give in proportion, rather than in amounts, without regard to proportion. . . .

“2. That they all gave in the same proportion—the tenth—a proportion which has nothing peculiar or striking about it that would cause men to select it, rather than a fifth or twentieth. . . .

“3. That heathen peoples maintained for centuries an ordinance which continually operated against the covetousness and selfishness of the human heart. . . .

“4. That the origin of the tithe among the heathen antedates the earliest human history; history finds tithing not only existing, but existing as a venerable custom. The Greek writers claim that it was practiced in their country B. C. 1500. The Romans say they had it B. C. 1200. It was certainly an ancient custom in Phœnicia B. C. 946. . . .

“5. That the ancients understood the tithe to be of divine appointment; they claim to have received it from their gods. . . .

“The question now recurs, Whence came this custom? To suppose that so many nations, so widely scattered, all happened to give in proportion, and all happened to hit upon the same proportion, when there was nothing in the nature of the case to lead them to select it, is a supposition too violent for belief. To say they borrowed it from the Jews would be equally absurd, because the heathen were acquainted with the tithe before the world began to feel the influence of the Jewish economy. . . .

“We are then forced, in order to find the origin of tithes, to go back to some period when all the nations could have derived it from one source. No such period can be found since the confusion of tongues at Babel. And as the descendants of Shem, Ham and Japheth all alike paid tithes, we cannot reasonably suppose the custom to have been originated later than Noah.”

We now supplement the report's reasoning with this: Abraham certainly paid tithes, not as one who inaugurated a custom, but as one who recognized an existing institution. Abraham was born 1946 after the creation of the world, and Noah died in 2066 after the creation; these two were contemporaries one hundred and twenty years. Noah and Methuselah were contemporaries six hundred years beyond the flood. And Methuselah and Adam were contemporaries two hundred and forty-three years. Abraham to Noah to Methuselah to Adam—it is very probable that the custom of giving one-tenth of the increase is as hoary as the custom of giving one-seventh of the time.

II. *The tithe system prevailed under the Mosaic dispensation, and did not pass away with the distinctive and special features of that economy.*

That the system prevailed from Moses to Malachi needs no proof, because it is universally confessed; but that it vanished with that economy many allege, and argument to the contrary must be made.

1. That system, which was operated by Abraham more than four hundred years before the Exodus, cannot be Mosaic in its origin; cannot be a special feature of the Jewish dispensation; cannot have faded away merely because that economy has changed. The *Mosaic modifications* of the system have become extinct; but it is grossly illegitimate to reason that the system itself, which was not Mosaic, disappeared, *ipso facto*, because Mosaism disappeared. Moses received the sabbatic law from the patriarchs, and gave it special determinations under his administration. So did he with the law of the tithe. The argument that carries away the tithe system in the wreck of Mosaism carries down the Sabbath law also. They are exact analogues.

2. The tithe system was not a creation of Jewish civil law, so as to end with the ending of that form of government, because it was not enacted by Moses as a civil lawgiver;<sup>1</sup> because it was not operated to raise a civil revenue;<sup>2</sup> because its income was paid to the Levites as compensation for religious service;<sup>3</sup> because God challenged the proceeds of the system as holy unto himself;<sup>4</sup> because the civil government did not force the payment of tithes.

3. The system was not a creation of Jewish ceremonialism, so as to pass away with the temporary forms of that economy: (1), Because it antedated all Jewish ritualism. (2), Because no provision was made for purging away any ceremonial uncleanness that might be contracted by the non-payment of tithes. The guilt was moral.<sup>5</sup> (3), Because there was nothing in the gospel typified by tithes under the law. Everything that belonged to the ritual was typical. If tithes were typical of Christian liberality, the antitype ought at least to match the type.

<sup>1</sup> Num. xviii. 20-24.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Sam. viii. 10-18.

<sup>3</sup> Num. xviii. 20-24.

<sup>4</sup> Lev. xxvii. 30.

<sup>5</sup> Mal. iii. 8.

4. It could not have passed away as a positive institute created for the occasion of that dispensation: (1), Because it was not instituted for the emergencies of that special time; (2), Because the occasion exists to-day which existed then, namely, the support of religion.

5. The tithe system was applied to sustain the worship of the synagogue. "After the exile, these prescripts (tithes), as the Mosaic law in general, were enforced with the greatest strictness, and from the synagogue the whole arrangement (of tithing) was transferred to the church."<sup>1</sup> "Erected out of the common funds or free-gifts of the community, it had also to be supported by taxes and donations."<sup>2</sup> "It is, moreover, well known that the early Christian churches were entirely organized after the pattern of the synagogues."<sup>3</sup> The synagogues were perhaps coëval with the temple, but in a more crude and unpretentious form than they assumed after the Babylonish exile under Ezra and Nehemiah. These men were inspired. They did not dare to transfer any part of worship which was distinctive of the temple to the synagogue; but the tithe system was applied to support the synagogue worship, and was therefore general to religion and not special and temporary.

6. It is an indisputable principle of jurisprudence that a law, once having been enacted, abides in force until it expires by limitation, by repeal, or is in some way legislated out of existence. The tithe law was once on the divine statute-book. That all confess. It has not expired by limitation, for there is as much occasion for the law to-day as when it was first formed. If it has been repealed, where is the annulling act? If it has been legislated out of existence, where is the legislation? The burden of proof is on those who deny that it is binding to-day.

Our argument has brought us down to the New Testament, over a period of four thousand years, and we have found that during those centuries the tithe system was the system of God. It now carries the weight of a venerable presumption for all future time.

III. *The tithe system was endorsed by Christ and his apostles in the New Testament.*

<sup>1</sup> Schaff-Herzog Ency., *Tithes*.

<sup>2</sup> Internat. Cyclo., *Synagogue*.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*



1. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! ye pay tithes of mint, anise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone."<sup>1</sup> Luke uses parallel language.<sup>2</sup> In this passage our Lord does not pronounce a woe upon the scribes and Pharisees because of their strict observance of the tithe law, but because of their glaring neglect of the weightier matters of the moral and religious law of God. They are not blamed for what they did, but for what they did not do. "They did right to pay tithes to the utmost. But, with all this attention to smallest matters, they neglected things of more importance."<sup>3</sup> "In conclusion, it may be remarked that the Lord did not repudiate the exact observance of the precepts of the law. In harmony with Matt. v. 19, the Saviour approves of the careful fulfilment even of those commandments in the Old Testament which appear unimportant."<sup>4</sup> "That there might be no misunderstanding, as if he meant to say faithfulness in *little things* is not necessary, Christ has put between these sayings these words: *These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.*"<sup>5</sup> "What you *have neglected* you ought to have *done*, and at the same time not *have neglected* what you are in *the habit of doing*, the former being of paramount importance; the subordinate matter, viz., your painful attention to tithes, is not superseded by the higher duties, but only kept in its proper place."<sup>6</sup> Thus it is perfectly clear that the tithe system received the endorsement of Christ.

But it will be objected that it received his endorsement for the scribes and Pharisees and all who lived under the Mosaic economy. But lay by the side of the "woe unto you scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites!" this tremendous utterance of the Sermon on the Mount: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxiii. 23.<sup>2</sup> Luke xi. 42.<sup>3</sup> Jacobus, *in loc.*<sup>4</sup> Olshausen, *in loc.*<sup>5</sup> Stier, *in loc.*<sup>6</sup> Meyer, *in loc.*

teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say unto you, That except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven."<sup>1</sup> If this passage does not fortify and perpetuate that tithe law which Christ approved, it must be for some one of the following reasons: because it was a mere accidental of the Jewish economy, or because it was a feature of the Jewish ceremonialism, or because it was a positive institute of the Jewish polity, or because it has been "fulfilled." But if the foregoing argument has any validity and consistency, it has been proved that the tithe system was in no way distinctively *Jewish*; and to affirm that it has been "fulfilled" is to affirm that the church to-day has no need of a revenue.

But it may be alleged that the passage in Matt. v. 17-19 has reference alone to the precepts in the moral law and to the doctrines in the prophets, and as the tithe law is a positive precept, this passage is not pertinent. In reply, we affirm that, just as the sabbatic law is a positive-moral precept, so the tithe law is a positive-moral precept; and if the passage is available for service in the Sabbath contest, it is likewise available in the tithe contest.

But further, when Christ came in contact with the popular views concerning the law of murder, the law of divorce, the law of swearing, the law of retaliation, the law of good neighborhood, all of which he treated in this sermon, he promptly corrected them and vigorously expressed his disapproval; but when he encountered the law of the tithe, he as promptly put his endorsement upon it: "*These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.*"

Again, if our Lord did not intend by these words, "these ought ye to have done," to fix the tenth as the minimum of Christian liberality, then what did he mean? Did he use this language to enhance his indictment of the hypocritical scribes and Pharisees? That cannot be, because it is the language of commendation. Did he mean to tell his hearers that it was their duty to observe this Mosaic law? No, because this was the very point upon which

---

<sup>1</sup> Matt. v. 17-19.

they stickled. Did he mean to admit that the scribes and Pharisees were right in their tithe-paying? Of course; but does this exhaust the meaning? If so, it is wonderful that he did not so much as hint here, or anywhere throughout all the history and teaching he left behind him, the new law of liberality which should supersede the old. Calvin's comment is: "*Tithes*, which Christ places inferior to *judgment* and *mercy*, were a part of divine worship"<sup>1</sup>—a permanent part, less significant than inward piety and the great matters of judgment, mercy and faith, but still important. The question of church support cannot rise paramount to the question of conversion, but it must be conceded its proper value.

2. "Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel."<sup>2</sup>

Rev. A. W. Miller, D. D., LL. D., in discussing this passage, says: "The altar had a large revenue. Tithes and other offerings belonged to it. And the priests did partake with it, did live of it, as a matter of right; else there had been no certain, settled maintenance. But there are no priests now under the New Testament. Hence the propriety of a New Testament statute for ministers of the gospel. And here we have the ordinance: The Lord hath ordained. What? That they who preach the gospel should live of the gospel. (*Ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*. 'Ex, from, out of, out of the gospel's treasury.) How? Even so—ὁῦτω—in the same way. *Ad hunc modum*.—(Scapula.) *Hoc modo, ad hunc modum, hac ratione*.—(Schleusner.) In the same manner, or like manner.—(Parkhurst.) In the same way that priests lived of the altar. What revenue, then, has the gospel? A revenue similar to that of the temple. Else it is not *even so*, as the apostle makes the comparison. But the revenue of the temple consisted, in the first place, of tithes, and, in the second place, of free-will offerings. Now, if the gospel has none but the last, how is it *even so* as the temple? If the priests of the temple were sure of a tenth, and much more, and the ministers of the gospel not sure of a hundredth or thousandth part, or of any part at all, how is their pro-

<sup>1</sup> *In loc.*

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14.

vision *even so* as that of the priests of the temple? Did the Lord *ordain* that every man should pay what he pleased? But law that imposes no obligation is not law. Then the *Lord's ordaining* amounts to nothing—as it has practically amounted to nothing in the case of hundreds of half-starved ministers of the gospel. The Lord, then, ordained tithes to the altar, and nothing to the gospel! How, then, did the Lord *ordain* a maintenance for the ministers of the gospel, *EVEN so* as for the ministers of the altar? There is no coherence, no comparison, no argument, no good sense, to be made out of this passage, unless we admit that the Lord has *ordained* tithes under the gospel as well as under the law. In the apostle's days there was no dispute as to whether tithes were to be paid. Nor could there be any at any time; for to Christ, the first after the order of Melchizedek, tithes were ever to be paid, for he ever liveth to receive them. The only dispute that could be was, to whom shall they be paid?"<sup>1</sup> This exposition is as lucid as it is masterly.

3. "And verily they that are the sons of Levi, who receive the office of the priesthood, have a commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though they come out of the loins of Abraham: but he whose descent is not counted from them received tithes of Abraham, and blessed him that had the promises. And without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better. And here men that die receive tithes; but there he receiveth them, of whom it is witnessed that he liveth."<sup>2</sup> "Melchizedek is shown to have been a representation of Christ. He was a prophet, for he saw that Abraham had the promises. He was also both a priest and a king, as the Scriptures affirm. His priesthood, like that of Christ, was without beginning or ending. Without doubt he was the most perfect image of the Son of God given in the Old Testament. Abraham is shown to have been the representative of the church. He is called the father of the faithful; he had the promises which belong to the church; and at that time he had in his loins the whole Jewish Church. These two representative characters meet. He who was the representation of Christ gave to Abraham bread and wine, and blessed

<sup>1</sup> *North Carolina Presbyterian*, July 13, 1887.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. vii. 5-8.

him. He who represented the church gave to Melchizedek tithes of all. Every point in this transaction has a meaning. It was a photograph of gospel times. Everything here affirmed of Melchizedek must be affirmed of Christ, and everything here affirmed of Abraham must be affirmed of the church; otherwise the representation is faulty, and the whole incident loses its significance. If, therefore, in anticipation, the church paid, and Christ received, tithes, now that Christ has come we cannot withhold them.

Again argues the apostle: The Levitical priesthood has passed away, having as a type been fulfilled in One who was after the order of Melchizedek. If, then, we say that the tithe which belonged to Levi has passed away, it will only establish the tithe which belongs to the priesthood of Melchizedek, for that priesthood still abides, and under it the worshipper paid tithes as well as under that of Levi. This also agrees with the words of the apostle: *And here men that die receive tithes, but there he receiveth them of whom it is witnessed that he liveth.* How does Melchizedek live and receive tithes except in Christ? The only answer to this question is that the priesthood of Melchizedek is here identified with the priesthood of Christ, and if Christ's priesthood was once a tithe-receiving priesthood, it is still a tithe-receiving priesthood, for it is an unchangeable one, seeing the priest ever liveth."<sup>1</sup>

4. Appeal is not unfrequently made, with great confidence, to 1 Cor. xvi. 2, as a passage furnishing the apostolic method of support and showing the abrogation of the tithe system. That verse reads: "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." But it is a canon of biblical hermeneutics, as it is indeed a law of universal interpretation, *that no passage shall be construed except in the light of its own context*; and an examination of the context of this text will show that Paul was providing for a special free-will offering for the poor saints at Jerusalem, and was not inaugurating a new system of ecclesiastical support. He was at Ephesus when he wrote this epistle, and on his way to Corinth.<sup>2</sup> At the very time of this tour the saints at

<sup>1</sup> Report to Charleston Presbytery, 1889. <sup>2</sup> Hodge: 1 Cor., Introduct., pp. 11, 12.

Jerusalem were suffering great hardships, and everywhere the apostle was raising funds for their relief.<sup>1</sup> "For some reason, not now to be certainly ascertained, poverty prevailed in Jerusalem among the believers more than in any other part of the church. Almost all the special exhortations to provide for the poor, in Paul's epistles, have primary reference to the poor in Jerusalem. He had exhorted the churches of Galatia to make a collection for their relief, and then those of Macedonia, and he now addresses the Corinthians on the subject. It is a very common opinion that the poverty of the Christians in Jerusalem arose from the community of goods introduced among them at the beginning, an error which arose from an excess of love over knowledge."<sup>2</sup> Departing from the Lord's system, in excess of zeal, they brought personal distress upon themselves, even as the departures from that system to-day, in excess of covetousness, has brought distress upon the church. But it is perfectly patent that in the passage under consideration the apostle was raising alms for an emergency, and not providing a perpetual precedent for all church support in its quiet and normal condition. (1), He distinctly specifies the object of the charity—*the poor saints at Jerusalem*.<sup>3</sup> (2), He as distinctly specifies his reason for having it laid up ready for him before he came—*that there be no gatherings when I come*.<sup>4</sup> He had a multitude of matters to attend to; he asked that this one be disposed of against his coming. (3), He distinctly notified them that what they gave would be carried to Jerusalem by himself, or men of their own appointment.<sup>5</sup> He asked them to contribute as liberally as their prosperity would allow. Now, the argument based upon this passage may be thrown into the following form: Whatever Paul ordered the Corinthian church to do on that occasion, the Christian church is directed to do to-day on similar occasions; Paul directed the Corinthian church to give alms to their poor brethren at Jerusalem, therefore the Christian church is directed to give alms to their brethren in times of suffering and emergency. But it is thoroughly illegitimate to reason from this *special collec-*

<sup>1</sup> Acts xix. 21; xxiv. 17; Rom. xv. 25, 26.

<sup>2</sup> Hodge: 1 Cor., p. 361.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. xvi. 3, 1.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Cor. xvi. 3, 4.

tion to meet an emergency to the settled financial policy of the church for its normal and stated wants.

Rev. John W. Pratt, D. D., says: "This passage has been grievously misunderstood and made to teach the propriety of Sunday morning collections in church for the support of the gospel, whereas it was Paul's direction how to provide in a special emergency alms for the suffering saints in Jerusalem, so as to avoid taking up a collection when he should come to preach to them."<sup>1</sup> "It is clear the whole passage teaches the duty of systematic laying aside of your earnings *at home* in order that you may be able to contribute to the poor saints as often as their necessities require, without resorting to collections in the church assemblies, when one would give by impulse, or caprice, or accident, or give nothing at all."<sup>2</sup>

#### IV. *The tithe system prevailed in the early Christian church.*

Bingham says: "It is generally agreed by learned men that the ancients accounted tithes to be due by divine right. Bellarmine, indeed, and Rivet, and Mr. Selden, place them upon another foot. But our learned Bishop Andrews and Bishop Carleton, who wrote before Mr. Selden, and Bishop Montague and Tillesly, who wrote in answer to him, not to mention many others who have written since, have clearly proved that the ancients believed the law about tithes not to be merely a ceremonial or political command, but of moral and perpetual obligation."<sup>3</sup> Bingham, in the chapter which he devotes to this subject, quotes as in favor of his view: Origen, A. D. 185; Jerome, A. D. 340; Augustine, A. D. 353; Chrysostom, A. D. 347. The report to Charleston Presbytery, already quoted, cites from Comber on Tithes the following: Irenæus, A. D. 115; Cyprian, A. D. 200; Ambrose, A. D. 340; Isidore of Pelusium, about A. D. 370; and the Councils of Tours, 567, Macon, 585, Rouen, 650, and Metz, 756.

The Encyclopedia Britannica: "Tithes were generally regarded up to the seventeenth century as existing, *jure divino*, and as having been payable to the support of the church ever since the earliest days of Christianity." And much that has been written against the tithe system has been written against it *as it was prac-*

<sup>1</sup> Sermons, p. 245.    <sup>2</sup> *Ibid*, p. 247.    <sup>3</sup> Christian Antiquities, Vol. II., pp. 176-182.

*ticed in the Middle and Dark Ages.* It was the civil enactments on the subject and the offensive tithing-man that stirred resistance and resentment. In every age of the church, the Mosaic not excepted, down to the Middle and Dark Ages, conscience and religion were the only tithe-collectors; and so should it always be. "Long before the eighth century payment of tithes was enjoined by ecclesiastical writers and by councils of the church; but the earliest authentic example of anything like a law of the state enforcing payment appears to occur in the Capitularies of Charlemagne at the end of the eighth or beginning of the ninth century."<sup>1</sup>

American Cyclopedica: "The early Christian church adopted voluntarily the custom of consecrating to religious purposes a tenth of the income, it being admitted that first-fruits and tithes were not of divine precept in the new law, but held that the obligation of supporting the ministers of religion is of divine origin;" that is, "the new law" did not give to the civil government any divine right to form and enforce any tithe laws.

International Cyclopedica: "This provision for the clergy passed at a very early period from the Jewish into the Christian church, and indeed the same or some analogous appropriation has been traced in the other ancient religions. . . . By some the claim was held to be of divine law; by others of human institution; but in the gradual progress of relaxation it came to pass that the right thus established solely for the church began to be usurped for themselves and for purely secular uses by nobles or other powerful laymen."

Dr. Otto Mejer, Professor of Canon Law in Göttingen, says in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia: "In the earliest times the Christian church was able to defray its expenses for liturgical purposes, for the care of the poor, etc., from the voluntary offerings of its members, consisting of wine, bread, oil, incense, and fruits. The Jewish custom of presenting first-fruit was very early adopted; and in the time of Tertullian (d. 215) contributions of money—monthly, annual or occasional—are mentioned. In the time of Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430), tithes began to be intro-

---

<sup>1</sup> Ency. Brit., Art. *Tithes*.



duced; and from the close of the seventh century they were quite generally established.”<sup>1</sup>

In these opinions the historians, Kurtz, Neander, Hallam, and Charles Hardiwick, concur.

Now, we make the following resumé of our argument: The tithe system prevailed, and those who practiced it were blessed of God, under the patriarchal dispensation; it was formally enacted, and those who practiced it were greatly blessed of God, under the Mosaic dispensation; it was carried over from the Old Testament by Christ and his apostles, and formally endorsed by them; it prevailed in the early Christian church, ere the pall of the Dark Ages had settled upon the world, and even through those ages it prevailed, greatly abused however; therefore it is not for the *progressiveness* of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to proscribe the system, and cause the church of Christ to take her seat upon the door-step as a dependent beggar, thankfully to receive such charity as men may be pleased to put in her empty palm!

While this article was in preparation, the following reasons against the tithe system appeared in the columns of a weekly journal. They outline the opposition argument: “1. There is no authority for it in the New Testament. 2. It violates Christian liberality. 3. There is not the least allusion to tithing in any of the New Testament passages on the duty of giving. 4. The origin and history of tithing in modern times are against it. 5. The scholarship of the church is against it. 6. The good sense of the church, as seen in her legislation, is against it. 7. The tithe, or any other fixed, arbitrary proportion or percentage, *would be unequal*, and therefore *unjust in its operation* on different individuals, and on the same individual at different times. 8. The arguments in support of the tithe as binding now, are all inconsequent. Each is a *non sequiter*. 9. The view that would enforce the law of the tithe as binding now is almost always held in connection with inadmissible and often whimsical interpretations of the sacred Scriptures, which would seem to discredit its advocates as teachers of the word of God, at least so far as tithing is concerned.”<sup>2</sup>

We are willing for the case to go to the jury—the church.

R. A. WEBB.

<sup>1</sup> Art., *Eccl. Taxation*. <sup>2</sup> *Christian Observer*, Sept 4, 11, 1889.

## VI. NOTES.

---

### THE REVISED DIRECTORY.

THE question of revising the Directory of Worship was broached by the General Assembly in 1864, but nothing was done in the matter until 1879, when it was entrusted to a committee consisting of Revs. J. B. Adger, D. D., B. M. Palmer, D. D., G. D. Armstrong, D. D., Stuart Robinson, D. D., T. E. Peck, D. D., James Woodrow, D. D., J. A. Lefevre, D. D., R. K. Smoot, D. D., and Messrs. Thomas Thomson and W. W. Henry. The draft of a new Directory was reported the next year, and ordered to be sent down to the Presbyteries for criticism. The revision was rewritten in 1881, and again referred to the Presbyteries. In 1882 the names of Drs. Girardeau and Boggs were added, and those of Drs. Robinson and Smoot and Mr. Thomson dropped, and the labor of revision proceeded. In 1885 the work was again laid before the Presbyteries. These courts approved the Directory, but recommended a continuance of the work; and in 1886 a new committee was formed, consisting of Rev. Drs. Hoge, Witherspoon, J. Henry Smith, and Armstrong, and W. W. Henry, Esq.

In the hands of this last committee the work of revision has been brought to a sufficiently perfect state for it to be approved by the General Assembly, and by that body to be laid before the Presbyteries for their adoption or rejection, by a vote of *yes* or *no*.

As this "Revised Directory for Worship" is formally before the Presbyteries to be voted upon, and if accepted by them, becomes a part of the constitution of the church, it will not be out of order to subject it to a little criticism; for to introduce any composition into the constitution of the Presbyterian Church is to place it on a very high plane of literary standing. The present work is a great improvement on the old Directory, and no doubt will be adopted either as it stands or with some modifications. Whether it is best just now to adopt it, or to wait until it can be a little more carefully chiselled out, is a question which the Presbyteries will have to decide before the next meeting of the General Assembly. If it should be necessary to postpone its final adoption for a short time, no important interest of the church would suffer, and there would be abundant compensation at the

end if the delay resulted in the improvement of the form and style of the work, and in making it, like the other parts of our constitution, a standard of which we might justly be proud.

It is well that on page 6 "the standing posture in public prayer" is recommended, because it is a scriptural, decorous and convenient one, and has the honor of having been the custom in Presbyterian churches of other days; but there is little probability of its being restored. It has gone or is going, and nearly all of our people sit during prayer, only showing their reverence by bending forward and leaning the head upon the back of a pew. There can be no question but that whereas standing is the Presbyterian posture, and ought to be maintained, sitting is not to be commended.

In the directions for the "prayer before sermon," ordinarily called the "long prayer," on page 7, where five paragraphs of subjects are given, the mere enumeration of which would constitute a rather lengthy orison, it would not have been amiss to insert a word of advice to the minister, that he should guard against becoming too lengthy.

On page 9 the number (6) in brackets ought to be 5 without brackets, and the numbering of the succeeding paragraphs of that page and the next should be changed accordingly, and read 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, instead of (7), (8), (9), (10), (11). This was an oversight merely on the part of the penman.

As the morning service for a Lord's day is so explicitly laid out, it would perhaps have been well to give some directions for the evening service also.

Under the head, "The Sabbath," page 11, where the study of the Scriptures and of the catechisms of the church is recommended, it would have been well to include also the "Confession of Faith."

It was with consternation that we read, on page 14, near the bottom, that "baptism is . . . the washing IN water!" This would give great satisfaction to our immersionist brethren; but let them not rejoice prematurely; we are not going over to their side; this was only a typographical error, and will be corrected.

In the same paragraph, continued on the next page, the phrase "*parties* baptized," might be improved to read, "*persons* baptized."

In giving directions, and most excellent ones, on page 18, for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, reference is made to certain well selected passages, one or more of which may be read as introductory to the ordinance. It would be a convenience to the officiating minister to have these scripture selections printed in full in the book.

In chapter V., section 1, page 22, copied from the old Directory, the rhetoric might be changed to advantage where it reads, "It is the indispensable duty of each person, *alone, in secret,* and of every family, *by itself, in private,* to *pray to and worship* God." It seems unnecessary to write, "*in secret*" after "*alone,*" and "*in private*" after "*by itself,*" and to put "*to pray to*" before "*and worship God.*"

It is a good suggestion, on page 23, that a person too diffident to pray extemporaneously may with perfect propriety "make use of a form of prayer."

On page 24 it is said, "Therefore *we* highly disapprove." Who are "*we*"? It might better read, "The paying of unnecessary private visits on the Lord's day *is* highly disapproved."

We now come to a feature of the Directory which is a real advance and improvement on what has gone before. There has long been a demand for a form of funeral service, not obligatory, but optional, to serve as a model, and to be used by laymen as well as ministers when occasion renders it necessary. Chapter VII., page 25, begins with an excellent series of directions for conducting a funeral. At the conclusion of this is appended "A Funeral Service." This form is, in the main, a good one, and the prayer at the end is of a very high order.

It does seem strange, however, that a funeral service should be prepared without the use of the whole or a large part of the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians. Of all things written about death in human and divine literature, this is the finest. It is the great Christian pean of victory over the tomb, and of the triumph in eternal life of the whole man, body and soul. It may be urged that this would not be appropriate to read in the obsequies of a man who died impenitent. Yes, but when a man departs in Christ, this ought to be used. Such embarrassment could be avoided, as is done in some liturgies, by having the opening sentences of such a general nature as would make it proper to use them on any occasion, and then for the body of the service to have a number of selections from which the minister could choose for each occasion. This would not only relieve the difficulty mentioned, but would also give variety.

This idea has been well carried out in the last revision of the Liturgy of the Reformed Church of France, which now lies on the writer's table. This work has recently been prepared by Rev. Eugène Bersier, D. D., of Paris, at the request of the General Synod of France, and has been sent down by that court to the "particular synods" for their adoption or rejection. The book is an admirable one, furnishing valu-

able forms for all public services. The funeral service begins with an extemporaneous invocation, followed by the reading of "All flesh is grass," &c. (Is. xl. 6-8.) If the service is at the house, it begins, "It is better to go to the house of mourning," &c. (Eccl. vii. 2.) Here follows a prayer of adoration and confession, drawn largely from the Scriptures. After the prayer, the minister says, "Let us hear the reading of some passages of God's Word." Then follow Psalms xc. 1-13; xxxix. 5-8 and 10-14, and cxxx. This constitutes that part of the service which is used on all occasions. There are then what are called the first, second, third, and fourth "*Series*," being four collections of passages, giving liberty of choice for any occasion. At the conclusion of this reading an opportunity is given for a funeral address if the minister desires to make one. A prayer comes next; then the minister says, "Why art thou cast down within me O my soul," &c. (Ps. xlii. 6), and gives out a hymn. The hymn is sung, the benediction pronounced, and the service at the house or church concludes with these words, "Go in peace, remember the poor, and may the God of peace be with you all. Amen."

The service at the grave is arranged on the same plan, giving opportunity for choice in a part of it, and ending with a prayer and benediction.

While we are referring to the French Liturgy, which is a remote descendant of one prepared by John Calvin, and which could be studied with profit by any minister, it will not be uninteresting to note that in ancient times in Reformed Churches of the continent, except in the Church of the Canton de Vaud, there were no funeral services; and in the Genevan Liturgy of to-day there is no provision made for the burial of the dead. Dr. Bersier, in a foot-note, quotes from chapter X. of "The Discipline," as follows: "There shall be neither prayer, preaching, nor public alms-giving, at interments, to avoid all superstitions." Dr. Bersier adds, "The result of this was that in countries where strictly Calvinistic traditions have prevailed, there have been at interments no religious services whatever. . . The use of religious services at funerals was only introduced into the Reformed Church of France, at the beginning of the present century." It is easy to see that this was an extreme reaction from the Romish superstitions in connection with burial.

The chapter on marriage in our new book partakes somewhat of the nature both of a directory and of a marriage service. It is a combination of the two things. The questions proposed to the bridegroom

and bride might be made to end with a more cheerful word than "death." How would "*as long as you both shall live*" answer? The preceding chapter on the burial of the dead contains a directory and a service. This chapter on marriage is almost a service. Would it not be just as well to have both of these simple directories, and place the *forms* of service for marriages and funerals in the appendix? If this book be accepted as it now stands, and the forms for marriage and funeral services ordered to be prepared by the committee be also adopted and added, we will find ourselves provided with a Directory containing two funeral services and one and a half for marriage.

There is no danger to be apprehended from the adoption of the proposed forms. Such a conservative and able committee as the one which has the work in hand could well be trusted to do nothing un-presbyterian. The church is practically unanimous as to the propriety of our having optional services for funerals and marriages, as it is also that we should have a form for the admission of members. It would be well to make the form for the baptism of infants a little more complete, and to place that, together with the others, in the appendix.

There seems to be every reason for our having well prepared, but optional, forms for funerals and marriages. It is evident, too, that the mind of the church is prepared for it. It is a question, however, whether it is wiser to adopt the revision in its present form, and then add an appendix in subsequent years, or to wait until it can be made as near perfect as possible before it becomes a part of the constitution of the Presbyterian Church.

ROBERT P. KERR.

---

### THE ORIGIN OF PSALM LXVIII.

It is an amusing conceit of the Jewish poet, Immanuel Romi, which represents King David as summoning before him in Hades the commentators upon the Psalms, that he may award the prize to the most successful; and then, when they eagerly rush forward with their commentaries, confounding their hopes by assigning them Psalm lxviii. as their task. But the Christian expositor of the psalm has a difficulty unknown to the Jewish, for, besides the inherent difficulties of the psalm itself, he must account for the Apostle Paul's unexpected application of it, as well as his alteration of its language. (Eph. iv. 8-10.)

And yet, is the poet right? Because subsequent generations find

difficulty in the interpretation of a writing, is there any reason to suppose that its author would recognize in it any peculiar difficulty? Does not our difficulty grow out of our ignorance of the circumstances under which it was composed, and the historical allusions that it contains, the knowledge of which made all perfectly plain to those for whose use it was composed, and would make all plain to us if we could find the key to unlock the whole? And in the case of this psalm, if we had the key that the inspired apostle must have had, is it not likely that his use of it would become equally as plain to us as the psalm itself?

It is because the writer believes that he has found such a key that he invites his readers to a discussion of the origin of this psalm. To put forth such a claim as this may seem presumptuous, in view of the vast array of learned research that has been expended upon it. But the question concerning a key is not, "Who found it?" but, "Does it fit?" Of that his readers must judge, but for himself he must say that, having found it when he was not searching for it, he applied it to the psalm, and it opened before him, revealing in the sphere of the typical, line for line and feature for feature, just that succession of events, just that combination of ideas, that in the epistle we find in the sphere of the antitype.

The modern critics of our psalm are divided into two principal classes. The more fashionable view at the present day is that which ignores the title לְדָוִד and assigns the psalm to a later date. Yet there are critics of the highest authority who maintain either its Davidic authorship or, at least, its composition in the Davidic age. Where the critics are divided we may, without entering into the discussion,<sup>1</sup> conclude that there is no convincing reason compelling us to accept the later date, and that we are free to accept the earlier date if we find independent reasons for so doing. This position is strengthened by the fact that the advocates of the later date differ very greatly among themselves, varying in the date they assign as widely as from the age of Hezekiah to that of the Maccabees.

Accepting the Davidic age for the date of the psalm, the next question that presents itself is the occasion of its composition.<sup>2</sup> Here,

---

<sup>1</sup> To do this would be merely to repeat Delitzsch and Perowne, who may be consulted with great advantage by the reader desiring to pursue this discussion.

<sup>2</sup> Into the question of authorship I shall not enter. For while the Davidic authorship will be assumed in accordance with the title, the argument would be in no way affected if it were composed by Asaph (as Delitzsch hints) under the direction of David.

again, we find two groups of interpreters—the one placing it among the processional hymns on the removal of the ark to Zion, and the other regarding it as a triumphal hymn in celebration of one or another of David's victories. With regard to the first view, while it unquestionably meets many of the requirements of the case, yet the psalm seems to regard God as already in his holy habitation (vs. 5), and the procession at the removal of the ark is described as a past event (vs. 24–27). If, on the other hand, it was a mere hymn of victory the prominence of the ark, and of the choice of Zion as God's dwelling-place, could hardly be accounted for. True, as we are reminded, the ark was taken to the field in the Syro-Ammonitic war (2 Sam. xi. 11,) and would be brought back in triumph with the spoils of war on the conclusion of the campaign (2 Sam. xii. 26–31); but the exalted strains of this psalm seem entirely out of proportion to the extent of this victory (especially in view of the painful events associated with the campaign); and the absence of all specific references to any of the persons, peoples or places involved in this war would be inexplicable in a psalm otherwise so graphic in its details. This last objection becomes more apparent by a comparison between our psalm and the song of Deborah (Judg. v.), which it so much resembles. Who could doubt after reading that song what victory it was intended to celebrate?

Is there any occasion in the life of David which would combine the elements found in these two hypotheses, which would call for a psalm that would be at once a pæan of victory and an outburst of praise for the ascent of the ark to Zion and Jehovah's choice of Zion as his permanent sanctuary? If such an occasion can be found, and if, while satisfying the conditions of the psalm, it should explain also the apostle's use of it, this psalm and the passage in Ephesians should no longer be numbered among the *cruces interpretum*. The writer believes that all these conditions are met in the occasion so graphically described in 1 Chron. xxviii. and xxix., when the spoils of war and the fruits of all David's victories were dedicated to God for the building of the temple. And the clue to this idea he finds in the last clause of the verse, that is acknowledged to be the core and heart of the psalm:

“Thou hast ascended to the height; thou hast led captive captivity;”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> At the risk of differing from the majority of the best critics, I retain this translation, as does the R. V. (though inserting the word *thy* rather unnecessarily). The fact that עָבְרִי is concrete, and construed as a cognate accusative in a prose passage like Num. xxi. 1, is not sufficient reason for so rendering in a highly poetic passage like this and Judges v. 12. In the latter passage the rendering *captives* seems to be



Thou hast taken gifts among men;<sup>1</sup>

Yea, even [among] the rebellious, *for the inhabiting of Jah Elohim.*"—vs. 18.

It is these last words, which have been found most difficult or most meaningless by commentators,<sup>2</sup> that the writer finds most full of meaning. While the critics contend over their connection and significance, and the expounders of the passage in Ephesians ignore them altogether (because not included in the apostle's quotation), taken in their most simple sense and natural connection, they contain the solution of the whole problem. *He has taken gifts, that he may dwell in them. The spoils of victory were for the building of his temple.*

---

excluded by the fact that none were taken—all were slain (Judges iv. 16). The idea seems to be the *reversal of captivity*, and it is so taken by some who render "thou hast led captives captive." So Briggs (*Messianic Prophecy*, p. 434,) speaks of the "train of *rescued captives*," and refers it to the return of Israel from exile. This idea, I submit, would never be suggested by the expression "led captives captive."

<sup>1</sup> "Among men," as the sphere in which the gifts were taken. The rendering of Luther and the A. V., as a dative, is an indefensible attempt to harmonize with Eph. iv. 8. Yet more unjustifiable is the attempt to read the doctrine of the incarnation into this passage by rendering "*in the [person of] man.*" The rendering "*of men*," as the material of which the gifts consisted, is forced and unnatural.

<sup>2</sup> It is not too much to say with Perowne (*Psalms, in loc.*) that (on the ordinary hypotheses) this clause, taken in the connection given, is meaningless, or, as he puts it, "stands very lamely," and it is just where we should expect a climax. Delitzsch (*Psalms, in loc.*) supplies "there" (*i. e.*, in Zion,) as in vs. 16, but the connection between the receiving of gifts and dwelling in Zion is not close enough for this to be the climax of such a passage. On the other hand, the supply "*among them*" of J. D. Michaelis (as cited by Perowne), in which he is followed by the Authorized Version and (substantially) by the Revised Version, while giving a good sense in itself, (he has received gifts among men and among the rebellious, as tokens of submission, that he may dwell among them,) ignores the idea that is evidently central, the choice of Zion as his dwelling-place. Perowne connects the last clause with אֵת־סוֹרְרִים, and renders, "Yea, even the rebellious, [shall be] for Jah God to dwell [among]"—a rendering open to the same objection. Briggs (*loc. cit.*) criticises this on grammatical grounds, and makes סוֹרְרִים the subject of the infinitive, rendering, "And even the rebellious are to dwell with Jah Elohim." Delitzsch regards this as grammatically admissible, but regards the expression as "too grand" to have the rebellious as its subject. In confirmation of this, note (*a*) that שָׁבַן has just been used with יְהוָה as subject in verse 16; (*b*) the original idea is that of *sinking* or *settling down*, so of the glory of Jehovah on Sinai (Ex. xxiv. 16), of the alighting of a dove (Psa. lv. 6; *Ileb.*, vs. 7), of the lying down (or crouching?) of an animal (Deut. xxxiii. 20); this idea, while appropriate for man's dwelling on the earth, or God's dwelling with man, is not appropriate for man's

For the development of this idea a brief historical summary may be useful. The tabernacle of Jehovah was now in Gibeon; how or under what circumstances it had been removed thither we are not informed. But the ark of the covenant had not been within it since it had been taken to the field in the days of Eli. After it had found rest in Kirjath-jearim it had remained undisturbed until it was removed by David, first to the house of Obed-edom, and then to the tent he had prepared for it on Mt. Zion. Asaph, with other Levites, was then appointed to minister before the ark in song and praise, while Zadok, with other priests and Levites, was to offer sacrifices on the brazen altar before the tabernacle in Gibeon. This divorce between the ark and the altar, so essentially connected in the Mosaic ritual, can only be understood when we remember how complete had been the prostration of the whole Mosaic system in the years of disorder that preceded this period, and that the arrangement of David was only temporary and provisional, looking to the complete restoration of the rites of the ceremonial law, when the ark should find a permanent abode in the temple that was to be built.

To this end all his arrangements are directed. The elaborate organization of the Levites was entirely beyond the present needs of the ministry before the ark, and was designed for the more complex requirements of the temple service. And among the officers thus appointed there were certain Levites whose duty it was to receive and have charge of all the treasures that were dedicated to Jehovah for the building of his temple, one officer having special charge of the dedicated spoils of war. (1 Chron. xxvi. 20-28.) David, having been forbidden to build the temple himself, gave himself zealously to the work of preparation; so that around the ark were collecting all those rich treasures that were to adorn the neighboring hill to which the ark was to be transferred, and with it all the associations, prerogatives and glory—yea, practically, the name itself—of Zion; associations, preroga-

---

dwelling with God; (c) usage is in the same direction; it is used of God inhabiting eternity, the lofty place and the humble (Isa. lvii. 15), the burning bush (Deut. xxxiii. 16), Jerusalem (Psa. cxxxv. 21), of his dwelling in the midst of his people (Ex. xxv. 8; xxix. 45; Zech. ii. 10, *Heb.* vs. 14); *cf.* also Rev. xxi. 3; where it is man dwelling with God, **יְשֵׁב** is used (Psa. ci. 6); (d) the term is specially appropriated to God in the derivations **פֶּשֶׁבַע**, *tabernacle* (*i. e.*, *the dwelling*), and the modern Hebrew **שְׂכִינָה**, *the* (Divine) *presence*. In addition to these reasons, verse 6 seems to show that the word "rebellious" is used of the obdurate enemies of Jehovah.

tives and glory that became irrevocably linked with the name of Zion by the sacred muse of David, so that when all that gave glory to Zion is removed to Moriah, the name is carried with it in the songs of Zion, and Zion becomes for ever the name of God's dwelling-place.<sup>1</sup>

In the last two chapters of First Chronicles we have a graphic account of David's last acts in connection with his preparation for the temple. He gathers to Jerusalem all the representative men of Israel (xxviii. 1), rehearses before them the history of his desire to build the temple, and God's command concerning it (vs. 2-7); exhorts the leaders and Solomon to be strong and carry out God's will (vs. 8-10); delivers to Solomon the pattern of the buildings, courts and vessels (vs. 11-19), and encourages him by showing the organization of the Levites and workmen that would be at his command (vs. 20, 21). Then, turning to the congregation, he reveals the great preparations he had been making, on account of the magnitude of the work and the youth of Solomon, the treasures he had dedicated out of the public resources (chiefly the spoils of war, cf. xviii. 1-13), and those he had given from his private store, calling upon the people to imitate his example (xxix. 1-5). To this the people respond willingly and joyously, and David pours out his heart in thanksgiving to God, and in prayers for the people and Solomon that they may carry on the work committed unto them (vs. 6-19). Then, at David's command, all the people worship God and offer sacrifices to Jehovah that day and the next, eating and drinking with joy and gladness before the Lord, and before dispersing re-anoint Solomon king and Zadok priest (vs. 20-23). Is it likely that a great national festival like this, the crowning event of David's reign, would be allowed to pass without a celebration of Jehovah's praise in sacred song? And what would be the theme of this song? In view of the present glory and prosperity of Israel, as manifested in the rich treasures that had been offered, the psalm would take the form of a thanksgiving to God as the source of this prosperity (cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 10-16), and might naturally touch upon the events of their history by

---

<sup>1</sup> It is evident that the tent for the ark was not pitched on the site afterwards chosen for the temple, for at this time the summit of Moriah was occupied by the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite. It is equally evident that it was placed in the "city of David" (1 Chron. xv. 1, 29, and xvi. 1), and that Zion and the city of David are identical (2 Sam. v. 7). The application of the name of Zion was naturally extended, so that the removal of the ark to Moriah was not regarded as a removal beyond the limits of Zion. But the effort made in Smith's Bible Dictionary (Art. *Jerusalem*) to show that Zion was strictly and originally the eastern hill (on which the temple stood) cannot be successful.

which he had led them into it. In view of the fact that these treasures were chiefly the spoils of war, it could hardly take any other form than that of a song of victory (cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 11, "the victory"); as the whole demonstration had reference to the settlement of Jehovah in his permanent abode, the choice of Zion must needs be a prominent idea in the psalm, in the expression of which we should naturally find allusion to the removal of the ark thither, seeing that it had been a great national festival calling for songs of praise at the time (cf. Ps. xxiv. and xlvii.), and remembered as ground of petition in after years (cf. Ps. cxxxii.); and finally, inasmuch as David was about to lay down the reins of government, and Solomon was young and inexperienced, there could not but be an anxious glance at the future, and a committal of all into the hands of God as the sole dependence of his people (cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 18, 19). All this we find in Psalm lxxviii., expressed under a figure in the highest degree striking and sublime. We may entitle the Psalm "Jehovah's triumphal march into his sanctuary."<sup>1</sup>

The psalmist begins with almost the very words used by Moses when the ark was lifted for the journeyings of Israel in the wilderness (Num. x. 35), and the idea contained in these words is expanded in the following lines (vs. 1-4). In the remainder of this stanza (vs. 5, 6), God is celebrated as the father and advocate of his widowed and orphaned people, bringing them forth from bondage into prosperity, leaving only the rebellious to perish in the desert.<sup>2</sup> The next stanza<sup>3</sup> (vs. 7-10), expands this idea by describing God's march through the wilderness before his people, the trembling of the earth at his tread, the refreshing of his weary and afflicted people by provision for their wants. The third stanza (vs. 11-14), describes the victorious entry into the land of promise, the women's songs of victory following immediately upon the Lord's word of command, by which their enemies are scattered and Israel brought out into the sunlight of prosperity and peace. The fourth stanza (vs. 15-18) describes God's choice and ascent of Zion; passing by the great and lofty mountains of Bashan, he chooses as his permanent abode the little hill of Zion, which thenceforth becomes the envy of the mountains of the earth; into the sanctuary the Lord enters with his innumerable chariots, the unseen defences of Israel. In invisible procession he has come with all his hosts from Sinai,<sup>4</sup> and has ascended with the ark to the height of Zion,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Briggs' *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 429.

<sup>2</sup> The historical standpoint of the psalmist is shown by the expression "in his holy habitation." The ark was already on Zion.

<sup>3</sup> Perowne's arrangement of the stanzas is adopted.

<sup>4</sup> I follow Perowne in the emendation of the text.

and having reversed the captivity of his people, he receives the spoils of his enemies for the building of his habitation.

At this point, the psalmist pauses to ascribe glory to God for his innumerable deliverances. He will not suffer the enemies of his people to escape by flight, and so continue their trespasses against them, but will bring them out from their fastnesses and deliver them over to their conquerors.<sup>1</sup> (Vs. 19-23.)

The sixth stanza (vs. 24-27) takes up again the subject of the ascent to Zion, and describes the visible<sup>2</sup> as the fourth stanza had described the invisible procession, giving a vivid description of the removal of the ark. The choice of Zion was no fiction of the poet, because men *had seen* the goings of God, Israel's King, into his sanctuary.

The seventh stanza (vs. 28-31) begins with an address to Solomon,<sup>3</sup> "Thy God has commanded thy strength," (cf. 1 Chron. xxviii. 20,) followed by the prayer, "Strengthen, O God, that which thou hast wrought for us," *i. e.*, "Bring to completion that which thou hast begun." The ark had found a resting-place, and the materials for building it a permanent habitation were provided; but the work of building was yet to be done. (Cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 19.) The prayer is followed by a glimpse of its fulfilment in the future—Zion crowned with the temple, and kings bringing presents because of it.<sup>4</sup> But that

<sup>1</sup> So Perowne, who refers to Amos ix. 1-3, as the true parallel.

<sup>2</sup> Perowne, *in loc.*

<sup>3</sup> Delitzsch, supposing this to be addressed to David, regards it as indicating another poet than David. The point is significant as justifying the application made above. There is no need, then, for textual emendation, to read with the LXX. and others, "O God, command thy strength."

<sup>4</sup> The rendering "Because of thy temple" is perfectly justifiable, and hence there is no need for connecting מְהִיבֶלֶךְ with the previous line, as Briggs and Perowne. "Because of" is a sufficiently familiar rendering of מִן, but consult, in proof, Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 97, note. It is difficult to see why Perowne should pronounce it inadmissible. With regard to the word הַיֵּבֶל, its use here and in other psalms has been regarded as decisive against their Davidic origin. True, the word is used of the structure in Shiloh (1 Sam. i. 9; iii. 3), but this seems to have been something more than the tabernacle, including the high priest's residence (explaining the "doors" of 1 Sam. iii. 15), and making the term "palace" more appropriate. It would seem very unlikely that David would use this term, or the term בֵּית יְהוָה of the "curtains," which he contrasts so sharply with the "house" of cedars in which he dwelt (2 Sam. vii. 2); but if we hold this we would have to give up as Davidic Psalms v., xxiii. and xxvii.; and xxvii. 5, shows conclusively

this may be accomplished, the psalmist again lifts up his heart in prayer that God would rebuke the brutal nations that delight in violence, until the riches of Egypt be brought to Zion, and Cush shall stretch out her hands to God. The last stanza (vs. 32-35) is an exhortation to the nations to join in the praises of God, who rideth on the heavens, whose voice is strength, whose majesty is over Israel, whose strength is in the clouds, who is terrible from his sanctuary, and who giveth strength and power to his people. (Cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 12.) The closing words, "blessed be God," suggest the opening of David's prayer and his exhortation to the people. (1 Chron. xxix. 10, 20.)

To sum up our conclusions, the examination of the psalm reveals not a single point inconsistent with our theory; there are several details that find in this theory their best explanation; there are numerous points of minute correspondence with the circumstances of the occasion in question; while the general outline is just what would be expected on this occasion, and the dignity of the occasion is in accord with the exalted strain of the psalm.

But to the reader who believes that Paul was not a rabbinical juggler, but an inspired apostle, that interpretation will be most satisfactory which, while meeting the conditions imposed by the psalm itself, will at the same time explain the application of it in Eph. iv. 8-10. Having applied our key to the psalm, let us now apply it to the epistle. The difficulties in the apostle's use of the passage may be reduced to three: (1), He applies vs. 18 of the psalm to Christ, when the psalm presents no evidence of having a Messianic character; (2), He argues from the ascension to an implied previous descent, or humiliation, when the reference in the psalm is to the pre-incarnate Elohim; and (3), He makes a point (and his chief point) out of the giving of gifts, when the psalm speaks of the receiving of gifts or taking of spoil.

With reference to these difficulties, Ellicott (Eph. *in loc.*) clears away some false explanations, and places us upon firm ground: "Remembering that the apostle wrote under inspiration of the Holy Ghost,

---

that the term is applied to the tent. It is probable that David, from the time that he conceived the idea of building the temple, applied the terms "house" and "temple" to the abode of the ark by anticipation. It was to him the palace of the king, because the king was there. I freely admit, therefore, that the use of the word does not of itself add anything to the argument of this paper, as would have been the case if it were not used in other Davidic psalms, but it is especially consonant with the theory that this psalm had a special relation to the future temple.

we recognize here neither imperfect memory (Rückert), arbitrary change (Calvin,<sup>1</sup> Theodore Mops.), accommodation (Morus), rabbinical interpretation (Meyer), but simply the *fact* that the psalm, and especially vs. 18, *had* a Messianic reference, and bore within itself a further, fuller and deeper meaning. This meaning the inspired apostle, by a slight change of language, succinctly, suggestively and authoritatively unfolds." This principle, thus clearly stated, is sufficient for the believing mind so far as the *fact* is concerned, but does not satisfy our proper desire to know *how* the meaning unfolded by the apostle is involved in the psalm. On this point Hodge (Eph. *in loc.*) lays down three principles—the typical character of the old dispensation; the identity of the Logos, or Son, manifested in the flesh in the new dispensation with the manifested Jehovah of the old; and (what is really involved in the first) that the historical and prophetic descriptions of the Old Testament are not exhausted by one application. But while these are the principles in the line of which we are to seek for the solution, the solution itself is yet to find. Spurgeon (*Treasury of David, in loc.*), Perowne and others draw nearer a solution when they make the ark prominent in their interpretation. Briggs (*loc. cit.*), whose broad study of Messianic prophecy has given him a grasp of its principles which is always firm, says, "The victorious march of Jahveh finds its appropriate fulfilment in that greatest of all victories, and that greatest of all triumphal processions,"—speaking of the triumphant ascension of Christ. Unfortunately, however, he makes the "train of rescued captives" the prominent idea, rather than the "gifts," which is the leading idea with the apostle. Delitzsch takes substantially the same view, and explains the change of language with reference to the gifts, essentially as do Perowne and Alexander (Psalms, *in loc.*), that a conquering king receives only to give. But while all these thoughts are true and helpful as far as they go, cannot they, like the interpretations of the psalm, be unified by applying the key-thought of this paper? Let us consider the ideas involved in vs. 18 of the psalm in connection with what precedes.

The ark, the seat of Jehovah's manifested glory, after a long period of humiliation, had ascended to Mt. Zion its chosen resting-place; this ascent is the mark of its enemies' defeat, and the earnest of its final victory over all foes; of this victory the spoils of the enemies are the

---

<sup>1</sup> This does not correctly represent Calvin's view (Psalms, *in loc.*), inasmuch as he can hardly be said to regard a change as *arbitrary* for which he assigns a reason, and which he proceeds to justify.

trophies, and these trophies are to be used in building it a permanent habitation.

Of the typical meaning of this there can be no doubt. The ark of the covenant is the recognized type of Christ. As all are not agreed about the meaning of the cherubim, we will not press the point that in God dwelling between the cherubim we have the symbol of God dwelling in the midst of a glorified humanity, an idea first realized when God was manifested in the perfect, and afterwards glorified, man Christ Jesus, and only in him and through him, capable of a further realization when he dwells in the midst of his ransomed and glorified saints. But as the centre and sun of Old Testament worship; as the material symbol through which God manifested his glory; as the spot where mercy and truth met together, and righteousness and peace kissed each other; where all the lines of atonement converged, that God might be just and yet the justifier of those that sought him in his appointed way—the ark was the most perfect symbol of the word, full of grace and truth, which became flesh and dwelt among us, that we might behold his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father.

If such be the typical meaning of the ark, its ascent to Zion can only find its prophetic fulfilment in the ascension of Christ. It needs no inspired apostle to tell us that Psalm xxiv., descriptive of this same event, is prophetic of Christ's ascension. But the ascension of him who inhabiteth eternity, dwelling in the height (Isa. lvii. 15), implies a previous descent, and the previous humiliation of the ark must have been typical of the humiliation of the eternal Son.<sup>1</sup> Nor need we have any hesitation in recognizing, as others have done, that the victories ascribed to Jehovah (as identified with the ark) were typical of, and found their highest fulfilment in, the victory of Christ when he spoiled principalities and powers, triumphing over them in his cross (Col. ii. 15); the spoils of the enemies must needs be typical of the fruits of that victory—the salvation which he plucked from the jaws of death, together with every gift that was necessary for the full execution of his purposes of grace (cf. Acts ii. 33); and as the spoils of victory re-

---

<sup>1</sup> We need not begin this humiliation with the capture of the ark (1 Sam. iv. 11) and its subsequent fortunes up to the time of its ascent. Rather would I take it that the whole period from the time that Jehovah descended from Sinai to lead his people through the wilderness to their promised inheritance, dwelling with them in tents, sharing their defeats and captivity as well as leading them to victory, until the time when he ascended to his resting-place on Zion, was typical of the humiliation of Christ and his sojourn in the flesh.



ceived on Zion by him that dwelt between the cherubim were to build him a habitation for glory and defence and beauty, so the fruits of Christ's victory were for the fulfilment of his eternal purpose of founding for himself a church in the world, of endowing it with every gift and grace necessary for its defence and perfection, and of building it up for his eternal habitation. That the temple was typical of the church is one of the elementary ideas of Scripture; and although it also typified Christ's body, as the habitation and seat of his divinity, that very idea expanded gives us the church, which is his body. (Eph. i. 23.)

When we turn to the passage under consideration we find that it is this last idea which is the prominent one, and which occasioned the quotation. Having showed to his Gentile readers their high privilege, as builded together with God's people for a habitation of God through the Spirit (ii. 22), and having besought for them graces corresponding to their privileges (iii. 14-21), the apostle now exhorts them to walk worthy of their calling, giving as reason for their mutual forbearance, the unity and perfection of the "body," and the fact that every one receives his gift from Christ in his own measure (iv. 1-7). It is upon this mention of gifts that he quotes Psalm lxviii. 18, and expounds its reference to Christ, once descended in humiliation, but now ascended that he may fill (or better *fulfil, i. e., complete*, a frequent usage of the word in the New Testament,) all things (vs. 8-10). And the gifts in question he bestows in varying measure (the idea of vs. 7), qualifying men for different offices in the church (vs. 11). And to what end? Let the apostle answer: "For the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, *unto the building up of the body of Christ*, till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ; that we . . . may grow up in all things into him which is the head, even Christ; from whom all the body, fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love" (vs. 12-16, Revised Version). The expressions *grow* (also *increase* in Greek), *building, fitly framed*, occurring in this passage and in chapter ii. 20-23, show that the apostle still has in mind the idea of the temple, and merely substitutes another of his favorite figures for the church that better carries out the idea of life and growth. The identity of these two figures has been pointed out above.

In the face of a correspondence like this the verbal difference sinks into insignificance. The apostle does not give a translation,<sup>1</sup> but speaks of the gifts alluded to in the psalm with reference to their use, rather than their source. Conquerors, as has been remarked, receive only to give; but above this idea is the more important truth, that between Christ and his people there is no *meum* and *tuum*—all his is ours, and all ours is his. The gifts that David dedicated are recognized by him as having come from God, not only as the source of all riches, but as the immediate author of the victories which had secured them (1 Chron. xxix. 11–16); yet they are given back to him as free-will offerings for his temple; and while the temple was built for his habitation, its blessings and privileges return to his people. So the gifts of grace are all from Christ, purchased by his blood and wrested from his enemies; yet his people are free-will offerings in the day of his power (Psa. cx.), and give themselves willingly to be living stones built up into a spiritual house (1 Pet. ii. 5), or to be pillars in the temple of their God (Rev. iii. 12). And while the glory of this temple is Christ's, its blessings, privileges, and immortal joys are given to his people for evermore, for the highest glory of Christ is the glory of his grace. The apostle speaks of these gifts in that aspect in which a grateful church ever loves to remember them.

PEYTON H. HOGE.

---

### ON LANGUAGE TEACHING.

It is not always given to one whose work has been the teaching of languages, to know what is being done in other fields of learning; but it would be interesting to compare the various degrees of mental activity in different fields. The language-men certainly cannot be accused of letting themselves stagnate, or of counting themselves to have apprehended. They are continually pressing on, if so be that they may attain unto some more excellent way. Every now and then a revolution is promised; but after awhile, it appears that only a very few, comparatively, have "revolved," and that the large majority are not yet ready to abandon the lines on which they have worked so long.

Some years ago, "The Natural Method" was widely and loudly proclaimed as being the way of ways for teaching language. Its

---

<sup>1</sup> How it would delight a certain class of commentators if they could show that Paul had followed an erroneous translation of the LXX! But the LXX. merely give an unintelligible word-for-word transfer of the Hebrew idiom.

special field was the modern languages; but it was claimed that it applied equally well, or at least better than any other method, to the ancient languages also. Summer schools were formed for the purpose of teaching the teachers. If Latin was to be learned, they were to come prepared to repeat by heart the first third chapters (we believe that was the number), of the Gallic War, otherwise no place was to be found for them. The ability to do this was as indispensable as the wedding-garment. Whoever could not do it was to be cast—no, to *remain*—in outer darkness. This was found to be too severe a test, however, and was not adhered to, for it excluded some of the shining lights that made the darkness visible. The Socratic method of question and answer was the remedy for all the ills that the study of language and the teaching of it were heir to. It was to stimulate teacher and pupil. Properly administered it was a mental tonic, not surpassed by some other tonics whose marvellous potency the advertising columns of the papers make us familiar with. It seemed as if dull and uninterested boys were soon to be classed with antiquities, provided the teachers could only be converted from the error of their ways. But just here was the difficulty. “Before taken, to be well shaken,” is an order accompanying some remedies for the physical man. Now, this was sometimes misunderstood, if history is to be believed, and occasionally not the remedy, but the patient, was well shaken. So in this case it became very evident that the ones most in need of the Natural Method medicine, had to be tremendously shaken before they could take it; and so most of them never took it at all. We need not explain why. Just imagine yourself trying to teach that way, speaking only the language you are teaching, with not a word of English allowed from teacher or pupil, and making up all sorts of interesting questions about Cæsar, and Gaul, and Ariovistus, or about Darius and Parysatis, and their harmonious offspring: these questions, mark you, to be not merely more interesting than anything the old methods could possibly present, but so instructive withal, that boys were to absorb the paradigms and principles, and do it “naturally.” Just imagine yourself, we say, teaching after that fashion, and you will soon see why the plan did not become popular. If you have not tried it yet, do so at your next recitation (*one* will no doubt be enough), and we venture to say that, before the hour is out, your chief thought will be, “words fail me,” and you will assuredly know “the respect in which” they fail you, even if you have never happened to meet the synecdochical accusative in the course of your linguistic wanderings. No, the plan did not suc-

ceed; and though some notable converts were made and joyfully heralded, we fear they have back-slidden. At any rate, the natural method does not at present *seem* to be the preponderating method of teaching even the modern languages.

About the same time "The Meisterschaft System" was vigorously urging its claims. It was a sort of Siamese twin to the Natural Method. The two sided together in their complete rejection of the old-fashioned plodding way of teaching grammar by drilling and parsing, and each would have worked a revolution, *if*— We were teaching French at the time in one of the numerous colleges that had added French and German to the curriculum, in order to "keep abreast of the times," but which, for want of funds to employ a special teacher, saddled the modern languages upon the teachers of Latin and Greek. We wanted to do our best, and while we hoped the work done was honest as far as it went, we were painfully aware that it only went a very little way. Dr. Rosenthal, in the advertising columns of various papers, promised even more than Dr. Sauveur had done. "*Nous changerons tout cela*," we thought, and immediately procured the first number of the French Meisterschaft series. The preface discouraged us at once. We were never to let the class get weary; to avoid this, ten-minute doses were all that could be given at one time, if memory serves us aright; after that, the children were to run out and breathe the fresh air awhile. That staggered us. We had the beginners' French class only twice a week, an hour each time. All the college recitations were planned on the scale of an hour for each, and it would most assuredly have changed "*tout cela*," if we had taught French ten minutes, turned the class loose for awhile, and then called it back. But we persevered and read further. We found we were to set out with a French sentence about going down town to do some shopping, and getting some one to go with us to help in the matter. Right here we were halted again. The learner was most explicitly told not to pass beyond that point till he could pronounce that French sentence just as fluently as if it were English! To follow that iron rule "strictly," would have limited the French course to that one sentence, and this we were extremely reluctant to do; it was such an unsatisfactory taste of French literature, a drop of whipped cream would be a feast in comparison. Then another *sine qua non* was never to pass over anything till it was "*absolutely mastered*." Considering that out of any average class of twenty only about two students can be said, in any reasonable sense, to have "mastered" the subject taught, it was hard to be told

that *every one* must master *everything* as the class proceeded. This condition is one that authors, especially authors of new schemes, are fond of making. It has a magnificent sound to it, to be sure; but bring it to the test of actual class-work, and it simply discredits any system in which "absolute mastery" is made one of the indispensable conditions of success in using the system; for such a claim utterly ignores the fact that teachers have to instruct *classes* and not individuals; it ignores the manifold imperfections of human character and the manifold limitations of the human intellect. Consequently, we laid our Meisterschaft down, fully convinced that, whatever it may do for *individuals*, if their sole aim is to get a quick knowledge of a modern language for everyday use, it is admirably unsuited for college instruction, where the aim is, *not* to give facility in speaking, for we recognize the absurdity of pretending to be able to do this in the time allotted by college curriculums, but to give a good grounding in the principles of the language, and at the same time to make the study a help in training the mental faculties. Whether the Meisterschaft system is gaining ground or not in our educational institutions we do not know.

Lately another "method" has been brought into great prominence, the "Inductive Method." It has won its chief success in this country in the realm of Hebrew, and the same excellent results there attained are said to be equally possible elsewhere; and to test the matter the two following books have been published by Messrs. Ivison, Blakeman & Co.: *An Inductive Latin Method*, by Harper & Burgess, and *An Inductive Greek Method*, by Harper & Waters. The preface to both bears the date of August, 1888. The *Latin Method* contains 323 pages, and the *Greek Method* 355. The fame of Professor Harper and of his system as applied to Hebrew makes these books of special interest to teachers. We say at once that we have again been greatly disappointed. We shall give our reasons, and leave teachers to judge for themselves. For convenience we shall confine our remarks to the *Latin Method*. The principle is exactly the same for both, however, and the preface (so far as it relates to setting forth the "method") and the "suggestions to teachers" are almost in identically the same words in the two books.

These are acknowledged to differ essentially from the other introductory books already in use. The fault found with these is that they "are all merely companions to the grammar, and not guides to the language," a characterization from which the authors of the books thus

described would no doubt heartily dissent. The Inductive Method, it is claimed, "will arouse enthusiasm; it will increase results." With Professor Harper to do the teaching, we have not a shadow of doubt as to the enthusiasm aroused. We should look for this, no matter what system was used, if *he* taught it. But we believe that an overwhelming majority of those who, though greatly inferior to him, are still rightly accounted excellent teachers, will decide that his method is an eminently unpractical one. We regret that our space does not enable us to give the whole preface, but we hope the following presentation of the system will be found full enough to be perfectly fair and just.

The *Latin Method* is limited to the first twenty-nine chapters of the Gallic War; the "Lessons" only go through twenty chapters, and an appendix contains notes on the other nine, the Latin text of all twenty-nine being given just after the "Lessons." The beginner is plunged *in medias res* (or *in mediam Galliam*) at the outset: "Gáll-ĭ-ă ĕst ô-mnĭs dĭ-vĭ-să ĩn păr-tĕs trĕs." On these seven words is based the first "Lesson." The English meaning is put under each word. The "text" is then made the basis of seven "notes," one paragraph for each word; these notes tell about the vowel-sounds, accent, related English words, and meanings of the final letters. *E. g.*, "the ending -ă indicates the feminine singular;" "-t, the ending of the third person singular of the verb, means *he, she, or it*;" "the ending -ĕs indicates the plural; *cf.* the English *hero, heroes*." Next come "Observations," which point out those principles which are of most importance in what has been mastered thus far. "The grammatical material obtained in the 'Lesson' is now systematized and arranged with references to two leading grammars." The "Grammar Lesson," in Lesson I., contains the following references to the sections of Allen and Greenough (we omit those to Harkness): "16; 17, entire; 19, *a, b*; 31; 28, *a, c*, and note." The beginner thus has to learn in his first lesson (or may be second, if the teacher chooses to divide the "Lessons") nearly two pages of Allen and Greenough, even leaving out § 17, which explains the English method of pronunciation. Then follow "Vocabulary A," containing in alphabetical order the seven words of the "text," and "Vocabulary B," giving eleven other words, three of them in -ĭă, like *Gallia*, and six in -ĕs, like *partes* and *tres*. Next come "Exercises," fourteen Latin sentences or phrases to be put into English, and ten English ones to be put into Latin. Finally we have "Topics for Study," which we give here: "1, Feminine ending; 2, Plural ending; 3, The word for

*all*, singular and plural; 4, Place of accent in words of two syllables; 5, In words of more than two syllables; 6, Sound of *v*, *s*; 7, Penult; 8, Antepenult; 9, Related words; 10, Difference in pronunciation between long and short vowels." Here endeth the first "Lesson." Lesson II. repeats the seven words in the "text" of Lesson I., and adds six more to it (*quarum—Aquitani*). Then follow in the regular order the "Notes," "Observations," etc., omitting, however, "Topics for Study," which is the ending of every Lesson in both books except here, and Lesson LII. in the Greek volume, and except in the Review Lessons. Lesson XII. in the Latin and Lesson X. in the Greek are the first Review Lessons. Lesson XII. covers six pages and a half, nearly two pages being references to the grammars.

"Absolute mastery" is as rigidly insisted upon here as in the Meisterschaft system; if anything, more so. Just before the "text" of the first lesson is given, we read: "Understand from the beginning that every word and sentence of the Latin [Greek] text is to be mastered. Nothing short of absolute mastery will answer the purpose." In a note that precedes the first Review Lesson we read: "It is understood that the student will in no case proceed to take up Lesson XIII. [XI.] until this lesson, with all that it includes, is learned. Let every word, every phrase, every principle, be mastered absolutely." What is to be done with the dull but interested boys who, following Paul's advice, forget the things that are behind, as they press forward? What is to be done with the dull and *uninterested* boys, to whom any kind of mental application is a horrid bore, from whom anything like scholarly accuracy is out of the question? That is, if the words above quoted mean what they say, and if the Inductive Method does not pretend to be a success unless these directions are complied with, then this "method" may do very well for boys in the millennium, but is totally unfitted for such minds as boys have now. On the other hand, if the words do not mean strictly what they say, why say them at all, and why repeat them so emphatically? Is not "absolute mastery" just what every teacher would like, for himself and for his classes? And does any teacher ever get it from a class, whether composed of men or boys? Does not a great school such as Harvard pass students from one class to the next higher on a minimum of about half? We wish very much that Professor Harper had included among his Suggestions to Teachers something to tell us how to secure this "absolute mastery." When the author of some new method does this, generations of teachers will arise and call him blessed. Make sure of this one point, and we warrant

that any "method," no matter how faulty its arrangement, will immediately sweep the field of all rivals. Until this is done, we much prefer books better adapted to the weak brains and poor memories of the average boy.

The "Exercises," we are told (p. vi. 6), "are always based upon the sentence or section which furnishes the basis of the 'Lesson.' Prose composition taught in this manner ceases to be dreaded by the pupil, and becomes, indeed, a source of delight." Here again we dissent. There is absolutely nothing new in this. Professor Whitney recommended it in the preface to the first edition of his German Grammar some twenty years ago, but made no special claim for it, as distinguishing his method of teaching German, so far as we remember. In fact, it is such a self-evident thing to do, to make the "exercises" merely a recasting of what has been already read in the foreign language, that we suppose it must be as old as "prose composition" itself. And yet how many are the teachers who have found the exercises "a source of delight" to their pupils?

But to come now to the special feature of the Inductive Method, its inductiveness. "Special emphasis is laid upon the collecting of facts from the living page of the text; but paradigms and vocabularies are also to be used for this purpose" (page vii. 2). To this principle (rightly applied) we most heartily say "amen." We have taught in accordance with it for many years. It has increasingly been our idea to make boys learn principles from Cæsar and Xenophon, and then test the correctness of the grammars by the authors read, and not *vice versa*, as is so often the case. But this was mainly in the learning of syntactical principles. For the mastery of an intricate system of inflections, such as is presented by the Latin and Greek, we think the skipping-about method given in these two books is greatly to be condemned. To illustrate: instead of learning the first declension at once out of a grammar, in the good old way, the Inductive Method gives it as follows: in Lesson I. the learner is told that "the ending *-ã* indicates the feminine singular" (no hint yet as to the declension or case). This, we will say, is on Monday. On Tuesday or Wednesday<sup>1</sup> (Lesson II.) he is told that "the ending *-æ* indicates the feminine plural as subject, *i. e.*, the feminine plural nominative." On the following Monday (Les-

---

<sup>1</sup> At the end of "Suggestions to Teachers" Prof. Harper suggests two recitations as the maximum time required for a "lesson." We give the illustration above on this basis, and also, for fairness, on the basis of one "lesson" every day, though Prof. Harper does not think an ordinary class can make such rapid progress.



son VI.) or *Monday week* (as the case may be), the same ending, -æ, is encountered, and the pupil is told that it is genitive singular. This ending as dative is first met with in Chapter VII. and occurs in Lesson XXXI. But as no notice is taken of it there, we look back, and in Lesson VIII., the "text" of which contains not a single form of the first declension, a paragraph of seven lines and a half is devoted to gathering up the first declension forms so far met with, and part of the "grammar lesson" is to learn the paradigm of the first declension, *stella* in Allen and Greenough, *mensa* in Harkness. In a similar way fragments of the various declensions, of pronouns, adjectives, verbs, etc., are picked up by the way, with absolutely nothing to guide the selection except that they *happened* to occur in this particular order in these particular chapters of this particular book of this particular work by this particular author, who, as so many teachers think, is by no means the most suitable one through whom to introduce boys to Latin reading. Notice how the pronouns (acknowledged on page 107 to be one of the three most difficult subjects in Latin) are to be "absolutely mastered." One of the "topics for study" at the end of Lesson VII. is: "List of pronouns in first seven lessons." A foot-note says: "The instructor should aid the pupil in this work of classifying his material. Blank-books, properly ruled, should be used. It is of extreme importance that, from the beginning, the pupil should be encouraged to do independent work." Well, the pupil finds he has had *quarum, qui, ipsorum, nostra, hi, se, horum, eos, ea, quæ*. That is, *perhaps* he finds them. He had been given the meanings of these words as he came to them, but was not told that they were pronouns (except in the case of *eos*), and perhaps some teachers, even, will be at a loss how to class *aliam*, in regard to which grammars vary. Is a beginner (say a boy of twelve) capable of doing this sort of work, even with the best-ruled blank-book in the world? And even if he got his record correct, can he hold these *membra disjecta* well enough to frame an organized body of paradigms? Why travel on foot, when you can go by rail a certain distance, with plenty of tramping to do after that? We believe in encouraging pupils to do "independent work," but this is too much of it, and at far too early a stage. We did not take an extreme case to illustrate by, for notice again: on page 98, one of the "topics for study" is, "All forms of *posse* which pupil should now know." Is that better than learning *all* the forms of *posse* connectedly in a grammar at one time?

The second Review Lesson covers eight pages (107-114); one of

these is a "*Diagram showing by examples in the third singular every regular form of the Latin verb learned thus far,*" the "thus far" indicating the method. In the next Review Lesson one of the directions is (p. 155), "classify all verb forms under their proper conjugation, voice, mode, tense, number and person; then compare your result with the 'Verb Diagram' of XXVI., and see what new verb forms have been discovered since the last Review." To do this, the learner, who has only been studying Latin about four months (counting forty-one "Lessons" as eighty-two lessons, and five of these a week), has to examine in Cæsar, chapters 5-11 inclusive. They contain, if our one rapid count is correct, about one hundred and ninety-eight verb forms (many of them being repetitions, it is true), and these babes in Latin are to search them out, determine conjugation, mode, tense, etc., classify them, and reject any that had appeared in the diagram on page 113. We leave every teacher of boys to form his own judgment about such a method. Really, Professor Harper must think he is still dealing with his summer schools in Hebrew, where he has mostly grown men, who have had a good college education, and who are bending every energy to one single subject, and that subject a language far more uniform in its structure than the Latin or Greek.

Notice one more point in which we are sure his judgment is utterly at fault. Half of Ch. 13, and nearly the whole of Ch. 14, is an *oratio obliqua*. "Every word, every phrase, every principle," is to "be mastered absolutely," we must remember. The indirect quotation of Ch. 13 is taken up in Lesson XLVI., say after five months' study of Latin. The pupil is to "master absolutely" in the "Grammar Lesson," on p. 171, the following principles: "Changes of mode in indir. disc., Allen and Greenough, 336, 339. Fut. time in the subjv., Allen and Greenough, 110, *a*, 286, Rem. last sentence. Change of person in indir. disc., H. 526." Again we make no comment, but leave each teacher to judge for himself.

Our opinion on the whole is that we have never had the fortune to come across a "method" that goes at things more unmethodically, nor a more difficult way of overcoming the difficulties complained of in the first paragraph of the preface. These beautifully printed books stand almost alone in their wonderful lack of practical adaptation to the needs of beginners in Latin and Greek.

Professor Harper's unwearied industry has given to students of New Testament Greek the following work: *An Introductory New Testament Greek Method*, by William R. Harper, Ph. D., and Revere F. Weidner,

D. D. 8vo.; \$2,50, net. It is published by the Scribners, and has the following "contents:" I. Fifty Inductive Lessons based on the Gospel of St. John; II. 1, A Critical Text of the Gospel of St. John; 2, A Literal Translation of John i.-iv.; 3, A Vocabulary of the Gospel and Epistles of St. John; 4, Lists of Words occurring most frequently. III. Elements of New Testament Greek Grammar. We leave any special notice of this book to those who are specially engaged in teaching New Testament Greek, with only the following general observations on our part:

1. For those who come to the New Testament with no previous knowledge of Greek, teachers will no doubt welcome this book, provided they like Professor Harper's method. But we do not very well see what place it would have in theological seminaries that demand a fair acquaintance with Greek from those who enter their walls.

2. As to the "literal translation" here offered, we do not believe it is going to serve its purpose a whit better than the Revised Version does. In fact, we believe it will be more of a hindrance than a help, if it is anything like the literal translations in the books reviewed above. Here is the literal rendering of the last section of the third chapter of the Anabasis: "Hearing however these, the chosen report to-the soldiers; to-the however suspicion indeed was that he-was-leading against king, yet however it-seemed-best to-follow. They-ask in-addition<sup>1</sup> however pay; the however Cyrus promises a-half-obol-more to-all to-be-about-to-give than-what before they-bore, instead-of a-daric three half-darics of-the month to-the soldier; that however against king he-was-leading not-even-there heard nobody in at-least the evident." This must be even a greater "source of delight" (to boys with a sense of humor) than the prose composition in the two books.

3. We concur most heartily in the choice of St. John's Gospel, because it is the easiest Greek in existence: and if there is any better principle in teaching than to begin with what is simplest, and proceed as gradually as may be to what is difficult, we do not know it. We have often felt tempted to use St. John's Gospel as the book for beginners, but were afraid it might diminish proper reverence for the sacred word, if it were used as a drill book.

There is a very small work to which we wish to call the especial attention of teachers of Latin and Greek. Though quite small (it costs only twenty-five cents), it is exceedingly meaty, and very juicy and

<sup>1</sup> No doubt a misprint for they-ask-in-addition, as the four English words render only a single Greek word.

breezy withal (if THE QUARTERLY allows mixed metaphors, which we hope it does, as we like them that way ourselves). The pamphlet, published by Ginn & Co., and entitled "The Art of Reading Latin," is by Professor Hale of Cornell, well-known as one of the most prominent Latinists of the country. Any teacher who reads it will almost certainly find himself instructed and stimulated, even if he finds himself unable to change his method of teaching so as to accord with Professor Hale's admirable plan.

That we may not seem to object to all other methods without suggesting anything in place of them, we present here in brief outline what we deem the best way to begin the study of Latin, using this language again for illustration.

Have the pupils come to the first recitation with three books: Cornelius Nepos, a note book, and some good introductory book—the simpler it is the better. Let the first book opened be Nepos, say at *Miltiades*. Tell about the letters and their proper sounds by reading to the class from "the living page," explaining the pronunciation as you go. At the same time, tell your pupils what the Latin means. In the note books let them write down: *filius, son*; *filia, daughter*; *filial*. *Unus, one*; *unite*. *Omnis, all*; *omnibus, omni-present, &c., &c.* The teacher can easily select a suitable number of Latin words with related words in English. Then teach the first declension, either by writing *gloria* on the board, or by making the class turn to the first declension in the introductory book they are using. In the first two lines of *Miltiades* we have three examples of this declension—*gloria, sua, modestia*. Show your pupils *at once* the four places that end *e*, the two that end *a* (if the quantity is not marked), and the two that end *is*. The second declension can also be shown them with *futurum, magnus, and numerus* as examples. If the teacher and various ones of the pupils (*all*, if the class is not too large) read and re-read examples of these two paradigms, they will be fairly well known before the first hour is out, and as a lesson to prepare for the next day, give these paradigms with whatever additional lesson out of the introductory book (their only text-book for awhile) the time at their disposal warrants. Continue thus from day to day, advancing in Nepos, keeping the class informed as to the progress of the story, giving each day a few English words derived from the Latin, and advancing the class over the forms as fast as is consistent with persistent drilling ("gerund-grinding," if any one pleases to call it so). By the time the four conjugations are finished let the class begin to read, and *begin where the teacher began*

*the first day.* They feel, to some extent, at home there, and many difficulties are thus removed for them. That ideas may reach the mind through *two* avenues, the eye and the ear, use the black-board a great deal. For some months omit the English into Latin in the introductory book, though many teachers will insist on having English into Latin from the very word go. We do not deny the force of their reasons; but the other plan has the advantage of pushing on more rapidly to the time when reading can be begun, and it also postpones "prose-composition" to a stage at which the beginners have more knowledge to go upon as a basis before they undertake what is usually the most difficult thing for them. Read only Nepos the first year. Take up Quintus Curtius next. Then take the more interesting portions of Caesar, the fifth book of course being included. The objects aimed at in the above outline, are: to introduce the beginner at once to a page of "sure enough" Latin, taking about the easiest and most interesting that is procurable; to excite his interest, if he has any to excite, in the relation between English words and Latin words; to get the *forms* as rapidly as possible, and to begin reading at the earliest practicable moment. In the first year, do comparatively little with syntax out of the large grammars, but rub in the forms till the few best boys know them "like a book," and till the larger portion of the class knows them with reasonable accuracy and fluency. Help your pupils to get at the sense *in the Latin order of words*. By teaching according to these suggestions, you carry out the great principle for beginners: "Maximum of forms; minimum of syntax; early contact with the language in mass."

ADDISON HOGUE.

## VII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

---

### STRONG'S SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY. A Compendium and Commonplace Book, Designed for the use of Theological Students. *By Augustus Hopkins Strong, D. D., President and Professor of Biblical Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary.* Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. 1889. Large 8vo, pp. 760.

The learned author informs us that, in 1876, he printed his "Lectures on Theology" for the use of students in the Rochester Theological Seminary. In 1886 he published an edition of those lectures, with the title of "Systematic Theology." The present volume is "an enlarged and amended edition" of the former work. It is not, therefore, new, except with reference to the additions and emendations which have been incorporated.

"The author's aim," he tells us, "has been not so much the writing of a theology for theologians as the construction of a hand-book for the use of students for the ministry." Notwithstanding this disclaimer, we have no doubt that the work will be appreciated by theologians themselves, not only because of its intrinsic ability, but for the reason that its merits, as well as the author's eminent position, entitle it to be regarded as, to some extent, exponential of the theological views held by the Baptist churches in America. As they recognize no Symbolic Formularies, it is very desirable that there should be some source of information in respect to the *consensus* of doctrine which must, in a greater or less degree, collect these independent bodies into theological unity. It is not meant that this or any other treatise, however able, would be appealed to as ecclesiastically authoritative. But it is to be presumed that such a writer as Dr. Strong would be apt, in the main, to represent those doctrinal views in which the body of his denomination concurs. In fact, situated as he has been for years, he must by the force of circumstances have created a theological sentiment, a certain amount of doctrinal agreement among the churches which have been affected by the teaching of ministers who have received their education at the Rochester Seminary. It must be a matter of interest to every one who is animated by a catholic love for all Christ's true people, and who prays for the spiritual prosperity, not alone of his own particular church, but of Zion at large, to ascertain the type of doctrine maintained by each evangelical denomination. For the satisfaction of this desire it is natural to look especially to the works emanating from the theological seminaries of the respective denominations.

As this work was no doubt amply noticed when the previous editions appeared, it is not our intention to enter into an elaborate criticism of its doctrinal contents. We briefly advert to the interesting questions, how far it aligns itself with any known system of theology, and how far it maintains views peculiar to itself. It

affirms, as a whole, neither Calvinism nor Arminianism, the main contestants, since the Synod of Dort, on the field of evangelical theology. It is eclectic. So far as unconditional election is concerned, it is Calvinistic. As to the extent of the atonement, it is Arminian. And if the inquiry is raised, how it attempts a reconciliation of these irreconcilable positions, its answer is derived from Amyraldism, or the scheme of hypothetical redemption: the atonement was universal, but its application is made to the elect by efficacious grace. It is thus partly Calvinistic, partly Arminian, and partly Hypothetical Redemptionist. So far as another crucial test is concerned, namely, the doctrine of federal representation, it is neither Calvinistic nor Arminian; it is *sui generis*. It denies the fact of a covenant between God on the one side, and Adam and his posterity on the other, and grounds the relation of the race to the first man simply in his natural headship. We admit that the doctrine of evangelical Arminianism is, at bottom, that of parental headship, but the earlier divines of that school, Watson, for example, expressly contended that Adam was a federal head and legal representative precisely because he was a parental head; that is, that parental and federal headship were concreated. This work is *pro tanto* less federal than Arminianism. It is true that it espouses the theory of generic identity, advocated by some Calvinistic theologians; but they would cease to be Calvinistic did they not associate with that doctrine that of the federal headship of Adam. Without going into a discussion, one cannot forbear asking a few questions in connection with this point. If Adam was merely a natural head, where is the analogy between him and Christ, as affirmed by Paul in the fifth of Romans? Is Christ also merely a natural head? Again, if the common nature committed the first sin, and we, of course, subjectively committed it, since, *ex hypothesi*, that nature was ours, how are we implicated in the sin of Adam as a head, and, of course, an individual as he was a head? Were the generic nature and Adam as an individual one and the same?—an impersonal nature and a person identical? If not, did the nature sin unconsciously, because impersonally? Was the tremendous act that revolutionized the moral condition of humanity, and reduced its hopes to despair, unconsciously done? Further, if we were not represented in a covenant head, and sustained no federal relation to God, involving a limitation of the time of trial, but existed under a naked, unmodified dispensation of law, how could justification ever have been attained? Without covenant limitations upon the natural, eternal exaction of law, how could Adam have been promised justification, or his descendants promised justification, either in him or without him? And how can sinners, without federal representation in Christ, or, what is the same thing, relation to him as a substitute, for a substitute is a representative, how can sinners be actually justified now?

The possibility of justification has ever been the question of questions: How shall man be just with God? The principle of federal representation, involving justification, is the connecting bond between the two schemes of natural religion and the gospel, the principle which brings them into unity under the generic denomination of religion—religion contemplating as its end the confirmation of its subjects in holiness and happiness to the glory of God. We admit, with the learned author of the work before us, that, in the last analysis, theology should be broad enough to include in its scope God and his relations to the universe of creatures, physically and morally considered, and that thus it should, together with its sister, philosophy, strive to reach the highest unity in God himself. But when the question is in

regard to that scheme of moral government which has been historically realized among men, we postulate a relative and subordinate unity, upon which the schemes through which that moral government has proceeded may be brought together—a doctrinal principle which, as generic, colligates all the specific truths of religion. Such a principle is that which has been mentioned. We are firmly persuaded that the organ by which the members of truth may be collected into the harmony and loveliness of “one immortal feature,” is the federal theology. We cannot, therefore, but regard a theological system as defective which, however correct it may be in many of its details, adverts to a covenant of works with Adam only to oppose it, and takes no account of the covenant of grace. This we are constrained to consider the vulnerable point in Dr. Strong’s theology. In passing we must, with all deference, suggest that Calvin’s and Thoruwell’s positions, in regard to the mode in which the race is involved in the first sin, are misapprehended.

While, however, we thus speak, it gives us pleasure to acknowledge the distinguished ability and scholarship, as well as the extensive theological and philosophical research, which characterize the work. Two features in the arrangement strike us as possessing especial value. One is that the reader is directed to sources from which he may derive additional information with reference to the topics which are handled. This is done with uncommon fulness. The other is that, instead of simple references to the places of Scripture which are appealed to as proofs, the passages are given in full.

The mechanical execution of the book is superb. It is an honor to the publishers.

BRIGGS’S “WHITHER?”

WHITHER? A Theological Question for the Times. *By Charles Augustus Briggs, D. D., Davenport Professor of Hebrew and the Cognate Languages in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.* 8x5 inches. Pp. xv., 303. Charles Scribner’s Sons, 743-745 Broadway, New York. 1889. Price, \$1.75.

Selden’s remark that “learning hath made most by those books on which the printers have lost” finds another illustration in the works of Dr. Briggs. His *Messianic Prophecy*, though marred by many errors, as we have elsewhere pointed out, and richly deserving the severe reprehension it received, was a really valuable contribution to biblical learning, and deserved the praise it received from Mr. Gladstone and others, as well as the censure; and, while we do not know that the printers lost anything on it, we are quite sure it was not so profitable to them as this last lucubration; for, only critical students of Scripture, as distinguished from popular readers, felt an interest in the former work, while hundreds of intelligent people, who had not the requisite scholarship and patience to appreciate that, will read this with avidity. The cause of sound learning, however, will make few positive gains by *Whither?*, for essentially it is not constructive but destructive, the author’s professions to the contrary notwithstanding. At the same time it is a book of great ability, and, although it represents much patient research and quotes largely from seventeenth century theologians, it is intensely interesting from beginning to end. It must be confessed, however, that the sort of pleasure one feels in reading it is more akin to the excitement of battle than to the pleasure which grows from the prosperous pursuits of peace. That the book has already proved a bonanza to the publishers we may justly infer, not only from the sensational character of the



work itself, but also from its relation to the burning question of revision, and from the almost unparalleled advertisement of it by the attacks of religious newspapers. Nearly all our Presbyterian journals, North and South, have devoted large space to it in their editorial columns, the Southern papers, we are glad to say, condemning it with one accord, though not in every case without qualification, as also we are glad to say.

It is having an immense sale. We are satisfied, however, that its circulation among our ministers is not due to any sympathy with the radical views of the author, but rather to a recognition of the truth of John Stuart Mill's remark that "a man who knows only one side of a question does not know that." If we would repel an enemy's assault we must know something of the disposition of his forces and his mode of attack. Then, too, we feel a fraternal interest in the great struggle upon which the Northern Church is entering, and which will almost certainly be fought out along the lines laid down in this book. Moreover, there is a not unnatural curiosity to know what Dr. Briggs has said about us in his frequent and generally friendly references to the Southern Church, and especially what he has said about two able and distinguished theological professors recently connected with two of our Southern seminaries, one of whom he quotes several times with hearty approbation, pronouncing him to be "the leading theologian of the Southern Presbyterian Church," though he does not hesitate to charge him, at the same time, with "rationalizing" in his doctrine of the Lord's Supper. By the way, Dr. Briggs badly discredits his own accuracy when he speaks of a famous institution in the South as "Hampden and Sidney College." The final reason for the interest felt by our people in this remarkable book is a pardonable desire to know more about the man who is now unquestionably the most conspicuous, if not the most influential, minister in the Northern Presbyterian Church.

Charles Augustus Briggs was born in the city of New York January 15, 1841, and is therefore about forty-nine years of age. He studied at the University of Virginia from 1857 to 1860, and there, as we have been informed, he was converted under the preaching of an honored minister of our church, who is now and has been for more than thirty years a pastor in an adjoining State and Synod, where his bow still abides in strength, a pastor who has been peculiarly honored of God in leading young men into the ministry. Young Briggs seems to have gone directly from the University to the Union Theological Seminary in New York, where he was a student from 1860 to 1863. From 1863 to 1866 he was engaged in mercantile pursuits with his father in New York. An interesting episode of this part of his life was his marching with the Seventh Regiment of New York Volunteers to the defence of Washington. In 1866 he entered the University of Berlin, Germany, where until 1869 he was engaged partly in the study of exegetical theology and oriental languages with Dr. Aemilius Roediger and partly in the study of the history of doctrine under the guidance of Dr. Isaac Dorner. This he tells us in the preface of the book under review, as if he were himself aware of the fact that there were to be found the head-springs of that brawling torrent called "Whither?" which is to-day dashing itself into foam against the rocks. He was pastor of the Presbyterian church at Roselle, N. J., from 1870 to 1874. Since 1874 he has been professor of Hebrew and the cognate languages in the Union Theological Seminary of New York city. On entering upon this professorship he made and subscribed, in the presence of the Board of Directors, the following declaration:

“I believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice; and I do now, in the presence of God and the Directors of this Seminary, solemnly receive and adopt the Westminster Confession of Faith as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures. I do also, in like manner, approve of the Presbyterian Form of Government; and I do solemnly promise that I will not teach or inculcate anything which shall appear to me to be subversive of the said system of doctrine, or of the principles of said Form of Government, so long as I shall continue to be a Professor in the Seminary.”

It will facilitate our understanding of the situation to remember that the government of the institution is vested in a self-perpetuating board of twenty-eight directors, one half of whom are not ministers, and that the General Assembly has simply an optional veto over the appointment of professors. In 1884 the University of Edinburgh conferred upon Prof. Briggs the degree of Doctor of Divinity; but we have the impression that he had worn the “semilunar fardels” for some years before that, though we do not know from what institution he first received them. In 1880 he became one of the founders and managing editors of the *Presbyterian Review*. A very competent judge has said that to him more than to any other one man was due the existence and the reputation and character of “the most able and scholarly review published in the English language.” For many years he has been a copious contributor to various periodicals and encyclopedias. He was one of the translators and editors of the commentaries on Psalms and Ezra in the American edition of Lange’s Commentary. In 1883 he published his first book, *Biblical Study: Its Principles, Methods, and History*, unsafe for general readers, but very suggestive and helpful to ministers and other well-furnished and discriminating students of Scripture; in 1885, *American Presbyterianism: Its Origin and Growth*, also of great value on many accounts, but written of course from the New School point of view; in 1886, *Messianic Prophecy: The Prediction of the Fulfilment of Redemption through the Messiah*, the first great contribution of American scholarship to the science of Biblical Theology; and now he caps the climax with *Whither?*

Wild as it is, this work is one of too much learning and ability to be simply sneered at. It contains enough truth to make its errors dangerous. Everybody is reading it. It is too important to be ignored. Therefore, although it has already been reviewed by more different periodicals of all denominations than any other publication that has appeared for years, we hope that the fire will not be slackened until every error in it has been slain. We shall shortly take another shot at it ourselves; but for the present it will perhaps suffice to give a conspectus of its contents, point out a few instances of the author’s unfounded statements and fallacious arguments, and indicate briefly the spirit and purpose of his discussion.

We should first perhaps allow him to state for himself the nature and object of his book. He is evidently anxious that the true genesis of it should not be misunderstood. It is not the spurt of a sudden impulse, but “a product of more than twenty years of study in the history of Puritan theology, and especially of the Westminster divines, the authors of the Westminster Standards.” When the author was in Berlin twenty years ago—

“He undertook a special study of the history of the doctrine of justification by faith and its relation to sanctification. In this study he learned the failures of the Protestant scholastics from the faith of the Reformation. When he came to the study of the Westminster Confession he was surprised to find that it had not

only retained the pure faith of the Reformation, but had advanced upon it in the unfolding of the doctrines of sanctification, faith, and repentance. This was a surprise, because it had not been noted by any of the British or American divines whose works he had studied, and it was entirely in advance of the faith of the British and American churches.

"Since that time his study of the Westminster Standards, in the light of the Westminster divines and their Puritan associates and precursors, has continued with constantly increasing interest. He has spared no time, labor, or expense in searching the original editions and manuscript sources of all documents relating to this subject; spending many months in the chief libraries of Great Britain and in the lesser Puritan libraries; and diligently searching in old bookstores for every book, tract, and manuscript that could be found and purchased. During the past fourteen years the kind friend to whom this book is dedicated has furnished all the funds that were necessary for making these purchases. This entire collection was given by Mr. McAlpin to the library of the Union Theological Seminary (New York), which now contains the best Westminster library in the world.

"These studies of the Westminster divines disclosed the fact that modern Presbyterianism had departed from the Westminster Standards all along the line. It is not strange that this departure has been unconscious, for the Westminster divines have been entirely neglected by the dogmaticians of our century. They have not been read. One looks in vain for their names in the works of Presbyterian divines. Instead of them, the scholastic divines of the seventeenth century, of the continent of Europe, have been used as authorities; and consequently the dogmaticians have taught in their systems the scholastic theology of the continent of Europe, and have interpreted the Westminster Standards to correspond with it.

"The author has been troubled for some years with these facts. He has occasionally referred to them incidentally in connection with various theological discussions in which he has been engaged; but he has hesitated to disclose all the facts for fear of exciting theological controversy and of doing more injury than good to the kingdom of Christ. He has waited for an external call to publish them. This call came in May last, through the action of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America with regard to the revision of the Confession of Faith. Accordingly he turned aside from other literary work to fulfil this duty.

"The question of the revision of the Westminster Standards has become the burning question of the Presbyterian world by simultaneous action of the General Assemblies of the American and Scottish Churches. Before the ministers can act intelligently it is necessary that they should know the facts that are presented to the readers of this volume.

"This book is historical. It aims to show what the Westminster Standards are, what the Presbyterian Churches have done with them in the past, and to interpret them by copious citations from their authors. Only by such study can any one intelligently consider the question of revision.

"The book is polemical. It is necessary to overcome that false orthodoxy which has obtruded itself in the place of the Westminster orthodoxy. I regret, on many accounts, that it has been necessary for me to attack so often the elder and younger Hodge, divines for whom I have great respect and admiration. Their names will always rank among the highest on the roll of American theologians. It has also been necessary to expose the errors of my younger associates in the editorship of *The Presbyterian Review*, and other divines, my friends and colleagues. The reader will see that this polemic has nothing in it of a personal character; it could not be avoided in the line of discussion that has been undertaken, for it is the theology of the elder and younger Hodge that has in fact usurped the place of the Westminster theology in the minds of a large proportion of the ministry of the Presbyterian Churches, and now stands in the way of progress in theology and of true Christian orthodoxy, and there is no other way of advancing in truth except by removing the errors that obstruct our path.

"The book is irenic. It shows that there have been so many departures from the Standards in all directions that it is necessary for all parties in the Presbyterian Churches to be generous, tolerant, and broad-minded. The author

does not wish to exclude from the church those theologians whom he attacks for their errors. He is a broad churchman, and all his sympathies are with a comprehensive church, in which not only these divines shall be tolerated, but all other true Christian scholars shall be recognized, and wherein all Christians may unite for the glory of Christ. He rejoices in all earnest efforts for Christian unity, not only in Presbyterian and Reformed Churches, but in the entire Christian world.

"The book is catholic. The six chapters that make up the body of the book use the Westminster Standards, as the test of orthodoxy, to determine the extent of departures from them in the Presbyterian Churches. But the doctrines discussed in them are those in which all Christian churches are interested. The author has kept in mind the common interests of catholic Christianity, and he has not hesitated to use, on occasion, a higher test of orthodoxy than the Westminster symbols. What has been done in six chapters of this book for the Presbyterian Churches could be done for all the other Protestant churches. They all alike have departed from their official standards of doctrine. What, then, is to be done under these circumstances? *Whither* are Christians to direct their minds and energies? It is the main intent of the book to ask this question, and to give, in some measure, an answer to it. Accordingly the two introductory and the two concluding chapters are wider than Presbyterianism, and have in mind the Christian world.

"The process of dissolution has gone on long enough. The time has come for the reconstruction of theology, of polity, of worship, and of Christian life and work. The drift in the church ought to stop. Christian divines should steer directly toward the divine truth as the true and only orthodoxy, and strive for the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The barriers between the Protestant denominations should be removed, and an organic union formed. An alliance should be made between Protestantism and Romanism and all other branches of Christendom. The Lambeth Conference, in its proposals for Christian unity, points in the right direction. The Church of England is entitled to lead. Let all others follow her lead and advance steadily toward Christian unity.

"True Christian orthodoxy will stand firm on the consensus of Christendom, will debate the dissensus in an irenic spirit, and will advance bravely until it masters the sum total of truth that God may reveal unto us, and exhibit the fulness of Christian life into which the divine Spirit may guide us."

There are ten chapters in the book, entitled severally as follows: Drifting, Orthodoxy, Changes, Shifting, Excesses, Failures, Departures, Perplexities, Barriers, and Thither. In the first, the author contends that religion in Great Britain and the United States is at present in a very unsatisfactory condition. He alleges that the current theology and life of the various denominations are very different from the theology and life of their founders, that all Christian denominations have drifted from their standards, and are now drifting. To his view, this necessitates the distinction drawn in the second chapter between orthodoxy and orthodoxism. What he means by this we can illustrate by the quotation of a single paragraph—

The drift of the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches from the Westminster orthodoxy into the scholastic orthodoxism, "has been gradual and imperceptible under the leadership of able divines, who did not take the trouble to study the Westminster divines, the authors of the Standards, but who relied on their *a priori* logic for the correct interpretation of the Standards as well as the Scriptures, and accordingly they interpreted both the Scriptures and the Standards to correspond with that system of scholastic Calvinism which had become to them the rule of faith. It was an evil day for Presbyterianism when the Puritan and Presbyterian fathers were laid aside, and the scholastic divines of Switzerland and Holland were introduced into our universities and colleges as the text-books of theology, and the tests of orthodoxy. The Westminster symbols were buried under a mass of foreign dogma. Francis Turretine became the rule of faith, and the Westminster Confession was interpreted to correspond with his scholastic elaborations and refinements."

The body of the book is made up of six rattling and bellicose chapters on the alleged variations of the American Presbyterian Churches from the Westminster Standards, and in reading them, one is often tempted to ask if it would not have been better to change the title of the book and call it, "Whither? A Theological Bombshell for Princeton," though Princeton is by no means the only object of its attack. For instance, he disposes of *our* orthodoxy in these two sentences, which follow each other at no great distance apart on the same page: "The Southern Presbyterian Church, as a body, seems to represent the scholastic type of Calvinism." "The doctrinal system of the Westminster symbols is not the scholastic type of Calvinism." Dr. Briggs is richly endowed with the gift of affirmation.

He gives a brief sketch of the Westminster Assembly, for the purpose of showing that it was more concerned with matters of church government and worship than with matters of doctrine, and says "it is a strange idea that has sprung up in recent times with the growth of American scholastic dogmatics, that the Confession of Faith and Catechisms are more sacred than the Directory for Worship and the Form of Government." We should like to call Dr. Briggs's attention to the following vow, which he nowhere mentions, and which every member of that Assembly had to take: "I do, seriously promise and vow, in the presence of Almighty God, that in this Assembly, whereof I am a member, I will maintain nothing *in point of doctrine but what I believe to be most agreeable to the Word of God; nor in point of discipline, but what may make most for God's glory and the peace and good of his church.*" Will Dr. Briggs deny that this difference of language implies a distinction between doctrine and discipline, and that it regards the former as more important than the latter? At the same time, he is right in saying that the Westminster divines never meant to exalt their work even in the doctrinal department above the possibility of revision. And that their successors have not so regarded it he proves by a description of the various revisions to which the American Presbyterian churches have subjected the standards, including our adoption of a new Book of Church Order and the revision of the Confession of Faith by the Southern Church as well as the Northern, in regard to the prohibition of marriage with a deceased wife's sister. The expediency of revision at any particular time is of course an entirely different question.

According to our author, the American church has made very important changes in the doctrine of the ministry. He makes a lively attack upon our theory of four different kinds of teaching elders, and declares that our ministerial evangelist would not be recognized by the Westminster divines as the evangelist of the New Testament. He says truly that lay-evangelists have no place in the Presbyterian Form of Government, and makes a strong plea for the collegiate system of church work, as against the one-pastor theory. This will be of special interest to the pastors of city churches. His discussion of the changes in Presbyterian worship also is exceedingly interesting, and will do great good. He is not far astray in regard to the long prayer, collections, singing, instrumental music, the neglect of the Lord's Prayer, of the public reading of the Scriptures, and of fasting, but we cannot say as much for his views about holy days. He defends the Westminster divines against the charge of indifference to the work of foreign missions.

In Chapter IV. he renews his old controversy with Drs. A. A. Hodge, Patton, and Warfield as to verbal inspiration, the inerrancy of the Scriptures, and their authority, authenticity, and canonicity. It is well known that on most of these questions

he stands with Luther, Calvin, Baxter, Rutherford, and the Westminster divines generally, and opposes the Princeton view. He asserts that Dr. Archibald Alexander not only departed from the principle of the Reformation, but actually went over into the camp of the Romanists, and followed the guidance of a Jesuit in his doctrine of the canon. Whether this charge be true or not, we are very certain that Dr. Alexander's doctrine is right and Dr. Briggs's wrong. To say that the canonicity of the books of the Bible is witnessed directly to the believer by the Holy Spirit, which is Dr. Briggs's view, if we understand him, is mysticism. Can any one believe that, if *Ecclesiastes* and *Ecclesiasticus* should be placed in the hands of any sincere Christian, he could tell without external testimony which was canonical and which apocryphal? Instead of answering this question, Dr. Briggs simply says in a foot-note "See p. 149 for Rutherford's reply to this argument." But, on turning to page 149, we find nothing to the point, but only a statement which no Christian denies—that the believer can recognize the voice of Christ speaking in his word. The truth and authority of the Scriptures as a whole and the canonicity of the separate books of the Bible are two very different questions.

Dividing the thirty-three chapters of the Confession of Faith into three groups of eleven chapters each, the author endeavors to show that in the first eleven chapters modern traditionalism is extra-confessional, erring chiefly by excessive definition; that in the second group of eleven chapters orthodoxy is infra-confessional, erring chiefly by failure and neglect; and that in the last group of eleven chapters it is contra-confessional, erring in the direction of heterodoxy, by actual departures from the doctrines set forth in these chapters. It would be idle to deny that he often makes his point as where he convicts Dr. A. A. Hodge of neglecting the doctrine of the living God; where he points out the comparative neglect of adoption by Turretine, the elder Hodge, and others where he exposes the error of Dr. Crosby's view of the humiliation of Christ ("no *action* of our Saviour's earthly life from Bethlehem to Calvary exhibits divinity"); where he commends Dr. Dabney's animadversions upon other systems for their neglect of the doctrine of repentance; where he quotes this statement from the Confession of Faith, "Good works are only such as God hath commanded in his holy Word, and not such as, without the warrant thereof, are devised by men out of blind zeal, or upon any pretence of good intention;" and then adds:

"It needs but a slight familiarity with the history of the Presbyterian Church, the reading of the Digest of the General Assembly, or attendance upon any General Assembly in recent years, to convince any one that the General Assembly has repeatedly violated this section of the Constitution, by prohibiting certain things that are not prohibited by the Word of God, and by commanding what the sacred Scriptures do not command. The Presbyterian Church in the United States was divided on the question of the sin of slavery. The Southern Presbyterian Church was certainly correct in the position, that slavery is not forbidden in the Word of God; and that, therefore, according to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, the General Assembly had no right to forbid it. Every act against slavery in the minutes of the General Assemblies has been a violation of this section of the Westminster Confession.

"The Presbyterian Church is not agreed on the question of total abstinence from intoxicating drinks. Certainly the sacred Scriptures do not prescribe total abstinence, and, therefore, the Presbyterian Church has no right to prescribe it. Every deliverance of General Assemblies in favor of total abstinence has violated this law of the Confession of Faith."

Elsewhere he says, with equal correctness: "Another sin against the sacrament has become common in recent times, owing to the movement in favor of total abstinence. The Master himself made bread and wine the sacramental elements. The early Protestants contended fiercely against the Romanists for withholding the wine from the laity, but many modern Protestants do not hesitate to banish the wine of redemption from the communion table, on the plea that it excites to intemperance. It would be lawful for a man who could be tempted to intemperance at the Lord's table to abstain from the cup. But it is not lawful to deprive all others of the cup of blessing on his account. And it is contrary to the Scriptures and the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church; it is a reflection upon the wisdom and grace of our Lord; and it is altogether disorderly to substitute any drink whatever for the wine which our divine Saviour himself invites us to drink at his table as the pledge of his redeeming love."

On the other hand, his attempt to make out a contradiction between Dr. A. A. Hodge's views of the divine justice and the Confessional statement that God is "most free," is nothing but an unworthy quibble. Equally unsuccessful is his endeavor to show a contradiction between two of our standards in regard to the original righteousness of our first parents. He says the Confession represents them as "endued with knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness," while the Larger Catechism describes it as "the estate of innocency wherein they were created." But on the very next page he quotes the *Larger Catechism* as saying that, "the sinfulness of that estate wherinto man fell consisteth in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of that *righteousness wherein he was created*," etc. Nothing quite equal to this in the way of sawing off the limb on which one sits has come to our knowledge since Dr. Shedd, in his article on revision, when arguing that "Foreordained to everlasting death" is not a clause liable to be misunderstood as containing error, and therefore does not need revision, said, "The allegation that there is error in this section of the Confession arises from *misunderstanding the meaning of the clause*."

Again, Dr. Briggs contends most earnestly that the Westminster Standards do not teach that sanctification becomes immediate at death. He says elsewhere that "the Catechisms are not taught in our churches." One of the most melancholy and conclusive proofs of the truth of this statement is the fact that an able and accomplished professor in one of our most conspicuous seminaries has recently published a revolutionary book entitled *Whither?* in which he betrays the most incredible and deplorable ignorance of the Shorter Catechism. *That* says "the souls of believers are *at their death* made perfect in holiness."

Dr. Briggs believes that the Confession teaches the damnation of some infants, and he cites certain of the Westminster divines to prove that it does. He then says:

"We do not hesitate to express our dissent from the Westminster Confession in this limitation of the divine electing grace. We are of the opinion that God's electing grace saves all infants, and not a few of the heathen. We base our right to differ from the Westminster divines on their own fundamental principle, that the electing grace of God is not tied to the administration of the ordinary means of grace.

"But it is vain to construct the doctrine of the universal redemption of infants on the ruins of the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith only. It is not necessary to destroy the Christian doctrine of the order of redemption through Christ. The relief is to be found in a more comprehensive view of redemption and an extension of the gracious operations of God into the middle state, between death and the resurrection, where the order of salvation, begun for infants and others in regeneration, may be conducted through all the processes of justification by faith, adoption, sanctification by repentance, and glorification in love and holiness, in the communion of God and the Messiah."

This brings us to what we regard as the head and front of his offending. In the eighth chapter he scouts the doctrines of judgment at death, probation after death, premillenarianism, and a millennium in the future before the advent of Christ, pronouncing them all extra-confessional, and yet he himself propounds the most extraordinary vagaries in regard to the middle state. These errors in eschatology we shall reserve for future discussion.

What was the author's object in writing this book? What cause did he expect to promote by it? Revision of the Standards? Not at all. That, says he, is the work of the rear guard of the church. Progress is not in that direction. No. *Destruction* of the Standards is what he aims at. He would, indeed, leave them just as they are, preserving them as interesting historical relics, but abolishing subscription. Broad-churchism is the word. He regards subscription to elaborate creeds as one of the barriers to Christian unity, the others being the theory of submission to a central ecclesiastical authority claiming divine right of government, insistence upon uniformity of worship, and traditionalism. He believes that if these were thrown down, an organic union of all Protestant churches, and even an alliance with Rome, would be effected on the consensus of Christendom. "Thither" all Christians should bend their energies. Protestants and Roman Catholics are agreed, he thinks, as to the essentials of Christianity. Our common faith is based on the Apostles' Creed, our worship on the Lord's Prayer, and our morals upon the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount. Old Thomas Gataker's remark that, "Fundamental poynts ly in a narrow compass," means a vast deal to him. For instance, he says the doctrinal differences between the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches do not justify separation. In short, he has undertaken to write the Presbyterian Church out of existence. This is too big a job even for Dr. Briggs. "The inheritance of the truth is more precious than external unity."

No doubt the reader is now ready to agree with us in the following propositions: 1, That as a theological gallimaufry, this book has absolutely no parallel in extant literature; 2, That the author's education is sadly defective in the departments of church history and symbolics; 3, That Dr. Briggs is no Presbyterian; and 4, That he is a "dogmatician" of the first water. A magisterial tone pervades the whole book, which, in view of the fact that it bristles with errors on almost every page, is positively comical. In reading these *ex cathedra* declarations, we are constantly reminded of the remark of the English wit who said of Lord Macaulay that he wished he were as cock sure of one thing as Macaulay was of everything.

But, as Tusser says, "It is an ill wind that turns none to good." This book will powerfully stimulate the study of the standards. W. W. MOORE.

*Hampden-Sidney, Va.*

#### WEISS' MANUAL OF INTRODUCTION.

A MANUAL OF INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. *By Dr. Bernhard Weiss, Ober-Konsistorealrath and Professor of Theology.* Translated from the German by A. J. K. Davidson. In two volumes. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 18 and 20 Astor Place. 1889. 8vo. Pp. 420 and 426.

There is a peculiar satisfaction in reading what is written on any subject by the one man who is allowed to know more about that subject than any other man living. That satisfaction is clearly reserved for the readers of this Manual. Be-



sides being the peer of Oehler and Dorner in biblical theology, and the easy match for any of the foremost among contemporary scholars in New Testament exegesis, Professor Bernhard Weiss is confessedly the greatest authority of the age in New Testament Introduction. It is in addition equally gratifying and advantageous to possess the great work of the German coryphæus done into English in a manner that is, when a few exceptions are taken, so creditable.

These two large volumes are, after all, only intended as a manual, but they are too much condensed and too much involved in debate to serve the purposes of an ordinary American text-book.

The first volume is made up of an introduction and two parts. The introduction and the first part embrace most of the general matter of the whole work. The second part of the first volume, and the whole of the second volume, except the final appendix, are devoted to a consideration of the several books which go to form the New Testament canon. The introduction contains a masterly account of the founding of the science of Introduction, of the history of criticism and apologetics, of the Tübingen school and its opponents, and of the present state of biblical and especially of New Testament learning in the departments already indicated. The first part of volume first is taken up with a history of the origin of the New Testament canon; the second part of volume first and the bulk of volume second with a history of the origin of the New Testament writings. These last are examined, and in the most scrupulous detail, under four divisions. The first division covers the Pauline Epistles (with an appendix on the Epistle to the Hebrews), and opens with a discussion, in successive sections, of Paul, of Paul and the primitive apostles, of Paul as a founder of churches, and of Paul as an author. This is followed up section after section by a treatment of the Thessalonian Epistles and the Galatians, the Corinthian disorders, the Corinthian Epistles, the church at Rome, the Epistles to the Romans, the Colossians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, and the Pastoral Epistles, with their peculiarities and criticism. The second volume begins with the appendix on the author, readers, and date of the Hebrews. The second division relates to the Apocalypse, and treats of its author, composition, and historical site. The third division deals with the so-called Catholic Epistles, and successive sections are devoted to the brethren of Jesus, and the Epistles of James, Jude, Peter and John. The fourth division is concerned with the historical books. The synoptical question is handled first. Then follow in succession the sections relating to the oldest source of the gospel narrative (preserved in Matthew and Luke alone), the Gospels of Mark, Matthew, and Luke, the Acts, the sources of the Acts, the Gospel of John, and the Johannine question. The Appendix at the end of the second volume, entitled "History of the New Testament Text," is in point of fact a superb but succinct digest of nearly all that is known about the text and textual criticism.

The first volume has been before the body of English readers for something like a twelvemonth. Anything of the nature of detailed examination is therefore reserved for volume second. If any one, however, desires to see one of the ablest, and the latest, first-hand exhibitions of the history of the subject from the apostolic fathers to the Reformation, and from Semler and Eichorn to our contemporaries, Hilgenfeld, Holsten and Volkmar, as well as of the critical and apologetic tendencies of modern research, and of the problem and method of the science of *Eindeitung*, let him turn to Dr. Weiss' Introduction.

If one were to let the book drop from his table, and find it open of itself at

one of the pages respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews, after reading on awhile he might well be tempted to exclaim, *ex pede Herculem!* The Berlin teacher opposes the Pauline authorship, but presents the church tradition in all its volume and strength. He equally opposes the ancient hypotheses, which attribute the epistle to Luke, to Clement, to Silas, and to Apollos respectively, and argues vigorously for the very old view (mentioned by Tertullian) which ascribes it to Barnabas. He rejects, of course, the genuineness of the inscription, but admits its truth, and holds that the letter was written to the Jewish Christians of Palestine. He contends for the Greek original, and avers that in the present state of knowledge such a fact, even on the Palestinian theory, would stagger no competent critic. The Lukan hypothesis is at once discounted, on the ground that the third evangelist was a Gentile, and that he gives no evidence of Alexandrian proclivities or culture. The resemblance (which our author admits) between the style of the Acts and of the Epistle has, he affirms, been exaggerated, and is general rather than special. Silas and Apollos (like Luke) he concedes fulfil some of the conditions. All had been companions and intimates of the apostle. Silas in this last respect has a stronger claim than even that of the Egyptian Hellenist, who, however, of course, better meets the demand for the peculiar Judæo-Egyptian culture. In Barnabas, the Levite of Cyprus, our author maintains that all the conditions are satisfied. This view, it seems, was revived in comparatively modern times by "the Scotchman Cameron," at the beginning of the seventeenth century. The view has since been supported by many, notably Schmidt, Ullmann, Tidesten, Wieseler, Thiersch, Adolf Maier, H. Schultz, de Lagarde, Rénan, Zahn, Volkmar, Overbeck, and Keil. The doctor concludes: "And unless with Eichorn, Köstlin, Ewald, Grimm, Hausrath, . . . and others, we refuse to name any one as the author, this view is certainly the only one that has every probability in its favor." Here, as in the case of the books in general, and especially the most important ones, we have a thorough discussion of the scope, contents, motive, doctrine, and whole environment of the sacred writing. Our author's *stand-point* in theology is regarded in Germany as highly conservative, and even "orthodox," but a few years ago would have been pronounced in this country to be very latitudinarian. Great allowances must be made for men who are not, like Beecher and Matthew Arnold, plunging from the light into the darkness, but, like Tholuck and a host of stalwart champions of Jesus Christ, are breaking their way from the darkness into the light. The graver judgment has been passed upon Bernhard Weiss that was passed upon Heinrich Ewald (whom Dr. Weiss resembles in his encyclopædic learning and daring genius), that he cares more for the intellectual combat than for the truth. We hope this judgment is a harsh one; and we hail this Achilles of the new criticism as in most respects our friend, and as a unique and redoubtable ally. Weiss may be said to occupy an intermediate ground between Keim and Keil.

The discussion of the Apocalypse, and its relation to the Apostle John, is highly interesting, but many will think not wholly satisfactory. The apostolic authorship it strenuously defended. Even the Tübingen school recognizes "this memorial of primitive apostolic Jewish Christianity" (p. 88). The account of the beloved disciple is full, and not in all respects familiar. It is held that he was not banished to Patmos. The ancient statements, it is alleged, were based on the book itself, which was misunderstood. The Asian and Ephesian labors of the apostle are confirmed. The date of the composition is set before the destruction of Jerusalem.

This is somewhat precariously inferred from Chapter XII. Tertullian's legends, including the one about the boiling oil, are unhesitatingly rejected. John's very martyrdom (certainly as said to be referred to by Papias) is regarded as fabulous. It is only since the Council of Nice that John has been surnamed ὁ θεόλογος. Jerome's "touching picture" of the aged apostle spreading his hands and bidding his "little children" love one another, is thought to have the appearance of being derived from John's epistle. The legend of the Wandering Jew arose from an earlier misconception and embellishment of John xxi. 29; and the apostle's actual death, as far back as Jerome, was looked upon as being only a sleep. The old story about Cerinthus and the bath has the look of authenticity and a very creditable parentage.

The symbolical theory of the Apocalypse is made to displace the historical; but there is much in the details that is novel and sometimes hazardous. The central part of the book is resolved into a series of visions. Each series goes over the whole ground; but they proceed in a climactic order as to the amount and nature of the revelation. These visions are supposed to have received their literary form upon subsequent retrospection, and the things said to be mere hints or devices to reproduce the fading impression of what had really been seen or heard. "From the religious point of view it is a kind of philosophy of history, to which apocalyptic prophecy gives birth, though not in the form of calm reflection, but in imaginative intuition." (P. 62.) The writer here refers to his own *Apokalyptische Studien*. (Stud. u. Krit, 1869.) The four living ones are (after Hengstenberg) held to represent the "collective creation." Here is a fine passage—resembling one quoted by Dr. Willam Lee in his work on inspiration:

"All that is brilliant in nature, the glitter of the sun or of gold, the lustre of precious stones or of pearls, becomes an emblem of the divine glory; all that is terrible in nature, lightning and thunder, the roar of the tempest and the whirlwind, hail and earthquake, emblems of the divine justice. The horns are symbolical of power, the eyes of omniscience, the white hair of eternity, the diadem of supremacy, garlands and palms of victory, incense of prayer. The symbolism of colors and of beasts is especially common; white is the color of purity, fiery red is blood color, black the color of mourning, paleness the color of fear; lion and lamb, eagle and serpent, dragon and beasts, appear as emblems of the qualities they represent. So, too, the symbolic acts of sealing and unsealing, the blowing of the trumpet and the casting down of the stone, the gathering of the harvest and the pressing of the wine, are immediately intelligible." (P. 65, foot-note.)

The Apocalypse (as against Harenberg and Bolten) was originally written in Greek. The text is still defective. Rhetorical motives and provincial ignorance may account for most of the peculiarities of the style. We have come upon no avowals as to the millennium question. As to the brethren of our Lord, the usual Protestant view is maintained, after Hegisippus and the Greeks, that James was the true brother of Jesus, and the author of the epistle which goes by his name. The catholic epistles are upheld, and, Second Peter and Jude especially, are discussed with vigor and originality. The internal evidence is shown to be favorable to the genuineness of Second Peter. Among other arguments "a long series of very striking resemblances," between this and the first epistle, is given, on page 166, in the foot-note. The external evidence is regarded as ambiguous. It is asserted that the third century is the first to have any knowledge of a second epistle of Peter. (P. 169.) There are, Dr. Weiss would admit, earlier but obscure and doubtful intimations of its existence. The silence of the second century is looked

upon as very suspicious. Yet the possibility of its genuineness, bedimmed for a time by unknown circumstances, need not, he thinks, be excluded, nor the question be declared definitely settled. The Tübingen grounds for rejecting the fourth gospel are powerfully rebutted, and its genuineness conclusively supported. The real problem is to reconcile this, the later aspect of the Christ as given in the "latest product of the apostolic age," with "the older tradition absolutely attested in its credibility." (P. 400.) This our author holds can only be done by conceding that John's gospel "presents apostolic reminiscences according to ideal points of view, and a reproduction of Christ's historical discourses combined with Johannine elucidation and explanations." (P. 401.)

We have left ourselves no room to speak of the Synoptics and of Acts, though this is one of the most striking and characteristic portions of the disquisition. Doctor Weiss finds in the canonical Mark the long sought for "*Ur-Markus*" of speculative and imaginative criticism. He demonstrates its genuineness, and advocates its essential independence. Luke, he argues, is made up chiefly of three sources, of which the Aramaic Matthew and the canonical Mark are the principal ones. The Acts, as might have been conjectured from its authorship, is also judged to have had its definite and discernible sources.

On the whole, these volumes of the famous Berlin scholar and lecturer are rich in new matter, fortified by every resource of learning and criticism, and are well intended as a mighty buttress of historical and living Christianity.

H. C. ALEXANDER.

#### DODS' INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. *By Marcus Dods, D. D., Author of "The Book of Genesis," "The Parables of Our Lord," "Israel's Iron Age," etc.* Second Edition. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House, 1889. 12mo, pp. 247.

This is a charming little book, inside and outside, to look at and feel and handle; it is the deepest of blue, the snowiest of white, and (so far as regards the lettering) the yellowest of gold; and it has just the right shape. The author's part corresponds not inaptly to those of the printer and the binder. Dr. Dods has come to be recognized as one of the highest authorities in Great Britain and Ireland on the peculiar class of subjects immediately, or somewhat more remotely connected with Bible study. He has been a marked man in Scotland for nearly or quite a quarter of a century. He was first principally known as a judicious editor of *Augustine*.

From the beginning of his career Dr. Dods has made it evident that he meant to think for himself. At the start, and for some time afterwards, the deviations from customary beliefs and opinions were to a great extent, we are disposed to say entirely, within the bounds of acknowledged orthodoxy. Dr. Dods belonged to a group of young and brilliant men in the Free Kirk, who have quaffed long and copiously from the fountains of rationalistic or neological German scholarship. This was therefore, by no means, the case referred to by the epigrammatic poet in the well-known lines:

A little learning is a dangerous thing,  
Drink deep or taste not the Pierian spring.

There are, on the contrary, waters in Germany, of which if one drink too often or too largely, the odds are that his veins will be infected with the poison of contemporary infidelity. The fact is, too, that Dr. Dods has partaken freely, and not slightly, of the head-springs of the German waters in general. The pity of it is that a man must do this in these latter days in order to get quite to the bottom of almost any subject that has been transmitted by the far-seeing ancients to the consideration of the modern world.

When Dr. Dods returned from these excursions, it was not judged that he had done so wholly uninfluenced by the atmosphere in which he had learned to breathe and move in comfort. He was presently taken to task for what were challenged as untoward and indefensible views as to Sabbath observance. Subsequently his notable contributions to the criticism of the Old Testament were received with disfavor in orthodox circles in Scotland and America, on the ground that they were in the direction of perilous advance along those lines. The paper read by Dr. Dods before the London Council, in the summer of the year 1888, created a hubbub in that usually serene and elastic body, because of the pronounced and questionable views to which it committed him regarding the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.

Yet Dr. Dods' *aim* has always appeared to us to be innocuous and conservative, which may be true as well of Reuss or Kuenen. The difference on the side of the Scottish critic is that (giving them credit for the same honesty) he has gone by no means so far in his aberrations as they have done.

We confess this pretty volume has been a surprise to us in this as it has been in other respects. The attempt of the author has been to hold the scales even as betwixt all opposing views, and to decide the question in each case "without fear, favor, or affection." Yet it is plain that his leanings have been towards the reception rather than the rejection of all the twenty-seven books constituting the irrefragable canon of the New Testament. At any rate, he either pronounces distinctly for the genuineness of every book (and he examines them all in some detail), or else he points out how the balance turns in that way, and not against them.

Our author first takes up the Gospels and considers them in general and in particular; then the Acts of the Apostles; then the Epistles. The Pauline Epistles are the ones examined first, in general and in particular, and then the Pastoral Epistles, which are subjected to a similar and a close and conscientious treatment. The book ends with a consideration of the Apocalypse.

The writer of the volume now under review manifestly prefers giving the opinions of others to giving his own. He is silent as to his view of inspiration. This is the less to be regretted, as that view, if it had been disclosed in these compact pages, would have proved unsatisfying to the great majority of our readers.

It is simply wonderful how much meat there is in this truly valuable compend. The style is perfect. It is all touch and go, but the salient or picturesque points are seized as by an unerring instinct.

Under the head of the Gospels the erudite author discusses *in limine* their authenticity, then the synoptic problem, the documentary theory, and the triple tradition. On page 9 there is an instructive summary, under six Arabic numerals, of the different phases of the hypothesis of documentary sources. After contending against the oral tradition scheme of solution, and presenting the view which presupposes prior original documents, or one primitive document antedating all of

ours, he concludes as follows: . . . "The critical question at present concerns not so much the date as the natural order of the gospels, their closeness to, or remoteness from, the primitive source. When these points are determined, there will be hope of a permanent and satisfactory solution of the synoptical problem." (p. 15.)

John's gospel, the Acts, the Thessalonians, the Hebrews, James, Jude, Second Peter, the Apocalypse, in short, all the canonical books, are cogently defended against hostile criticism. The question as to the date and authorship of the Hebrew letter are left in a state of dubiety. Jude is understood to cite Second Peter as already being fulfilled, and to quote from the book of Enoch. The Pauline Epistles are distributed under three heads, viz., First, The Epistles of the Missionary Activity of the Apostles; Second, The Epistles of the [First] Captivity; Third, The Closing Epistles.

H. C. ALEXANDER.

#### SMITH'S COMMENTARY ON REVELATION.

COMMENTARY ON THE REVELATION. *By Justin A. Smith, D. D., in consultation with James Robinson Boise, Ph. D., D. D., LL. D.* Philadelphia: Baptist Publication Society.

This is one volume of a series in process of publication by this Society, under the general supervision of the accomplished scholar, Dr. A. Hovey, which is designed to cover the entire Scriptures, Old and New. This volume presents an example of judicious and painstaking research highly commendable to the scholars engaged in its preparation. Dr. Smith, the responsible author, is the accomplished editor, of more than thirty years standing, of the leading religious paper of the Baptist denomination in the West—*The Standard*, of Chicago. Without laying claim to what is technically termed in these days the "critical faculty," Dr. Smith has shown in many ways his eminent ability as a commentator. To varied scholarship, he adds a profound reverence for the word of God. He brings to the study of Scripture a well-balanced judgment. His imagination, a faculty which, in the treatment of the Apocalypse especially, is liable to get the better of so many, is held in admirable control. He has evidently no pet theories to advance, no patent nostrums to throw upon the theological market. He cares more for the honor of his Master, and is more anxious to unfold his mind and declare his will, than to gain for himself the reputation of a discoverer. Every page of this carefully written work reveals the conscientious, modest, cultured Bible student intent upon the one great duty of giving to the world a concise, clear, and consistent exposition of a confessedly difficult portion of the divine word.

In a well-written preface the author informs us that, "for the most part, the Greek text of Westcott and Hort, which was made also the chief textual basis of the revision printed in this volume, along with the Authorized Version, has been followed," and that "the works mainly of Alford, Lange, Hengstenberg, Düsterdiech in Meyer, Carpenter in Ellicott, *The Speaker's Commentary*, Stuart, Auberlen, Zülig, Wetstein-Ellicott's *Horæ Apocalyptica*, Wordsworth-Farrar, besides lectures of Edward Irving and of Dr. Vaughan, formerly of the Middle Temple; and as among older writers, Bengel, Brightman, Dunbar, Mede, and others" have been consulted. As we read these pages, however, we are convinced that while these various authors have been before him for reference, they have not been servilely followed. Dr. Smith has done his own thinking, and has weighed every opinion

advanced by others in an independent balance. He has evidently depended more upon the Bible itself, making it, as far as possible, its own interpreter, than upon the views of antecedent commentators. He has struck the happy mean between a presumptuous independence of other minds and a weak reliance upon stereotyped theories of interpretation.

In his introduction, which, with the analysis of contents by chapters, covers about twenty pages, Dr. Smith treats in a manner highly satisfactory, 1st, of the author of Revelation; 2nd, of the language and literary style of the book; 3rd, of the place where and time when it was written; 4th, of the theories of interpretation; 5th, of the symbolism of the book; 6th, of its character; 7th, of its purpose, or why it was written; 8th of the *Parousia*; and lastly, he presents an admirable condensed general analysis greatly helpful to the common reader.

As a specimen, at once of the author's chaste, attractive style—for this is a readable book—and as an index of his estimate of the place which Christ's second coming occupies in the Apocalypse, we quote from the introduction (pp. 18, 19):

“If any one theme can be named as the absorbing and comprehensive one in this book, it must be given to us in the words (i. 7), ‘Behold, he cometh with clouds.’ With this announcement the book opens. With the Lord's own declaration, ‘Behold, I come quickly,’ (xxii. 7,) and the response of his servant, ‘Even so come, Lord Jesus,’ the book closes. The Dispensation whose events and issues the book in the main prophetically traces, so far from being a final one, is but preparatory to that which *is* final. Of this fact, indications appear everywhere in the book itself down to its closing chapters. The scene presented is not that of a final condition, settled and permanent, but a broken and changeful one; a theatre upon which warring forces meet, a vast stage of human history crowded with actors and issues, while in some of the changes of the tremendous drama heaven itself seems in suspense as to what the final act shall be. The souls of martyred ones under the altar, through many centuries of ordeal, are crying, ‘How long! O Lord!’ while it is only in the finishing of ‘the mystery of God’ that any final answer is given.

“All this indicates a continual looking forward; the attitude is one of expectation; only as this consummation is reached is the key to the mysteries of divine providence at last found. And that consummation reaches its climax in the personal coming of the Lord. Now, the crucial point in the interpretation of this book is, for these reasons, that which concerns this second personal advent, more especially in its relation to that peculiar and significant feature of the whole prophecy—the millennium. This is not the place to set forth the reasons which influence us in placing the personal second advent *after* the millennium rather than *before*. It must suffice here to simply announce the fact that our convictions, after careful study of the prophecy, compel this conclusion. The grounds upon which these convictions rest will appear in the proper place. For the present we simply declare our acquiescence in that view of this second coming of our Lord which makes it the great event of the future, which regards it as bearing a relation to all that is now passing, and is yet to come in the present Dispensation, no less vital than the first advent bore to the four thousand years of human history that preceded it; and which claims that only as this event is set in its true relations, can this consummating book of the New Testament be adequately understood or explained.”

Under the head “General Analysis,” the author presents a fourfold division of the Apocalypse, in accordance with which, in his opinion, the book may be profitably studied. He says (Introduction, p 19), “A phrase rich in significance occurs at chapter x. 7 in this book, ‘the mystery of God.’ ‘In the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he is about to sound, then is finished the mystery of God, according to the good tidings which he declared to his servants the prophets.’

(Revised Version) This 'mystery of God' may, in general, be said to be the subject of the book. One finds in it, indeed, when carefully studied, what seems like a gathering up, in brief and sublime summary, of the whole of that inspired prophecy, the details of which we find sown all through the earlier books of Scripture. It is a panoramic exhibition of the divine procedure in dealing with the church and the world. It is human history at the point of view of the kingdom of God in its *origin*, its *ordeal*, its *progress*, its *consummation*."

In the body of the work we find the accepted and revised versions arranged in parallel columns, and after each chapter occur "general comments" which embody for the most part historical illustrations, or practical suggestions more in place there than in the strictly exegetical portions, and also an occasional "*excursus*" treating somewhat in detail of such controverted or doubtful points as the forty-two months and twelve hundred and sixty days, antichrist, the vials, the battle of Armageddon, etc., which features add to the value of the work. It is, of course, too much to expect universal accord with all our author's views, but our judgment is that, for private and family reading, for Sabbath-school teachers, and for the mass of our clergymen, pressed as they are for time, no more useful commentary on the Apocalypse has issued from the American press.

W. W. HARSHA.

SHIELDS'S "PHILOSOPHIA ULTIMA."

PHILOSOPHIA ULTIMA; OR, THE SCIENCE OF THE SCIENCES. *By Charles Woodruff Shields, D. D., LL. D., Professor in Princeton College.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1889. Two Volumes. Pp. 420 and 482.

In the year 1865 several gentlemen in Philadelphia, impressed with the importance of the matter, united in founding a chair in the College of New Jersey which should deal with the relations of science and religion. The scope of the work pertaining to this chair is indicated by its title, "The Harmony of Science and Revealed Religion." To this chair the author of these handsome volumes was appointed, and their contents are the fruit of his labors therein. In the preface to the first volume the author tells us that this treatise is the result of nearly thirty years' work in the department of inquiry to which it is devoted. This being the case, we would naturally expect breadth of view and wealth of learning, and we are by no means disappointed, though unable to agree with the learned author in some of his main positions.

It is proper here to state that, while closely related, the two volumes do not contain a continuous treatment of the subject in hand. This arises largely from the fact that they were not originally published at the same time. The first volume was originally published in 1877, and was in a measure complete in itself. It is the third edition of this volume which is now before us, and along with it the first edition of the second volume appears. Moreover, the second volume consists of an elaborate expansion of the last chapter of the first volume, and in this way the two volumes are linked together historically rather than logically.

A general idea of the scope of the two volumes may be gathered from their titles, which are as follows: Volume I.: "An Historical and Critical Introduction to the Final Philosophy, as Issuing from the Harmony of Science and Religion." Volume II.: "The History of the Sciences and the Logic of the Sciences." Both



volumes are largely historical, and there is considerable repetition in them. This could scarcely be avoided, as more than half of each volume is historical, and much of the same ground is travelled over twice. Yet the treatment throughout is so interesting and eloquent that the repetition is not tiresome, but rather helpful to a better understanding of the whole subject.

It is worthy of remark, that the aim of the author is a noble and inspiring one. At the present day the advance made in the various sciences is marvellous; and any attempt to obtain a systematic view of the whole field, and to link science and religion, reason and revelation, in one comprehensive system deserves high praise. This is the splendid goal, high up near the portals of the temple of eternal truth, which the Final Philosophy as the Science of the Sciences sets out to reach. We may now follow our author through his readable volumes, and see how successful he is in his lofty endeavor.

VOLUME I.—A very readable introductory chapter treats of “the academic study of Christian science.” The province of each science is carefully defined and its limits clearly prescribed. The various topics with which it is to deal are outlined, and the general relations of science and religion are indicated. That there must be inner harmony, not inherent antagonism, between science and religion is assumed, and the importance of this, alike to science, to philosophy, and to religion is emphasized. Here also the scope of the author’s conception of the Final Philosophy appears. It is “the theory and art of perfect knowledge.” This Final Philosophy, he thinks, will “promote science and vindicate religion.” The real question to be discussed is, “whether true science and true religion are susceptible of being correlated;” whether, “though distinct and diverse, they are not reciprocal and complementary;” whether they are “but opposite halves of the same rounded whole of truth?” These hints as to the nature of the task undertaken by the author appear a little vague, but they open up as he proceeds. A captious critic might be disposed to find some fault with the title of the treatise, but as the author adopts it and tells us what he means, we are not disposed to criticise.

The main body of this volume is divided into two parts. Part I. sketches “The Philosophical Parties as to the Relations between Science and Religion,” while Part II. unfolds “The Philosophical Theory of the Harmony of Science and Religion.” Each part is divided into five chapters, making ten complete discussions in all.

The first chapter traces “the conflicts and alliances between science and religion” from the dawn of Greek philosophy, through the pre-Christian and post-Christian ages of pagan science, and then through the patristic, scholastic and Reformation periods of Christian science. The treatment of these topics is well balanced and quite complete. Compared with Draper’s sketch of the same period it is immensely superior. The absence of a clear distinction between science and religion in early times leads our author in his discussions over nearly all the ground of philosophy as well as of science. It might have been an advantage if our author in his expositions had always kept this distinction more clearly before his own mind.

The other four chapters of this part traverse the field thus marked out in a four-fold way and with much ability. One treats of the modern *antagonism* between science and religion; another of the modern *indifferentism* between them; another discusses modern *eclecticism* between science and religion, and the last deals with modern *skepticism* between them. This plan of discussion leads us over nearly

the same ground four times, but as a different conveyance carries us each time by a new route and past other landscapes, we do not feel like objecting to the trips. Each journey we are led through the territories of the following sciences: Astronomy, Geology, Anthropology, Psychology, Sociology, Theology, Religious Philosophy, and Religious Culture. Four pleasant journeys through these interesting fields are made. The first time we take the coach of *antagonism*, the second that of *indifferentism*, the third that of *eclecticism*, and the fourth that of *skepticism*. This historical sketch, occupying nearly two hundred pages and covering a very wide field, deserves much praise and little criticism. Three simple remarks is all we have space to make:

1. In the chapter on modern antagonism between science and religion it is made evident that the conflict is not always that of theologians against scientists, but often that of scientists against each other. This consideration might have been even more strongly stated than it is by our author, for many new scientific discoveries were as much opposed by scientists themselves as by theologians, and the theologians were not always on the side of error. The controversy concerning Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood is but one of many illustrations that might be quoted here.

2. The geological and anthropological sections are generally the most satisfactory in each of the four chapters, while the chapter on Modern Skepticism between science and religion seems more meagre and superficial than any of them. In the chapter on Eclecticism, the treatment of Genesis and Geology constitutes a very complete discussion of an extensive and inviting field.

3. The general conclusion of Part I. may be given in the author's own words: "We may therefore conclude, after a full survey of all modern philosophical opinions, that the two great interests of religion and science are not only reconcilable, but actually being reconciled. Let neither the scientist nor the religionist despair of their ultimate harmony, but rather let both strive together to effect it, and therein hail at once the thorough fusion of Christianity and civilization, and the practical union of earth and heaven." (P. 242.)

Part II. opens with a significant chapter on the "Umpirage of Philosophy between Science and Religion." This chapter is by far the most important in the book, inasmuch as in it is unfolded the author's fundamental positions in regard to the relations between science, philosophy and religion. We shall, therefore, examine this chapter with some care, first stating the author's views pretty fully, and then estimating their import.

Professor Shields' general position is thus expressed: "Philosophy, in the best sense of the word, is the umpire between science and religion." (P. 271.) In this statement it is of great importance to get a clear idea of the meaning of the term philosophy; yet we have to confess considerable difficulty in getting such an idea. He defines and explains philosophy in various ways, of which the following are some leading examples: "It is the science of things human and divine, together with their causes." "It includes whatsoever is common to both the secular and sacred departments of learning." "As the science of knowledge, it aims to ascertain inductively the validity, the limits and the functions of reason and revelation." "As a summary of universal science, it receives and cherishes impartially and equally the discovered and revealed bodies of knowledge that it may organize them into a rational system." "In the most common and literal sense of the

word, it is love of wisdom." (P. 271.) "If we would characterize a lover, seeker and reconciler of all truths, both natural and revealed, we must term him a philosopher." "If we would describe that special work which is to be done in adjusting the relations of religion and science in ascertaining and defending their respective spheres and prerogatives, in devising and applying logical rules to their pending controversies, in sifting their several portions of truth from error, and combining them into a harmonious system, we can only speak of all this as a peculiar intellectual task belonging neither to religion alone, nor to science alone, but to their common ally and friend, philosophy." (P. 272) It must be confessed, that no very clear conception of the nature and office of philosophy can be gathered from these passages, other than the very general one of the love of truth, and the right use of reason in general.

As to the umpirage of philosophy, our author says: "Religion alone could not furnish the needed umpire;" "science alone could not furnish the needed umpire;" "philosophy, at least, is the actual and accepted umpire;" "philosophy, too, is the only available, . . . the only desirable umpire." (Pp. 272-274.) "The reconciliation of science and religion is not only the distinctive problem of philosophy, but precisely that one chief problem by the solution of which her own function is exhausted, her goal attained, her mission accomplished." (P. 276.) This is certainly a high and sacred task for philosophy; but it may be doubted whether philosophy will submit to such limitations as are therein involved. She will likely still persist in dealing with many other problems besides the reconciliation of science and religion, important as that office is admitted to be. It must be added here that our author is careful to point out, that in using the term "umpirage," he does not design "to exalt science over religion, or philosophy over either." "An umpire is but the servant of the game that he watches, making neither the laws nor the facts, but simply applying the one to the other." (P. 277.)

To illustrate the manner and results of the "umpirage of philosophy," a few examples may be taken from some of the living issues between science and religion as mentioned by our author. The first is from purely physical science, and relates to the origin of the cosmos. It is thus stated in the book before us: "On the scientific side of this question we have the hypothesis of universal evolution, of a spontaneous growth of worlds out of crude matter, by means of its own laws, from an indefinite immensity and antiquity; in a word, the rise of the present cosmos from a primitive chaos." (P. 249.) "On the religious side of the same question we have the dogma of immediate creation, of an instantaneous starting forth of the heavens and earth from nothing, in their present form, at the mere word of Jehovah." (P. 250.) In geology a similar antagonism appears: "On the one side (that of science) of the question is the hypothesis of secular evolution, of a slow unfolding of the globe from a chaotic mass into its organized form, through the action of existing causes, during indefinite time." (P. 252.) "On the religious side of the same question is the dogma of successive creations, of Almighty fiat calling into being one after another land and sea and sky, reptiles and plants and animals, in six days of twenty-four hours, a few thousand years ago." (P. 253.) Another example from anthropology must suffice: "On the scientific side rises before us the hypothesis of derivative evolution, of a gradual growth of animal into human species, under organic and climatic laws, long ages ere history was born." (P. 255.) "On the other side of the same question stands the dogma of independent creation,

of an immediate formation of man, out of the ground, in the image of God, on the sixth day of the first week of the world." (P. 256.)

According to our author, philosophy is to act as umpire between these antagonistic views on the scientific and religious sides, and decide whether the cosmos is the result of "a spontaneous growth by means of its own laws," or the product "of immediate creation;" whether the present condition of the earth is the result of a "slow unfolding of the globe from a chaotic mass into its organized form," or the product of "successive creations;" whether man is the result of a "gradual growth of animal into human species," or the product of "an independent creation." The "umpirage of philosophy" between science and religion will at once appear from these examples to be a delicate and difficult task. It will likely happen that in many cases one side or the other will dispute the decisions of the umpire; and in that case our author does not say what must be done.

In replying to certain objections to his views, our author makes some important statements of much value in this connection. In regard to the conflict between science and religion he says: "Before the debate can proceed intelligently there are certain preliminary questions which must and ought to be settled, and which can only be settled, as we have maintained, by philosophic minds." (P. 280) These preliminary questions are such as lie in the field of natural theology and the evidences of Christianity. He says: "The whole field of natural theology and the Christian evidences logically precedes all questions between science and the Bible." "If these evidences are sufficient, it would be unphilosophical for a scientist to reject or ignore that revelation in debating with a theologian." (P. 280.) The following remarks may be made on the views above stated:

1. Our author's conception of philosophy seems extremely vague and indefinite. He says it means a love of all truth, and other statements imply that he employs the term to denote the proper use of human reason in regard to the questions in debate between science and religion. This conception is as applicable to the scientist and theologian as to the philosopher. All profess to be lovers and seekers of truth, and all three would no doubt regard it as slander to accuse them of not using reason properly. A conception of philosophy which is so broad as to be equally applicable to science and religion is of little use in deciding controversies between them. We admit that reason has an important preliminary office in regard to the evidences of religion; but our author evidently means much more than this when he says that philosophy is the umpire between science and religion. Something much more definite than this view of philosophy is needed in order to meet the demands of the problem.

2. In the examples of the antagonisms between science and religion cited by our author, the form of expression presents the opposition too sharply, and in a somewhat one-sided way. Why use the term "dogma" in every case on the religious side when that term is in bad repute in certain quarters and the better word, "doctrine," is at hand? Why present the extreme non-biblical hypotheses on the scientific side in every case, as if these were fully established on merely scientific grounds? Moreover, there are scientific dogmas and dogmatic scientists, as well as theological dogmas and dogmatic theologians. At the present day perhaps the former outnumber and make more noise than the latter. A little care here would have made this chapter much more satisfactory.

3. In regard to the discussions on the scientific side, as above cited, it must be

remembered that the work of the scientist is not complete until he has reached well assured conclusions. The scientist has not merely to frame hypotheses and hand them over to the philosopher for verification ; he himself must verify them before his work is done. In regard to the origin of the cosmos, the method of its development, and the origin of man, as cited from our author, it cannot be said that science has yet reached her final result, for the theories of to-day may be discarded to-morrow. Until science has spoken her last word she is not prepared to hand over her jurisdiction and submit to the umpirage of philosophy. Hence philosophy cannot commence her umpirage till science has ended her labor, and then it may be found that there is nothing for philosophy to do, inasmuch as all conflict with religion has vanished when true scientific results have been reached.

4. In like manner, on the religious side as little can religion be expected to abdicate in favor of philosophy, and submit her well founded doctrines to the umpirage of philosophy for modification or rejection. Reason having discharged her primary office in regard to the evidences of divine revelation, and sound interpretation of that revelation having been reached, the result on the religious side is final, and no umpirage on the part of philosophy is permissible, and none is necessary. The proposed umpirage of philosophy, in spite of our author's protest, brings us dangerously near the malarial region of unhealthy rationalism.

5. The nature and relations of science, philosophy, and theology can only be indicated in the briefest way. Science deals with observed facts in any field ; philosophy treats of first principles in general ; and theology, in the strict sense, discusses revealed truth. Science has a wide field, but raises questions which philosophy must answer, while philosophy again starts problems which theology only can solve. To a certain extent they may cover the same ground, and deal with various phases of the same problems, and yet each has its own distinctive territory and material. Scientific inquiry necessarily runs up to the region of philosophy, and philosophical speculation naturally rises up to the realm of theology. Hence science, philosophy, and theology constitute a trinity graded in order one above the other. When reason has discharged its preliminary office in regard to theology and set her upon the throne, it must at once acknowledge her supremacy. Thus philosophy cannot remain the umpire between science and religion. Revealed theology is supreme, not only in her own proper sphere, but wherever she speaks concerning topics common to her and science, or to her and philosophy. At her right-hand stands philosophy, and at her left science ; both must heed her voice and do her homage.

In the second chapter the "Positive Philosophy, or Theory of Nescience," is discussed in a very satisfactory way. The pretensions of Comte are passed through the crucible. It is shown that the law of the three states—*theological, metaphysical and positive*—is not confirmed by the experience either of the individual or the race. The three stages are found coëxistent at the present time ; and, instead of supplanting one another, are actually complimentary. Our author also points out that there is no basis in the mental and moral constitution of man for this law ; and it is further found that both theology and metaphysics are flourishing at the present day. This chapter, though going over well beaten ground, is a very satisfactory one.

The third chapter deals with the "Absolute Philosophy, or the Theory of Omniscience." Five questions concerning the absolute are asked and answered. Is it

conceivable, credible, cognizable, revealable, and demonstrable? An affirmative answer, with certain limitations, is given to each of these questions, and with most that is said we can agree. The only remark we are inclined to make is that our author does Hamilton scant justice in such passages as this: "It was charged by Hamilton that Kant 'had slain the body, but had not exorcised the spectre of the absolute; and this spectre has continued to haunt the schools of Germany even to the present day.' But it may now be charged upon Hamilton himself that in his zeal to exorcise the spectre he has mangled the body of the absolute, and left the remains of philosophy in the hands of infidels." We call attention to this passage as an illustration of many that we find in current philosophical literature which seem to us to indicate a somewhat one-sided and superficial view of Hamilton's philosophy as a whole; for while we admit that Hamilton too rigidly maintained that by the pathway of pure intellect the absolute is inaccessible, yet by another avenue, too often overlooked—that of faith—a well grounded conviction of the reality of the absolute is reached. Many writers ignore this important side of Hamilton's philosophy, and Spencer especially has done Hamilton serious injustice in using him as he does in support of agnosticism.

The fourth chapter deals with the "Final Philosophy, or the Theory of Perfected Science." As neither the positive nor the absolute philosophy furnishes a complete theory and system of knowledge divine and human, as that wherein reason shall appear concurrent with revelation, another theory must be sought. Here, again, with some repetition, the objects, methods and results of positivism and absolutism are defined and contrasted, and various reasons are given for their reconciliation in the so-called Final Philosophy. Whilst the aim which our author has in view is lofty and noble, and the discussion scholarly, yet it must be confessed that the treatment of the subject is so vague and general that its perusal is not entirely satisfactory, especially as expectation is somewhat raised by the title, Final Philosophy.

VOLUME II.—Having devoted so much space to the first volume, much less can be given to the second. It has already been stated that the second volume consists in an expansion of the last chapter of the first volume, which treats of the "Project of the Perfected Sciences and Arts," and that the title of the second volume was "Philosophia Ultima, or the Science of the Sciences—The History of the Sciences and the Logic of the Sciences."

The introduction is an exceedingly eloquent exposition of the aim and scope of philosophy. The term philosophy is still used in a general sense, and it aims, our author says, to answer three questions: What can we know? How can we know? Why should we know? The answer to the first gives "a science of the sciences," to the second "the art of the sciences" and to the third "the science of the arts." This opens up the main divisions of the treatise, but in the detailed discussion of these three questions the first occupies 410 out of 482 pages. What we have to say by way of review will be confined entirely to this part of the work, wherein philosophy is viewed as the science of the sciences, in the discharge of her function as the umpire between science and religion.

The first chapter proceeds to discuss, at great length and with much ability, "The Purification of the Sciences." After the manner of Bacon, the sources of error are pointed out, and then a definition of "science" is given as "exact, verified organized knowledge." The great topic of the classification of the sciences is treated at length and with immense stores of learning. The conditions of the for-

mation of a science of the sciences are then laid down as follows:—1. All the sciences must have come into being. 2. All the contents of all the sciences must be included. 3. All the legitimate factors of human knowledge must be included. 4. Revealed religion as the metaphysical complement of the sciences must be embraced. These conditions are important, and this chapter is an able and instructive one, showing everywhere marks of wide and careful research.

The second chapter makes a rapid yet very complete survey of the various leading sciences, and the ground travelled over is nearly the same as that covered by the historical portion of the first volume. Astronomy, geology, anthropology, psychology, sociology, and theology are each gone over in turn, and in each science the *natural* and the *revealed* elements are sketched in a very complete manner. No proper idea of the extent of our author's work here can be given.

In the third chapter "The Science of the Sciences," the Final Philosophy, is taken up, and the most important part of this volume now comes before us. This universal science is divided into three great branches:—Philosophic science, metaphysic science, and theosophic science. The first deals with "the theory of knowledge," the second with "the theory of being," and the third with "the theory of divine things." In the first department the relations of realism and idealism, of transcendentalism and empiricism, and of absolutism and positivism are dealt with. In the second department the relations of monism and dualism, of evolutionism and creationism, and of optimism and pessimism are sketched. In the third department an outline is given of the relations of naturalism and supernaturalism, of rationalism and super-rationalism, and of agnosticism and gnosticism.

The scope of the discussion will appear to be of immense extent from the above brief recital of the topics embraced. There is much that we would like to say, both in way of commendation and of criticism, but we mention only two things in a sentence or two.

1. There is in this chapter a very good and careful sketch of the field of Comparative Religion, where the conclusion is reached (p. 285), "That as yet it would be premature and misleading to attempt anything like a strict scientific correlation of non-Christian and Christian, or rational and revealed religions." It may be questioned whether such correlation should be regarded as an open question, even with the incomplete study of non-Christian religions that has yet been made. Such study has, in our judgment, pointed more and more to the *generic* difference of Christianity from all other forms of religion rather than to their correlation.

2. The conclusion reached as to the present state of the question in the review made by our author of evolutionism and creationism is stated as follows, on p. 343: "From present signs it would seem that the tide of controversy has turned in favor of evolutionism in some form and degree as logically consistent with the strictest creationism." We cannot here enter upon this question at any length, but must confess our inability to agree with the conclusion thus stated. To us *strict* creationism and evolutionism in any *proper* sense are inconsistent with each other. Much of course depends on the meaning given to the terms in the above statement, especially the term evolution. If it be used in the wide sense of ontological evolution, as it is by H. Spencer, then creation in the strict sense can have no place. But this form of evolution must build bridges between the non-vital and the vital, between the vital and the mental, between the mental and the moral, and between the moral and the religious, before it can carry us across. Here we venture to say

that the first bridge is not yet built, and what is more significant, the architects seem to have given up the contract. If it be used in the narrower sense of biological evolution, then the bridge between different species in the vegetable and animal kingdoms must be completely and permanently constructed. Here, too, we venture to think that the proposed bridge is not strong enough to carry its own weight; and, if we are not mistaken, the tendency on the part of leading scientists during the last four or five years is to speak with more caution than was their habit fifteen or twenty years ago upon this great subject. One example of great weight may be quoted in this connection. Professor Virchow, of Berlin, is one of the leading biologists in the world at the present day. At a meeting of an Anthropological Congress held during the present year in Vienna, he made an able address, in the course of which he said: "Twenty years ago the Darwinian theory made its first victorious march through the world. . . . We have sought in vain for the intermediate stages which are supposed to connect man with the apes—the proto-man—the *pro-anthropos* is not yet discovered. For anthropological science *pro-anthropos* is not even a subject for discussion. The anthropologist may see it in his dreams, but as soon as he awakes he cannot say that he has made any approach towards him. In the course of five thousand years no change of type worthy of mention has taken place. If you ask me whether the first man was white or black, I can only say I do not know. Every living race is still human; no single one has yet been found that we can designate as simian or quasi-simian."

But we cannot follow this subject further, nor can we allude to many other inviting things in this elaborate treatise of Dr. Shields. To those who wish to know more about it we would say, "Get the portly volumes and read them carefully." Their perusal will well repay the reader for the time spent in going through them.

Before concluding we wish to call attention to some simple blemishes which mar the text of the second volume especially. These blemishes appear in the orthography of proper names. The following are some examples: We find Jehovah on p. 24, and Jehova on p. 445; Du Bois Reymond, p. 105, and Dubois, p. 211; D'Holbach, p. 214, d'Holbach, p. 363; Hæckel, p. 246, Haeckel, p. 313; Wolff, p. 63, Wolf, p. 260, Wolfe, p. 297; Mahomedanism, p. 266, Mohamedan, p. 268, Mohammedan, p. 274; Boodhism, p. 268, Budhism, p. 277, Buddhism, p. 283; Luthardt, p. 325, Luthard, p. 366; Tholuch, p. 366, 'tholuck, p. 384; Shakspeare, p. 176, Shakespeare, p. 389. Whatever form of these proper names is chosen by the author or proof-reader, there should be uniformity in the one used. Otherwise the letterpress is excellent, and the paper and binding all that could be desired.

F. R. BEATTIE.

*Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C.*

#### SAYCE'S "HITTITES."

THE HITTITES: The Story of a Forgotten Empire. *By A. H. Sayce, LL. D., Deputy-Professor of Philology, Oxford.* London: The Religious Tract Society, 56 Paternoster Row. 1888. pp. 150; 7½ x 5 in. Price 2s. 6d.

This slender volume, which one can read at a single sitting, is the latest addition to that excellent series now widely known under the general title of "By-paths



of Bible Knowledge." The series is one that deserves the heartiest commendation, not only because of the permanent value of such monographs as *The Diseases of the Bible*, by Sir J. Risdon Bennett, and the thoroughly scientific character of such discussions as *Egypt and Syria*, by Sir J. William Dawson, and *Galilee in the Time of Christ*, by Dr. Selah Merrill; but also because such volumes as *The Dwellers on the Nile*, and *Babylonian Life and History*, and *Recent Discoveries on the Temple Hill at Jerusalem* are the most successful attempts yet made to put general Bible readers abreast of the latest archæological research in the East.

They are not written by tyros, but by the most distinguished specialists in their several departments. For instance, three of them are from the pen of Professor Sayce, of Oxford, the greatest of living archæologists. The first of these three, and the best of the whole series as a popular manual, is *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*, which is now found in the library of nearly every reading minister. We have all read and re-read its sketchy but delightful chapters on the Cuneiform Inscriptions, the Discoveries in Egypt, the Moabite Stone, the Siloam Inscription, the Assyrian and Babylonian Invasions of Palestine, and the Empire of the Hittites. As Professor Sayce's second contribution to the series, viz., *Assyria, Its Princes, Priests, and People*, was only a fuller treatment of one of these topics which had been thus merely sketched in the first, so this last volume is simply an expansion of the chapter on the Hittites.

The Religious Tract Society could not have entrusted the work to more competent hands. For, aside from his unsurpassed familiarity with Oriental archæology in general, it will be remembered that to him belongs the honor of having first rehabilitated the Hittite empire in its entirety. It was his discovery of Hittite hieroglyphs on the sculptures in the Karabel Pass, near Smyrna, that revealed the real extent of that ancient confederacy, and demonstrated that it had reached not only from Palestine to the Black Sea, but also from the Euphrates to the Golden Horn, covering the whole of Asia Minor. It was his paper "On the Monuments of the Hittites," in 1880, that blazed the way for that great body of literature concerning these people which has come into existence within the last eight years, including such books as Dr. Wm. Wright's *Empire of the Hittites*, and the fourth volume of the elaborate work of Perrot and Chipiez, on *L'Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité*. Finally, it is to his scholarship and ingenuity that we are indebted for the first clue to the still mysterious hieroglyphs; he first translated the famous bilingual "Boss of Tarkondemos." For all these reasons he speaks on every phase of the subject with the authority of a master, and it is not at all surprising that he occasionally falls into the familiar use of the first person.

His generous recognition of the work of other scholars in the same field is noteworthy, and especially his repeated references to Dr. Wm. Hayes Ward of the New York *Independent*, who, it will be remembered, was the first to discover the boustrophedon character of the Hittite inscriptions. By the way, Prof. Sayce declares that Mr. Gladstone was probably right in saying that he had found a reference to the Hittites in Homer.

The work contains an unusually good index and list of Scripture references, also twelve helpful illustrations; but, to our surprise, no picture of the Ibreez sculptures; and, while there is a full account of the battle of Kadesh and of Pentaur's poem, there is scarcely a reference to the great wall-painting at Abu Simbel.

In the eight chapters of this little book Prof. Sayce not only restates all the

points of chief interest about the Hittites, now well known to Bible students, showing how completely this astonishing discovery has vindicated the impugned statements of Scripture; what a flood of light is thrown upon the Exodus and several passages in the Acts and in the historical books of the Old Testament; how the armed priestesses of the great Hittite goddess gave rise to the Greek fancy about the Amazons; what the Hittite civilization was as to art, letters and religion; what relation they sustained to ancient Egypt, Assyria and Israel; how their art influenced that of Greece; and how their favorite symbol, the double-headed eagle, brought to Europe by the Crusaders in the fourteenth century, became the emblem of the German emperors, who have passed it on to the modern kingdoms of Russia and Austria; but he also brings out some new points of great interest, such as their institution of Cities of Refuge before the time of Moses. It will interest those who have followed former discussions of the Hittites to know that Prof. Sayce does not accept the enormous antiquity of their empire which seemed to be demonstrated by the reference to it in the astrological work of Sargon I. It is well known that our author, like most Assyriologists, defends 3800 B. C. as the date of Sargon, but he says that the reference to the Hittites in the "Observations of Bel" is a later interpolation. We close this notice with a single suggestive excerpt:

"For us of the modern world the resurrection of the Hittite people from their long sleep of oblivion possesses a double interest. They appeal to us not alone because of the influence they once exercised on the fortunes of the Chosen People, not alone because a Hittite was the wife of David and the ancestress of Christ, but also on account of the debt which the civilization of our own Europe owes to them. Our culture is the inheritance we have received from ancient Greece, and the first beginnings of Greek culture were derived from the Hittite conquerors of Asia Minor. The Hittite warriors who still guard the Pass of Karabel, on the very threshold of Asia, are symbols of the position occupied by the race in the education of mankind. The Hittites carried the time-worn civilizations of Babylonia and Egypt to the furthest boundary of Asia, and there handed them over to the West in the grey dawn of European history."

W. W. MOORE.

*Hampden-Sidney, Va.*

#### STEELE'S "OUTLINES OF BIBLE STUDY."

OUTLINES OF BIBLE STUDY. A Four-years' Course for Schools and Colleges. *By G. M. Steele, D. D., Wilbraham, Mass.* Boston and New York: Leach, Shewell & Sanborn. 1889.

It is gratifying to hail another course of study offered to the public for use in "academies, preparatory schools, colleges," and "adult Bible-classes." It marks progress in the tendency to make a knowledge of the Bible a necessary part of all education, a tendency which promises now to grow and prevail until every course of study will include the systematic study of the English Bible. The writer is simply amazed at the rapid growth of this idea, which was generally regarded as a novelty of doubtful utility eighteen years ago, when he first sought to verify and test it in the class-room. The formulated results of an actual experience are always valuable, and the book before us is the result of a teacher's experience in his own academy. The course aims, not so much at a mastery of the Scriptures, as to give a "good general knowledge of the character and contents of the Scriptures, using only the Bible as a text-book." "The plan chiefly adopted is that of analysis and syllabus, with suggestive questions."

The *first year's course* "embraces Patriarchal and Hebrew history, from the creation to the end of the reign of Solomon," barely touching Pentateuchal legislation. Twenty-three lessons. The *second year's course* "completes the Hebrew history," with "added outlines of the poetic and prophetic books." Twenty-four lessons. The *third year's course* comprises the life of Christ as contained in the four gospels. Twenty-seven lessons. The *fourth year's course* embraces the "propagation of the gospel as narrated in the Acts of the Apostles and illustrated in the Epistles and the Book of Revelation." Twenty-seven lessons. There are several maps in the book; and careful introductions of the most of the books of the Bible are furnished, with questions, as a part of the study of each book, especially the prophetic and poetical books and the epistles. This is intended to obviate the necessity of handling any text-book except the Bible and the outlines, and is a good feature.

The lessons strike one as too long for successful classwork, but the author suggests that they may be subdivided in many cases with profit, and still each year's work can be finished with one recitation a week. The outlines are so constructed that they serve "rather as guides and suggestions of method" than as "lessons to be learned," while much is "left to the discretion of the teacher," in view of the grade and character of his class. While the writer is an earnest advocate of a course far more thorough and exhaustive for a liberal education, still he is not disposed to object to the "outlines," because a mastery of this course in the academy or preparatory school would be a most excellent preparation for a more exhaustive study of the Bible in the college or university. The devout attitude of our author, and his large freedom from taint of the higher criticism, makes the book safe for use with the young, and is refreshing in this day of mischievous novelties.

J. B. SHEARER.

*Davidson College, N. C.*

#### ARGYLL'S "WHAT IS TRUTH?"

WHAT IS TRUTH? *By the Duke of Argyll.* New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1889.

The well known Christian character of the Duke of Argyll and his loyalty to truth and his lucid discussion of all the questions he touches, excite well-merited interest in this his latest publication. It is a lecture delivered by request before the Students' Representative Council of the University of Edinburgh, February 22nd, 1889, written after delivery and somewhat expanded. It consists of six sections.

In the first section he seeks a definition of truth, adopting substantially that given by the late George H. Lewes, "Truth is the coincidence between the external and the internal order." From this he mounts up step by step along the same line till he reaches the God-given formula, "Thy word is truth." The "Word," the "Logos," he expounds by the phrase, "Divine reason," and then speaks of truth as the "correspondence of our own reason, as far as it can go, and that universal reason which animates the cosmos in which we live." All of which is very beautiful, but very unsatisfactory to one who regards the notion of the "true" as absolutely simple, undefinable, and incomprehensible, by which all this so-called "coincidence," "conformity," "harmony," or "correspondence" is itself

to be tested. We are not disposed to be critical, because he follows distinguished leaders and because of his intense loyalty to truth in all its manifestations.

In the second section he outlines the only safe method in the pursuit of truth, guarding his hearers against being misled by mere words and phrases. A careful, painstaking and *honest* analysis of terms and their corresponding facts is the *sine qua non* in the pursuit of truth.

In the next three sections he takes three words or phrases from the departments of politics, physical science, and religion for illustration. Taking first "wealth," he shows how a partial analysis leads to false definitions, and then to mischievous heresies, which threaten to overturn civil and social order, whilst accurate analysis gives safe definitions and goes far to solve some of the most vexatious problems of the day. In the same manner he takes up the terms "natural selection" and the "supernatural," and shows how a loose and fallacious use of them sometimes undermines the whole of truth, natural and revealed.

In conclusion he emphasizes the fact that the "physical sciences are becoming more and more metaphysical in all their concepts and in all their corresponding forms of speech." The danger is that the analysis which proves the relativity and subjectivity of knowledge once thought to be absolute and objective will lead us to doubt the reality of that knowledge. Our author presses his illustrations here so far as to raise the suspicion that he holds to a sensualistic philosophy, and saves himself from the breakers on which it might land him by clinging to his definition, "Harmony between the external and the internal order."

J. B. SHEARER.

HAYS' "MAY WOMEN SPEAK?" ETC.

MAY WOMEN SPEAK? A Bible Study by a Presbyterian Minister. *Rev. George P. Hays, D. D., LL. D.* Woman's Temperance Publication Association, 161 La Salle Street, Chicago. 1889.

WOMAN IN THE PULPIT. *By Francis E. Willard. Ibidem.*

The distinguished name appended to the first of the works mentioned above challenges attention, and will doubtless secure a wider reading than would otherwise be accorded to the pamphlet. It will be a surprise to many to find a man so deservedly eminent as Dr. Hays becoming sponsor to so doubtful a movement.

The title of the tract is misleading; the whole tenor of the treatise looks towards the admission of woman to the functions of the ordained ministry, so much so that it was with real surprise that we lighted, almost at the close of the essay, upon the following paragraph:

"The question of the admission to ordination and official preaching is entirely distinct from the question of admission to all such work (suitable to women) as may be done by unordained men. THE ARGUMENT OF THIS PAPER IS SPECIFICALLY FOR THAT PRIVILEGE FOR WOMEN AS THEIR SCRIPTURAL PRIVILEGE AND DUTY."

If this be all, we must consider the argument a very needless one. This may be the ostensible aim of the tract, but the real purport appears a few paragraphs further on:

"The Presbyterian Church authorizes Presbyteries to make exceptions of uneducated men, and if they are specially useful and blessed of God, they may be licensed and ordained, no matter how they may murder grammar, dictionary,

rhetoric, and good sense. In the presence of the conspicuous blessing of God in their labors, who dares to object to their ordination? Many a scholarly minister would gladly exchange his learning for the usefulness of some of his less learned brethren. But there must be no exception ever made for a woman, no matter how educated, eloquent, or blessed of God. The only inflexible, infallible test is sex. God's blessing and success can make up for every other defect; but if a person's gender is wrong, no endorsement of the Holy Ghost and no favor of Christian people can atone for that in the eyes of the Presbyterian Church, nor indeed in any other evangelical church except the Quakers."

This paragraph reveals what the argument of the paper "is specifically for," and its title should have been, "May Women *Preach*?" Had such been announced formally as his topic, the argument must have been different, or else it must have lost much of its apparent force. For if he is avowedly contending for woman's place in the pulpit as a scriptural privilege and duty, what force or pertinence is there in citing circumstance after circumstance and incident upon incident to establish simply the general prominence of woman in the civic, social, and religious life of the Scriptures? Yet this is just what the major portion of his discussion is devoted to.

Ruth, the Moabitess, and Rahab, the Canaanitess, are incorporated into the line of the Messiah; the Queen of Sheba visited Solomon and was royally received; Esther occupied an exalted position; Miriam sang her song; Deborah ruled Israel; Huldah prophesied; "daughters" are mentioned in Joel's prediction; "words of Mary, Elisabeth and Anna" are quoted; Priscilla taught Apollos; Philip's daughters were "prophetesses"; women "ministered of their substance to Christ"; women "labored with Paul"; women are mentioned and commended in the salutations of the Epistles; women were undoubtedly among the followers of Christ; they were most probably with those who were scattered abroad by persecution and who went everywhere preaching the gospel; Christ announced his resurrection to a woman, and by her sent the tidings to others; he drew a reluctant and public testimony from the woman cured of the issue of blood. These things are unquestionably true, and we have the facts elaborated through many pages, but after all what does the whole of it amount to? As thus aggregated in the tract there is some appearance of force in the simple accumulation of incidents; but examine each in turn, and as an argument for the *official preaching* of women its strength will be *nil*; of course the mere multiplication of such instances will avail nothing.

Dr. Hays calls attention to the fact that in the epistles to the Romans and to the Hebrews "there is no suggestion of any restraint laid upon any form of womanly proclamation of the gospel," but it would scarcely occur to the writer of these epistles to restrain a custom which had, as we maintain, no existence; in the same connection he says of the conclusion to the Romans, "In all of these practical discussions no warning is made against woman's work, but, on the contrary, great stress is laid upon it in the last chapter." "Woman's work" is a very convenient generality; suppose we substitute woman's *preaching*! So far as woman's work is concerned the Presbyterian Church also lays great stress upon it, gladly and gratefully encourages it; indeed, the prominence accorded it in our age is at least as great as that given it in the New Testament narrative

Our author then proceeds: "This brings our study to the consideration of the two famous passages which are the sole reliance of those who insist on forbidding women to speak." Now this statement is hardly fair in our author. The labored effort he makes through many elaborate pages, the frequency of inference he indul-

ges, the skilful massing and manipulation of scripture incident, his habitual careful avoidance of direct phraseology in interpretation, the necessity of substituting vague general terms when discussing scripture precedents; all this demonstrates most perfectly that *there is not in the whole range of Holy Scripture one single clear unequivocal text or precedent or incident* to support the position his essay undertakes to establish. Suppose now, on the contrary, he had given us a "Bible study" to prove the admission of man to the pulpit as a scriptural privilege and duty; does any one suppose we would have been presented with such an "argument" as this?

We believe that the thoughtful reader of Dr. Hays' tract will lay it aside with the conviction that this "Bible study by a Presbyterian Minister" indirectly but powerfully vindicates the author's church in her position on this subject.

We have no space left for Miss Willard's little book. The greater part of it has appeared before in the Homiletic Review; it is smart, breezy, somewhat sarcastic, and altogether very entertaining.

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

PRATT'S "GIVEN TO CHRIST," ETC.

GIVEN TO CHRIST, AND OTHER SERMONS. *By John W. Pratt, D. D.* With a Biographical Sketch of His Life and Labors. 8vo. Pp. 301. \$2. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co., 38 West Twenty-third St. 1889.

Beginning with a brief biographical sketch, containing estimates of Dr. Pratt by eminent, intimate and loving friends, we have a handsome volume in the excellent style of the celebrated house which publishes it, comprising twenty-four discourses, followed by several prayers, given as specimens of the devotional part of service, from one eminent in this department of religious worship.

We cannot bring to the perusal of this work the privilege of a personal acquaintance with its lamented author, and hence we lack the inestimable advantage contributed by the memory of his personal presence, so important an element in preaching. We have a distinct recollection of a sermon from him read by us ten years or more ago, and printed, if we mistake not, as a specimen of his preaching in the Cincinnati Music Hall; it created the impression of decided individuality and unusual vigor of thought. The sermon recalled a conversation had with one who had been a student in Lexington, Va., and as such a regular attendant upon Dr. Pratt's ministry. This student spoke in the highest terms of Dr. Pratt's preaching, the excellence of his elocution, the eloquence of his rhetoric, and the impressiveness of his delivery. Having in mind this report from a regular hearer, we concluded that such matter, with the advantage of such manner, must place a minister far toward the very front of the great preachers of his day. The estimates given in the biographical sketch sustain our inference, and we can easily see how such an impression must be created by the sermons contained in this volume, if delivered in the manner ascribed to their author.

The discourses here published are marked by thoroughness, comprehensiveness, ability and originality; they are eminently thoughtful and rich; suggestive rather than exhaustive; adapted to the thoughtful reader rather than to a popular audience. They evince very thorough and careful preparation, being evidently written sermons, and as such are masterpieces and models of manuscript preaching.

We believe the volume will prove a credit to our Southern Presbyterian Church, and as such we rejoice the more in its publication.

*Columbia. S. C.*

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

## DAWSON'S MODERN SCIENCE IN BIBLE LANDS.

MODERN SCIENCE IN BIBLE LANDS. *By Sir J. W. Dawson. LL. D., F. R. S., F. G. S., Principal of McGill University, Montreal, and Author of "The Story of the Earth and Man," "Origin of the World," etc.* Pp. 606. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1889.

This interesting and useful book is the outcome of a tour made through Italy, Egypt and Syria, by the learned and devout author, in 1883-'84. It is not, however, merely "notes of travel" from the pen of an expert geologist; it is rather a series of careful and compact discussions of such geological and archæological topics as are presented in the lands where Bible narratives are laid. As may be expected, therefore, the sciences which are chiefly dealt with are geology and anthropology, with passing allusions to history and biblical criticism. Though it is the production of an able geologist who has given his lifetime to scientific studies, yet the book is written in such a pleasant, popular style that the ordinary reader may peruse it with intelligent interest and abiding profit.

The body of the work consists of nine chapters, the first three of which are somewhat introductory to the main subject of the treatise. The following brief outline will give some general idea of the scope and import of the book:

In Chapter I., which is termed "*Introductory*," several vital questions connected with the relations of science and religion are briefly discussed. The general lines of harmony, as presented in the author's work on "*The Origin of the World*," between Genesis and Geology are briefly but clearly presented. The reverent spirit of the author breathes through these introductory pages.

In Chapter II., there is an entertaining description of "*The Fire Belt of Southern Europe*." The basin of the Mediterranean Sea is described from the geological point of view, and its coast outline at the glacial era is indicated. Then thrilling descriptions are given of Vesuvius and its eruptions, and the geological conditions of the seismic disturbances of this region are set forth at length.

In Chapter III., "*The Haunts and Habits of Primitive Man*" is the subject of an exceedingly satisfactory chapter, which treats of some vital questions in anthropology. Some interesting cave-remains on the Sidonian shores of the Great Sea are described and compared with similar remains found in France and Belgium. Then various biological and geological data are given to settle the antiquity of the human race. As against Harckel and others, who maintain that man has been many thousands of years on the earth, the conclusion is reached by our author that "the earliest certain indications of the presence of man in Europe, Asia or America, so far as yet known, belong to the modern period alone." For the facts of the so-called "stone age," for the foundation of the Niagara gorge, and the laying down of the Mississippi alluvial deposits, he concludes, and with good reasons given, that the biblical period is quite adequate.

With Chapter IV., "*Bible Lands*" proper are entered on, and "*Early Man in Genesis*" is first taken up. The topography of Eden is discussed with much ability and soberness. No attempt is made to locate it at the North Pole, nor to imagine a Lemurian continent to find it in. It is placed near the confluence of the Tigris and Euphrates, two of the rivers of paradise, the others being the Karun (Pison), and the Kerklah (Gihon), in the same locality. The Fall, the Deluge, the early condition of the race in civilization and religion are also treated of, and the follow-

ing general conclusions reached, at the close of a capital chapter: 1. "The Bible presents man as a distinct creature, made in the image of God." 2. "Man, according to Genesis, is the latest and culminating product of creation." 3. "The absolute date of the first appearance of man cannot, perhaps, be fixed within a few years, or a few centuries, either by the biblical chronology or by the science of the earth. Yet we are limited to two or three thousand years before the deluge, and about seven thousand years at most from the present time."

The Chapter on "Egyptian Stones and their Teaching" (V.) is a good presentation of the record of the wonderful early civilization of the ancient dwellers on the Nile, as inscribed "with an iron pen on the rock."

Chapter VI., on "Egypt and Israel," contains a detailed geological description of Lower Egypt and the Red Sea region, with some important historical expositions.

Chapter VII., dealing with the "Topography of the Exodus," is one of the best in the whole book, and full of interest throughout. The route taken by the Israelites in leaving Egypt is followed minutely step by step, and the chief points mentioned in the Bible are identified with care—Rameses, Succoth, Elham, Migdol, Pi-hahiroth, Baal, Zephon, Marah, Rephidim and Sinai are all looked at in turn.

In Chapter VIII., under the heading, "Palestine, its Structure and History," is found one of the best brief geological sketches of the Holy Land with which we are familiar. The description of the Dead Sea region is particularly fine, but we cannot enlarge upon it.

In the last Chapter (IX.) "The Resources and Prospects of Bible Lands" are treated in an impartial and sensible manner, and the conclusion stated that with proper cultivation and good government Bible lands would be far more productive than they are. The hope of the country and people is in the Gospel and the results of Missions.

There are several instructive appendices of a somewhat technical nature, and a number of useful maps, diagrams and illustrations. The letterpress and binding are excellent. On the whole, we commend the book most heartily as one which combines the results of careful scientific research with the spirit of a devout believer in the inspiration of the sacred Scriptures in a most satisfactory way. Moreover, the results of the scientific research are none the less valuable because the author of the book is an earnest Christian.

F. R. BEATTIE.

*Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C.*

#### HUTSON'S FRENCH LITERATURE.

A HISTORY OF FRENCH LITERATURE. *By Charles Woodward Hutson, Adjunct Professor of Modern Languages in the University of South Carolina, Columbia.* 12mo. Cloth, pp. 353. \$1.10. New York: J. B. Alden. 1889.

In a charming preface to his exquisite edition of the *Vicar of Wakefield*, Mr. Austin Dobson endorses the sentiment: "When a new book comes out, read an old one." After reading Mr. Hutson's book, we felt an irresistible longing to know what Mr. Saintsbury had said on the same subject in his excellent *History of French Literature*. The comparison is not altogether flattering to the new book.

"How to write a good literature in any language," is a question that still awaits complete solution, but the question "when to write a literature" ought to be a comparatively easy one to answer. With Saintsbury already in the field, the answer



should have been immediate and decisive to Prof. Hutson. A compiler can never hope to achieve any real success in a field already occupied by a careful, loving student of every important inch of the soil. The latter possesses the subject; the former is possessed by it.

If Mr. Hutson's book is written for scholars, it is unnecessary; if for purposes of general culture, and this is presumably its design, it is confusing from a multiplicity of names and frequent violation of proportion. The general sketch at the beginning is too meagre and skeletal to give the ordinary reader any adequate idea of the field to be surveyed. A more appropriate introduction would have bodily outlined the leading movements that have influenced the literature. An enforcement of these general statements, by a few striking illustrations, would have improved both proportion and perspective. This, we admit, would have been an extremely difficult task. But it might have been shunned altogether by using the very simple device of starting at the beginning, thus avoiding a repetition later on of points brought out in the initial rapid résumé of the literature from earliest times to the Revolution, and from the Revolution to the present day.

Another general objection. Literature and life are indissolubly linked together. In France the fusion of the two into one organic whole is unusually complete. Yet in Mr. Hutson's book, though we are surfeited with "works" and authors, little is told us of the motive forces that gave the age its special momentum, and the literature its dynamic impulses. Especially do we miss an account of the Salon. Again, why is it that the demon of exhaustiveness seems to possess the soul of almost every writer of the history of literature? Surely *here* a part is greater than the whole. One might have dispensed altogether with Achard, Tastu, Viennet, Houssaye, Féval, Dupuytren, Soumet, and Gozlan, in order to get more than two pages on Victor Hugo, and half a page on Dandel, and a page on La Fontaine. Honore de Balzac, the prototype of Zola, Henry James, Amélie Rives and the whole host of the modern intensely realistic school is dismissed in less than a page. This is very disappointing, because, when the author does write at length, as in the case of Voltaire, Racine, and Mme. de Staël, he firmly grasps his subject with loving sympathy and scholarly appreciation.

We feel sure, therefore, that this compilation—for such it is in a very large measure—was made to order. Surely his heart could not have been in the work. If it had been, he could not have refrained from quoting more frequently the authors of his choice. So colorless is the book in this respect that we can form little idea of Mr. Hutson's likes and dislikes in the domain of French literature.

The task he had to perform, perfunctorily or willingly, is impossible of accomplishment. A failure in it, therefore, is not any reproach to the accomplished writer, who has gained reputation by his other works. To put over three hundred authors into a book of three hundred and forty-seven pages, and expect the reader to get an adequate idea of many of them, is too much to ask of any man.

W. S. CURRELL

## VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

---

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS. *By the Rev. Prof. G. G. Findlay, D. D., Head-  
ingly College, Leeds.*

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS. *By the Rev. Marcus Dods.*

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN. Twenty-one Discourses, with Greek Text, Comparative  
Versions, and Notes, chiefly exegetical *By William Alexander, D. D., D. C. L.,  
Brasenose College, Oxford, Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe.*

Each volume crown 8vo, from 350 to 450 pages. Cloth, \$1.50. New York:  
A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1889.

These beautifully bound and clearly printed volumes are among the latest additions to the series called "The Expositor's Bible." The character of this series has already been described in the pages of THE QUARTERLY. The advantages of the system upon which the series is based become more and more apparent as it advances, and not less happily is the idea carried out with each succeeding volume. The general design is to give the substance of each book treated, in the form of popular exposition, rather than of learned verbal exegesis. While in all the volumes rare and accurate scholarship is evinced, it is held in the background, and the results popularly expressed. The expository method of interpretation is, after all, the true method of preaching the word of God, for it embodies within itself all other features of interpretation, and necessitates the most thorough study in all the departments of biblical learning. In acquiring this habit, learning how to use it, and in showing the people how "biblical truth lies in masses," the minister will find these volumes a model in every respect. No less are they adapted to the laymen who would intelligently traverse broad stretches of the word of God and thoroughly analyze and study books instead of verses.

In the EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS, the expositor adopts the usual analysis, with some slight modification of the dividing line at one point, and treats the epistle under the subjects of the Prologue, the Personal History, the Doctrinal Polemic, the Ethical Application, and the Epilogue. In respect to the general purpose and the doctrine of the epistle the great body of interpreters are agreed, and it is with these that the expositions mainly deal, rather than with those isolated passages over which exegetes have striven from time immemorial; though in touching these, as, *e. g.*, the famous passage in iii. 20, Dr. Findlay hesitates not to give his own views plainly. The entire book is written in clear and attractive style. The author strikingly and truly declares the epistle to be "the charter of evangelical faith;" and in speaking of its relation to the letters to the Romans and the Corinthians calls them "a solid, impregnable quarterion, a fixed starting point and an indubitable test for the examination of the critical questions belonging to the apostolic age."

Dr. (now Professor) Dods' FIRST CORINTHIANS is characterized throughout by the great force as well as learning for which the author is so widely known. The

volume is not as much marred as we would expect by the questionable positions of the author which have lately caused some alarm in the minds of his friends and admirers. There is enough, however, to lead one to read cautiously. In discussing the relation of Sosthenes to Paul he says, "Certainly Paul's easy assumption of a friend as a joint writer of the letter sufficiently shows that he had no such stiff and formal idea of inspiration as we have;" and again, in reference to the statement of Paul that he spoke by the Holy Ghost (ii. 13), "Whoever gathers from this that every individual word Paul wrote or spoke is absolutely the best, does so at his own risk and without Paul's authority. Certainly it was not Paul's intention to make any such statement. And it is quite as dangerous to put too much into Paul's words as to put too little." His exposition consists of twenty-four chapters, each dealing with a single theme, as the church in Corinth, Factions, the Foolishness of Preaching, Divine Wisdom, etc. In a manner truly "scholarly, popular, and adapted to general readers," as the scope of the work requires, Dr. Dods has so united learning and homiletics as to give here a remarkable specimen of genuine progressive exposition. The book is charming reading from beginning to end, and not a mere work of reference.

In giving the Greek text and comparative versions (in parallel columns), as well as in the copiousness of critical notes, the volume on THE EPISTLES OF JOHN has a larger display of learning and its apparatus than its predecessors. The work is a revision and condensation of the author's contribution to the *Speaker's Commentary*. In the first part he deals with the historical surroundings from which these epistles emanated, compares the Epistle with the Gospel of John, discusses the polemical element in the epistles, and sets forth the spiritual life of John. In the second part the reader will find the more critical treatment of the epistles, with exegetical and expository discourses interspersed. The style is sometimes not so clear as that of some of the others of this most admirable series, but is fresh and stimulating, often poetical, and above all full of unction.

THE BIBLICAL ILLUSTRATOR; or, Anecdotes, Similes, Emblems, Illustrations, Expository, Scientific, Geographical, Historical and Homiletic, Gathered from a wide range of Home and Foreign Literature, on the Verses of the Bible. *By Rev Joseph S. Exell, M. A.* 8vo, Vol. I., St. Matthew, pp. 708; Vol. II., St. Mark, pp. 262; Vol. III., Galatians, pp. 574; Vol. IV., Ephesians, pp. 719; Vol. V., St. Luke, Vol. I., pp. 700. \$2.00 each, net. By mail, \$2.25. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1889.

The publishers invite ministers' and students' attention to this work as one upon an entirely new plan. It is designed to issue a series, two or three volumes each year, that will cover the entire Bible. The volumes, however, will be sold separately, each being complete in itself. That on Luke's Gospel will be particularly useful during this year, inasmuch as the Sabbath-school Lessons will be confined to this Gospel.

The "Biblical Illustrator" is a genuine encyclopedia, arranged in the order of the verses of the Scriptures. Almost every word as well as verse has been profusely illustrated and explained, and the views upon it of authors and preachers of every age and section given. Of exegesis or exposition there is but little; of homiletics there is a dangerous abundance; for so striking and suggestive are many of the subdivisions, and so full many of the analyses, that the lazy mind will

come to depend upon them instead of merely using them to stimulate its own thought and activity. Properly used, however, and their temptation resisted, these great storehouses of anecdote, illustration and enforcement of Bible truths will prove a wonderful help to many a minister and teacher.

THE SERMON BIBLE, Vol. II: Psalm lxxvii to Song of Solomon. 12mo, pp. 476. Cloth, \$1.50. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1889.

The character of this work was fully described in the April ('89) QUARTERLY. The present volume continues the impression made by the first. It is filled with the best homiletical work of the best preachers of the present day, presented in brief outlines of notable sermons, and followed, in the case of each text or passage treated, by references to other sermons or works upon the same words.

THE GOSPEL OF COMMON SENSE, as Contained in the Canonical Epistle of James. By Charles F. Deems, D. D., LL. D. 12mo., pp. 322. \$1.50. New York: Wilbur B. Ketcham. 1889.

The volume consists, after an introduction, discussing the authorship, object, date and present use of the Epistle of James, of a series of expository discourses on that Epistle. The author makes his own translation, and otherwise shows his familiarity with the original and possession of the usual resources of the scholar. But it is from the inexhaustible fund of his own common sense that he draws most largely in attracting his readers to the common sense taught by James and applying it to nineteenth century conditions. The book is admirable in its spirit, glowing in its thoughts and practical in its expositions and application.

WORD STUDIES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Marvin R. Vincent, D. D., Baldwin Professor of Sacred Literature in Union Theological Seminary, New York. Vol. II., the Writings of John: the Gospel; the Epistles; the Apocalypse. 8vo, pp. 607. Cloth, \$4. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1889.

Since the first volume of the author's *Word Studies* appeared, in 1887, he has been made a professor in the Union Seminary, New York, a worthy recognition of his gifts and attainments in the department of sacred literature. Like its predecessor, this volume occupies ground midway between an exegetical commentary and the lexicon, traversing ground with which the critical student is familiar, and aiming to put into the possession of ordinary readers of the English Bible many of the advantages which hitherto only the learned enjoyed. Among these advantages are tracing the history of a word, unfolding the form in which a thought came to the mind of the Hellenist, displaying the picture or figure that sometimes lies in a word, explaining synonyms, accounting for many changes from the older versions which to the lay mind often appear arbitrary and unsettling, showing the simpler distinctions between the tenses which are so much more flexible and expressive in the Greek than in the English, etc., etc. To this end, if we omit the introductory chapter, which treats in popular form of John's history, the origin and purpose and authenticity of his Gospel, its relation to the synoptic Gospels, his Epistles and the Revelation, the author confines himself to studies of the words of the writings of John, introducing no analysis of the general thought, except so far as single words or phrases suggest it. There are many valuable foot notes of a more technical and

critical character and presenting the views of various scholars on controverted points. The attempt to enter into a detailed examination of such a book would be like reviewing the contents of an unabridged dictionary. So far as we know Dr. Vincent is alone in his method, or rather in *confining* himself to the one line of "Word Studies," as a means of letting in light upon the sacred text. He has done his work most successfully. English readers, and that large class of people who have once studied but long since laid aside the Greek, will find the work constantly helpful. It brings them into direct contact with the inspired and inspiring original of the Word.

BIBLE STUDIES FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT, Covering the International Sunday School Lessons for 1890. By *Geo. F. Pentecost, D. D.* Pp. 391. Paper, sixty cents. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co.

The success of the author's "Bible Studies" of the past two years is a sufficient warrant for his preparation of another in the series. Teachers and students of the Lessons for 1890 will find this volume the equal of its predecessors in every respect. It is remarkable for its helpfulness, suggestiveness and compactness, as well as evangelical fervor and soundness.

CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. A Comprehensive Treatise on Systematic and Practical Theology. By thirty-seven different writers. Edited by *Bishop Jonathan Weaver, D. D.* 8vo., pp. 611. Dayton, O.: United Brethren Publishing House. 1889.

This volume we may suppose represents fully the theology and the spirit of that body called "The United Brethren in Christ"—a name, by the way, which frequently leads one to identify them, improperly, with the "*Unitas Fratrum*," or Moravian body. It is prepared by as many different writers as there are subjects discussed. It therefore lacks, in large measure, that unity which treatises on systematic theology are expected to possess. This, however, the editor of the volume believes is fully compensated for in the greater variety of style in authorship. Having carefully examined most of the chapters, we would pronounce the book more a work on practical than systematic theology. This is, indeed, its principal aim. It is not proposed to have it take the place of more elaborate works. It is simply intended, we are told, to bring directly before the mind in a practical way the leading doctrines contained in the word of God. In this respect it is eminently successful. From the Calvinistic standpoint rather than Arminian, however, it might have greatly strengthened many of its positions. The book is handsomely printed and substantially bound. To one desiring to be better acquainted with the faith of the not widely known denomination which it represents it will be decidedly useful.

A DEFENCE OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH CONCERNING THE SATISFACTION OF CHRIST, against Faustus Socinus. By Hugo Grotius. Translated, with Notes and an Historical Introduction, by *Frank Hugh Foster, Ph. D. (Leip.), Professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary at Oberlin.* 12mo. Pp. lvii., 314. \$1.50. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1889.

English readers will be glad to have a readable translation of this work of the eminent Dutch statesman and theologian. The only other translation ever made

was first published in London, in 1692, and in the effort to be absolutely literal was almost as obscure as the original, besides being marred by many blunders, both in its rendering of the author's involved sentences and in the mechanical execution. Prof. Foster's translation is both readable and exact. The more idiomatic Latin sentences and occasional Greek phrases have been relegated to the foot-notes. As an apology for the governmental theory of the atonement, and defence of the church's faith on that basis against the Socinians, this work in its present translation is a valuable addition to a library that one desires to see well equipped with the best treatises on all sides of questions and representing various shades of theological belief.

In addition to Grotius' work itself, the translator has given a very full Historical Introduction, showing, among other things, the development of the Grotian theology in New England, where it acquired such currency as to take on the very name of that region itself. In this mere notice of the work we can only demur to the translator's concluding statements in his Introduction, that the orthodox affinities of Grotius' scheme, the government idea, are exhibited by its survival and final adoption in an orthodox Calvinistic system and its firm establishment there. The scheme may have lived for a time, and be still living, as almost all errors; but it has not yet been incorporated in the orthodox Calvinistic system, as the latter is fairly expounded by its most intelligent advocates.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE JESUITS. *By Paul Bert.* 12mo, pp. xlii., 612. Boston: B. F. Bradbury & Co. 1889.

The publishers state that this is a translation, except such parts as are too gross to be given in plain English to American readers, of the thirteenth edition of Paul Bert's famous analysis of the Jesuit Jury's *Compendium Theologicæ Moralis*, and *Causæ Conscientiæ*. As a direct statement of the principles and practices of the crafty Romanists whom it exposes, it is overwhelming in its proof of the absolute unfitness, in decency or morality, of the Jesuits for the spiritual guidance or instruction of human beings. One need read but a little way to see that the author's conclusion is correct, that "if the Jesuit does not know what is love, nor even decency, no more does he know what is delicacy, generosity, devotedness, friendship, personal dignity, civic duty, love of country; he ignores so thoroughly these noble things that he does not know even their names."

THE LORD'S SUPPER. *Compiled by John L. Brandt.* Pp. 493. Cloth, \$1.50. Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company. 1889.

The compiler's object in this book of several hundred extracts from preachers and teachers and commentaries representing all classes of thought, is to give "the views of the Lord's Supper as held by the leading religious bodies of the world; to furnish a variety of fresh and suggestive thoughts on nearly every phase of the subject as viewed by the various theologians; to aid those who frequently serve the emblems in making the service sweet, impressive and scriptural; to aid in perpetuating an ordinance which, in its history and its significance, establishes the central truth of Christianity." The compiler has classified the extracts given by the feature of the Lord's Supper of which each treats, and arranged the subjects alphabetically. It is the first attempt of the kind of which we know, and will be found useful as a communicant's hand-book.

THE PATH TO WEALTH; OR, Light from My Forge. *By a Blacksmith.* With an Introduction by Rev. J. H. Vincent, D. D. Thick 12mo, pp. 440. Richmond: B. F. Johnson & Co. 1889.

A discussion of God's money laws, and the relation between giving and getting, between cash and Christianity. So says the title page. The author gives his own views and experiences. Besides his contribution to these pages, there are also admirable papers on Systematic Beneficence by Bishop Taylor, Dr. Francis R. Beattie and others. The *tithe*, with its perpetuity, and the practical features and results of it, is the basis of the discussion. The book should be read for its good sense and suggestiveness. The duty and delight of constant and systematic giving to God and God's work are admirably set forth.

THE TESTIMONY OF JUSTIN MARTYR TO EARLY CHRISTIANITY. Lectures delivered on the L. P. Stone Foundation at Princeton Theological Seminary, in March, 1888. *By George T. Purves, D. D.* 8vo, pp. viii., 302. \$1.75. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1889.

In their strict adherence to the principle that the inspired Word "is the only rule to direct," Presbyterians have often been inclined to disparage patristic testimony to the truths of this Word. The volume before us is a faithful and scholarly study of Justin Martyr, a Father whose writings have been variously interpreted and sometimes misapplied. Dr. Purves has carefully studied the life and environment of his subject and presented his testimony with great good judgment and keen analysis. In the first chapter, the author discusses the importance of Justin Martyr's testimony to early Christianity; in the second, his testimony to the social and civil relations of early Christianity; and in the third, his testimony to the relations of Gentile and Jewish Christianity, where Justin Martyr's rejection of Judaism as the germ of Christianity is philosophically examined, and especially in the light of its bearing upon the modern rationalistic theories of the rise of Christianity as expounded by Baur and Ritschl. Justin Martyr's high estimate of the Old Testament, his belief in its inspiration, and his use of the prophecies, and yet failure to appreciate the positive worth of Judaism and the relation which Paul taught that it sustained to the new Testament make this part of Dr. Purves' study an exceedingly valuable and interesting one. In the remaining three chapters, Justin Martyr's testimony to the influence of philosophy on early Christianity, to the New Testament and its canon and text, and to the organization and belief of the post-apostolic church are the subjects considered. The last chapter will be found to give little comfort to those who must have a "a historic episcopate." The book throughout shows a fine grasp of the subject, thorough study, a philosophical spirit and especially a remarkable judicial balance of mind. It is written in a style at once attractive and clear, and the printers have given a model of attractiveness and clearness in the mechanical execution of the work.

CHURCH SONG. For the Uses of the House of God *Prepared by Melancthon Woolsey Stryker.*  $7\frac{5}{8} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ . 464 pages; 464 Hymns; 458 Tunes. Half Morocco, red edges. \$1.25. New York and Chicago: Biglow & Main. 1889.

This book is a model for the clearness and beauty of its mechanical execution. Bound in red half-morocco, with red edges and round corners, and printed in clear,

legible type, it is by long odds the best in its make-up that we have ever seen. In its contents the compiler has studiously avoided the light, trivial subjects and tunes of late so common and to the judicious and thoughtful so abhorrent, and has given us only those hymns and melodies which are destined to live. His fine taste and skill are shown on almost every page. Judging by this book, we should like to worship a few times in the compiler's congregation. We know its praise-service is good. To our commendation of the collection we have but two qualifications to make. One is the compiler's using so large an amount of his own composition, in both words and music, and the other is his occasional "divorce" of hymns and tunes which have been so long married that the separation seems well nigh a sin. For the first it may be said that Dr. Stryker is recognized by many and has a growing reputation as a hymnologist, and it is not so much a question of worth as of taste that he gives thirty hymns of his own and ranks next in number to Watts, Wesley and Montgomery. For the giving of any other tune but Gerhardt to the splendid hymn, "O Sacred Head once Wounded," for the use of as brilliant and joyous a tune as Medfield, with its splendid movement, with the hymn "Alas! and did my Saviour die," and for the separation of Toplady's "Rock of Ages" from Toplady, and some other such separations, there is no excuse.

FOREIGN MISSIONS—Their Place in the Pastorate, in Prayer, in Conferences. Ten Lectures. *By Augustine C. Thompson*, author of "Moravian Missions," etc. 12mo., pp. 469. \$1.50. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1889.

THE GREAT VALUE AND SUCCESS OF FOREIGN MISSIONS. Proved by distinguished witnesses, being the testimony of Diplomatic Ministers, Consuls, Naval Officers, and Scientific and other Travelers in Heathen and Mohammedan Countries; together with that of English Viceroy, Governors and Military Officers in India and in the British Colonies, etc. *By Rev. John Liggins*. With an Introduction by Rev. Arthur T. Pierson, D. D. 12mo., pp. 249. Paper, 35c., cloth, 75c. New York: The Baker & Taylor Co. 1888.

THE MISSIONARY YEAR BOOK FOR 1889-90. Containing Historical and Statistical Accounts of the Principal Protestant Missionary Societies in America, Great Britain and the Continent of Europe; also Numerous Maps and Diagrams. 12mo., pp. 428. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell. 1889.

The wonderful awakening of Protestant Christendom on the subject of Foreign Missions is more clearly shown by no single fact than the demand for permanent and periodical missionary literature. That great publishing houses like the Scribners and others send forth these volumes is a fact that indicates that there is a demand for them, and it is a healthy indication. The more a Christian studies the principles that underlie the work and informs himself of the progress of it, the more will he have of that missionary spirit which will intensify his convictions and broaden the manifestation of them in money and work.

The three volumes above named furnish a whole library on the subject. The first named work contains ten lectures delivered to the senior class of Hartford Theological Seminary. These lectures set forth lucidly the true principles upon which mission work to the heathen turns, the obligation of it, the difficulties and objections found at home, the methods, the needs and the encouragements for developing a missionary spirit. "No man can fulfil his ministry short of an abid-



ing effort in behalf of the largest practicable number of heathen." Such words should be written upon every pastor's heart. The book glows with earnestness and is well calculated to stimulate and encourage the ministry. Its indication of the best and most effective way of applying the principles to church work and of developing the interest of God's people makes it eminently practical and instructive. The author's personal acquaintance with mission fields, and close association with such men as Rufus Anderson and others, as well as his own interest in missions, amply fitted him for the preparation of these lectures.

Dr. Thompson's volume is well followed by the others, which give, in Mr. Liggins' book, the overwhelming evidence, from independent and disinterested sources, of the great practical value of foreign missions, and in the *Missionary Year Book* a comprehensive view and reliable information of the entire Protestant work in all countries. With the first book to give the principles, the second to furnish the testimony and the third to show the work, the pastor who possesses these three volumes is well equipped for the Monthly Concert. He has a complete library.

LECTURES TO MY STUDENTS. Second Series. Being Addresses Delivered to the Students of the Pastors' College, Metropolitan Tabernacle. *By C. H. Spurgeon, President.* 12mo. Pp. xiv., 283. \$1. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1889.

Spurgeon always writes and speaks to the point. This work is no exception. It is an eminently practical series of addresses to his students on timely and practical themes. His topics are: The Holy Spirit in Connection with our Ministry; The Necessity of Ministerial Progress; The Need of Decision for the Truth; Open Air Preaching, its History and Remarks thereon; Posture, Action and Gesture, and Illustrations of them; Earnestness, its Marring and Maintenance; The Blind Eye and the Deaf Ear; On Conversion as our Aim. The subjects indicate the practical nature of the book. The word pictures which Spurgeon draws far surpass the exceedingly poor wood cuts which are found in the chapter on Posture, Action and Gesture. These illustrations, showing errors in posture, etc., are suggestive and striking, but the work deserved better.

ALDEN'S MANIFOLD CYCLOPEDIA OF KNOWLEDGE AND LANGUAGE. With illustrations. Vols. XIV.-XVIII. Pp. 632 each; cloth, 60 cts.; half morocco, 85 cts. each. New York: John B. Alden & Co. 1889.

Since our last notice five volumes of this rapidly growing publication have appeared, carrying us from the word "Exclude" to "Holywell." These volumes well sustain the reputation which the work deserves for its comprehensiveness and ability. The plan, already described in these pages, is that of a combined dictionary and encyclopedia; and as the work progresses, its excellence more and more appears. Illustrations are freely used and are helpful, and the treatment of the various topics, while terse, is clear and practical. As the work advances the price of each volume is slightly increased, so that the many who need just such an encyclopedia—and for ordinary home use it answers every purpose of the more bulky and costly publications of a similar character—would do well to subscribe for it at once. Its price is so low for such a handsomely bound series that we wonder how the publisher can continue to issue it.

REST AWHILE. *By Rose Porter*, Author of "In Quietness and in Confidence," etc., etc. 16mo, pp. 263; cloth, red edges, \$1 00. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1889.

Under ten chapters, Rest Awhile, Children of Light, the Seeing Eye, the Problem of Prayer, the "I Ams" of Christ, Thoughts on Prayer, Grace for Grace, Called to be Saints, Angels by the Way, and Looking Towards Sunrise, the author gives many happy suggestions concerning the Christian life and hope, and in an exceedingly practical and scriptural way furnishes a solution of many of the hard problems that meet us in the religious life. A thoroughly spiritual and evangelical tone pervades the book. It is one of the best, and especially one of the most quietly sensible, of its class that we have ever seen. Its beautiful binding and letterpress, as well as convenient size, adapt it particularly as a gift book to the weary, sick, anxious, disheartened, timid children of God.

JOHN G. PATON, MISSIONARY TO THE NEW HEBRIDES. *An Autobiography*. Edited by his brother. 12mo, pp. xvi., 375; cloth, \$1.50. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1889.

In an introductory note Dr. Pierson says: "We calmly affirm, after careful perusal, that this biography is not surpassed, for stimulating, inspiring and helpful narrative, by any existing story of missionary heroism." An examination of the book justifies this high commendation. It is the story, told in graphic and simple words, of a laborious, consecrated and courageous missionary who first labored among the poor of the city of Glasgow, and then felt the call to the larger foreign field in the New Hebrides, where his many experiences, happily recounted, make this biography as thrilling as a romance.

HOW THEY KEPT THE FAITH. A Tale of the Huguenots of Languedoc. *By Grace Raymond*. 12mo, pp. 389. \$1.50. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1889.

A religious historical romance, most entertaining as fiction, and sufficiently based upon facts connected with the trials of the Protestants under Louis XIV. to make it useful in impressing the lessons of history. It especially emphasizes the fact that it was the truth itself which sustained and animated the sufferers under the reproach and persecution, and even death, to which they were subjected. Showing this in the lives of her leading characters, the gifted author has at once made a valuable contribution to wholesome, inspiring, helpful literature, and shows by her style and method of treatment that the spirit which she describes finds an echo in her own heart. The book is intensely, but not oppressively, religious, full of feeling, and abounds in thrilling passages. It is decidedly one of the best books of the year in its department.

THOMAS HARD, PRIEST. *By Barton Lee*. 18mo, pp. 64; cloth, 50 cts. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1889.

This book will take the bad taste out of the mouth of many who have read "John Ward, Preacher." A Ritualistic Priest and a Puritan girl find their hearts growing together, marry, and settle sensibly the multiplied complications of their life. That's the whole of the story. It is simply, sweetly told.

NEWLY ENLISTED: A Series of Talks with Young Converts. *By Theodore L. Cuyler, D. D.* 16mo. Pp. 160. 50 cents. New York: American Tract Society. 1889.

An admirable little book, in Dr. Cuyler's best vein, to place in the hands of those who have recently come into the church. It will help older Christians also. The subjects presented are such as, "Enlisted for Life," "Girding the Loins," "Show your Colors" "The Mighty Word No," "More Abundant Life," "Bright Christians," etc.

THE SALT CELLARS. Being a Collection of Proverbs, together with Homely Notes thereon. *By C. H. Spurgeon.* 12mo. Pp. 334. \$1.50. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1889.

This volume is a compilation from "John Ploughman's Almanack," for many years published annually by Mr. Spurgeon. The "proverbs and quaint sayings, old saws and rhymes," have been gleaned from all sources and wide reading. They are sharp, pointed, and full of wisdom, and the compiler rightly says, "A line may strike where a discourse may miss. Godly sentiments sandwiched in between slices of wit and common sense may become nutriment for the soul, although they may be almost unconsciously received." The book, which is arranged alphabetically, carries one through the letter L, and will be followed by another volume.

FAMOUS WOMEN OF THE OLD TESTAMENT: A Series of Popular Lectures Delivered in the First Baptist Church, Montgomery, Ala. *By Morton Bryan Wharton, D.D., Pastor.* Illustrated. 12mo. Pp. 318. \$1.75. New York: E. B. Treat. 1889.

Eve, Sarah, Rebekah, Rachel, Miriam, Ruth, Deborah, Jephthah's Daughter, Delilah, the Witch of Endor, Hannah, Abigail, the Queen of Sheba, Jezebel, the Woman of Shunem, and Esther, are the "famous women" whose lives and influence are portrayed in these lectures. The lecturer's style is easy and popular. His delineations are life-like and correct. The book will be read with interest. There is something "dashing" in the author's way that attracts, though perhaps lacking in dignity, as, for instance, the title to one lecture, "Miriam, the Grand, Patriotic Old Maid!"

THE HOLY PLACES OF JERUSALEM. *By T. Hayter Lewis, F. S. A., Past Vice-President of the Royal Institute of Architects, and Emeritus Professor of Architecture, University College, London.* 8vo, pp. xii., 13. London: John Murray.

The determination of the sacred sites in Jerusalem is one of the most interesting problems of the day in historical and archæological circles. The radical differences among scholars and explorers only add zest to the investigation. Professor Lewis has in his work made a specialty of the architectural features of ancient Jerusalem, and thus wrought in a field which has not yet been so thoroughly explored as the historical and archæological, Prof. Willis and Mr. James Fergusson being, we believe, the only architectural experts who have preceded him. The author seeks not so much to decide any of the mooted questions of locality, as Fergusson did in so startling a manner, as to give the date, which will enable the thoughtful student to reach his own conclusions.

VOICES OF THE SPIRIT. *By George Matheson, M. A., D. D., Minister of the Parish of St. Bernard's, Edinburgh, author of "Moments on the Mount," etc.* 16mo, pp. 241; cloth, red edges, \$1.25. New York; A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1890.

A devotional book, consisting of ninety-five meditations on as many texts, taken in order from Genesis to Revelation, which set forth some aspect of the Holy Spirit's work. All acceptable and useful devotion must be based upon an intelligent apprehension of the truth. This the author fully realizes, and hence the reader will find each meditation here not merely sentimental, but full of solid thought. The subject is not enough studied. The Spirit is oftentimes apparently the neglected Person of the trinity. May this little book quicken and instruct many a heart.

FROM SAMUEL TO SOLOMON. *By Charles S. Robinson, D. D.* 12mo. pp. 310. \$1.25. New York: American Tract Society. 1889.

The lives of Samuel, Saul, David and Solomon cover the "golden age" of Israel's history, and are equally interesting because of their incarnation of many New Testament truths. The volume before us traces these lives, in a series of twenty-nine lectures, or discourses, all of which the writer says have already done duty in the pulpit. In his usual forceful and vivid style, Dr. Robinson shows that these biographies are full of the richest thought and instruction for believers or inquirers of to-day.

NEW NOTES FOR BIBLE READINGS. *By S. R. Briggs.* Pp. 229. \$1. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell. 1889.

This book is not a reprint of the author's "Notes and Suggestions," which has been so widely popular, but is an entirely new collection. An introduction, by Rev. J. H. Brookes, D. D., contains a brief memoir of Mr. Briggs, who recently died, and from whose papers, supplemented by many others from such men as Moody, Whittle, Munball, *et al.*, this volume has been made up. Like its predecessor, it will be found useful to those who adopt this method as a means of teaching or studying the Bible. Its setting forth of the practical features of religion is often striking. A synopsis of Dr. Pierson's "Keys to the Word," is given in this book, and a very full index adds to its usefulness.

# THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 12. — APRIL, 1890.

---

## I. BAPTISM UNDER THE TWO DISPENSATIONS.<sup>1</sup>

OF the three definitions of baptism given in our Westminster Standards, the most complete is that found in the Larger Catechism. It constitutes the answer to Question 165, and is in these words: "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, wherein Christ hath ordained the washing with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to be a sign and seal of ingrafting into himself, of remission of sins by his blood, and regeneration by his Spirit; of adoption, and resurrection unto everlasting life; and whereby the parties baptized are solemnly admitted into the visible church, and enter into an open and professed engagement to be wholly and only the Lord's."

This definition has primary reference, of course, to ritual baptism, but it distinctly indicates that "the washing with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," derives its significance from the fact that it has been appointed by Jesus Christ to symbolize the benefits that come through *real* baptism, which alone introduces to membership in the invisible church.

This real baptism is effected through that operation of the Holy Spirit by which the soul is united to Christ, and thus has secured to it remission of sins and adoption into the family of God; by which it is regenerated and its resurrection unto everlasting life realized. It is to this baptism that the apostle refers in 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13: "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Great Baptizer.* A Bible History of Baptism. By Samuel J. Baird, D. D. 12mo, pp. 489. Philadelphia: James H. Baird. 1882.

one body; so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have all been made to drink into one Spirit." Again he says, Rom. vi. 3, 4: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."

In these passages, and others of similar import which might be cited, the term is used in the well-known secondary sense, in which it indicates the transaction by which whatever is baptized, be it person or thing, is brought under an influence that completely pervades and controls it. Here the influence is that of the Holy Ghost, as is distinctly stated in one of these texts, and as distinctly implied by the context of the other; while the subjects are those who are chosen to constitute the body of which Christ is the head.

If we recall, in connection with these words of Paul, the declaration of John the Baptist, recorded by several evangelists, the Scripture representation is complete: "There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. I indeed have baptized you with water: but *he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.*" (Mark i. 7, 8.) This prediction was signally fulfilled on the day of Pentecost; but not less truly has it been fulfilled whenever a soul has been renewed. The administrator of real baptism is the Mediatorial King himself, who, in the exercise of his sovereign prerogative, applies redemption by shedding forth his Holy Spirit upon those that are his. Thus does he provide for their being raised to newness of life, cleansed from their native defilement and corruption, and made fit to constitute that "glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing."

It will not be disputed by any that the mode of introduction into the invisible church has been the same from the beginning. It is true that only upon the ascension of Jesus into heaven was he, as God-man, formally installed Mediatorial King. Then, as Son of Man, "God exalted him with his right hand to be a Prince

and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." But his blood had availed before it was shed, and he had applied salvation before he was exalted, as the reward of what he suffered. From the moment the scheme of redemption for sinners was inaugurated—that is, from the date of the fall—the Son, as "heir of all things," has administered the affairs of the kingdom of grace, and has been calling effectually through his Spirit those who are appointed unto everlasting life. This is to say, that real baptism has been administered in all ages alike, and that all true believers, under all dispensations, have been equally the subjects of it.

Now, as real baptism stands related to entrance into the invisible church, so does ritual baptism unquestionably stand, under the New Testament dispensation, to entrance into the visible church. As the first removes an obstacle, otherwise insuperable, out of the way of spiritual fellowship with God, and introduces the subject of it as an actual member of the family of God, so the latter removes an obstacle which hinders outward fellowship with God, and introduces the subject of it to the privileges of that body of men who profess the true religion and separate themselves from the world as the people of God.

The obstacle, in the first instance, is the corrupt nature, with all that it involves, which, according to the scriptural conception of it, gives rise to a real pollution and defilement which none but the Holy Ghost can purge away. The obstacle, in the second instance, is a ceremonial defilement, symbolical of that real pollution; an appointed "uncleanness" which rests upon every human being at birth, and which can be removed only by the ritual "washing with water," instituted by Christ to that end.

It is not to our purpose, at this stage of the discussion, to dwell upon the significance of baptism with water as it is a *seal* of the blessings conferred by the baptism with the Holy Ghost. We confine attention, for the present, to the fact that it sets forth, in a most impressive manner, though it be symbolically, the great truth that without "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost," it is utterly impossible to come into the true fellowship of the saints or be recognized by God as his child.

Just here the question presents itself, whether, under the Old Testament dispensation, real baptism was symbolized in the same way as under the New.

It will be remembered that our Saviour in his conversation with Nicodemus deals chiefly with what we have designated real baptism. To the astonished Pharisee he declares that, "Except a man be born from above he cannot see the kingdom of God." When Nicodemus reveals his utter ignorance of the whole subject, the divine teacher proceeds to state his meaning more plainly in the words, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God." This implies that there was a symbolical use of water which set forth the work of the Spirit, otherwise this utterance was no explanation of his first declaration. That it was an adequate explanation, and ought to have been understood by Nicodemus, is indicated by the rebuke which our Lord administers when Nicodemus still stumbles and inquires how these things can be. "Jesus answered, and said unto him, Art thou a master of Israel and knowest not these things?" The appropriateness of the rebuke thus administered clearly depends upon the fact that the reference to water in connection with the Spirit's agency in the new birth should have called to mind symbolism full of light for "a master of Israel." If we turn now to the Mosaic institutions, we find the presumption raised by our Saviour's dealing with Nicodemus abundantly justified.

For the best understanding of the matter, it will be necessary for us to take a brief survey of the Levitical regulations concerning ceremonial defilement, and we shall find no better exposition of the subject than that given by Dr. Samuel J. Baird, in his *Bible History of Baptism*. He says:

"In the laws of Moses there were two grades of uncleanness defined: uncleanness of seven days, and uncleanness till the even. The former was a symbol of that essential corruption which is in us by nature, to which are essential the redeeming blood of Christ and the renewing of the Holy Spirit, without which no man can see God in peace. Uncleanness till the even symbolized those casual defilements to which God's renewed people are liable by contact with the evil world. The ritual, concerning the uncleanness seven days, was designed to signalize the light in which man's apostate nature, and the depravity and sin thence resulting, appear in the sight of a God of ineffable holiness. To this conception the word *unclean* was designed to give expression, the intense meaning of which is liable to-



escape the casual reader of the Scriptures. It signified, not the mere external soiling of the living person, but death, corruption, and rottenness within the heart, the fermenting source of pollution poured forth in the outward life. To impress us with a just sense of the exceeding evil of this thing the Spirit employs every variety of figure expressive of deformity and loathsomeness. . . . David in his penitential psalm indicates his sense of this radical evil of his nature. 'Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity and *cleans* me from my sin. . . . Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me. Behold, thou desirest truth in the inward parts; and in the *hidden part* thou shall make me to know wisdom. Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be *clean*; wash me and I shall be whiter than snow. . . . Create in me a *clean heart*, O God; and renew a right spirit within me.' (Ps. li. 2-10.) Isaiah and other sacred writers represent the same evil by the figures of the vomit and filthiness of a drunken debauch, and by every kind of abominable and loathsome thing. (Isaiah xxviii. 8; Prov. xxx. 12.) By the designation, unclean, the moral deformity of Satan and the 'unclean spirits,' his angels, are described. And in the accounts of the riches of grace and glory in store for the church, the crowning feature is the exclusion of the unclean. (Isaiah xxxv. 8; lii. 1; Rev. xxi. 27.)

"For the purpose of inducing a profound sense of this evil and loathsomeness of sin, as working in the heart, the ordinances respecting the uncleanness of seven days were appointed, each having its own lesson." (Pp. 60-62.)

The significance of the period for which the uncleanness lasted is thus set forth by the same author :

"The defilement was for seven days. God's work of creation ended in the rest of the seventh day. That day was hence appropriated as a type of the final rest of Christ and his people upon the completed work of redemption. . . . [See Heb. iv. 4-9.] But the Sabbath thus reserved for God's people, coincides with 'the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.' Hence a seven days' uncleanness was typical of such a corruption of nature as is essential and therefore persistent to the end; and the exclusion of the defiled from the camp and the sanctuary signified the sentence of the judgment of the last day, when those whose natures are unrenewed, and whose sins are unpurged, will be excluded from the Sabbath of redemption and from the new Jerusalem, and remain finally under the woe of the second death." (Pp. 64, 65.)

This uncleanness of seven days symbolizes, then, exactly the same condition of the natural man as that which is symbolized by the uncleanness which is purged away by the washing of water in Christian baptism.

Now, let us see the provision made under the Mosaic economy for the removal of this ceremonial uncleanness, which, while it lasted, excluded from fellowship with the people of God. We will take the case of one who had contracted it by contact with a dead body.

For use on such occasion there were kept on hand the ashes of a red heifer, which had been slain without the camp, its blood sprinkled towards the door of the tabernacle, and its carcass, entire, burned along with cedar wood, hyssop and scarlet. (See Num. xix. 1-9.) A small portion of these ashes was taken and mingled with living water, which was then sprinkled, by any person clean himself from defilement, upon him who was to be purged. This was done upon the third day and again upon the seventh, the administrator using as his instrument a bunch of hyssop dipped in the "water of separation;" *i. e.*, this water appointed to abolish separation. The ashes of the red heifer were a reminder of a sin-offering, which pointed to the blood of him who should in the fulness of time offer himself without the gate. In the living water we have the cleansing element, which signifies the Holy Spirit, who alone can purge away that corruption of nature symbolized by the ceremonial uncleanness which rested upon the man undergoing purification. That this was the significance of the water of separation cannot be doubted in the light of David's language in the fifty-first Psalm: "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin. . . . Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me. . . . Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow. . . . Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy Holy Spirit from me."

In every application of the water of separation there must be, as administrator, a *clean* person, who, being himself in fellowship with the Head of the visible church, was capable of representing him who is the only true and real baptizer with the Holy Ghost. The symbolism here is found to be exactly parallel with that of the "washing with water" under the New Testament. The ceremonial was complicated with elements which were appropriate only to the time that then was; but there was the same sort of hindrance to the outward fellowship of Jehovah as that which attaches to the unbaptized now; there was the same purging of it away, as the condition of that fellowship by the sprinkling of water upon the unclean.

In view of this striking parallelism between the sprinkling of the water of separation under the Mosaic economy, and the "washing with water" in Christian baptism, the inquiry naturally suggests itself, whether, under that dispensation, the application of the water of separation was required in the case of every individual as the condition of outward fellowship with Jehovah. Or, to state the question in another way, whether all contracted seven days' uncleanness, from which they must be purged in order to the enjoyment of the privileges of the visible church.

Dr. Baird, in his *Bible Baptism*, maintains the affirmative of this question, on the ground that all infants were included with their mothers in the seven days' uncleanness which attached to every woman who bore a child, and that this defilement of both could be removed only by the application of the water of separation. He says:

"It was a fundamental article of the faith from the beginning that men are all natively unclean. Job, Eliphaz, and Bildad, each severally states it as an unquestionable proposition, that man born of woman must be so. (Job xiv. 4; xv. 14; xxv. 4.) David cries: 'Behold, I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me. . . . Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean; wash me and I shall be whiter than snow.' (Ps. li. 5-7.) He not only recognizes the radical nature of his moral corruption as born in him, but indicates the remedy under the very figure of sprinkling with the water of *nidda* [נִדְדָּא], *separation*], to which the hyssop refers. The Lord Jesus, speaking at a time when the Old Testament ordinances and system were still in full force, testifies, 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again.' (John iii. 6, 7.)

"To signalize this native corruption of man and the remedy, the ordinances concerning the defilement of *nidda* and its cleansing were appointed. In them the new-born infant was regarded as the product of overflowing corruption, and as a fountain of defilement to the mother, who thus became unclean, until purified with the water of separation.

"The child was identified with the mother in this uncleanness, (1), as being its cause in her; (2), as being subject to her touch, which was defiling to the clean; and (3), as being bone of her bone and flesh of her flesh, born of her body.

"In accordance with the doctrine of man's native defilement, above illustrated, it was characteristic of the law that it recognized none as clean unless purged by water of sprinkling. The infants at Sinai were so purified and admitted to the covenant as well their parents. So it was with the daughters of Midian [Num. xxxi. 18, 19]; and no other principle was known to the law,—no other practice tolerated by it. 'The man' (the person) 'that shall be unclean, and shall not purify

himself, that soul shall be cut off from among the congregation, because he hath defiled the sanctuary of the Lord; the water of separation hath not been sprinkled upon him; he is unclean.' (Num. xix. 20.)" (Pp. 83, 84.)

As corroborating this view, our author produces evidence that our Saviour was himself purified along with his mother by this only method of purging the seven days' defilement by the application of the water of *nidda* :

"It is a remarkable fact, that while we have in the Scriptures but one single example specifically mentioned of the purifying of an infant from this ritual defilement of birth, that example occurs in the person of Him respecting whom the angel said to Mary, 'That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.' (Luke i. 35.) In the same gospel in which is this record we read, respecting Mary, in the common version, that 'when the days of *her* purification, according to the law of Moses, were accomplished, they brought Jesus to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord.' (Luke ii. 22.) But it is agreed by critical editors that this is a corrupted reading, which is wholly without authority from any respectable manuscript. Instead of 'the days ( $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ ) of *her* purification,' it should read ( $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon$ ), 'the days of *their* purification'; that is, of both mother and child. Besides all the other authorities, the three oldest manuscripts, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and Alexandrinus, unite in this reading. [*Cf.* the Revised Version, *loc. cit.*, which adopts the emendation.] How the mothers were purified, we have seen; and from these facts, we know the children to have shared with them in the baptism." (Pp. 84, 85.)

It would be difficult to exaggerate the significance of this fact, so clearly stated, that Jesus received, and therefore needed, the ritual purification with the water of *nidda*. If he, though personally sinless, was, by reason of his birth from a woman, ceremonially unclean, and must be purged of it before he could be presented to the Lord (that is, could be recognized as fit for the fellowship of the visible church,) it follows that this must have been true of every child born under the old dispensation.

Incidental reference has already been made to the daughters of Midian, the facts concerning whom furnish additional proof of our author's thesis:

"On account of their licentious wives against Israel, Midian was doomed to destruction. In the campaign which followed, none were spared, except the female children. These were reserved for bond-servants. (Num. xxxi. 18; and compare Lev. xxv. 44-46; and Deut. xxi. 10-14.) But from the days of Abraham, all bond-servants had been by divine authority and command endowed with equal right and share with their masters in God's favor and covenant. And as Israel itself had been purified from the defilements and idolatries of Egypt, and ordained as the peculiar people of God by baptism of blood and water at Sinai, so these chil-

dren of licentious Midian, spared from the destruction incurred by their parents, and about to be joined with Israel as God's people, must be cleansed and admitted in the same manner.

“During the expedition many of the army had become defiled by contact with the slain, and were therefore to be cleansed with the water of separation, according to the law. Moses, therefore, issued orders to the men of the army: ‘Do ye abide without the camp seven days; whosoever hath killed any person, and whosoever hath touched any slain, *purify* both yourselves and your *captives* on the third day and on the seventh day.’ In these directions as to the third and seventh days, we recognize the exact requirements of the law with respect to the water of separation for the purification of sin. But the narrative is still more specific. ‘Eleazer, the priest, said unto the men of war which went to the battle, This is the ordinance of the law which the Lord commanded Moses. Only the gold and the silver, the brass, the iron, the tin, and the lead, everything that may abide the fire, ye shall make it go through the fire, and it shall be clean. Nevertheless, it shall be purified with *the water of separation*, and all that abideth not the fire, ye shall make go through the water. And ye shall wash your clothes on the seventh day, and ye shall be clean, and afterwards ye shall come into the camp.’ (Num. xxxi. 19-24.) ‘The water of separation’ here, is, in the original, ‘the water of *nidda*’—the water, that is, in which were mingled the ashes of the red heifer. With this, therefore, it was that these daughters of Midian were baptized and cleansed. There were thirty-two thousand of these captives thus rescued from the destruction incurred by the licentiousness and crimes of their own people, purged from their uncleanness, engrafted into the family of Abraham, and endowed with the blessings of the covenant. All were ‘women children’ (Num. xxxi. 18); and undoubtedly many were mere babes; the first recorded example of distinctively infant baptism.” (Pp. 81, 82.)

In this transaction we have distinctly set before us the mode in which outsiders, or Gentiles, were purified before they could come into the communion of the visible church under the old dispensation. There is evidence that always to the end proselytes, male and female, received this baptism, and only through it were they fully incorporated with the people of God. And this being true, it justifies our citing another passage as evidence that the water of separation must be applied to all, male and female, who were born of the seed of Abraham, as the condition of participation in outward fellowship with Jehovah. That passage reads: “One ordinance shall be both for you of the congregation, and also for the stranger that sojourneth with you, an ordinance for ever in your generations: as ye are, so shall the stranger be before the Lord. One law and one manner shall be for you and for the stranger that sojourneth with you.” (Num. xv. 15, 16.) This, being true of the ordinances relating to the various offerings and

the passover (Ex. xii. 49; Num. ix. 14), applies equally to the ordinance concerning the sprinkling of the water of *nidda*.

This use of living water mingled with the ashes of the red heifer was the form which ritual baptism took under the Levitical ceremonial, but it was not its original form. Just as the passover, which antedated the Levitical institutions, was, during the time those institutions were in force, regulated by them, and in the fulness of time losing its typical element, passed over into the Christian sacrament of the Lord's Supper, so did baptism with water antedate those institutions, yet was regulated by them while they prevailed, and then, losing its typical accompaniment, survived as Christian baptism. We discover the institution first in connection with the ratification of that covenant which Jehovah made with Israel at Sinai, by which the visible church received its complete organization, when the entire body of the people accepted Jehovah as their God, and were all, together with their little ones, baptized with water and with blood. Says the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews: "When Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, *with WATER and scarlet wool and hyssop*, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament (covenant) which God hath enjoined unto you." (Heb. ix. 19, 20.)

Here we find the same essential elements as in the application of the water of *nidda* afterwards. There is the blood, which was afterwards represented by the ashes of the red heifer, a reminder of a completed sacrifice, of which not only the blood had been sprinkled, but the whole body had been consumed; there is also the water mingled with the blood, as the living water was mingled with the ashes, and the same is sprinkled upon all the people, old and young, with the hyssop branch, all which represented most distinctly that baptism of the Holy Ghost administered in virtue of the blood shed upon Calvary. Who can fail to see in it a sign of that baptizing office of him who "came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood"? (1 John v. 6.)

It has already been intimated that this Sinai transaction, ante-

dating, as it did, the imposition of the Levitical institutions, completed the organization of the visible church. That church then took the shape which it has preserved, without *essential* modification, to the present day. A careful study of those chapters of Exodus (xix.—xxiv.), which give us an account of this covenant, proves that Dr. Stuart Robinson, in his *Discourses of Redemption*, states the facts correctly:

“It was a covenant with this church as a *representative* body, standing for the church of all succeeding ages. Moses, forty years after, when this generation that stood before Sinai had all perished, expressly says to the next generation, ‘The Lord made this covenant, not with our fathers, *but with us, even us who are all here alive this day.*’ By parity of reasoning the church that stood at Sinai, thus representing one, represented all succeeding generations. And, accordingly, thenceforth in the succeeding ages, including that of the apostles, the inspired teachers regarded the church as still under this covenant. And you will observe how, under the New Testament dispensation, Stephen says, ‘Our fathers *received the lively oracles to give unto us;*’ that is, they stood there as representing us.

“It was a covenant *wholly spiritual* in its significancy. Moses, just as Jesus afterward, sums up its provisions in the generalization, ‘Love the Lord thy God with all thy mind, soul and strength.’ And the apostle expressly argues that, so far from disannulling the previous covenant of spiritual blessings with Abraham, as representative father of all who believe, and who thus constitute the true circumcision, it is intended to include that covenant, and both confirm and develop more fully its provisions of spiritual blessing.”

It is important to notice that upon this occasion all the people publicly assented to the provisions of the covenant; and when Moses told them all the words of the Lord, they responded, “All the words which the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient.” (Ex. xxiv. 7.) Here was the public profession of faith and engagement to be the Lord’s, first made by the people; and upon condition of this profession made, the seal was affixed, in the sprinkling of the water and the blood. This baptism was administered to “*all the people,*” says the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 19), among whom were included, as we learn from the detailed account of the renewal of the covenant on the plains of Moab, the “little ones” as well as the adults. (Deut. xxix. 11.) Then, as now, the rite was administered to the children upon profession of faith on the part of the parents.

Passing over the centuries during which the Levitical institutions were in force, we come down to the days of John the Bap-

tist. It was a time when there seems to have been an especial need for a renewal of the covenant. On account of their sins, Jehovah had for four hundred years withdrawn his presence from his people. Instead of true devotion to the service of God according to the spirit of the engagement ratified at Sinai, "All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient," "an intense zeal of self-righteousness was cherished, under the two forms of a fanatical pride in the blood of Abraham, and an ardent devotion to the external forms and rites of religion; to tithes and offerings, to fastings and purifyings,—to 'righteousnesses of the flesh,'—whilst the spirituality and power of the divine law were obscured and set aside by the glosses and interpretations of the elders. Such was the religion of the scribes who 'sat in Moses' seat,' as instructors of the people. The great mass of the nation, led by these blind guides, were with them hastening to destruction; while the few who still sought after the God of their fathers were as sheep without a shepherd."<sup>1</sup>

As the condition of renewal of the covenant, and the reinstatement of Israel, practically excommunicated for centuries, there must be repentance and renewed engagement to be the Lord's. John was sent to preach that repentance, to mediate the return of the apostate people, and to affix again the seal of the covenant.

"The same office of warning and testimony on behalf of the forsaken covenant which Elijah exercised towards the ten tribes, John fulfilled to the Jews. To understand the full force and significance of his mission, the fact must be distinctly appreciated that Christ's humiliation and sufferings, however momentous in themselves, and however transcendently important to us, were a mere transient incident in the work undertaken by him. His coming into the world was a coming to the throne, to which the cross was a mere stepping stone,—a means to his exaltation, and to the achievements of his sceptre, in purging his Father's floor. In those achievements, justice and judgment are as conspicuous as grace; and if the latter witnessed a first signal and glorious display in the scenes of Pentecost, the former was as signally illustrated in the destruction and desolation of the city and land that rejected their King. It was with a view to the crisis thus created in the history of Israel by the coming of Christ that John was sent as his forerunner and herald. John did not ignore that abasement of Christ which was the antecedent condition and means of his exaltation and glory. But his distinctive theme, the subject which filled his heart and inspired his tongue, was the throne, the kingdom, the power and justice. Of it he was the official herald, and from it his preaching and

---

<sup>1</sup> *Bible History of Baptism*, p. 226.



baptism took their form and significance. His commission was threefold: (1), To announce the kingdom of heaven at hand, and herald the coming of the King, the Messenger of the covenant, the Baptizer with the Holy Ghost and with fire; (2), To identify and point him out in the person of Jesus; (3), To prepare the way before him. In fulfilment of the first and second of these functions, John preached the coming of 'One mightier than I,' who should baptize Israel with the Holy Ghost and with fire. He pointed out and announced the Lord Jesus as that coming One,—'the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world,'—'the Son of God.' And by connecting this testimony with his proclamation and baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, he anticipated the preaching of the apostles, and summed and published the gospel of atonement and remission through the blood of Christ. By this preaching and by the seal of baptism to those who received his testimony he fulfilled the third function above mentioned, and 'made ready a people prepared for the Lord.' (Luke i. 17.)

"There were two termini to which John's baptism sustained peculiar and intimate relations, and from which his ministry derived all its significance. The first was that 'day of the assembly' at Sinai, when Israel entered into the covenant by which she took God as her King and received the baptismal seal sprinkled by the hand of Moses. It was the office of John to announce the personal coming of the King of Israel; to warn them of the penalty of the violated covenant; to announce the remission of sins and restoration of the covenant to those who should repent and return to their allegiance; and to certify this by the renewal of the broken seal.

"The second terminus to which John's baptism looked was that day when the covenant King of Israel should appear in person, assume his throne, and enter on the functions announced by John under the figures of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and the baptism of fire. Of the former, so conspicuous in the prophecies, the baptism of Israel by Moses and that now administered by John were alike typical. The grace of the Holy Ghost, administered by the enthroned Baptizer, was the end and fulfilment of both."<sup>1</sup>

Looking, as did this renewal of the covenant under the ministry of John, directly to the transition of the visible church from the old dispensation to the new, which was to be preëminently the dispensation of the Spirit, it was especially appropriate that the rite which sealed it should assume that simple form which employs water alone. Contemplating across fifteen centuries the bloodshedding on Calvary, upon the basis of which the covenant of Sinai was made, Moses mingled the element which symbolized the Spirit's work with the blood which typified that transaction in virtue of which alone the Spirit could be given; and it was provided that, in all the ages intervening, there should be, whenever the water was applied, a reminder of that sacrifice in the ashes of the red heifer mingled with it. But now the offering of the sacrifice

<sup>1</sup> *Bible History of Baptism*, pp. 230-232.

itself is imminent. John can point to him who is to lay it upon the altar, and say, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world!" The kingdom of God is at hand. He who was to wield its sceptre, and to whom those who repented were to be obedient, in whom they were to recognize their sovereign Lord, was already engaged in that atoning work which culminated when his blood was shed. There was no need longer of the blood of bulls or goats, or of the ashes of an heifer. Therefore, living water alone was employed.

The fact should not be overlooked that John was not the only administrator of this baptism. Our Saviour himself took up the theme upon which John had dwelt, and he and his disciples went throughout the land preaching, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." To those who responded to this call, the disciples, under the direct authority of Jesus, administered the rite of baptism; and so numerous were those who received it at their hands that the Apostle John could say that "Jesus made and baptized [by the hands of his representatives] more disciples than John." (John iv. 1, 2.) This was unquestionably the same baptism as that of John. The forerunner himself was clearly of this opinion, for certain of his disciples, disturbed by the fact that Jesus seemed to be superseding him in his peculiar office, came to him with the plaint, "Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him." Whereupon "John answered and said, A man can receive nothing except it be given him from heaven. Ye yourselves bear me witness, that I said, I am not the Christ, *but that I am sent before him.*" (John iii. 26-28.) The reply is relevant only upon the supposition that John meant to say that Jesus was appointed of heaven to supersede him in the office which he had filled of calling Israel to a renewal of the covenant, and affixing the seal of baptism in the case of those who responded to the call. There is no reason to doubt that the office thus assumed by our Saviour, he continued to discharge to the end, and that, throughout the three years of his earthly ministry, the disciples administered this baptism to all those who professed repentance and claimed to be looking for the kingdom.

When mention is made again of baptism it is by the Lord himself, after his passion and resurrection. The scene is Mount Olivet, and he is about to take his departure from the earth. Matthew tells us (xxviii. 18-20) that "Jesus came to them [the disciples] and spake unto them, saying, All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

Can any one who candidly considers the facts suppose that the Lord speaks of a new rite, which he now, for the first time, ordains? In that case he must have expounded its nature and described its mode. Shall we assume that such explanations were given, and yet no record was made of them? The supposition is gratuitous, and unsupported by a single hint from any one of the evangelists. The only rational conclusion is, that the baptism of which he speaks was a familiar rite, concerning which they needed no instruction.<sup>1</sup> We are justified in assuming that the only change he made was that which he expressly mentions, namely, that the rite which before could be administered only to those who were of the literal seed of Abraham, or had been formally incorporated with that seed, was now to be administered to the Gentiles also, upon the sole condition of their accepting the teachings of the apostles and professing themselves disciples of Jesus the Christ, the ascended Lord and Head of the church.

Against the view presented in this article, as to the essential identity of baptism under the Old Testament and the New, two objections doubtless will be urged.

The first is, that it ignores the fact that, under the old dispensation, circumcision was the seal of the covenant; that it was the rite initiatory to the privileges of the visible church; that it is represented by the New Testament writers as signifying the same truths as does baptism under the present dispensation, by which

---

<sup>1</sup> See Armstrong's *Sacraments of the New Testament*, "The Doctrine of Baptisms," § 7.

rite it has been superseded as the ordinance through which members are admitted to the fellowship of the visible church.

The objection fails to take notice of the fact that all along we have kept steadily in view that, under the old dispensation, it was an indispensable condition of membership in the visible church that one should be identified with the seed of Abraham after the flesh. In the case of all the males the rite of circumcision must be administered. The great design was to keep the literal seed of Abraham distinct from all the nations, inasmuch as of that blood Christ was to be born. Circumcision was the seal of the covenant which insured this consummation, and therefore it was set in the flesh of the males only, from whom the descent was reckoned. By circumcision, strictly and immediately, was meant the shedding of the blood of the promised seed of Abraham *par excellence*. Hence, by implication, it meant the crucifixion of our old man with him. It thus implies a work of grace to which the agency of the Holy Spirit is indeed necessary; but it is presented in a light essentially different from that represented by baptism. Baptism signifies the primary office of the Spirit—the imparting of life to the dead soul; the other the consequent death of the old man. The former is the primary grace, which is comprehensive of all else. The latter exhibits *one* of the consequences resulting from it. This view of the significance of circumcision is in exact harmony with all those passages of which Deut. xxx. 6, Rom ii. 28, 29, iv. 11, and Col. ii. 11, may serve as examples.

Now, when our Lord gave his final commission to the disciples on Mount Olivet, he abolished the connection between the literal seed of Abraham and the visible church. By virtue of that act he abolished circumcision as a condition, on the part of the males, of being recognized as members of that body; and, in that he left baptism as the only seal of the covenant, he virtually ordained that it should fill, not only the place it had always filled, but also stand in the place of circumcision, so far as it had been a condition of the recognition of membership in the visible church. There is a true and proper sense, therefore, in which baptism, under the New Testament, supersedes the circumcision of the Old. Those who before must be both circumcised and baptized, now receive

only the washing of water, and on that condition are recognized as fit for the outward fellowship of Jehovah.

The second objection is, that it is essential to Christian baptism that it should be administered "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" and since John's baptism and that of the disciples before the passion of our Lord, not to speak of the earlier baptisms, were not administered with this formula, it cannot be identified with the rite under the new dispensation.

After a careful study of all the passages of Scripture bearing upon this point, we have reached the conclusion that, however appropriate this formula may be in connection with the administration of the sacrament of baptism, our Saviour does not mean to prescribe it as a form to be used, but simply intends to require that all who are baptized shall, as a condition, make confession of the triune God, and in being united to the visible church shall be brought into outward relations with God as now revealed as Father, Son and Holy Ghost. The preposition employed is  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , "*into* the name," and indicates the character of the profession which must be made. But although the profession of the Israelite before the advent was not explicitly a profession of faith in the triune God, it was such implicitly. Will any one affirm that profession of faith under the Old Testament was essentially different from that under the New? Will any Presbyterian deny that profession of faith under the old dispensation opened the way into the same outward fellowship that profession of faith in Christ now does?

Dr. Baird very significantly remarks on this subject of the formula:

"The silence of all the evangelists, except Matthew, as to the words in question is wholly inconsistent with the supposition that they were given as a formula. The importance of the rite is of common agreement. And resting, as it does, as an obligation on every soul that hears the gospel, it is the first and foremost of all the practical duties of those who receive it. If, therefore, the formula was now given as an element in the administration of the ordinance, it is of the first and universal moment. How, then, is it possible for three of the evangelists to have ignored it in their several versions of the gospel? Evidently they attached to it no such significance as obtains with those who hold it as of the essence of baptism.

“The fact that it is not once used or alluded to in the whole subsequent history and epistles is conclusive. Those records are a testimony, as much by silence often as by utterance. But on this subject they are not silent. On the day of Pentecost, Peter calls upon the inquirers to be baptized ‘(ἐπί) for the name’s sake of Christ.’ (Acts ii. 38.) The Samaritans and the twelve disciples of John at Ephesus were baptized ‘into (ἐῖς) the name of the Lord Jesus.’ (Acts viii. 16; xix. 5.) And Paul distinctly implies that the Corinthians were baptized into the same name. ‘Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized into the name of Paul?’ (1 Cor. i. 13.) How these facts are consistent with obedience to Christ’s command we have already seen. . . . He that is spiritually baptized into Jesus Christ thereby receives the Spirit, and is united in Christ to the Father. He is baptized into the three.”<sup>1</sup>

In connection with this question concerning the identity of the baptism of John and of the disciples of Jesus with Christian baptism, distinct note should be made of the fact that there is no evidence that any one who received that baptism, and from that time adhered to Jesus as the promised Messiah, ever received baptism after the new dispensation was ushered in. There were comparatively few who understood the import of the profession which they made, but there were some—the eleven disciples, the seventy, and a few scores besides. It is evident the twelve disciples of John, of whom we have an account in Acts xix. 1–7, had failed completely to apprehend the significance of the transaction which John mediated. Paul explains to them the nature of John’s baptism, of which they had to that moment remained in profound ignorance, although they had received the rite at John’s hands: “John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that *they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus.*” (Acts xix. 4.) Luke adds, that “when they heard this,” that is, when they understood what was the real nature of the profession which John called upon the Jews to make, they made that profession, and then “they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.” (Acts xix. 5.) The repetition of baptism in their case was due to the fact that they, through ignorance, had never renewed the covenant, and were to that day that Paul expounded it to them as truly outsiders as were the three thousand upon the day of Pentecost.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Bible History of Baptism*, pp. 439, 440.

It is not our purpose to dwell here upon the bearing of this identity of baptism under the two dispensations, upon the question concerning the subjects of the sacrament, or that concerning the mode. In either case any multiplication of words were superfluous. If the proposition for which we contend be admitted, there can be no doubt, in the mind of any fair-minded person, that the infant seed of believing parents are to receive the seal of the covenant upon the faith of their parents, as they did from the first institution of the visible church to the day when our Saviour appointed that same seal for all the nations. As little question can there be that the water is to be sprinkled, as it was for fifteen centuries before our Saviour's advent, to represent symbolically the shedding forth of the Spirit of all grace, by the Great Baptizer, upon all those who are subjects of "the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." In all the Old Testament Scriptures there is no trace of immersion. We are fully persuaded that in the New Testament there is no more warrant for it than in the Old.

JAMES F. LATIMER.

*Union Theological Seminary, Hampden-Sidney, Va.*

## II. INTER-PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES.

FROM time immemorial the three learned professions of Medicine, Divinity, and Law have been coördinated—three links in the chain of fellowship embracing all the interests of the human race. Rooted in the necessities of man, as individual and social, not one of the three can ever be discarded. So long as the body shall be invaded by disease, the remedial art will be invoked to turn back the ebbing tide of life. So long as the soul shall yearn after communion with the Deity, the sacerdotal office will interpose its mediation between earth and heaven. So long as men touch each other in the complex relations of society, the law must throw around them the shield of its protection. It is not strange, therefore, that a feeling of brotherhood arises between coadjutors who are associated in beneficent functions without which society could not exist.

The affinity, if not the consanguinity, of the three professions is evinced by their consolidation, during the world's infancy, in one individual person. The first society was that of the family, branching into new households at each descent, until the clan or tribe is constituted. But from centre to circumference of this expanding circle swayed the sceptre of the original Patriarch, whose age was lengthened through centuries, to give permanence to society slowly crystallizing into form. The feebleness of the administration is sufficiently attested by the enormous wickedness which could only be purged by the waters of the Deluge. But from the paternal character of this early government was derived the conception of the King as the Father and Shepherd of his people, set forth in the Homeric songs, and concealed even under the absolutism of Oriental despotism. This patriarch was, however, not less the priest than the king of the nascent state. By virtue of his headship over the issue of his loins, the sacrificial knife gleamed in his hand at their altars of worship, and through his intercessions the favor of heaven was obtained. Thus Noah came forth from



the ark and builded an altar unto the Lord, and with him, the second father of mankind, the covenant was made, of which the bow in the cloud remains the sign until this day. Thus, too, Job offered burnt-offerings continually, according to the number of his household, saying, "It may be that my sons have sinned and cursed God in their hearts." The mitre and the crown rested together upon the patriarch's head, the royal sceptre and the bishop's staff were placed in either hand.

If the medical art fails to read its earliest record in the twilight of this patriarchal age, it has full compensation in the clearness of its identification with the law-giver and the priest of the Mosaic period. It is enough to suggest the minute sanitary code handed down to ancient Israel, through the law-giver who communed with God in the bosom of the cloud, and that the leper could be cleansed from his spots only through the office of the priesthood. The historic association of the healing and sacerdotal functions had its root in the primitive faith, that diseases marked the judgments of God upon the sins of mankind. But whatever its origin, we trace the conjunction between the two within the domain of profane history at a period far later than we have yet considered. Æsculapius was one of the most important divinities of antiquity, and was worshipped throughout Greece as "the representative or personification of the healing powers of nature." To his temple the sick were brought; to whom in dreams the god was supposed to reveal the remedies for their cure. The votive tablets hung upon the walls of these temples testified, with the names of those who were restored, the diseases and the methods of recovery, supposed to be the earliest example of "recorded cases" through which medical experience has been accumulating from age to age.

It would be tedious to dwell longer upon these archæological references. In passing from them, suffice it to adopt the language of an admitted authority, who says of those early days, "The practice of medicine was intimately associated with religion. The knowledge of medicine was regarded as a sacred secret, transmitted from father to son in the families of the Aselepiadæ; and we still possess the oath which every one was obliged to take when he was put in possession of the medical secrets." The source of

this singular union of offices is not far to find. Our present systems of theology, hygiene, and jurisprudence would none of them exist, but for

“The fruit  
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste  
Brought death into the world and all our woe.”

Were man not a sinner, his approach to the Deity would be easier, and his creed far simpler than it is to-day. But for this original apostasy, the restraints of law would lie softly upon human freedom in the protection of property and life. As for the profession of medicine, it would be fairly vacated had not “sin entered into the world and death by sin”—death, the generic term for “the thousand natural shocks that flesh is heir to.” We cease, then, to wonder, in this common origin, that healer, priest, and ruler should thus be blended into one, and that they should be dissevered only as wants were multiplied with advancing civilization.

The historic unity of this triad suggests the theme of this article—THE EQUAL AND INTERCHANGEABLE RESPONSIBILITIES WHICH REST JOINTLY UPON THE THREE PROFESSIONS.

I. *First of all, consider their reciprocal obligations, arising from the special relation they sustain to each other.* As necessary guilds, they divide betwixt them all the interests of men; and being responsible for the common welfare, they occupy a joint trust. These must not degenerate into mere trades—a trafficking in the urgencies and pressures of human life, by which one’s daily bread is earned. They are sacred callings, with which a divine voice has filled the ear of those who bring relief and comfort to the weary and the sad. Let a representative of each class, side by side on some mount of observation, survey the work assigned to them in common. Upon the plain beneath, the maddening crowd surges like the billowy sea. Here, “the pale horse,” whose rider is death, tramples beneath his cruel hoof “the fourth part of the earth,” over which “power is given him to kill with the sword and with hunger and with death and with the beasts of the earth.” There, murder and theft and fraud and lechery and corruption fill the land with violence and crime; and society, separated at its numerous joints, melts into anarchy and ruin. Whilst here and there

and everywhere, ignorance and sin are shutting out men from God, and fill with fierce foreboding of the coming judgment. Shall the three spectators obey the call to each without first locking hands in the fellowship of labor, and pledging faith each to the other in the acceptance of their joint commission? God and man alike exact this confederation between those who are constituted in a special sense the organs of society.

Indeed, the three professions overlap each other to an extent which makes success in each sphere somewhat dependent upon support that shall come from without. The interests of society are interwoven, as threads in the web: no man liveth to himself in the private relations of life, far less he who is engaged in the discharge of public functions. To no combination does the sentiment of Pope apply with greater emphasis than to this triad, whose reciprocal obligation we are now considering:

“ Heaven forming each on other to depend—  
 A master, or a servant, or a friend,  
 Bids each on other for assistance call,  
 Till one man's weakness grows the strength of all.”

Here, for example, is the jurist enforcing the supremacy of law through the decisions of a human court: who should stand with aid and comfort at his side, if not the preacher, who asserts in the doctrine of atonement the unchangeable necessity for a perfect obedience? No broader statesmanship displays its banner in senate or parliament, than that upon which the divine polity is based in the sacred Scriptures. No finer forensic pleading utters its voice at any earthly bar than that by which divine equity reconciles justice with mercy in the sinner's pardon. Who, then, in the fierce contentions which shake society to its foundations, can more than the preacher lend support to the permanence of government and the majesty of law? Distinct as the church may be from the state, and officially restrained as the preacher is from intermeddling with questions of political partisanship, the legislator and the jurist have still the right to demand of him the full measure of private and personal influence in support of public order and the safety of the commonwealth. By parity of reasoning,—that “the reciprocity be not on one side,”—the bar is under

equal obligation to lend its countenance to the pulpit. Aside from personal convictions of truth and the claims of Christianity upon the individual soul, the interpreters and administrators of law are bound to uphold the clergy as one of the vital forces of society—if for no other reason, in recognition of those antecedent deliverances of conscience which underlie all just legislation and true legal practice.

The interdependence of the medical and legal professions is equally manifest. The physician is the guardian of the public health. He cannot protect his immediate constituency from disease, except by purifying the atmosphere they breathe. The sanitary measures which shall suppress the poison of contagion and dry up the fountain of pestilence, must emanate from his knowledge and experience. This constitutes him a counsellor of the state, and gives him the right to call upon the civil arm to enforce the laws which a wise sanitary legislation must first authoritatively proclaim. In the joint discharge of these important functions, the two professions blend their separate agencies and fulfil their reciprocal obligations, without the recognition of which both would be equally impotent in the public service.

Still more closely associated are the physician and the pastor. They meet in the same chambers of sickness; they bend together over the beds of the dying; they mingle their consolations in the hour of bereavement and sorrow; they blend their ministry in the sufferer who is smitten at once in body and soul. How can either dispense with the aid afforded by his natural ally? The most obstinate cases of religious gloom are those which have their origin in nervous depression; and every experienced pastor, oftener than is generally thought, has remanded a spiritual dyspeptic to the care of the doctor; and quite as often the prudent physician has summoned the clergyman to his aid in "ministering to a mind diseased." The relation between the two is so close, and the assistance rendered is so reciprocal, as almost to blend them into one. They diverge only at the point where the two elements of man's complex nature are joined, the spiritual welfare being the goal of the one, the corporeal the goal of the other.

Nothing more impressively establishes the relation between

spiritual and bodily healing than the miracles of merey by which the Author of Christianity proved his divine mission. The great Teacher was the great Physician. It is recorded of him that "he went about preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness and all manner of diseases among the people." Of his apostles after him the comprehensive testimony is, that "they went preaching the gospel and healing everywhere." Typical of the grace which shall cure the sickness of the soul, was the benevolence which shall cure the sickness of the flesh, uniting through all time, in harmony of effort, the two professions which now divide the double function.

There is a class of diseases, such as incipient madness, which lie along the border line separating matter from mind. They are the cases in which the medical practitioner is forced to reply :

"Not so sick, my lord,  
As she is troubled with thick coming fancies,  
That keep her from her rest."

The difficult task is how to

"Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow;  
Raze out the written troubles of the brain;  
And with some sweet oblivious antidote  
Cleanse the stuffed bosom of that perilous stuff  
Which weighs upon the heart."

The consulting fee in such a case must pass to one who deals not with "rhubarb, senna, or what purgative drug," but to him who deals with conscience and the laws of thought, the anatomist of mind, who can reach the secrets of the soul. We are far from intimating that medical education does not embrace within its range the study of mind as well as of body, at least with reference to those peculiar affections in which both are involved. But certainly those may afford collateral aid, whose entire business is with the soul, especially in cases where a morbid religious experience throws its blight over the whole man, and warps everything out of its proper course. A hearty coöperation is clearly demanded between parties who stand thus side by side upon the same plane.

A special illustration of the common ground occupied by the two professions is furnished in the "faith-cure" and the "mind-cure," and other modern charlatanries, which undertake to drive all phar-

macy from the field, and to substitute the wizard for the doctor. By the first theory, every cure is a miracle wrought through a supernatural faith that the Deity will interpose his immediate power, without instrumental agency of any sort. Fanaticism can indulge no deeper frenzy, unless it should teach that harvests may be reaped without tillage, or life be sustained without breath. The second theory, with a little more modesty, substitutes the laws of mind for those of matter, and physic gives way to metaphysic. What is called sickness is nothing but an illusion of the mind. Man has only to concentrate his will, and through the magic of a fixed purpose the peccant humors of the body will disappear, and psychology reign supreme through the triumph of the imagination. All this is eminently suggestive. These marvellous pretensions could never be advanced if the healing art were not by some mysterious affinity connected with the sentiment of religion. Reason indicates that the peril which fanaticism threatens to these allied professions should bring into intelligent concert both the faculties of theology and medicine. Indeed, from the relations subsisting between the three, including of course the profession of the law, the obligation is mutual to support each other with the homage and respect which are due to all.

II. *There is a common service which these professions alike owe to truth.* But what precisely do we mean by truth? If we reverse the wheels over the track of ages, we reach the point at which time itself was born. Beyond that is God, in the vastness of his own eternity; only he, with his own thoughts.

"Wisdom sits alone,  
Topmost in heaven—she is its light, its God;"

and the flashes of this light, God's produced thought, that is truth. It is the Creator's thought rolling up the firmament, and setting within it the sapphire stars; the Creator's thought lifting the dripping continents from their watery bed, and pouring the seas into their vast basins; the Creator's thought hiding in her deep bosom nature's secret forces, and ordaining the constant laws which nature must obey: all this mind of God, which science must disclose and philosophy interpret, that is truth. As the charred

forests and the tree-ferns of geologic times were stored in our present coal-measures, as the precious metals were fused in the veins of the rocks, so has God stored his wisdom in the frame of the universe, that man may draw it forth as truth, and rejoice in the heritage of knowledge. As we walk through the aisles of this vast cathedral, voices come up to us from earth, air and sea, whispering of God and of the wisdom which is his. It is this divinity of truth, "the daughter of the skies," that lifts those who embrace her to the loftiest espousal upon earth. By the hand of this queenly bride, we are led into the holiest chamber, where the Deity conceals the working of his power. Not until we have penetrated these mysteries have we arrived at truth. The mere collection of surface facts does not yield it, any more than the perusal of a dictionary yields us knowledge. Not the words alone, but the words related to each other in sentences and intelligible propositions—it is this that constitutes knowledge. So it is the pressing behind naked facts to the principles which lie at their heart, and which makes them to be facts—it is this generalization of science which gives us truth. Chaldean shepherds gazed upon the stars centuries before Copernicus was born, and the Greek sailor by their light guided his bark over the Ionian sea ages before Kepler and Newton; but there was no astronomy until science, through her diagrams and formulas, wrought out the mathematics of the heavens. It is this interpretation of the divine purpose and plan, through the regulative principles by which the universe is constructed, upheld and governed, that is truth; and when compassed by man becomes his knowledge.

If other argument were needed than truth's own sacredness, let her value be estimated by the practical benefits she confers in the applied science of our day. Changing but a single word, we can say, with Mr. Emerson, "Truth is the summit of being; *invention* is the application of it to affairs." No sooner was the Creator's thought interpreted through the discovery of nature's silent methods than men began to fill the world with surprising inventions. Science, putting herself in line with him who established this unchanging order, now works through these fixed laws and

with these material forces. Wisdom in man learns from the wisdom that is highest in God to subdue nature herself as the instrument of his will, and through her subordinated agency to achieve the universal dominion given him in trust at the first creation.

Such is the obligation under which the world lies to truth. Upon whom, therefore, does it devolve, more than upon the learned professions, to maintain her supremacy? Three-fourths of the human race are busy in the scramble for bare subsistence, with neither time nor culture for any higher aspiration than to meet the necessities of the passing hour. From the remaining fourth a large and increasing number of noble thinkers are engaged in throwing the discoveries of science into practical and concrete form in a thousand witty inventions which shall abridge human labor and increase the comfort of life. But these are powerless until supplied with the abstract truths, which they are unable to formulate and can only fashion into bodily shape. Who, then, shall enter into the service of truth herself, search into her deep mysteries, and disclose the principle or force which is to become the animating soul of the future invention?

“Not a truth has to art or to science been given,  
But brows have ached for it, and souls toiled and striven.”

Upon whom shall truth call for this supreme devotion, if not upon those who are recognized as professionally the leaders of public thought? More or less cloistered from the great Babel around them, engaged with abstract truth which they seek to express as doctrine, relegating each to its proper place in a harmonious system, under pressure still from the world without beating at their doors with questions upon the unsolved problems of life, who but the healers, the teachers, the lawyers of the land, should take each upon himself the vow,

“I will find  
Where truth is hid, though hid it were indeed  
Within the centre?”

The performance of this duty will require a division of labor, for the field of truth is too broad for a single adventurer to explore. It so happens that the three professions—nay, four, unless



we include in one of these the large body of educators rapidly swelling into a distinct and recognized order—it so happens that these professions fall, by the bent of their studies, into the provinces they should severally occupy.

Medical science, for example, is experimental. It begins with observation, gathers its facts, compares and judges, arranges and classifies, and builds itself up from its own records. It studies the structure of the body, learns the parts and organs of which it is composed, the functions discharged by each, the disorders by which they are assailed, their reciprocal influence, and how they are combined and modified. It enquires into the origin and history of every disease which sweeps over the earth, and searches through nature's domain for those remedial agents, whether in mineral, fountain or plant, which the divine pity has furnished for the relief of human suffering. Its researches are pushed in all directions, until it boldly confronts every ailment of the flesh with the remedy for its cure. The habits of thought thus acquired, combined with the character of the studies, fit the members of this profession to preside over the whole department of natural science. Society should be able to lay its hand upon an organized guild, which it shall hold responsible for loyalty to truth in this province of her dominion. Individual scientists are prone to be so dazzled with the splendor of their own theories as to forget that hypothesis is only the rude scaffolding employed in erecting the temple of truth, and no part of the building itself; simply a method of inquiry, and not its ascertained result. The physician, on the contrary, is constrained by the very empiricism of his calling to bring everything to the test of actual experiment and trial. A practical cast is thereby given to his researches, rendering him eminently conservative in the conclusions which are reached. As a member of an organized fraternity, he is also in a measure accountable to the class to which he belongs, inducing a caution which shall guard against rash and hasty deductions; whilst the isolated student, in the seclusion of the cloister, may permit himself to be intoxicated with the fumes of his own imagination, unchecked by a sense of responsibility anywhere. Speculation is seldom healthy when too

far removed from the practical world to which it is so often a stranger.

Medical knowledge is thus seen to be itself a branch of physical science. Its researches are conducted upon the same principles, and largely by the same methods; whilst many of the most important discoveries in nature it immediately appropriates as instruments or agents in its own service. By this necessary alliance, the medical fraternity is under special obligation to enforce the canons which inductive science has laid down for its own guidance. It may not proclaim as truth any theory which has not been verified "by confirmations strong as proofs from holy writ." A partial induction, which takes not in all the facts, gives the lie to truth in all that it omits. It would be a partial induction to leave out the mind in studying the constitution of such a being as man; and hence the bias to materialism, so often charged upon the medical profession, would be illicit because it is unscientific. Indeed, the protection of their own honor constitutes them the body-guard of true science over the whole field of physical investigation.

In like manner and in equal degree the theologian is responsible for philosophy. The peril to truth is no less from so-called philosophy than from so-called science. The freedom of speculation often degenerates into lawless licentiousness. The cautious induction which should proceed from facts to the principles upon which they rest is spurned as the drudgery of thought. Genius must go prancing upon the high "a priori" road, to conclusions that are independent of proof. Abstractions airy and unsubstantial as the spider's web are, like the spider's thread, spun from the bowels of an idle fancy. They hang around the corners of the chambers of imagery, black with the dust they gather continually, until they become the disgrace and the scandal of reason. Even this is not the worst. A false philosophy distils its poison into the whole literature and life of a people, penetrates every system of education, percolates through every stratum of society, frets with its leprosy all the institutions of government, until everything useful and noble on earth is smitten with blight and lapses into ruin.

What class is so publicly ordained to protect society from these disasters as the clergy? Their studies lie distinctly within this sphere. Their office is to deal with mind, and thought is the very instrument of their labor. In the obtaining and imparting of knowledge they are compelled to recognize the laws of mind. They must understand the doubts which they undertake to remove, the scruples which they seek to resolve, the conflicts in which they expect to triumph. Their entire training is that of an intellectual athlete, under the discipline of philosophy. They are supposed to have encountered the speculations of all the schools, and to hold in their hand the touchstone by which every system shall be tested. They bow, it is true, to the authority of divine revelation; but this does not exempt them from the exercise and responsibility of reason. The revelation itself submits its evidences to the most searching examination, and demands to be intelligently interpreted. Its testimonies are scattered in magnificent profusion through the sacred books, just as the materials of science are distributed over the field of nature, and are to be collated and digested into system by the same inductive method. Individual thinkers there are as profoundly versed in philosophy as they, and quite as competent to explode the errors which find currency under that august name; but they are hidden from sight, and do not conduct their inquiries under a sense of responsibility to any but themselves. Here, on the contrary, is an organized body which has taken the oath "at the high altar of eternity" to be loyal to truth. Society can lay upon it the supreme obligation to sift the teachings of all the schools, that a spurious philosophy may not go forth to debauch the intellect and conscience of mankind.

In the distribution of this work, what special function shall be assigned to the last member of our triad? Undoubtedly the legal mind is fitted by scholastic training to grapple with the most difficult problems of philosophy or science. But the lawyer's position in the vortex of all the activities of life defines his office as dealing not with the abstract, but with the concrete; not with the contemplation, but with the application of truth. It is a crushing responsibility under which the legislators and jurists lie, in confronting all the social problems of the age; and that not as specu-

lative studies quietly pursued in the closet, but as practical issues which involve the safety, nay, even the existence, of society. The open conflict everywhere between labor and capital; the complete organization of every craft, and the massing of these into a grand army moving in concert at a moment's signal from a single will; the resistance of powerful monopolies, wealthy enough to control the legislation of the land; the communism which publicly threatens with dynamite explosion the thrones of ancient monarchies and the overthrow of government in all its forms; the centralism which is swallowing up the feebler powers of the world, obliterating the landmarks between nations, and arraying continental forces against each other in the struggle for universal dominion—from even this partial enumeration, who does not see society rocking beneath the prophetic tremors of an earthquake in which it may be speedily engulfed? No empirical treatment will answer for organic diseases seated thus in the frame of the commonwealth itself. Whatever the outward circumstances in which society may be developed, no permanent reconciliation between these antagonistic forces can be secured, except upon the unchanging principles of justice and rectitude. The mastery of these principles in their essential purity, and the knowledge of their application which is gained from the history of the past, this alone opens to us the solution of these vexed questions, which are the terror of our modern civilization. Much of this antecedent knowledge may be gained from the silent thinkers of the closet; but the solemn trust of translating it into practical measures for the protection of society must be reposed in the noble order which embraces the makers, the expounders and the enforcers of law. Is it not plain, then, that the times in which our lot is cast do not allow a schism between the three guilds that have always been associated in the promotion of human welfare? This is what is meant by the joint loyalty which they alike owe to truth.

Two things are required for the maintenance of this accord. The first is, that each profession should know why it exists. It should keep before it the precise object which it proposes to accomplish. It should wear upon its front the badge by which it is distinguished, and breathe the spirit in which it was originated. If

the law has for its function the repression of crime, a robust sense of justice should be the seal of the order by which it is administered. If the office of the pulpit be mainly one of testimony for divine truth, it should be characterized by fidelity to the record in which that truth is revealed. If medicine takes its rise in the spirit of benevolence which weeps over human suffering, this must be the signature of its whole career. A high ideal should flame like a guiding star before every noble calling—a star rising ever to the zenith, and lifting those who gaze upon it to loftier aspirations and achievements.

The second requisite is a large culture beyond the limits of a particular vocation. A bright student once cast the horoscope of his classmates in the following terms: "A will become the greatest scholar of us all; B will become the greatest writer; but I will be the greatest man." Whether this boastful prediction was ever fulfilled is a matter of no importance to us; but the distinction itself is worth considering. The man is more than the scholar or the writer, precisely as the whole is more than the part. The restriction of the mind within a certain class of studies begets a narrowness incompatible with real greatness. The mental faculties react upon each other, and the end of true education is to bring them all up in perfect symmetry. The academic curriculum is constructed upon this principle, and the studies of our youth are mingled in such proportions as shall give equal development to all the powers. But education continues through life with those who expect to be leaders of men. Hence the necessity of lifting one's self out of professional routine by wide excursions into other fields of thought. We thus keep in the current of human progress; the pulse quickens as it throbs in unison with the universal heart. In no better way can the three great professions maintain that reciprocal sympathy which has been shown to be so necessary in the discharge of their common trust.

Above all, a hearty consecration to duty should be impressed upon each: who, though sometimes severe in her aspect, carries in her hands most ample rewards. It were well if each living man could apostrophize her in the words of a poet too little esteemed in our day:

“Stern law-giver! yet thou dost wear  
The Godhead’s most benignant grace;  
Nor know we anything so fair  
As is the smile upon thy face:  
Flowers laugh before thee on their beds,  
And fragrance in thy footing treads;  
Thou dost preserve the stars from wrong;  
And the most ancient heavens, through thee, are strong.

To humbler functions, awful power,  
I call thee: I myself commend  
Unto thy guidance from this hour;  
Oh! let my weakness have an end!  
Give unto me, made lowly wise,  
The spirit of self-sacrifice;  
The confidence of reason give;  
And in the light of truth, thy bondman let me live.”

B. M. PALMER.

### III. THOUGHTS ON THE RELATIONS OF CHURCH AND STATE.

AT first glance the books of Moses appear to mingle moral, ceremonial, civil and sanitary laws. A patient examination, however, will show that all, or most of the items in Moses' law, may be arranged under three heads, viz., moral statutes, ceremonial statutes, and civil statutes.<sup>1</sup> In seeking an answer to the question, What distinction does the Mosaic law make between things civil and things spiritual, between church and state? it will be seen that all public religious service was assigned to the tribe of Levi. Certain portions of it were further restricted to the priests, while a few could only be performed by the high priest. Here surely was not only a distinction made, but also a separation. The tribe of Levi had no secular callings, no inheritance among the other tribes, and no means of support excepting that which they received in the performance of their sacred callings. Besides this entire separation of a whole tribe for religious service, we find a most extensive ceremonial which had no secular uses nor application at all. Thus we find a strictly religious organization, and that organization supplied with a ritual. But, it may be asked, did not religious officials in the Mosaic economy perform civil functions along with their spiritual ones? A few cases bear that appearance. Moses was lawgiver, prophet, and judge. Eli was priest and judge, and so also was Samuel. There is also to be noted a single item in the law which directed that difficult cases should be brought to the priest for solution. (See Deut. xvii. 8-13.) These apparent exceptions receive sufficient answer in the following facts: Moses, like the apostles, was an extraordinary officer, so that his case establishes no precedent. Eli and Samuel were indeed judges, but there is no reason to believe that there was any mingling or confounding of the offices. The reference of a difficult case to the priest for decision was no doubt done because he could inquire of

---

<sup>1</sup> Or, more accurately, non-civil moral statutes, civil moral statutes, and ceremonial statutes.

God. This fact does away with the exception, because the reference was really made to God himself.

We have seen the line distinctly drawn cutting off the spiritual service to itself; how was it about the secular? Was it a distinct department in the kingdom of Israel? The degree to which it is separated from the spiritual and set off by itself will surprise any one who has not looked into the matter. We learn in Exodus, eighteenth chapter, that Jethro counselled Moses to appoint rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens. We read further that Moses acted upon his advice, thereby establishing a thorough system of judges, in things civil, throughout all Israel. Should any one suppose that this was merely a part of human wisdom, and merely a temporary expedient, he will only need to refer to Deut. xvi. 18-20: "Judges and officers shalt thou make thee in all thy gates, which the Lord thy God giveth thee, throughout thy tribes; and they shall judge the people with just judgment. Thou shalt not wrest judgment; thou shalt not respect persons, neither take a gift." If we put these two passages together, or even omit the first, we shall have all the evidence needed to show that there was a thorough system of judges in Israel. In the judiciary, however, we have only half the evidence of the civil department of Israel. When one has collected together all the civil statutes of the law of Moses he has a complete moral code, not that it has in it all the items that we might need, but that it has in it all the items that Israel had need of, and, we hesitate not in the least to affirm, it has in it all the moral principles which any just government will need. Look over some of the items. There are here statutes covering the questions of murder, slavery, fighting, injuries done to property, casualties resulting to persons or property through carelessness or neglect, trespass, theft, property left in the hands of another, to which evil happens, seduction, adultery, protection of the helpless, restitution, marriage, divorce, weights and measures, laws of inheritance, cities of refuge, capital punishment, number of witnesses necessary to condemn to death, perjury, etc. Here, then, are two great facts, viz., a moral code of civil laws and a gradation of judges charged to execute them faithfully and justly. Some of these, moreover, are laws involving the



death penalty. One more principal fact must be added here. Provision was even made in the law for the setting up of a king. In Deut. xvii. 14, *ff.*, we read that in the event of their setting up a king, he was to be chosen of God; and the chiefest of all the requirements therein made of him is that he shall write a copy of the law, and shall read therein all the days of his life. Here, then, was civil government provided for, whether with or without a king. In any case God's law contained the only civil as well as religious code. In view of all that has been seen concerning the spiritual service and spiritual officers, and the civil laws and civil officers in Israel, it is evident that every Jew must have made a distinction between the two spheres, and, perhaps, as clearly as we do.

Were there no other facts to be examined excepting those just considered, we might conclude that there was a civil and a religious department in the kingdom of Israel, not only distinguished, but entirely distinct and separate from each other. There is, however, a class of facts which forbids us to arrive exactly at that conclusion. Distinct as the two spheres appear to have been, they were bound together, as with a chain, in this, that Moses put death as the penalty of sorcery, adultery, Sabbath-breaking, the cursing of father and mother, and the refusal to observe the passover and other religious ordinances, as well as for rape and murder. Here the two spheres of church and state appear to be bound together. The execution of men for gross offences against the state is clear enough, but here are several cases in which the offence seems to be purely moral, not appearing to affect the state, and yet the death penalty is to be executed, and, so far as we can see, under the direction of civil officers. It does not appear to have been true in the theocracy that the spiritual was wholly separated from the civil. God was teaching other things along with spiritual service. There were spiritual laws and spiritual officers, and civil laws and civil officers, and yet the two spheres were not entirely disconnected.

We may ask, therefore, Why did God combine and apparently commingle the spiritual and secular departments of the kingdom of Israel? In attempting an answer to this question we shall have

occasion to present a number of reasons, each of which we believe will serve, in part, as an answer. The first is this: God had chosen a nation as well as a church. That nation had to be cared for as a nation, as well as the church cared for as a church. In it was preserved the line of which the promised seed should come. In it also was typified the kingdom of our Lord. The state-church, moreover, afforded the best means of carrying out the elaborate symbolic ritual. Another great fact was, that God was Ruler of the state as well as of the church. This explains why it was that spiritual offenders were executed. God could as well direct the state to do it as to do it himself, seeing that he was Head of it. Another great reason why God gave those laws was, no doubt, because he wished to do more than give religious laws. The moral law would not have been fully exemplified had we not had a state as well as a church. We shall see, indeed, that both the church and the state together do not call the whole moral law into exercise. God was not serving the church only, nor Israel only, at that time, but the world. The moral law is for all men, as a rule of life; the ceremonial law is for all men, to explain and illustrate the great salvation of Jesus Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit; and the moral-civil law, with all its details, is given to guide men in framing laws for the governing of the nations of the earth. Such at least is the belief of the writer. Some reasons will be given below.

The thoughts suggested at the close of the last paragraph, with reference to God's purpose in giving a civil code of laws, as well as a religious one, leads to the inquiry, What is the application of the moral law? The one only complete answer is this: The application of the moral law is *personal*. Every one of the ten commandments is *personal*. "Thou shalt," or "thou shalt not," either expressed or implied, is the beginning of every commandment. The full application of the moral law, then, is to the individual, and to him only. It applies to him in every relationship which he can possibly sustain towards God or man. We may view man as variously situated as we will: in his relations to God, the church, the state, as ruler, as subject, as teacher, as learner, as old, as young, this moral law applies to him; and in the individual in his

several possible relationships we may conceive of all of its demands falling upon the individual man, and in this sense the moral law would exhaust itself, because it would have no further demands to make. These thoughts appear to be so clear as to need neither proof nor illustration. A few words will be added, however, lest what has been expressed should not be sufficiently lucid. We have two commandments which require the individual to perform moral duties to God, and him only; these are the first two. The second two require duties owed to God, but each has a man-ward application also. The fifth and seventh commandments require mainly the performance of duty towards the family, but the fifth applies also to the state and to society, while the seventh has a wide range of application. The sixth, eighth and ninth commandments require moral duties owed chiefly to other individuals, while the tenth enjoins upon each man the careful guarding of his own heart. Could we follow these all out in their bearings we should then see the whole moral duty of man presented, and presented, moreover, as the duty of the *individual*. This thought seems to the writer to be the key to the whole subject now in hand. "The law of the Lord is perfect." The moral law is a perfect moral law, and it abides for ever. If, therefore, the person or individual exhausts that law, then other questions ought to adjust themselves under the individual who exhausts the whole field; this will be true, provided only the other fields lie in the sphere of the moral law.

Let us pass on, then, and ask, What relation does the church sustain to the moral law? The answer to this question must be given in parts, and according to the function of the church which is considered. If we view the church as a legislative body we must answer that, strictly speaking, the church has no function to exercise. God has given her all her laws, so that legislation, excepting in some secondary sense, is outside her sphere. When we come to view the church as a teacher or witness, she has quite enough to occupy her powers. The church is appointed to deliver the whole counsel of God. With reference to the moral law, which occupies our attention chiefly just now, the church is to teach the whole moral law as found in the word of God, and

to enforce every bearing thereof found in that word, and use every detail and illustration found there relating to the individual man in all the relations of life; at least the church is not to shun to do any one of those things. No man who believes in the perfection and perpetuity of God's law will think of questioning this plain duty of the church. There is another function of the church that is to be viewed in its relation to the moral law; that is, its disciplinary function. What may or what must the church require of her members, as respects the moral law? It may be answered in general that the church, like the commandments, knows men only as individuals. If the law be given to individuals, and the gospel be given to individuals, and the great commission be given to individuals, then surely discipline can be only of individuals. Bodies of Christians might receive censure, but discipline must fall on individuals. When we come to view the field a little more closely we shall see that discipline cannot be exercised to the full limit of the moral law. This limitation arises out of several facts. Many breaches of the moral law are private, and cannot be known, or are complicated with family, social, political or civil affairs to such an extent that no church court could handle the case, because it could not command the facts.<sup>1</sup> Again, private Christians frequently go contrary to the advice and counsel of the teachers of the church; and while their actions may be sinful, yet their offences are not sufficiently clear to be made cases of discipline. What, then, are disciplinable breaches of the moral law? All gross violations of the moral law which become known, and are susceptible of proof, if committed by professing Christians, are properly disciplinable. It does not matter, either, what the position of the party may be. He may be a church officer, a private member, a man in private life, a single man or married, a merchant sinning in his business, an author sinning with his pen, a politician sinning in his tricks or with his tongue, a legislator sinning by his vote, a judge practicing corruption on his bench, or a president committing manifest wickedness in his private or official capacity. In any such case of gross sin, clearly proven, the of-

---

See Professor W. M. McPheeters' *Spirituality of the Church*.

fending professor not only may be, but must be, disciplined for his offence.

This brings us directly to the question, Does the church exercise any authority or control over the state? While we are yet in the Old Testament in our investigations, still we may sufficiently anticipate the divorcement of church and state in the New Testament to give an intelligible answer to this question. We have already seen that it is the business of the church to teach the whole word of God. Whatsoever the Bible teaches concerning the duties of citizens, legislators, judges, kings, and other members of the state, it is the business of the church to inculcate in the minds of all men with whom she comes in contact. In so far as those Bible teachings instilled into the minds of men by the church influence them, just so far will the state be affected thereby. Christian states have already gained much from this source. Other than that, we know of no control or influence the church has over the state, since Jesus said, "My kingdom is not of this world." She surely has no legislative power, as she has none, properly speaking, in her own sphere; and she has no disciplinary power, excepting that which we have seen, in which she calls not the state, but her own members, to account for their sins.

We examine next the question, What relation does the state sustain to the moral law? Rev. Dr. T. E. Peck styles the state "God's ordinance, a moral institute." One thing is very certain, it has its authority and foundation in the moral law. We find in all just civil laws a wonderful correspondence with the moral law. Indeed, it could not be otherwise. "The law of the Lord is perfect," consequently all those laws which Moses gave for the state, as items falling under the Decalogue, were absolutely perfect when given, and are so yet. If civil laws be just, they must agree with the moral law. One other thought must be given by way of preface, and that is, that the relation of the state to the moral law will be clearly seen by seeing the duty of each individual member of the state towards the moral law; the duties of each will of course be varied according to his position in the state. We begin the answer of the question, "How is the state related to the moral

law?" by saying, first, that the legislator is in duty bound to frame laws for the state agreeably to the moral law, so far as civil statutes touch morals at all. This is true from more considerations than one. It is true because God has furnished him with a civil code which he declared to be perfect. It was absolutely perfect and complete for Israel; all they needed, and every principle in it, is perfect yet; hence the man who knowingly departs from this moral law given by God, and assists in legislation for man, and not agreeably thereto, is disobedient to God's revealed law, and sins against God. He moreover wrongs the state by giving to it laws which are inferior to those at least indicated by the moral law. This appears very clearly from Romans xiii. 4, where Paul, speaking of the civil magistrate, says, "For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." Here it will be observed that Paul calls the civil magistrate God's minister, and adds, that he is his minister to perform a certain thing, viz., to execute wrath upon evil doers. If, then, God appoints a man to do this specific thing, where does he learn his duty? He can learn it nowhere but in this moral law. It follows from this, without other evidence, that God means his moral civil code to become substantially the code of the nations. Another powerful evidence is presented in capital punishment. It would be monstrous to think of taking life as a mere human expedient. God tells the civil magistrate when he may rightly do so. The same argument applies, with less force, however, to all legal punishments; we have our authority for them in God's law.

Just here we feel that a digression must be made far enough to apply the principle just proven. One Sanford H. Cobb, of whose calling in life we have no knowledge, wrote an article in the *Princeton Review* some time since, entitled "The Theory of Prohibition," which has been reprinted in pamphlet form by the National Publication Association, Louisville, Ky. The fact that it has been reprinted shows that it has received no little attention. Mr. Cobb is evidently a candid, thoughtful Christian gentleman. His article is cited here because the writer believes

his fundamental proposition in the pamphlet to be false, and because that principle is contradictory to one just established in this article. He says, page 1, pamphlet edition, "The only justifying ground for a prohibitory law, if found at all, must be found in the principles, not of morality, but of political economy." Again, on page 3, "Thus far it is clear that the essential question is solely one of public good. The morality of the question is accidental." Again, on page 5, he says: "When the general sense of society is agreed that the greatest good of the greatest number requires a prohibitory law, that law will be enacted and enforced as naturally and promptly as are the laws against stealing and smuggling." Now, we are not appearing at this time on behalf of prohibition, but on behalf of the truth. Mr. Cobb seems to hold that all civil legislation must proceed upon grounds of political economy, and not on moral grounds; indeed, he flatly says so with reference to prohibition, and yet he owns that it is a moral question. Such a position is simply monstrous. Here is a moral responsible being—a legislator—who is handling a moral question, legislating for a nation of Christian people, and lowering that question to a utilitarian standpoint! Would the gentleman have his neighbor hanged on such grounds—for the greatest good of the greatest number? God forbid that such sentiments should ever prevail. If intemperance did not affect the state, then state legislation would evidently be out of place; but if intemperance does touch the state, and a moral question is involved, then God demands that justice must be done, and not utility followed. The reason why the state may imprison men, fine them, or execute them, is because God has given such authority in his holy law. Had God not clothed the civil magistrate with the sword to execute justice, no human compact could have made it right to execute a man; and other punishments have a like authority. It is but putting it mildly to say that civil law has a moral basis, and it is that which constitutes the right of the state to punish offenders. This theory of legislation, where moral questions are involved, may not be acceptable to many people, but we believe we have shown that it is right, and consequently ought to be accepted.

Let us return now from our digression, and ask, What is the relation of the executive officer of the civil law to the moral law? What does the moral law require of him? If the civil laws, which he is called upon to execute, be just and right, then the executive officer of the law will have nothing to do but to go on and execute it faithfully, "for they are the ministers of God attending continually upon this very thing." If, however, a man were chosen or appointed to an office, the duties of which he could not conscientiously perform, then he would be bound, in duty to God, to resign his office, or decline it, in case he foresaw the difficulty.

The relation of the private citizen to the moral law is equally simple. He is to obey the law of the land so long as the state stands and the laws remain unchanged, provided he can do so in consistency with the moral law (the law of his God); but if he finds that he is directed to act one way by God and the opposite by man, he must obey God rather than man. In that case, however, he must submit to the penalty of the broken human law, if need be. Some other features of Bible-teaching, relating to the state and to its citizens, will be presented from the New Testament. Before we leave this general subject of the relation of the state to the moral law, however, we shall briefly consider two things. The first is this: The only difficulty that could plausibly be urged against our theory of a divine basis for civil law would be the fact that corporeal punishment, even death, was inflicted by law upon some who committed moral offences, not touching the state. That is true, but the answer is at hand, and it is complete, viz., The separation of church and state by our Lord put all such cases outside the sphere of the state. The other matter to be considered is this: Does the state possess any authority or control over the church? We have already seen that the responsibility of the individual exhausts the moral law, and that the church as well as the gospel deals with the individual; it may be added that the civil law also makes its requirements upon individuals. So long as the church adheres to her legitimate work, the state, if it keep its sphere, has no concern with the church, excepting with its individual members,



and then only in state matters. As the church has to deal with members of the state concerning church duties, so the state deals with church members concerning civil matters, and yet neither does thereby interfere with the other. Even in cases in which property is involved it is a worldly affair on the part of the state.

What has been already said has, to some extent, anticipated the teachings of the New Testament. Let us, however, more fully examine the latter, as it is under it we are living. One remark must be made, before all others, which is this: All the moral teachings of the Old Testament remain in force, and must do so, so long as the present dispensation endures. All that was established, therefore, in our study of the Old Testament stands, excepting as modified by the separation of the church from the state. That act of our Lord was the great modifying act in this matter of church and state. He told Pilate (see John xviii. 36), "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence." Our Lord is speaking of the visible, as well as of the invisible church. Had he referred only to the invisible church his remark would not have been candid. He meant to say, evidently, that he was in no such sense a king as in any way to militate against any civil government. He meant also to announce the termination of the church-state of Israel. Civil punishments for purely moral offences, as under Moses, are unauthorized under this dispensation. Paul speaks to the same effect in 2 Corinthians x. 4: "For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal." Jesus stood just on the border of the two dispensations. He had already changed the sacrament of the passover into that of the Lord's supper, and he now virtually announced the close of the old dispensation. Physical force, then, is not a means of supporting or propagating the spiritual kingdom. What, then, are the means of its propagation? These are the word, the sacraments and prayer, on man's part, and Christ's intercession, pastoral care and providence, and the work of the Holy Spirit, on God's part. This kingdom is one which exists for spiritual ends, viz., the glory of God and the salvation of man. It is a kingdom

which acknowledges no ruler excepting Christ, who is its King. He alone gives laws to the church, and, under the New Testament dispensation, those laws are spiritual only. These spiritual laws are to be enforced only by spiritual means, and for spiritual ends alone. This much concerning the purely spiritual character of the church may suffice for present purposes.

We next ask definitely, What duties to the state are enjoined in the New Testament? They are few in number, but important, and of wide application. The first that will be cited is that of submission to existing governments. In Rom. xiii. 1, Paul says, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God." This thought is further enforced in the six verses which follow. Again, in 1 Peter ii. 13, 14: "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto governors." Titus iii. 1 is of the same import. It will be observed here that the duty enjoined is submission—submission to such governments as exist under the providence of God. Christians live under all sorts of civil governments, and often under cruel governments. They are not exhorted to enthusiastic support, which might be impossible, but to render submission, which is a duty that is always possible. This class of passages does not forbid necessary and righteous revolution, but requires Christians to be good, subordinate citizens, two things which are not inconsistent. Another duty is the payment of taxes. Rom. xiii. 6: "For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers attending continually upon this very thing." Matt. xxii. 21: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." Here is a clear statement of the duty of paying taxes, and even intimations of the reasons why it is a duty. A third duty enjoined as owed to the state is a duty to rulers. 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2: "I will therefore that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men: for kings and for all that are in authority," etc. This duty differs from the foregoing in that it is spiritual. The fourth and last of the civic duties enjoined by the New Testament is honor to civil rulers, 1 Peter ii. 17: "Honor all men, love the brotherhood, fear God, honor the king."

The reader will recall the fact that the relation of the state to the moral law was considered in the light of the Old Testament. It will be observed here that the duties enjoined upon the individual, as owed to the state, are all *moral* duties. These duties fall under the commandments as follows: Under the fifth fall honor to rulers, submission to rulers, and prayer for rulers; under the eighth falls the payment of taxes. And if we were to infer the duties of patriotism and protection of rulers, they would fall under the sixth. If any one will consider the extent of application these few injunctions of duty have, he will see that little, if anything, could be added by way of civic duties. Two thoughts already insisted upon are further confirmed, we may say thoroughly settled. They are these: 1, All the duties enjoined by the Old and New Testaments, as owed to the state, are *moral*; 2, All these moral duties enjoined upon men, as owed to the state, are *personal*, *not collective*, not for the church but for the individual to perform.

It will be proper to consider more fully a class of subjects already referred to upon which the Bible refuses to speak. The Bible does not decide concerning the legitimacy of governments. "The powers that *be* are ordained of God," whether they be republics, kingdoms, empires or despotisms. What, then, about revolutions? Are they utterly prohibited? Certainly not, for then Christians could hardly be enjoined to submit to the new governments resulting from them. What then? Why, plainly God has left men to follow their own judgments, enlightened, of course, by his word. What God does say amounts to this: So long as governments stand, the individual citizen is to render lawful obedience; that, however, does not debar him from engaging in a revolution to overturn a government that is unendurable. The right of revolution and the legitimacy of governments are two kindred questions not pretended to be handled by the word of God. Another field, somewhat akin, is likewise excluded; *i. e.*, questions of equity. Jesus was approached by a man who asked him to speak to his brother that he divide the inheritance with him. Jesus replied (Luke xii. 14): "Man, who made me a judge

or divider over you?" In the former case, matters of the legitimacy of governments are evidently left by the Bible to private judgment, while in this case they would be referred to the civil tribunal.

From all that has been found in the word of God it will be seen that, under the New Testament dispensation, church and state are intended by our Saviour to be absolutely separate and distinct. They are different spheres, touching at no point. They contain, to some extent, the same people, and take cognizance of the same sins and duties, under the guidance of the same moral law, but deal with people from a different point of view, with different ends in view. The state seeks temporal ends only and requires civic duties. The church seeks moral, eternal salvation. The state uses brute force; the church the sword of the Spirit. Incidentally church and state render assistance to each other, but they can only do so (lawfully) incidentally. The church teaches the people morals and instills submission, while the state affords protection.

To summarize: 1. A foundation principle is that the moral law covers all of man's original duties, is personal in its application, but requires him to perform each branch of his duty toward its appropriate object. Duties are owed to God, other men, self, the church, the family, the state, society. The individual owes his duty toward each, and each may hold him bound to perform the part due to itself, the church may hold him responsible for the part owed to her, the state may hold him responsible for the part due to it, etc., but only God can hold man bound for his whole moral duty.

2. The church is a spiritual body, seeking spiritual ends, and using spiritual means to accomplish them. Her allegiance is given to Christ, her spiritual Head. She has no lawful connection with any civil government, has no commission to endorse any, nor to support any, nor to destroy any, but is enjoined to teach submission to such as God may set up wherever Christian people live.

3. It is the business of the church, by her standards and from

her pulpits, to seek to declare the whole counsel of God. This will involve the teaching of the moral law in its bearings upon duties owed to God, man, the church, the state, the family, society, commerce, letters, etc. The church is to enforce all the moral principles taught in the word of God and all the details therein given.

4. In matters of discipline, the church is to require all her members to abstain from gross sin in all their relations in life. This is true regardless of the positions men may occupy. Sabbath-breaking, dishonesty, polygamy, etc., are disciplinable, if committed in private life; they would be none the less so if a legislator, in framing laws for his state or country, should give his vote in favor of laws which would legalize these sins. There might be difficulty in making out a case, but if the case were made out the latter would be as much a subject of discipline as the former.

5. Certain questions arise concerning the relations of church and state, and the right of petition by the church to the state. It may be said in general, if each kept within its sphere there would be no need of petitions, unless perhaps by way of securing moneyed interests, a secular matter, so to speak. If, however, the state has infringed upon the rights of the church, it is but just that she should be allowed to ask the removal of the wrongs inflicted upon her. There is something in Scripture bearing somewhat of that appearance. Paul's life was twice endangered under the forms of law, and twice he appealed to civil powers for protection; once to Cæsar himself. It is true he sought bodily safety, but the case is sufficiently parallel to be quoted. What is to be said, however, respecting those great moral questions which engage the attention of the public, as temperance or the Sabbath? The answer to these hinges upon other questions. Has the state made laws on these moral questions which infringe upon the liberties and privileges of the church? If so, then the church may and should petition their repeal. So far as the Sabbath is concerned, we believe the state has so legislated and should be petitioned to undo it. In this case the church as such has a right to petition. What about prohibition? We have not been able to see that legislation on this point.

has affected the church; hence, though a moral question, the church has no right to petition. Citizens may petition, if they think they ought to do so, but not the church until she is molested.

6. On the whole matter of moral reforms it is to be noted that many are only to be accomplished by voluntary efforts. Some things are to be regulated by the family, by being kept in bounds or kept out, neither church nor state being able to reach them; *e. g.*, doubtful literature. Some things are to be corrected by the government upon petition of citizens. In such case they must be matters affecting the state, else the state could not handle them; *e. g.*, the sale of liquor. Moral questions which are outside the province of the church, and which affect the state, may always be laid hold of in this way, by petition on the part of Christian and other moral citizens.

7. One other question arises relative to the church's attitude towards the state. Granted a settled, civil government, without a rival and without revolution, does not the church as such owe certain duties to that government as such? Beyond teaching the duties prescribed in the Bible to the people as individuals, we fail to see any. The church's duty in the premises is to teach individuals to perform their individual duties to governments and rulers, and if need be to require the performance thereof, by spiritual means of course.

8. Turning now towards the state, we note that the whole moral foundation of the state, as well as of the church, is the moral law. If we leave off the first two and the last commandments, we shall find need for all the others as guides for the civil legislator in the preparation of statutes. Even the first commandment is in practical use whenever an oath is administered. But the fact that we have a moral basis for civil law in the ten commandments is not definite enough. God evidently gave the civil code to Israel, not only for their use, but that it might serve as a perfect model by which the nations should frame their laws.

9. The civil legislator is in duty bound to take the moral law as his guide in framing laws for the commonwealth. This duty is two-fold: to God who gave the law, and to man who needs its benefits.

10. The duty of magistrates and citizens is plain in view of all that has been said. Magistrates are to execute the laws faithfully, if they can do so without sin; if they cannot, they must give up their offices. Citizens are to obey the laws, if they can do so without sin; if they cannot do so without sin, they are to refuse obedience, even though they should suffer for it.

11. The right of revolution is reserved to the decision of the private judgment in the light of God's word and providence.

12. We are now able to pronounce upon the relation of church and state as finally set forth in the New Testament. The church knows no state further than to teach the people their duties toward any state which God in his providence may set up, and to see that her people lead exemplary lives in whatsoever positions they may occupy. The state knows no church as such; she only knows individuals who constitute the state, and she requires of them only civic duties. So long as church and state keep within their legitimate spheres there can be no conflict between them.

ALFRED JONES.

#### IV. FELLOWSHIP.

OF justification, Dr. Thornwell wrote: "We regard justification as the dogmatic principle which reduces to scientific unity the whole doctrine of religion. It is the bow which spans the whole hemisphere of grace." What Dr. Thornwell said for justification we claim for the doctrine of fellowship.

Fellowship is the consummation and the comprehension of all other facts in the Christian religion. Fellowship with Christ is God's ultimate purpose with respect to his people. From this mount of transfiguration we have a complete survey of the successive steps which lead up from the dark valley of man's estate of sin and misery. Fellowship begins at the lowest round and mounts to the summit. Fellowship is itself the ladder which, like that of Jacob's vision, reaches from earth to heaven.

What is fellowship? Let the Scriptures say. In the original Greek we have two words, *κοινωνέω* and *μετέχω*, which indicate ownership in common. Not to dispossess one's self for others, but to share with others, is the idea conveyed by these words. A few illustrations of the usage will suffice. And first, as to *κοινωνέω*. In Rom. xv. 27, we read: "If we have been partakers of their spiritual things;" Gal. vi. 6: "Let him that is taught . . . communicate unto him that teacheth;" 1 Tim. v. 22: "Neither be partaker of other men's sins;" 1 Pet. iv. 13: "As ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings." In the nominal forms we have, Rom. xv. 26: "To make a certain contribution;" 1 Cor. i. 9: "Called unto the fellowship of his son;" 2 Cor. xiii. 14: "The communion of the Holy Ghost;" Phil. ii. 1: "If any fellowship of the Spirit;" 1 John i. 3: "May have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Christ Jesus;" Luke v. 10: "Which were partners with Simon;" 1 Cor. x. 20: "I who am . . . also a partaker of the glory;" 2 Pet. i. 4: "Partakers of the divine nature." From this it is apparent



that they are guilty of tautology who speak of the communion *and* fellowship of the Holy Ghost.

We turn now to *μετέχω* and its cognates. 1 Cor. x. 17: "We are all partakers of that one bread;" Luke v. 7: "They beckoned unto their partners;" Heb. i. 9: "God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows;" *Ib.* iii. 1: "Partakers of the heavenly calling;" vs. 14: "We are made partakers of Christ;" *Ib.* vi. 4: "Were made partakers of the Holy Ghost."

In Heb. ii. 14, we have both words: "As the children are partakers (*κοινωνέω*) of flesh and blood, he also himself took part (*μετέχω*) of the same;" 2 Cor. vi. 14: "What fellowship (*μετέχω*) hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion (*κοινωνέω*) hath light with darkness?"

These passages show that there is no essential difference between these words, which are used thus interchangeably. To hold in common and to have with another are but different ways of expressing the same thought. The use of two such words places the meaning beyond question.

It should now be plain that the common conception of communion as being converse with God is not the scriptural conception. The meaning is fellowship, or partnership. The Christian is a partner with Christ. This idea is still further emphasized in the original by the composition with the verb of the preposition *σύν*. Eph. v. 11: "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness;" Rev. xviii. 4: "That ye be not partakers of her sins;" Rom. xi. 17: "And with them partakest of the root;" Eph. iii. 6: "And partakers (literally, co-partakers) of his promise in Christ."

From this last passage it is plain that Christians are not only partners with Christ, but with each other. Sectaries may deny "fellowship" to others, meaning thereby Christian recognition at the Lord's table or elsewhere, but they can no more sever that fellowship which the Scriptures reveal than brothers can obliterate their consanguinity. Had the scriptural conception of fellowship been more signally recognized and more generally received, that barbarous expression, "refuse to fellowship," had never obtained currency. A safeguard against unscriptural notions is the use of

Bible words as exponents of Bible thoughts. Unscriptural views of conversion are due to a violation of this rule. The idea conveyed by the words communion, fellowship, is partnership; and partnership is the dominant fact of redemption. The doctrine of fellowship is the stronghold of orthodoxy.

No Christian will deny that eternal glory is the end which God designs for his people. This is the consummation of redemption. This consummation is realized in fellowship with Christ; it is his eternal life and joy and glory which are shared with his people. We sit together with Christ in heavenly places. Our vile bodies (bodies of humiliation) shall be changed like unto his glorious body. We shall reign with him as kings and priests upon the earth. "I," said Peter, "am a partaker of the glory which is to be revealed."

It may be said, however, that one may be partaker of like glory with another, because he has attained unto it by like merits all his own, and that this is all that is meant by the passages cited above. That such is not the case, but that, on the contrary, we are admitted by grace as partners to a glory which is all Christ's own, is made abundantly evident. Our acceptance is *in the beloved*. He that believeth on me hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day. He that hath the Son hath life; he that hath not the Son hath not life. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear then shall we also appear with him in glory. Because I live ye shall live also. This is that eternal life which was with the Father and is manifested unto us. He is made unto us of God—redemption.

While it is true that every one shall receive his own reward according to his own labor, yet in the midst of diversity there is unity, for eternal life is to all his saints the gift of God, and this life is in his Son. Ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God. We are begotten again to a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead to an inheritance. If Christ be not risen there is no glory in store for us, but, on the contrary, we are yet in our sins. Whatever may be the saint's individual reward, to be a partaker of the glory which is to be revealed is to share in glory which is exclusively Christ's. The glory which thou, Father,

hast given me, I have given them. Enter ye into the joy of your Lord. If we are heirs of God, it is because we are joint heirs with Christ. We are made partakers of Christ if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end. And so the glory of the saints is the final development of fellowship. What a touchstone for the detection of error is this grand truth! Its acceptance is the rejection of all heresies having the slightest taint of Pelagianism.

Fellowship is not only the consummation, it is also the comprehension of the whole doctrine of religion. Only the main points may now be touched. The eternal life and glory are the life and glory of redeemed humanity. They are men who are glorified. But, as we have seen, the life was Christ's originally, and man's subsequently, because the saints were made partners therein. Therefore the Christ who is our life is of necessity a man. We can share with the Christ his life and glory only on the supposition that he is as human as we. We can have no share in the glory of God's essential being, omniscience and omnipotence. And so the Scriptures teach that it was the man Christ Jesus who ascended into heaven and sat at the right hand of God. Thus the humanity of Christ emerges as a corollary of the doctrine of fellowship. It is a fact which requires and receives emphasis. He is the "Son of man."

We shall see also that from the standpoint of a revealed fellowship his divinity is equally a deduction of reason, but, for the present, presupposing his divinity, we readily perceive that the doctrine of the incarnation is involved in fellowship. If divine, he was from eternity, and must become human in time. And so the Scriptures teach us that the word who was with God and was God, became flesh. Because the children were partakers of flesh and blood he also himself took part of the same. And thus it appears that in this fellowship both parties contribute something of their own. In order that he might share his glorified humanity with us, it was necessary that we share our human nature with him. He becomes our "fellow." His humanity is our contribution in the partnership; the glorification thereof is his. His risen body is only the first fruits from the grave. We are begotten to

a living hope by his resurrection. If Christ be not risen, ye are yet in your sins.

But how did the man Jesus attain to resurrection and glory? As the reward of his righteousness; by the deeds of the law was he justified. Not otherwise can justification be secured. God is holy and just. God must be just in justifying. It is he himself who hath said: "He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination to the Lord." Reason demands absolute justice in God, and Scripture endorses this demand.

And so Jesus declared that he came to fulfil all righteousness. And again, "Therefore doth my Father love me because I do always those things that please him." The Father himself says: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

The Old Testament predicted his exaltation as consequent upon his holiness and righteousness: "Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption." The New Testament proclaims his glory as the due reward of merit: "Being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient; . . . wherefore God also hath highly exalted him." The doctrine of fellowship finds a restatement in the declaration that he was raised for our justification.

Thus the doctrine of fellowship rigidly excludes all human merit as the basis of the sinner's redemption, and paves the way for the doctrine of justification by faith: "If any man glory, let him glory in the Lord." We should rather say, the doctrine of salvation by faith, for justification is final, and as wide as glorification; whom he justifieth, them he also glorified. If we be partakers of Christ's eternal resurrection-life and glory, and that life and glory be due solely to his righteousness, our good works can have nothing whatever to do with his glory nor with our fellowship therein. Under the strong light of this great truth, the popish and Arminian error of salvation in part by the deeds of the law fades away like mist before the noonday sun. And right here we would reiterate the opinion that not justification, but fel-

lowship, is the doctrine which "spans the whole hemisphere of grace."

This doctrine very clearly implies man's depravity and inability to attain to justification and glory by his own righteousness. Had it been possible for man to deserve God's favor, then God would not have resorted to the scheme of salvation by fellowship. If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But it was not possible. By the deeds of the law shall no flesh living be justified. Because we cannot find acceptance with God in our own persons, therefore are we "accepted in the beloved." By one man's obedience the many are made righteous. We are made the righteousness of God in him. Be found in him, not having my own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith. We are God's saints—holy ones—because sanctified in Christ Jesus. He is made unto us of God wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, redemption. Dead in Adam, we are made alive in Christ, the second Adam. Jesus was glorified, because justified, and justified, because he was righteous. We are justified and glorified, because he is our righteousness, our life, our hope of glory. He has obtained eternal redemption for us.

At this point the doctrine of Christ's divinity looms up to impose conviction on the mind, as the rising sun compels perception by the eye. Not only Scripture, but conscience, declares that there is none righteous, no, not one. But Jesus is *one* of us. If any man say he hath no sin, he deceiveth himself. No mere son of Adam could claim the Father's love upon the ground of doing always those things which please him. But Jesus did make this claim. Since then that which is born of the flesh is flesh, the absolute sinlessness of Jesus, as evolved in the scheme of redemption by fellowship, would lead reason to surmise that the Christ is not only Son of man, but also Son of God, and shuts us up to the acceptance of the biblical account of his miraculous birth as not only probable, but necessary. No mere man could fulfil all righteousness. Jesus did, and therefore was not mere man. And, on the hypothesis that any mere man could, it would still be neces-

sary to explain the inexplicable problem how this Man could admit us to partnership in his righteousness and its reward. On this point more anon.

And so we find Jesus claiming to be the Son of God. Because he made himself equal with God, the Jews took up stones to stone him. Dost thou believe, said he to the man born blind, on the Son of God. . . . Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that talketh with thee. . . . And he worshipped him. The Word was with God and was God. . . . All things were made by him. The Word was made (became) flesh and dwelt among us. Thus fellowship involves the deity of Christ.

His divinity will still further appear when we look more narrowly into the nature of that righteousness he came to fulfil. He assumed not only our human nature, but with it the ability to satisfy a sinner's obligations to a broken law. He did not assume our fallen human nature, but our nature and our obligations. The righteousness he came to fulfil is that compliance with law which is due by sinful man. In being made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him, he was no more made a sinner than we are made personally righteous. There is in neither case a transference of moral character. The obvious scriptural doctrine of *imputation* seems strangely misunderstood by some. A transfer of moral character is not taught by the doctrine of imputation. That doctrine is radically associated with fellowship. A transference of moral character would not be partnership, but a change of places. It would prove a futile theory for a sinner's salvation at the cost of a Saviour's perdition. In fellowship we contribute the legal consequences of our sins, and Christ the legal consequences of his righteousness.

The legal consequences of our sins were borne by the Christ. The soul that sinneth it shall die. Jesus died. He obeyed the law; he fulfilled all righteousness. Had Socinus understood the doctrine of fellowship he would never have offered the stupid objection that the sufferings of Christ were in no sense an equivalent for the execution of the penalty of the law in the persons of all sinners; that he satisfied only the obligation of a single individual. Fellowship furnishes the only adequate and satisfactory

answer. We have partnership in the righteousness of *one man only*. By *one man's* obedience we many are made righteous.

The question which is often raised, why Christians die if Christ paid the penalty for our sins, ceases to perplex when viewed from the standpoint of fellowship. Christ's death was not substituted for ours. He took partnership with us in death as we take partnership with him in life.

We may add here, that had he who scoffed at orthodoxy as the "theology of the shambles," taken the doctrine of fellowship for his interpreter, the sneer had never been uttered.

The bearing of these views upon the modern theory of faith-healing is obvious. That the atonement of Christ provides for the removal of our sufferings and sorrows, as well as our sins, is the fundamental principle of the faith-healers. The late R. R. Stanton, D. D., of Washington City, one of the ablest champions of this theory, in reply to Rev. M. R. Vincent, D. D., uses this language:

"The Scriptures everywhere assure us that his work, for sins and sorrows alike, is complete, and that our simple duty is to accept his complete work in full faith, and thus be relieved of both sin and sorrow. This, my dear Doctor, is, in a word, the essence of the whole doctrine of those you are pleased to sneer at as the 'faith-cure school;' and this is also the essence of the gospel of the Son of God. But just so long as you mistake this gospel, by mistaking its central truth, you cannot be expected to understand aright anything else about it. If the Lord Jesus did *anything* 'for us,' he *bore away* 'from us,' so that we need no longer bear them, but 'cast the burden' of them, as we are bidden to do, upon him alone, our sorrows equally with our sins—all of them."

The doctrine of fellowship is a complete, clear, simple and decisive refutation of this new theory. It is not denied that God may, and does oftentimes, heal his people's sicknesses, as in the case of Hezekiah. That he will deny us no good thing we know. But the Son of God did not "bear away" our sorrows; he shared them. The virtue of his death, its righteousness, was vicarious, and believers have partnership therein; his dying itself was not vicarious—believers die. Christ came to fulfil all righteousness.

We do not know how Dr. Stanton would have explained Col. i. 24. "Now I (Paul) rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and fill up (on my part—R. V.) that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church."

This passage will puzzle none who understand that Christ suffered as a partner.

The fellowship view of the atoning work of Christ removes all excuse for antinomian weaknesses. The Son of God was made under the law to share with us our obligation to fulfil all righteousness, not to bear it away. While we have utterly failed of justification, our best righteousness being but as filthy rags, and have fellowship with him in the righteousness of his obedience unto death, and in him are justified, still our duty to obey God's will remains untouched, for Jesus only shared that duty with us. Christ is the believer's life, and the latter's good works are not for life, but from life. In the discharge of duty, life is no longer the *terminus ad quem*, but the *terminus a quo*. Under the illumination of fellowship, difficulties often thought subtle cease to be difficulties at all, even to minds the most uncultivated.

And right here again his divinity shines forth. Had he been mere man, the suffering of death had not been "obedience unto death." When a man dies he endures the inevitable; he cannot help it. There is no merit in suffering the due reward of our sins. It is not an act of obedience. This man Jesus had done nothing amiss. And only he, the divine Christ, could say: "I have life in myself; no man taketh my life from me; I lay it down of myself; I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." Christ was a priest in his death; his dying was a priestly act of sacrifice. No mere man has the right to lay down his life. This command Jesus had received of his Father. No mere man, then, can fulfil all righteousness, because the death of a sinner lacks the element of obedience.

Through the eternal Spirit the Son of God offered himself without spot to God. He was made perfect by suffering, in the obedience due by a sinner. And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him. By one offering he hath perfected for ever all the saints. Blessed be God for so great salvation. We are crucified with him; risen with him; and sit together with him in heavenly places.

But still further, that through death the Christ might deliver



us from him that hath the power of death, inasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he himself also took part of the same. Just so, that we may be made partakers of Christ's righteousness and its desert of glory, we must be made "partakers of the divine nature."

We have said that, even though it were possible for a man to ground eternal life for himself in a perfect righteousness, it were still inconceivable that others could be admitted to partnership therein with himself. Surely great is the mystery of godliness, of God manifest in the flesh, for only a communication from heaven is competent to expound our fellowship with Christ in life and glory by revealing to us the fellowship of the divine Spirit of Christ. As an essential feature of the doctrine of fellowship, the communion of the Holy Ghost brings out in bold relief the divinity of Jesus. It shines with light unclouded and unquenchable.

That these words of the familiar benediction are widely misunderstood is manifested by the use of that redundant phrase, "the communion and fellowship of the Holy Ghost." By this the masses understand the witness of the Spirit communicating with our spirits. Let it be noted, that while the Scriptures speak of fellowship with Jesus, the expression "communion with the Holy Ghost" never occurs. It is always "of the Holy Ghost." The divine Spirit of Christ is communicated to us, is a common possession. We are all made to drink of one Spirit. We are made partakers of the Spirit.

And upon the communion of the Holy Ghost the Scriptures insist as indispensable. Said Jesus to the woman of Samaria: "Thou shouldest have asked of me, and I would have given you living water." And again to the Jews: "Whosoever believeth on me, out of his bowels shall flow rivers of living water." This, adds the evangelist, he spake of the Spirit. We all have access unto the Father by one Spirit. If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. They that are in the flesh cannot please God. Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of God dwell in you. If the Spirit of Christ dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies. No language can more emphatically affirm

the imperative need of the communion of the Holy Ghost. The doctrine of fellowship elucidates this necessity. That Christ might win glory for us, he partook of our flesh and blood; and that we might take part in his glory we must be made partakers of his divine Spirit; we must be vitally one with him.

Much skeptical objection to the doctrine of free grace would be averted did men perceive that in fellowship there is no fiction, but a reality; that partnership in death and in life is based upon a partnership in the human and divine natures, which constitute a veritable oneness. Atonement—at-one-ment—is a word capable of profounder significance than mere reconciliation. It may suggest not only reconciliation as the effect, but communion as the cause.

The theory of substitution (a word by the way which itself is not found in the Bible), at which so many cavil, would perhaps cease to be an aggravation, were it recognized as but a half truth, the whole truth being identification, union, at-one-ment. All suggestion of arbitrariness is excluded by the scriptural doctrine of fellowship.

Says the *Catechism*: "We are made partakers of the redemption purchased by Christ, by the effectual application of it to us by his Holy Spirit." True is this, and also true it is that effectual calling is the work of God's Spirit, whereby convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ, and renewing our wills, he doth persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ, freely offered to us in the gospel. Bible truth this is, but Bible truth misnamed, we venture to think, when the work of the Spirit producing repentance and faith in us is called *regeneration*. It is not a moral change wrought in us by the Spirit that unites to Christ, but the communion of the Holy Ghost himself, by which we put on the new man, by which we are made partakers of the divine nature. This is effected by the *indwelling of the Spirit*. Know ye not that your bodies are temples of the Holy Ghost, habitations of God by the Spirit? This, and not a moral regeneration, or the renewing of the mind, or a change of heart, is of such a radical nature as to be called a regeneration, a new birth. By natural birth we are one with Adam;

by regeneration we are one with Christ, the second Adam. Our Lord alleges the absolute necessity of regeneration. Ye must be born again. He assigns the reason. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. The Scriptures elsewhere identify this regeneration with the indwelling of the Spirit: ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of God *dwelt in you*. This ought to settle the true nature of regeneration. It is not a moral change, but a radical change. It is the putting on of the new man. It is a quickening, or making alive in Christ, of them who by nature died in Adam, by the consummation of fellowship with Christ through fellowship of the Spirit. It is called a new creation, wherein all things have become new, old things having passed away. Such words can have no reference to the change of heart or life; they have a perfect and glorious realization in the fact that the believer's standing with God in Christ Jesus is absolutely that of a new creature. The Scriptures have a word for change of heart, not regeneration, but repentance—*μετανοία*. Our symbols of faith nowhere confound regeneration and change of heart.

The temple and the shechinah typified this communion of the indwelling Spirit. Jesus, we are told, spoke of the temple of his body when he said, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will build it up." His was the first human body so honored by the indwelling of the Spirit, that in all things he might have the preëminence. What! the reader is ready to exclaim, were not Enoch, Abel, Noah, Abraham, and all the Old Testament saints partakers of the divine nature? We offset this query by the statement that, if they were, then much more were the apostles of Jesus in the days of his flesh, and yet to them Jesus said, He (the Spirit) *is with you*, and *shall be in you*. A distinction is here clearly expressed which theological writers have failed to notice with commensurate emphasis. The Spirit was with them as he was with all the Old Testament saints, working in them faith and repentance, but he was not in them. The Spirit was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified. It is common to expound this passage by saying, that in the glorification of Jesus redemption was perfected, and not until then could the Spirit show clearly unto us the things of Christ.

But this explanation is manifestly inadequate. There was a development of doctrine all along, through continuous revelations, and for the apprehension thereof it sufficed that the Spirit was *with* the saints. If, after the glorification of Jesus, the Spirit did no more than apply the truth, what is there in the fulfilment of Messianic prediction to justify the marked distinction between *in* and *with*, the declaration that the Spirit was *not yet given*, the statement that Jesus was made a curse for us in order that (*ζῆνα*) we might receive the *promise* of the Holy Ghost, and that, having ascended to the right hand of God, he had received from the Father the gift of the Spirit?

But some may ask, How then were the Old Testament saints saved if the Spirit was not, in a very important and indeed essential sense, given till the glorification of Christ? In response we will ask, How were the Old Testament saints saved when Christ had not yet made propitiation for sin? The blood of bulls and of goats could not take away sin. The truth is, the Old Testament saints were saved in anticipation of what was to be done by Christ.

We repeat, then, that not until Christ was glorified was the Spirit given to dwell in the saints. We but repeat the very words of Holy Writ. Fellowship with Christ is secured to the saints only by the communion of the Holy Ghost; for if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his. And not until Jesus appeared in the very presence of God, a righteous, justified and glorified man, was eternal redemption obtained for us, and that work perfected of which the saints are made partakers through fellowship with Christ. Of the saints before Christ it is written, These all having obtained a good report through faith received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us that they without us should not be made perfect. That promise was the promise of the Spirit,—the *κοινωνία*,—the communion of the Holy Ghost,—the Spirit indwelling. The impartation of the Spirit to be in us, is regeneration. It follows upon the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Father's consequent love of complacency.

That Jesus had risen and received of the Father for his people the gift of the Holy Spirit, was regarded by the apostles as

necessary and conclusive evidence of his Messiahship. That the gift might be demonstrated, the apostles, as divinely authorized witnesses of the resurrection, were empowered by the laying on of their hands to confer the gift of tongues. "We are witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him." (Acts v. 32.) Thus the gift of the indwelling Spirit was sensibly attested, and thereby also the divine commission of the apostles.

If we refuse to confound regeneration with change of heart, then all these scriptures which plainly point to the gift of the Spirit as subsequent to faith no longer bristle with difficulties. Of such passages the following are examples: This spake he of the Spirit, which all they that believe on him should receive. Have ye received the Holy Ghost *since* ye believed. Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith? In whom *after that* ye believed ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise who is the *earnest* of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession. This last passage should convince us that, not the charismata of the Spirit, which were peculiar to the apostolic times, and ministry of witness-bearing to the fact of resurrection, are referred to, but the gift of the Spirit himself, in all ages, and of which the charisms were only the signs in the formative period of the church.

And so we have fellowship *with* Christ by fellowship of the Spirit. And the Christ with whom we have fellowship is he who being the Son of God became a partaker of flesh and blood because the children were human; and being found in fashion as a man, humbled himself and became obedient unto death; but because there was no sin in him—because he feared God, was delivered from death and obtained eternal glory. This he shares with them who believe on him, by first sharing with them the indwelling Spirit; for if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his. Thus being one with him, it follows that "as he is, so are we." He shared with us our human nature and the penalty of our sin; we share with him his divine nature and the reward of his righteousness.

The *perseverance of the saints* appears as a necessary corollary.

We are crucified with him; we are risen with him; we are dead, nevertheless we live, for Christ liveth in us. Eternal life means for us precisely what it means for him. Therefore we are begotten again to a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

While Christ therefore takes partnership with us in that death which is common to the whole human race, and in this sense made propitiation for the sins of the whole world, his death avails only for them who are or shall be one with him. There is no fellowship consummated when there is no communion of the Holy Ghost. In the obedience of Christ's death only they have "communion of the body and blood" of Jesus who are baptized into Christ by one Spirit.

How beautifully and harmoniously do the Christian ordinances of *baptism* and the *supper* set forth these two communions of the Spirit, and of the body and blood.

The Bible doctrine of baptism is only another mode of reiterating what has already been said as to the need and nature of regeneration. Of Jesus John said, "I indeed baptize you with water; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." At Pentecost Peter said, "He being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this [as a palpable sign of the gift] which ye now see and hear." Subsequently, Peter and those with him were astonished because "on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For [as evidence thereof] they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God. Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" In rehearsing the matter afterwards in Jerusalem he said, And as I began to speak the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. That this baptism was absolutely essential to salvation, Peter declares in his epistle: Baptism doth *save* us. What astonished Peter in the case of Cornelius was the fact that a Gentile could be saved without being circumcised as a proselyte to Judaism.

Says Paul, in 1 Cor. xii. 13, "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body [the church invisible] . . . and have all been made to drink of one Spirit." That this baptism is identical with the "communion of the Holy Ghost," "the fellowship of the Spirit," the indwelling of the Spirit, in consequence of which we are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, in a word with regeneration, is further evinced by the Scripture. We are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. Not otherwise, then, than by the indwelling of the Spirit, is fellowship with Christ in redemption consummated. We are in Christ because the Spirit of Christ is in us. "I in you and ye in me." Sanctification of the Spirit is effected by baptism into Christ, whereby we are thenceforth "sanctified in Christ Jesus."

The believer, therefore, is "clean" by the washing of regeneration, the renewing of the Holy Ghost, because he is in Christ. And this baptism of the Spirit, represented as poured out upon us, is beautifully symbolized by the pouring of clean water. The gift of the Spirit is also pictured in the pouring of oil upon the head; all Christians have "received an unction from the Holy One." But lest the sign, externally applied, should cease to be associated with the fact of the Spirit's indwelling, we are expressly told, "The anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you."

As having a bearing upon the mode of water baptism, let it also be noted that we are baptized into Christ; *i. e.*, into the living, risen, justified, and glorified Jesus. With a living Christ we are united. We being dead in sin, our baptism into the living Christ is wholly a quickening. Baptized into the living Christ it is only retrospectively and logically, not actually, that we are baptized into his death, and crucified with him. We have by baptism with the Spirit actual fellowship with Christ in his life. He that hath the Son hath life. That life is the reward of obedience unto death, and being one with him in that life, we are thereby said to be partakers of his righteous death. That righteousness is ours, as we have seen, by imputation only of its desert; the life itself is actually ours. And so that is no correct symbol of baptism which

initiates us first into death and then into life. Baptism quickens only. Baptism does not symbolize our union with Christ in death and resurrection, but the communion of the Spirit by which that union is effected. Well says the *Confession of Faith*: "Baptism is a sign and seal of regeneration." And only in association with baptism do our symbols have anything to say of regeneration.

And simply and beautifully does the Lord's supper set forth our partnership in the body and blood of a crucified Saviour, and also the faith which appropriates him. The doctrine of fellowship sheds additional light on the ordinances of the Church.

Admit fellowship, and every vital truth of revelation is easily deduced therefrom. And receive it we must, if we accept the Scriptures as the word of God, for it obtrudes itself upon our notice on almost every page of the New Testament writings.

To the intelligent and instructed observer of the heavens there is a cosmos, a beauty and order, which fills the soul with awe and praise; the same scene appears to the eye of the ignorant rustic as an irregular and meaningless distribution of luminous points. The uniqueness of this scheme of redemption by fellowship with the Son of God; its symmetry; its harmony; its completeness; its sufficiency to satisfy all man's needs for all eternity, and all God's demands of both justice and mercy, overwhelmingly persuade the mind of its truth. We want no other evidences of its divine origin. In the presence of its sublimity all difficulties raised by higher or any other sort of criticism sink into utter insignificance. That any one should question the divine origin of the gospel as the power of God unto salvation because of things which are not understood, seems to us as stupid as it were to question the fitness of man's bodily organism for his needs because there are glands whose functions baffle enquiry. We can account for skepticism only by the theory that the skeptic, with all his display of minute investigation, does not understand the grand plan of salvation. It passes comprehension how any one can for a moment tolerate the thought of bringing Buddhism or Confucianism into comparison with Christianity. We may also say Romanism, for it is as much a stranger as the others to the doctrine of fellowship. The Protestant pervert to Rome never apprehended this grand



doctrine. It will be found that they who institute such comparisons conceive the gospel to be only one of many schemes of salvation by works.

The Lord Jehovah is our strength and our song, because he also is become our salvation. Not merely as interposing for the deliverance of his people by deeds of might, but in a sense unknown in Old Testament times, in a sense not known till the fulness of time, is Jehovah now known as himself, in his own person, become our salvation. When Simeon looked upon the child Jesus, he said, "Mine eyes have seen thy salvation." In the light of a completed revelation, we see salvation in the person of Jesus, and our own salvation in fellowship with him. To all who believe on him his Spirit is given. Praise ye the Lord. God is faithful. What God? He who has called us into the fellowship of his Son.

JOHN W. PRIMROSE.

## V. THE LAW OF THE TITHE.

### IS IT BINDING NOW? <sup>1</sup>

THIS is a live theme in our church to-day. Our highest court has made it such. Whether wise or otherwise, necessary or superfluous, the last General Assembly invited a discussion which might better have been left out of this year's experience. "The true author of war," says Montesquieu, "is not he who declares it, but he who renders it necessary."<sup>2</sup> It may be remarked in passing, that while not *ultra vires* perhaps, it is a rare thing for the Committee on Bills and Overtures to volunteer<sup>3</sup> such an overture to the Presbyteries as in this case received unsolicited recommendation; and little less rare for the General Assembly to send down such a paper without the least indication of wish or will from the church. One objection to the procedure is that, because it is the action of our supreme court, it may give the subject an importance largely, if not altogether, adventitious, which in this case neither the subject itself nor any of its connections could otherwise command. But the debate is on, and we must get ready to give the next General Assembly "carefully formulated papers" "on tithing as a means of raising the funds of the church."<sup>4</sup>

In the following discussion my wish is to treat all advocates of the tithe with becoming respect and courtesy. Some of them

---

<sup>1</sup> It may not be out of place or against "good form" to say: I should not have presumed to teach the teachers of the church, but requests to prepare this article came from such persons and in such way as to make refusal extremely difficult, if not impossible. Low health has prevented a visit to one of the larger cities to examine all the "fathers" and other authorities not in my own library. I often feel the limitations of a provincial pastorate in the want of access to large collections of books. I have diligently used what my private library supplies. If any think the matter of references a bit overdone, I beg respectfully to suggest that, as in Ellicott's *Life of Christ* and in Hase's *History of the Christian Church*, the notes are the history, so in this article, in a large and true sense, the authorities are the argument.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted in *Napoleon's Caesar*, Vol. II., p. 593.

<sup>3</sup> J. A. S., in *St. Louis Presbyterian*, Dec. 8, 1889.

<sup>4</sup> *Minutes General Assembly*, 1889, p. 607.

are known to me personally, and are held in high esteem and affection. It is desired to speak the truth in love, seeking truth, not victory. "The triumph of a ruthless polemic may gratify the natural heart; but far more like the Master, where it is possible, is a winning irenicum."<sup>1</sup> And yet it must be permitted me to speak with freedom, of which they themselves set a not too restricted example. Like Paul, in this if in nothing else, I shall use great plainness of speech. It is needed. Zeal for their cause leads some advocates of the tithe to insufficient care of their facts and authorities, of their quotations and arguments. With the best intentions they are too fond of glittering generalities, and a trifle too loose in their statements and reasoning. It will not fall in line with this discussion to say much of these peculiarities. At another time they may be noted more fully. Ten or twelve lying in my path will be of use. They may be taken as examples of what is much too common.

I. In principle, there are but two methods of raising the funds of the church, the voluntary and the compulsory. There is no third method thinkable, except as made up of these two. They are often combined. They were united in Mosaism. Does Christianity use both? Has the compulsory any proper place in the new dispensation? Specifically, is the law of the tithe, as set forth in the Old Testament, in force now? Does it bind the Christian's conscience? Have church courts, or any persons whatever, divine warrant to enjoin, or even to advise, that the law of the tithe be made in any way the measure of gifts and rule of benevolence in the church of Christ? Have they any authority to enjoin it? Have they any right to advise it?

To each and to all of these questions there can be but one answer with due regard to God's word properly understood, and under guidance of the Spirit of God working in his church through the ages: a distinct, emphatic and unhesitating negative. The voice of history in God's free church, and the voice of inspiration in the New Testament of his grace, are identical here. In not one of the great historical churches, unfettered by the state, has there ever been from their higher courts any utterances teaching

---

<sup>1</sup> *Imago Christi*, Stalker, London, 1889, p. 298.

that the law of the tithe is binding now. Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, differing on so many other matters, are in perfect agreement here.<sup>1</sup> There is no exception. And preëminently our own church in her entire history has borne no doubtful testimony. Individuals have advocated and practiced tithing; the free church of Christ *never*. Human societies have imposed this yoke upon themselves; the body of Christ, in whom the Spirit dwells, *never*. The state and state establishments of a religious sort have exacted it; the spiritual kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is not of this world, *never*. For ourselves, therefore, and for our church from the beginning, nay, for the whole church, to speak in general terms, as unbound by secular shackles, we must say, in reference to the tithe, with strong emphasis, "*Aut hæc non est lex Christi, aut nos non sumus Christiani.*"

II. It may be well to set forth just here, in a clear way and at some length, the exact state of the question. And this all the more, because much confusion has arisen from failure of the esteemed advocates of the tithe to distinguish the real point of their contention, namely, that the tithe is binding now, from other aspects and relations of the Christian grace and duty of making gifts for pious uses.

(a) There is no question as to the duty of giving. The obligation is universally acknowledged. Indeed, it is so interwoven into the texture of the gospel that it is not easy to see how one can be a Christian and fail to recognize it. Gifts are the very warp and woof of the gospel. The warp, God's gift to us, his "unspeakable gift" being chief of all and inclusive of all. The woof, our gifts to God. Of these are woven the whole fabric of the Christian's character and life and destiny. God's gifts to us comprise all bestowments of divine love, the eternal Son and boundless grace of God, the Spirit and word of life, the church and all her ordinances. And our gifts to God embrace all that we can offer in return: ourselves, our supreme love, our living service, our possessions, our time, our influence, our patient endurance of trial. These are the gospel. They constitute also our religion.

---

<sup>1</sup> Some minor bodies have adopted it more or less modified.

(β) There is no question as to liberality in giving. Here, too, there is general accord among God's people. As grace works in them, they are enriched to all bountifulness.<sup>1</sup> All see and feel the charm and force of the example of those Macedonian Christians whose joy and deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality.<sup>2</sup>

(γ) Nor is there question as to the need of system in giving. Not only is the word of God quite clear on this point;<sup>3</sup> it needs but a modicum of wisdom to know that, as a general rule, liberality can only be secured by careful system and intelligent method.

(δ) Small difference of view will be found as to what is said by the apostle, that each is to give according to his ability. This is the decision of natural justice, as well as a law of the new life and an instinct of the new heart. The great principle here is, that if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to what a man hath.<sup>4</sup>

(ε) There is no question as to motive. All Christians agree, it may be ventured, that while there may be many secondary motives, the one grand, supreme motive is the love of Christ; a grateful and constraining love, responsive to his own for us, and leading to cheerful compliance with his will and glad imitation of his example. This love is the Christian's inspiration and joy in this as in all other duties. In God and in man love is the fount and origin of all that is good and gracious.

Now these five points, together with the doctrine of rewards, indicate the whole duty and privilege of Christian giving, as presented in the New Testament. There is no place, as there is no shadow of authority, for the tithe, or for any fixed arbitrary amount of universal obligation. It is as every man purposeth in his heart. Yet it may be well to add:

(ζ) There is no denial to any one of the right to adopt the tithe rule for himself if so inclined. This is within his Christian liberty. He may give at his own sweet will, a fifth, a tenth, a twentieth, or any other portion approved by conscience and judg-

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. ix. 11.      <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, viii. 2.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. xvi. 2; ὅ ἅν ἐδοῦδάται.—*Alford*, "As he may be prospered."

<sup>4</sup> 2 Cor. viii. 12; καθὸ ἐὰν ἔχη. See Acts xi. 29; καθὼς ἐδοκροεῖτό τις.—*Alford*.

ment enlightened by the word and Spirit of God. No doubt, if all were to give tithes, the funds of the church would be much increased. If each would give a fifth, those funds would be increased much more. So, if it be a matter of desire on our part as to what Christians might do, or as to resulting increase of the funds of the church, the fifth is certainly better than the tenth. And we have in the church of Christ precisely the same authority for one as for the other. If a man is able to give a fifth with due regard to other obligations, it is his duty to give it; the giving of a tenth will not be a discharge of duty in that case. Each must give according to his ability, as God hath prospered him.

(7) The precise question, as implied before, is this: Has our Lord ordained the law of the tithe for his church of the new dispensation? Does the New Testament teach it? Has it any obligation for the Christian's conscience? Is the tithe binding now? Has any one the right to enjoin or to advise it in the name and by authority of Christ our Lord?

III. What is this tithe, the law of which, it is claimed by a few among us, is now in force? The want of accurate and full information on this subject among advocates of the tithe is surprising. As scholarly a man as the late Dr. John W. Pratt says:<sup>1</sup> "The support of the priests was derived solely from the tithe." This view is essential to one of their main arguments; but it is a mistake, as will be seen below. Of the several tithes extant among the ancient Jews, but one calls for attention in this discussion, since by universal consent the others are not obligatory in the church of Christ.

This tithe was a divinely ordained institution of Mosaism for the maintenance in chief part of the tribe of Levi.<sup>2</sup> The priests were to receive a tenth of this tithe.<sup>3</sup> It was far from being the sole source of their support. Forty-eight cities, with their suburbs, *i. e.*, large pasture lands, were set apart for their use.<sup>4</sup> These included thirteen cities for the use of the priests.<sup>5</sup> Six were the celebrated "Cities of Refuge."<sup>6</sup> The priests received

<sup>1</sup> *The Gospel Self-Supporting*, p. 230.

<sup>2</sup> Num. xviii. 21.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 28.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* xxxvii. 2, 7.

<sup>5</sup> Josh. xxi. 4.

<sup>6</sup> Num. xxxv. 6, 11.

the first fruits,<sup>1</sup> and money in redemption of the first born.<sup>2</sup> They also had for their own use a large part of the sacrifices not provided for by the tithe,<sup>3</sup> as well as of the voluntary offerings of the people. There were other sources of revenue to the Levitical ministry in addition to tithes. Maimonides enumerates about a score altogether.

This Levitical tithe was a tenth of all the increase of lands and cattle remaining after the first fruits had been taken out. It was a perfectly unique thing. There has never been anything identical with it, so far as history reports, at any time among any other people. It stands alone. Some nations exacted a tenth for civil taxes, as Rome under the agrarian laws. In many cases individuals gave a tenth of the spoils of war, less frequently a tenth of the fruits of the field and of commerce. But all these were voluntary,<sup>4</sup> except the civil taxes. There were no general laws requiring payment of tithes for religious purposes outside of Judaism. All was spontaneous. And it was exceptional. The very fact that it was signalized in the lives of a few men shows that it was not a practice of the many. Just here the exaggeration and confusion of the friends of the tithe become conspicuous. They confound civil taxes with religious tithes, and they indulge in hyperbole of statement which neither history nor ethics will justify. For exaggerations take the following: "The tithe system was in force under the patriarchal dispensation, and dated back in antiquity to the flood, and probably to Adam himself."<sup>5</sup> "All the nations of the earth gave to their gods according to a fixed proportion."<sup>6</sup> "They all gave according to the same proportion."<sup>7</sup> This is "making history" in a very special sense and with great freedom. "If they practiced tithing *after* the flood, they must have practiced it *before* the flood."<sup>8</sup> In this argument my venerable friend uses a sort of Macropus-Giganteus logic—*per saltem*—with a prodigious leap which staggers "the historic sense," and

<sup>1</sup> Num. xviii. 12, 13. For the beautiful ritual of the first fruits see Deut. xxvi.

<sup>2</sup> Num. iii. 48-51, and xviii. 15.      <sup>3</sup> Lev. vii. 31, 34, and Num. vi. 30.

<sup>4</sup> Leyrer in *Schaff-Herzog Encyc.*, p 2365.

<sup>5</sup> *Presbyterian Quarterly*, last number, p. 79.      <sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 82.      <sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> J. A. S., in *St. Louis Presbyterian*, Dec. 13, 1889.

even the imagination. It is a hop-scotch of the Titans.<sup>1</sup> But there is a more serious case. A late writer, under the proposition, "The tithe system prevailed in the early Christian church," quotes from *Encyclopædia Britannica* these words: "Tithes were generally regarded up to the seventeenth century as existing *jure divino*, and as having been payable to the church ever since the earliest days of Christianity."<sup>2</sup> But he does not quote the next sentence and what follows. The article in the next words goes on to say, "History, as Selden showed in his learned and exhaustive treatise (*History of Tithes*, 1618), does not bear out this view. In the words of Hallam, 'the slow and gradual manner in which parochial churches became independent appears to be of itself a sufficient answer to those who ascribe a great antiquity to the universal payment of tithes.'"<sup>3</sup> And then the advocates of the tithe often confound civil taxes of a tenth with religious tithes. Whenever they find the word *δεκάτη*, or *decima*, they use it for their purpose, not careful to distinguish whether it is a civil or a sacred tenth that is meant. Dr. W. Robertson Smith, who on a point of this sort will be held to be good authority, says, "The tithe, in fact, appears to have been a common form of tax upon the produce of land or other revenues, for civil as well as for sacred purposes. We find it in Greece (as at Athens) and in Sicily and Asia, under the Roman empire, but its special home was in the East. It was exacted on agricultural products and flocks by Hebrew kings (1 Sam. viii. 15, 17), and on imports by the monarchs of Babylon (*Aristotle*, Econ. ed. Berlin, p. 1352 β). Aristotle gives the tithe on fruits of the soil the first place among the revenues of satraps (*Ibid.* p. 1345 β), and it still forms an important element in the fiscal system of Mohammedan states. It will be observed that the proportion of one in ten has been applied in the East to imports of very different kinds, and in Mohammedan tax-

<sup>1</sup> "Ridentem dicere verum, quid vetat."—*Horace*.

<sup>2</sup> Last number of this REVIEW. I have recently read quotations so handled as to make the impression that Hooker and Owen hold to the present *jure divino* authority of the tithe. Hooker distinctly admits there is no divine right for it now. (*Laws of Eccles. Polity*, Bk. V., Chap. LXXIX.) [12]. Owen makes an unanswerable argument against it. (*Owen's Works*, Phila. ed. Vol. XIV., pp. 321-327.)

<sup>3</sup> Hallam, *Med. Ages*, Harper's one vol. ed. p. 263.



ation we find the name retained in cases where much less than a tenth is actually taken. In like manner Aristotle (*ut supra*) makes *δεκάτη* a mere synonym of *ἐκφόριον*, or tax on produce; the proportion of one in ten, it would seem, was so commonly taken in antiquity as the basis for *ad valorem* taxes that any such tax or tribute might be called a tithe."<sup>1</sup> This is a genuine case of what Lord Bacon calls "idols of the market," "the most troublesome of all," saith Sir Francis of Verulam, "which have entwined themselves round the understanding from the association of words and names."<sup>2</sup>

The Levitical tithe was peculiar in these particulars: (1), It was universal and compulsory; (2), by express divine appointment; (3), for the maintenance of one tribe, (4), set apart for the benefit of the other eleven tribes; (5), which tribe, of Levi, was to be forever a landless community among an agricultural and pastoral people. God, as divine proprietor, apportioned the holy land in severalty to the eleven tribes. The tribes themselves subdivided the lands among their families. These family possessions were inalienable. Such as had passed temporarily into other hands reverted to the original possessors every fiftieth year.

The tribe of Levi was consecrated as representatives<sup>3</sup> and for the service of the other eleven tribes. This service was chiefly religious, "in charge of the sanctuary." Not exclusively so. They also acted as school-teachers<sup>4</sup> and as judges,<sup>5</sup> and probably in other lines of secular life. Destitute of lands and other means of support, and set apart for the public good, their maintenance was provided for by the tithe-tax, one-tenth of all the fruits of field and cattle remaining after the first-fruits had been taken out. This was not a large tax for the purpose. Rome collected under her agrarian laws "one-tenth of all corn-lands and one-fifth of vines and fruit trees, with a moderate rate per head for sheep and cattle grazing on the public pastures."<sup>6</sup> And this is approximately

<sup>1</sup> *Encyc. Brit.*, Vol. XVIII., p. 438.      <sup>2</sup> *Novum Organum*, Bk. I., Aphor. 59.

<sup>3</sup> Num. iii. 11, 41, 45; Ehler's *O. T. Theol.*, § 93, p. 203.

<sup>4</sup> Dr. Girardeau, *Music in the Church*, p. 41.

<sup>5</sup> Lev. x. 11; Num. xxvii. 2; Deut. xxiv. 8; xvii. 9, 17; xxi. 5.

<sup>6</sup> *Encyc. Brit.*, *Agrarian Law*; *Napoleon's Caesar*, Vol. I., p. 45.

what is paid by farm-renters in our country to-day; and this merely for the annual use of the property. Three things should be kept in mind necessary to a right view of the Levitical tithe: (1), It included many things which are now a separate charge, distinct from offerings for pious uses; (2), It was part of legislation, of which the restoration of possessions every fiftieth year was also an integrant element. It was thus a constituent part of a social order impossible in modern civilization; (3), The obvious inequality of the tithe as an absolute rule was reduced to a minimum by the restorations of the jubilee year, together with the further modification, according to the Talmud,<sup>1</sup> that "only the cattle born during the year, and not those that were bought, or that were received as presents, were to be tithed, and that unless ten animals were born there should be no offering." The extremely poor were therefore exempt. So would be all who for a time had lost their lands. They would pay nothing, because having nothing to tithe. *Ex nihilo nihil fit*. Indeed, instead of paying tithes, "the poor" were made beneficiaries with the Levites of one tithe, that of the third year.<sup>2</sup>

IV. We now come to the direct argument. It will be found that time and space have been saved<sup>3</sup> by these large preliminaries. The argument will be drawn chiefly from the New Testament teaching and the history of the church, pertinent passages from the Old Testament receiving due attention in proper place. On the New Testament field must be the Waterloo of this controversy. Who wins here, gains all. Who fails here, loses all. All other parts of the conflict are secondary, and will in the end go with the principal victory. Three rules of interpretation shall guide us: (1), Every sentence must be construed in connection with its context and under guidance of the leading thought and purpose. (2), Every author must be interpreted by his own writings.<sup>4</sup> (3), The Lord Jesus Christ is sole law-giver in his church. Our divine

<sup>1</sup> *Schaff-Herzog Encyc.*, p. 2365, "Tithes among the Hebrews."

<sup>2</sup> Deut. xiv. 29.

<sup>3</sup> "Stay a little that we may make an end the sooner."—*Bacon's Essay on Despatch*.

<sup>4</sup> Dr. Hoge in *Union Seminary Magazine*, Vol. I., No. 2, p. 83.

Teacher and King, in issuing to his apostles the great commission, said, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." These words involve three things: (1), They were to teach all that Christ commanded. (2), They were to teach nothing but what he commanded. (3), The church was to obey their teaching. This left the church no discretion as to doctrine, polity and worship. She is absolutely bound by Christ's commands. She is obliged to do all he has commanded; she is forbidden to do anything he has not commanded.<sup>1</sup> "No voice is to be heard in the household of faith but the voice of the Son of God. The power of the church is purely ministerial and declarative. She is only to hold forth the doctrine, enforce the laws, and execute the government which Christ has given her."<sup>2</sup> "She can proclaim no laws that Christ has not ordained, institute no ceremonies which he has not appointed, create no offices which he has not prescribed, exact no obedience which he has not enjoined."<sup>3</sup>

Each word weighed with scrupulous care, the following propositions are laid down as fully sustained by the evidence to be submitted: In the whole New Testament there is not one sentence which, by any legitimate interpretation, can be made to teach that the law of the tithe is in force under the Christian dispensation. In not one of its passages on Christian offerings is there any allusion, explicit or implied, to the tithe. On the contrary, there is a studied avoidance of it, as if it were feared that such allusion might give, or seem to give, some continuing authority to the tithe law. They do not use the language of the tithe. To the principles and rules given in the New Testament for regulation of the sacred duty and privilege of making offerings for pious uses, the tithe, or any fixed amount of universal obligation, is thoroughly repugnant.

1st. Our great Prophet often discourses on the duty of giving for pious uses. He presents it in many lights and enforces it by many motives. It comes to us in his own words, now with the pathos of the utmost self-sacrifice of love, then with the thrill and surprise of an unexpected and glorious reward; now it glows in

<sup>1</sup> Condensed from Dr. Girardeau.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Thornwell's *Coll. Writings*, Vol. IV., p. 163.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 245.

the pictures of his parables, then it adds tenderness and compassion to the grandeur of his miracles. All the New Testament writers speak of it more or less. Paul gives it one elaborate discussion, and then frequently refers to it incidentally and briefly. Thus Christian offerings are seen to be a not infrequent theme in the discourses of our Lord, and of his inspired disciples. They are presented in every possible aspect. Yet never once is the tithe mentioned as a rule of duty or measure of beneficence for the Christian. This silence ought to be conclusive. For it is quite incredible that the great Teacher would have left this duty, if one at all, for his church of the new dispensation without one word of authority or commendation, either in his own discourses or in those of his inspired followers; a duty so important, so fruitful of good, so vital to Christian character and to the work of evangelizing the world as the tithe is represented by its advocates to be. And yet there are a few among us who insist on putting the law in the place of the gospel, Moses in the place of Christ.

*First, Our Lord has not commanded, or even recommended, the tithe for the Christian church.*

According to the record, Christ mentioned the tithe but twice: Once,<sup>1</sup> in denouncing Pharisaic hypocrisy, the most terrific invective he ever uttered; again,<sup>2</sup> in condemning Pharisaic self-righteousness. In both passages he severely censures the tithers; not indeed for tithing itself, but for what was exhibited and expressed by *their* tithes. And let it be noted: (1,) Neither of the passages has anything to do with the Christian duty of giving. They are both as far as possible from that topic. In one case the theme is Pharisaic hypocrisy; in the other, Pharisaic self-righteousness. It is a bald wresting of Scripture from the mind of the Master to make either of these passages say one word, or hint one item, on the duty and privilege of making Christian offerings. (2,) They were spoken under the Old Testament dispensation. The Mosaic law was still in force. The new dispensation had not yet been introduced. All the institutions of Mosaism, therefore, were still binding, sacrifices, festivals, tithes and all. (3,) They were addressed to members of the Jewish church by a loyal member of

---

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxiii. 23; Luke xi. 42.

<sup>2</sup> Luke xviii. 12.

that church, who stated publicly, at the beginning of his official ministry, that "it became him to fulfil all righteousness." Of course, therefore, those Pharisees ought to pay tithes. As honest members of the Jewish church it was their duty. But the duties of condemned Pharisees under the law cannot well be taken as examples, or the measure of the duties of accepted Christians under the gospel, accepted in the Beloved. And yet some advocates of the tithe are neither afraid nor ashamed to quote these passages as proof-texts in support of their peculiar views.

But, they reply, our Saviour said, "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven."<sup>1</sup> Solemn words, of a truth, and full of divine suggestion as to the need of a spiritual religion which includes aims and motives, affections and passions, in contrast with an external legalism which, while observing the minutest points of uncommanded additions to the ritual, can with Pharisaic self-complacency and self-righteousness go on neglecting justice, mercy, faith and the love of God. This use of these solemn words of Jesus is one of the worst perversions of Scripture possible. In the whole chapter containing the opening portion of our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, there is not only no reference to tithes, there is none to giving. The whole chapter is devoted, more or less directly, to the spirituality of the religion of Christ. And all respectable exegesis so understands it. I will not quote old Matthew Poole's Synopsis, though having just risen from a reading of his five long folio columns on this verse, where is found abundant authority for what is here asserted. I prefer to cite more recent exegetes. Calvin says of the Pharisees, on this verse, "By confining the law of God to outward duties only, they trained their disciples to hypocrisy." Stier calls them "the men of the letter of the law and of hypocritical outside appearance." Good old Henry says, "They minded only the *outside*, but we must make conscience of *inside* godliness." Bengel in Meyer: "They observed ceremonial and external, but neglected moral, righteousness." Olshausen: "The Pharisees, on the contrary, confound the form with the essence, and insist on the former instead of the latter."

---

<sup>1</sup> Matt. v. 20.

Thus I might go through all the commentaries on my shelves without finding one exception, probably, to the universal consensus. I close these quotations with one from my revered teacher (Dr. J. Addison Alexander), who is not only learned and accurate, but always full and fair, "The *prima facie* meaning seemed to be, that they must imitate the scribes and Pharisees, and go beyond them in the same direction, or they could not be admitted to the kingdom. The meaning, as afterwards explained, was that the Pharisees and scribes, instead of having too much, had too little, nay, had nothing of the quality required, so that instead of trying to be like them, they must seek in this respect to be as different as possible." Let us emphasize once more the law of interpretation, that the context and theme of discourse must determine the meaning of every sentence. There has just come to hand an extract from a late decision of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, as true for the gospel as for the law: "No rule of judicial interpretation is wiser or better settled than that which prohibits the taking of a single sentence, even though it forms a separate section of a statute, and construing it apart from the context, or without regard to the subject matter and the general purpose sought to be accomplished."<sup>1</sup>

*Secondly, None of the inspired followers of our Lord enjoin or recommend it.*

(a) In all the records of their speeches and writings the title is named but once—in the Epistle to the Hebrews.<sup>2</sup> This epistle was written, primarily, to guard Hebrew converts against relapse into Judaism, and, secondarily, to teach the whole church forever the superiority of Christ, that, as Paul says in the Colossians, he might in all things have the preëminence. The great argument of the epistle shows the almost infinite superiority of Christianity over Mosaism, because of the infinite personal and official superiority of its divine founder and head.

The passage naming tithes is a part of the argument on the priesthood. Christ's priesthood is superior to the Levitical, because it is after the order of Melchisedec, and not after that of Aaron. Then is shown the superiority of Melchisedec over Levi

<sup>1</sup> *Presbyterian Journal*, Jan. 9, 1890.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. vii. 5-9.

in this, that Melchisedec blessed and received tithes of Abraham, official blessing and taking tithes being universally regarded as tokens of official superiority. In his argument, the author of the epistle is led to refer to the short account of Melchisedec given in Genesis. Two persons went out to meet Abraham returning from his great victory over Chedorlaomer and the allied kings. One of these was Melchisedec, who refreshed Abraham with bread and wine. The record of Melchisedec is brief. His family and his personal identity are unknown. He is without any official genealogy, has no register of pedigree, *i. e.*, none in the Bible,<sup>1</sup> so vital in the Levitical order. His name makes him king of righteousness; his chief city, king of peace. The author of the epistle is careful to explain that these descriptions come from translating his name and the name of his chief city. He was also priest of the Most High God. So meagre is the record, that we know nothing of his father or mother, of his birth or death, of any predecessor or successor. This king-priest may be taken as a type of our divine King and great High Priest, because thus standing apart from all others, as presented in the brief and fragmentary account of him in the Bible. And no doubt the author's reference to him has given Melchisedec an importance and mysteriousness which were never his while living. We may say of him what Cicero said of Cæsar: "All the acts of Cæsar, his writings, his words, his promises, his thoughts, have more force since his death than if he were still alive."<sup>2</sup> As Delitzsch has beautifully said, "The Melchisedec of human history has indeed died; but the Melchisedec of sacred history lives without dying, fixed forever as *one who lives* by the pen of the sacred historian, and thus stamped as type of the Son, the ever-living priest."<sup>3</sup> Chrysostom had long before said, "'Likened,' he says, 'to the Son of God.' And wherein does this likeness display itself? In the fact that we know neither the end nor the beginning of either the one or the other; but of the one, because the beginning and the end are not recorded; of the other, because they have no existence."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Heb. vii. 3; Lüttnemann in Meyer.

<sup>2</sup> Cicero, *Epistolæ ad Atticum*. Quoted in *Napoleon's Cæsar*, Pref. xiv.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted in Lange on Heb. vii. 3.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

(1.) The subject of the whole passage in the epistle is the superiority of Christ's priesthood because it is after the order of Melchisedec. The only use of the tithe in this passage is to prove the inferiority of the Levitical priesthood to that of Melchisedec. And as the author made no other use of it, no right interpretation of the passage can warrant any other use. Least of all can there be drawn from the author's peculiar argument any intimation that tithes are binding in the church of Christ.

(2.) If pressed beyond the single point intended by the author of the epistle, the argument proves too much, and is therefore worthless. For Jesus was as truly a son of Abraham, "according to the flesh," as was Levi; and any but official inferiority would belong to him as well as to the tribal ancestor of Aaron. Too great care cannot be taken to construe Scripture in its connection, in the light of the context.

(3.) Most of those who read these pages will agree that Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews. Interpreted by his other writings, the apostle could not mean to teach in this passage that the tithe is now in force. He never speaks of the tithe elsewhere, though it would, if obligatory, be just to his hand. When discoursing of Christian giving, he pleads, he exhorts, he entreats, using many arguments and plying many motives. He never mentions the tithe.

(β) The celebrated passage in 1 Corinthians<sup>1</sup>—the *locus classicus* of our tithing friends—is held by some to authorize the tithe indirectly, though not naming it. Erroneously, however. Such a view disregards the context, taking the verses out of their connection. It does worse than disregard the sources whence was derived the support of the Levitical ministry. It leaves Paul's failure to enjoin the tithe without explanation. (1.) The subject is his own right as an apostle, and the right of all ministers of Christ, to support by the church while they are engaged in the work of the ministry. He had been led to forego his own claims; but this voluntary relinquishment of his support must not be viewed as a doubt or denial of the right. For the truth's sake and for the sake of Christ's ministry through all time, he insists on the

---

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14.



right to a support, as coming from the law of God and from the nature of the case. Nothing whatever is said, express or implied, as to the method of securing that support. It is the ministers' right; the church is bound to support them. That is all. (2.) As a matter of fact, the temple and the altar were not supplied exclusively by the tithe. Sacrifices and revenues came largely from other sources. So, then, they who "lived of the things of the temple and were partakers of the altar" were very far from being supported solely by the tithe. Nothing but the right to a support is here affirmed. (3.) Here was Paul's opportunity to lay down the law of the tithe, if it were to be binding in the church of Christ. He does not name it; he does not refer to it. His silence is inexplicable, except on one ground, that is, the tithe law was not in force, and he therefore had no right to enjoin it. Indeed, the course of the apostle was often such, especially to the Corinthians, that, if the tithe were still in force, he was in part responsible for their disregard of it. His silence was culpable. He was *particeps criminis*, (*sit venia verbo!*) There is but one explanation, one justification: there was no such law for Christians.

*Thirdly, The quotations from the Old Testament scrupulously avoid all reference to the tithe.* This is the uniform practice of the New Testament writers.

*Fourthly, They do not use the language of the tithe.* The tithe says "pay," they say, "give." Tithes are "dues;" Christian offerings are called alms, bounty, gifts, liberality. The tithe law commands; the apostles persuade, entreat, exhort. Those familiar with pro-tithe discourses know what importance they attach to the very words used, and that some of their least excusable invectives are against what will be found to be the *ipsissima verba* of the New Testament.

*Fifthly, There are principles and rules, as well as examples, in the New Testament for Christian giving.* They are divinely ordained and clearly expressed. They can be seen in the eighth and ninth chapters of 2 Corinthians, and elsewhere in the teaching of Christ and his inspired disciples. The heart's core of this giving is its liberty. It is free; the voluntary offering of each one as he purposeth in his heart, according to the ability God hath

given him. Now, any external arbitrary rule fixing the amount by universal law is utterly and for ever repugnant to this liberty in Christ. It is a return to that bondage against which the apostle so earnestly warns in his Epistle to the Galatians.

It is claimed that the tithe was voluntary. This is juggling, paltering with words in a double sense in a discussion like this. If the tithe law was not compulsory, then there never was and there never can be a compulsory law. God's laws in nature are both compulsory and self-executing. Yet you can violate every one of them. The only alternative in any law is, obey the law and enjoy its benefit; transgress the law and suffer its penalty. Under the old Mosaic system, the tithe law came with the divine categorical imperative, and with alternative blessings and curses affixed. These blessings and curses are made much of nowadays. They say, "Tithe, and be prosperous; refuse to tithe, and incur adversity." But one of their own way of thinking shall make answer. It is in reply to the words, "If his people refuse to give, he will not compel them. He has provided no alternative." Thus the reply: "This is certainly a startling assertion, if indeed it be not unintelligible. What does he mean by 'compel' ? Physical force is out of the question. Does he mean moral or spiritual compulsion, a requirement under penalty of God's displeasure, and his providential and spiritual judgments? If so, his assertion is manifestly erroneous."<sup>1</sup> Dr. Stillman's words were affirmed of the New Testament teaching. Rev. A. L. Hogshead's reply is in the interest of the tithe. None the less, it explodes this claim that the tithe law was voluntary. This strangest of all strange claims is dismissed with this legal maxim for reflection, which would read as well and be as true with *ratione* for *lege*: "*Nihil in lege intolerabilius est, eandem rem diverso jure ceneri.*"

*2nd.* For centuries the church of Christ heard and knew nothing of the tithe as a rule and measure of duty. This is true of the Western church, whatever may have obtained in the East.

*First,* The Acts of the Apostles, that grand first chapter of ecclesiastical history, the inspired record of "the planting and training of the Christian church by the apostles," has not one word

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Gospel Self-Sustaining*, p. 57.

to say of the tithe. This is universally admitted. The silence is significant. But there is one instructive passage,<sup>1</sup> full of suggestion on our theme. The apostles and elders met in the first general assembly of the church at Jerusalem, called expressly to consider a question of the Jewish law referred to them by the church of Antioch. They enjoined the "necessary things" as it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to them. Among "these necessary things" the tithe is not mentioned any more than circumcision or Mosaic sacrifices. It therefore goes with them. It is not necessary. "*Expressio unius est exclusio alterius.*" This is a universal rule of the interpretation of law; we are considering a question of law. *It did not seem good to the Holy Ghost and to them to enjoin the tithe.*

It is not forgotten that the question referred was about circumcision. But the preface to the assembly's "decree" is broader. Certain judaizing teachers went from Jerusalem, troubling and subverting the souls of the Antiochean disciples, saying, "Ye must be circumcised and keep the law, to whom we gave no such commandment." So the body of the decree goes beyond circumcision. Indeed, that is decided at all only as it is omitted from the list of the "necessary things." The maxim just quoted excludes tithes from "necessary things" as logically and as authoritatively as circumcision and sacrifices are excluded. Nor is it worth while to lose time on the poor quibble that this would also subvert the Lord's day and infant baptism: for *they* rest on a better foundation than any positive enactment of Mosaism, ceremonial or moral. And this exclusion of the old by omission from the new is the divine method. There is no positive articulate "abrogation." In the laws and institutions of the new dispensation, our Lord and his inspired followers leave them out, and they are *ipso facto* excluded. And in this case, the law naturally becomes inoperative. It has served its purpose. The tribe of Levi is about to perish; the temple is soon to be destroyed; the law of the temple ministry therefore will cease to apply. It will have reached its end.

Here, again, was an inviting opportunity for apostolic authority to enjoin and explain the tithe law, had they felt at liberty to

---

<sup>1</sup> Acts xv. 23-29.

do so. This silence of the assembly can be reconciled with the position of the apostles in the church and the need of instruction to the early disciples, only on the supposition that the apostles were perfectly aware that tithes had gone with circumcision and sacrifices. This is all the more clear, since the assembly itself broached the question to the keeping of Jewish law. Perhaps there was no one point of more importance to the young missionary church going forth to conquer the world for Christ than just the one of a large regular revenue for prosecution of her great work. Still the apostles are silent; the assembly does not speak. *Tithes are not among the "necessary things." It did not seem good to the Holy Ghost and to them to name tithes among the "necessary things."*

*Second, The apostolic fathers say nothing of the tithe.*

This universal negative is ventured, not only because careful search, as thorough as the writer could make it, has disclosed nothing of the sort to him, but also because Dr. A. W. Miller, who appears to have ransacked the universe for anything to sustain his views, does not quote them. They exhort to alms and to care of the poor.<sup>1</sup> They make grateful mention of gifts to themselves, speaking of being "refreshed"<sup>2</sup> by the brethren. "Good works" have already become prominent in some of them, regarded apparently as causal and efficient in salvation. Never once do they mention the tithe. The apostolical constitutions may be omitted, not only because worthless in themselves, but because their testimony is contradictory on the topic in hand.

*Third, Not until the close of the fourth century, or the beginning of the fifth century, was there any individual utterance in favor of the tithe as a binding rule and measure of gifts; and not until towards the close of the sixth century was it first recommended (565), and then commanded (585).*

Dr. H. F. Jacobson, Professor of Law in Königsberg, says: "In the West, Jerome [d. 420] and Augustine [d. 430] spoke in favor of the same idea [that the tithe was binding]. It was

<sup>1</sup> Clem. to Cor., Barnabas, Gen. Epist., Hermas, Com. II., Sim. II., Polycarp to Philip.

<sup>2</sup> Ignatius, *Epist. to Smyrn.*, *Epist. to Trall.*

This note was misplaced and overlooked. It is inserted to complete the list of early documents:

ΠΙΣΤΑΝΤΩΝ ΔΙΔΑΧΗ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ; or the fuller title, *Διδαχὴ Κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων*. This remarkable "find" of Philotheos Bryennios, Metropolitan of Nicomedia, belongs to the second century, probably to the first third of it, and is of rare interest in many ways. In several of its chapters giving is spoken of, but tithes are not mentioned.

Chapter I. speaks of giving, quoting from the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 42), with additions. It closes with a strong and odd word on the need of care in giving: Ἰδρωσάτω ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη σου εἰς τὰς χειράς σου, μέγρις ἂν γνῶς τίνι δῶς. "Let thine alms sweat in thy hands until thou knowest to whom thou shouldst give."

Chapter IV. enjoins giving, not without a hint of error already. εἰάν τις ἐχθρὸς, διὰ τῶν χειρῶν σου δώσεις λύτρωσιν ἁμαρτιῶν σου.

In Chapters XI., XII. and XIII. giving receives attention, but tithes are not mentioned. Nowhere in the whole "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" is the tithe once named or, as I read, once referred to.



recommended by the Second Council of Tours (567), and commanded under penalty of excommunication by the Second Council of Macon (585)."<sup>1</sup> Dr. Otto Mejer, Professor of Canon Law in Göttingen, says: "In the time of Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430) tithes began [note, *began*] to be introduced, and from the close of the seventh century they were quite generally established."<sup>2</sup> Dr. Jacobson again: "During the Carolingian age the institution [of the tithe] became firmly established in the Frankish Empire, that is, in France and Germany. Charlemagne imposed it upon the newly converted Saxons. (See *Capitulare Paderbrunn*, of 785.) At the same time tithes were introduced in England, first in Mercia by Offa [d. 794], and then throughout the Saxon dominion by Ethelwulf [d. 858]. In Portugal and Denmark they were introduced in the eleventh century; in Sweden in the thirteenth."<sup>3</sup>

Thus late did the tithe originate in the Christian community. It was first heard of in exhortations from individuals long after the church had been taken under patronage of the state. It received formal endorsement still later, in an age of intellectual darkness and spiritual decadence. When the corruptions which led to popery were rife, then only was the tithe regarded and enjoined as binding in the Christian church. The confessional was used to enforce it. It belongs to the great world power of popery, to the huge secular tyranny of that gigantic despotism, and has been an effective factor in the development and extension of that corrupt form of Christianity. Its history suits its origin. It belongs to state churches. Such was the Jewish Church; such was the Roman Church. All the state churches of Europe were prompt to avail themselves of such an affluent source of revenue. It began with nascent papacy and advanced *pari passu* with it. The Reformers were almost unanimous in opposition to it; nor could it long have survived in the light and liberty of the great Reformation, but for the wileful craft of those who tied the church to the state, making of the Lord's spouse Cæsar's concubine. Mormonism, probably the most hideous travesty of Christianity ever de-

<sup>1</sup> *Schaff-Herzog Encyc.*, p. 2365, "Tithes." <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 2303, "Taxation Eccl."

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 2365, "Tithes."

vised, is also, as a state church in its idea, the latest instance of a tithe-paying church, so called. Can it be a violation of the gentleness and charity of Christ to cry out with all earnestness, *Procul, O procul este, profani!*

3rd, *The standards of our church are against the tithe.*

The Confession of Faith,<sup>1</sup> the Larger<sup>2</sup> and Shorter<sup>3</sup> Catechisms, the Form of Government,<sup>4</sup> and the Directory for Worship<sup>5</sup> are quite clear on this point. Let these passages be read consecutively. Though not yet adopted, the Revised Directory for Worship is referred to for brevity and precision.

These parts of our Standards and Revised Directory for Worship, construed together, clearly teach that, (1,) Christ, as the Head, has sole right to order the parts of public worship in his church; (2,) What Christ has not commanded is forbidden; (3,) The parts of public worship authorized by Christ are, prayer, singing, Scripture, offerings, benediction and the sacraments; (4,) The scriptural duty and privilege of regular, systematic and liberal offerings for pious uses should be done as an exercise of grace and an act of worship; (5,) No plea of antiquity, custom, devotion, or good intent, will avail to justify or excuse the introduction of anything which Christ has not prescribed; (6,) We are not to advise, counsel, command, or in anywise approve what Christ has not commanded; (7,) We are in duty bound to disapprove, detest and oppose everything not enjoined by our Lord; and (8,) As we are able endeavor to remove it.

Now, it has been clearly shown that, (1,) Christ has not prescribed the tithe for his church of the new dispensation; (2,) The apostles did not enjoin or practice it; (3,) The assembly at Jerusalem, met to consider matters of the law, did not include it in the list of "necessary things;" (4,) Our Lord and his apostles have laid down principles and rules for Christian offerings which are exclusive of, and irreconcilable with, the tithe-law; (5,) There is no intimation, direct or indirect, by express command or by necessary inference, that the law of the tithe has any authority in the church of Christ.

<sup>1</sup> XX., I., ¶ 2.

<sup>2</sup> Quest. 108, 109.

<sup>3</sup> Quest. 51.

<sup>4</sup> II., IV., V.

<sup>5</sup> I., III. and p. 9 (6).



We therefore conclude from our standards interpreting the word of God,<sup>1</sup> that (1,) We have no right to use, command, counsel, or in anywise approve the Levitical law of the tithe; and (2,) We are required and obliged to disapprove, detest, and oppose it, and, as we are able, to remove it.

Our standards have put the brand of their condemnation on the Levitical tithe law as a universal and imperative rule and measure of Christian offerings for pious uses. And, in the words of Dr. Girardeau, "the officers of that church of which they [the standards] are a directory of faith and practice are under a special obligation, resulting from their voluntary acceptance of these standards as a true interpretation of Scripture, and from their covenanted agreement with their brethren of the same faith and order, to be governed by them as the constitution of the church. It is therefore with reference to them, . . . in a very special sense, that, in the construction and development of this particular argument, the appeal is made to the Presbyterian standards. I speak as unto wise men; let them judge of what [has been] said in relation to this venerable tribunal."

*Ath, The legislation of our church under her constitution interpreting the word of God is against the tithe.*

(1.) Our church has never enjoined it. She has never referred to it as a binding rule and measure of duty. She has made appeals to Christian responsibility, philanthropy, love to the souls of men, to supreme regard for the glory of God, and to the love of our adorable Redeemer; but never to the tithe.

(2.) Our church has constantly made distinct and uniform declaration of the opposing truth. What is each Christian's part in offerings, "he is left to determine in prayer before God and in the light of the divine word." "Now, to procure such contributions [as had been described], it is not so material that any particular plan be urged on the churches, in whose details all should agree, and according to whose provisions all should act. All that is properly demanded is, that the duty of securing the desired result [of larger offerings] should be urged and its execution enforced."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Thornwell's Collected Writings*, Vol. IV., pp. 366-368.

<sup>2</sup> See Baird's *Digest*, pp. 156, 158.

The undivided Assembly long ago said, expressing the substance of all our legislation and exhortation before the division and since: "The gospel settles nothing as to the proportion to be given; but it says, 'As ye abound in everything, in faith, in utterance, in knowledge, and in all diligence, and in your love to us, see that ye abound in this grace also.' [Can you by any outward standard measure faith, knowledge, love? Then may you put no such measure to this grace also.] The motives it urges are of the highest kind. Every believer must feel their force. 'Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye, through his poverty, might be rich.'"

And therefore we answer the other question, Should our General Assembly or other church courts enjoin or in any wise counsel or approve the tithe? in the negative. Should they do so, led thereto by any considerations whatever, they would do what our Lord never did in the whole course of his teaching while on earth. They would do what the inspired apostles never did in their frequent instructions and exhortations to the church on the duty and privilege of pious offerings. They would do what the early church never did for centuries after Christ, and only did at all when controlled and corrupted by an unholy alliance with the state. They would do what our standards forbid in every possible way. They would do what our church has never done in the whole course of her history. Desolated by war, impoverished, the Master's cause suffering for lack of funds, she has always and only said, though with yearning spirit and burdened heart she has said it: Give; give as an act of worship and as an exercise and means of grace; give regularly, systematically, and liberally; give as each one purposeth in his heart, according as God hath given ability; give from love to man and love to God in Christ; but never once has she said, as injunction or advice, pay your tithes as dues under the old Levitical law. And may the great Head of the church, by his grace and Spirit, defend her from ever doing it.

D. OWEN DAVIES.

## VI. MISSIONARY SOCIETIES IN THE CHURCH.<sup>1</sup>

THE Presbyterian Church in the Southern States, by her geographical position as well as by her traditions, is conservative. Lying off the great lines of travel and commerce which connect Europe and Asia with the United States, she is not the first to invent or to adopt such new methods of church work as the growing activities of the age may suggest. In this she has both an advantage and a disadvantage. When new measures for advancing the kingdom of Christ are introduced into the churches of Christendom, she has the opportunity to watch their tendencies and study their effects before she either rejects them or adopts them as her own. On the other hand, if the measure be well-devised and fruitful of good, she finds herself among the last to receive the benefits which it confers.

It is owing to these conservative elements of her life that our church now finds herself face to face with a question which, in almost any other evangelical denomination, would never in this day be raised for discussion. An overture, signed by four ministers and three ruling elders of Concord Presbytery, which suggests a thorough eradication of all missionary societies from the body of the church, has been sent down by the General Assembly to all the Presbyteries, "with the direction that they patiently consider the whole subject of societies within and without the church, . . . and return carefully formulated papers" upon this point "to the next Assembly." It is now almost a century since a foreign mis-

---

<sup>1</sup> "Voluntary and Missionary Societies," THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, January, 1890. "Overture from Members of Concord Presbytery," *Minutes of the General Assembly*, 1889. "Societies, Unions and *The Missionary*," *Central Presbyterian*, November 20 and December 25, 1889, January 8, 1890.

The writer, before the last-named articles appeared in *The Central Presbyterian*, had accepted the invitation of THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY to prepare an article on "Voluntary and Missionary Societies" for this number of the QUARTERLY. The character of the article in *The Central Presbyterian* made it necessary for him to reply to it, and its similarity to the one in the January QUARTERLY will account for the similarity of his reply in the *Central* to the one here made.

sionary society, composed of devout men from various evangelical bodies, was organized in Great Britain. It is fully a half century since a woman's foreign missionary society, stretching out over all parts of the Established Church, was formed in England. In the years that have followed, missionary societies, and especially woman's foreign missionary societies, have been organized in almost all, if not all, the evangelical churches of the world. These societies by their zeal and good works have commended themselves to the conscience of well nigh the whole of Christendom. The General Assembly of our own church has year after year declared its approval of the societies formed within its bounds, and has urged the formation of such societies in every congregation. Year by year these societies have increased in number and in the value of the support they give to the missionary work of the church. It may seem, therefore, a little strange that at this day the General Assembly, "without expressing any opinion on the subject involved," should submit to the Presbyteries an overture which presents the question whether societies should be allowed among us at all.

The explanation of this matter may be found, we think, in two facts: First, the overture brings forward and urges the principle that the church, by her divine constitution, is "a missionary society, every member of which is bound by covenant obligation to seek the salvation of souls by personal efforts and oblations in his own appropriate sphere." This is a great truth, acknowledged by all Presbyterians; and it may be that the Assembly thought that the consideration of this principle by all the Presbyteries at this time would have a wholesome effect. But, the second, and as we take it, the more controlling consideration in this case was that in two or three of the Presbyteries a union had been formed of the ladies' missionary societies within the presbyterial bounds; and in *The Missionary*, the magazine edited by the Secretaries of Foreign Missions, the opinion had been expressed that such an enlarged organization would be of advantage to the church. The Assembly, it would seem, regarded this as an open question yet to be determined by our church; and so, without any expression of opinion on it, sent it down to the Presbyteries for their con-

sideration. The whole matter of "societies within and without the church" is therefore before the Presbyteries now for their judgment. Meanwhile, in the overture itself and in various published articles, we find arguments adduced to show that no societies of any kind should have a place in the church.

The overture, as has been stated, urges the truth that the church is "a missionary society." Had it stopped here, no one would dissent. But it goes further. It takes the ground (and we interpret it in the light of the commentaries on it written by its authors), that only in her organized unity must the church do the work of making known Christ to the world; that this alone is the scriptural model; that for individual Christians to associate themselves together in missionary societies is a departure from the model given in the Bible; that these missionary societies are merely "organizations of human devising," having no right to a place in the work of evangelizing the world, and, therefore, the true blessing of God cannot rest on them. Every missionary society, "within and without the church," has been a mistake, an evil.

To this there is a reply which must readily suggest itself to every student of the modern missionary enterprise. Had such a principle been allowed to govern in the last century, a large part of the noblest work that has been done for Christ on earth, would have been left undone. Who planted the martyr church of Madagascar? A society, a missionary society, made up of faithful Christians from the Independent, the Presbyterian, and the Established Churches of Great Britain—the London Missionary Society, organized in 1795. As the first century of its work draws to a close, do we see the blessing of God resting upon it? By its fruits let it be known. It sent Robert Moffatt and David Livingstone to Africa. It sent the first Protestant missionary, Dr. Morrison, to China. Its medical mission in Tientsin is under the patronage of the foremost statesman of China, Li Hung Chang. Its missionaries are far back in the interior of the empire, while some of them have crossed over the Great Wall, and are making known Christ to the Mongols. Its men have gone from island to island in the South Seas, and have changed the dark savagery of cannibal tribes into the light and peace of the gospel of Christ.

All this has been done by a missionary society under no ecclesiastical control.

When Stanley, a few months since, after his long and perilous journey through the dark continent, came in sight of the outposts of Christianity, when he espied a church at Usambiro, and knew, he says, that at last he had reached "blessed civilization," by whom had the church been planted? By a society—another missionary society—one that, amid the ritualism and the rationalism of the Church of England, took for its pure motto, "Spiritual men for spiritual work"; a society formed in 1800, and that spends now every year in the foreign work, \$1,200,000; the Church Missionary Society, whose missionaries are almost literally under every wind under heaven, and the blood of whose martyrs is still fresh on the shores of the Victoria Nyanza. Or, we turn to a society nearer to ourselves, The American Board, first organized in 1810, and which sixteen years later embraced the representatives of the Congregational, the Presbyterian, the Dutch Reformed, and the Associate Reformed Churches; a society which sent to Africa the beloved and honored Dr. J. Leighton Wilson, and whose annual meetings at home, as well as its work abroad, have been an inspiration to all the churches of America. So we might notice the work of the China Inland Mission, a society that presents itself as being not merely undenominational, but pan-denominational; that within the last twenty years has sent the gospel to nine out of the eleven provinces of China which were without a missionary, and that recently, in one year, added a hundred new missionaries to its force. And so we might name society after society, but time would fail. The truth is, that the greater part of the work that has carried the gospel to the benighted nations of the earth in this century has been accomplished by missionary societies. But if the principle asserted in the overture now before the Presbyteries were correct, not one of these societies could have had an existence. And yet the principle applies with much more force against the societies that have been named than against the societies that have been organized in our own church, whether congregational or presbyterial, all of which really nestle under the wing of a direct ecclesiastical control.

And why is it, we may ask, that so much of the great work for the heathen world has been done by missionary societies? The answer is plain. In all the churches of Christendom, which are organized units, there has been a large proportion of the membership utterly indifferent and faithless as regards the foreign mission work. The result has been that the faithful and zealous, under the guidance of God's Spirit, as we believe, not through mere "human devising," have come together and formed societies for the work. The days of the century now soon to close have not been as the days of Joshua, when all the tribes moved forward as one man to the conquest of the land. They have been as the days of Barak, of Gideon, of David in the early rising of his power. Reuben has abode among the sheepfolds; Dan has remained in ships; Asher has continued on the seashore; Meroz has come not up to the help of the Lord; but a part of the host has been in the field; the battle has been fought by bands. Whether we look at the whole of Christendom, or whether we look at individual congregations, such has been the history of the times. At the last meeting of the Synod of Virginia, Dr. Hoge declared that in some of the churches the fire on the altar of missionary zeal had been kindled and kept alive by a few devoted women organized as a missionary society. "They ceased in Israel until that I Deborah arose." In the broad work of Christendom men have been the leaders; but whether by men or by women, it is through their organization into missionary societies that many of the greatest victories of this century have been won.

And now let the tendency of these societies be clearly noted. It has ever been to infuse life and zeal into the whole church of God. In the day of Israel's wide-spread apathy and unbelief, it was the faithful deeds of the small bands that gave courage and faith to the whole host. The victory of Gideon and his three hundred brought Naphtali and Ephraim into the field. The success of David and his six hundred was an inspiration to every Israelite; and so the zeal for conquest was contagious, until at last all the tribes, as one man, swept forward, and the land was won from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth. Just so with the missionary societies. "Within and without the

church" they have studied the plan for the conquest of the world, they have prayed for it, they have worked for it, and their zeal and success have been gradually awakening the whole church. Take as an example the Presbyterian bodies in the United States. In 1817 they first undertook a distinctive foreign mission work. They began with a society—"The United Foreign Missionary Society"—a society made up of representatives from the Presbyterian, the Dutch Reformed and the Associate Reformed Churches. In 1826 this society made over all its missions and property to the American Board. As a union society, the American Board received money and men from all denominations, and for some years it was almost the National Foreign Mission Society of America. Its work in India, in the Sandwich Islands and in Western Asia, increased the missionary interest in the Presbyterian churches. As a result, the Synod of Pittsburgh formed itself into another society, called "The Western Foreign Missionary Society," whose object was to rally Presbyterians to a distinctive church work in the foreign field. This society, like the American Board, had marked success, and its missions were planted in India, Africa, Smyrna and China. The result strengthened the hands of those in the church who desired a denominational agency, and in 1837 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church organized its Board of Foreign Missions, to which the Western Society transferred its whole work. The New School branch of the church continued to send its contributions of men and money to the American Board until 1854, when it appointed its own Committee of Missions; and in 1869, on the reünion of the Old and New School branches, the reünited church received from the American Board a number of mission stations that previously it had maintained. The American Board itself is now chiefly supported by the Congregationalists, though there are Presbyterians still in its corporate membership, and its work is far in advance of what it was at the time the Presbyterians took up an independent work. Meanwhile, in all these denominational bodies, missionary societies have been organized in many of the congregations, and the effect on the congregations has been precisely that which the inter-denominational missionary societies produced on the denomi-



nations. There has been through them an increase of missionary knowledge and zeal.

Our own branch of the church, we have seen, has for years given her warm approval to the missionary societies organized within her bounds. In this she has done wisely. These societies, rightly conducted, are schools for the study of the wonderful work of God in making known the gospel of his dear Son in the world; they are channels through which a continuous flow of beneficence may go out by the church to the nations; they are centres of influence to which the careless and indifferent of the church may be attracted, and in which their sympathies are awakened for those who have not so much as heard the Redeemer's name. Every pastor who has fostered these societies has known the value of their aid. In a few of our churches missionary societies have been organized among the ladies, among the men, among the children. If the questions be asked, Why separate the people into societies?—why not have them all together? the answer is plain. There is a method of studying this work which is adapted to children, and should be provided for them. There are matters connected with woman's missionary work in heathen lands which appeal especially to the sympathetic aid of woman in the home church. It is well for our ladies to have some direct communication with their sisters who have gone to the mission fields. And so there are many practical matters of great importance which demand the broad, comprehensive grasp of men of business. These should be studied by the men of the church. It is a significant fact, that in almost every large denomination of Christians in this day we see three missionary magazines published—one for children, one for women, one for men. Do these things mean that there is any lack of unity in the church? Not at all. The beloved disciple certainly did not regard it as any breach of unity when he addressed the church by classes, "I write unto you, fathers, . . . I write unto you, young men, . . . I write unto you, little children." Let the training be in men's societies, in ladies' societies, in children's societies. Then, when the pastor meets the whole congregation in the interest of the foreign mission work, whether at the times of the annual collections, whether

at the monthly concert of prayer, he will find among them a sympathetic intelligence, a noble purpose of endeavor, a true unity of spirit, such as will make glad his heart.

The overture from the members of Concord Presbytery, while it grants that the General Assembly has commended the formation of missionary societies, regards this action of the Assembly as inconsistent with a principle which was declared by the Assembly of 1866. The overture says, "In the year 1866, our General Assembly affirmed as follows: 'The doctrine that the church, in its organized capacity, with its officers and courts, is the sole agency which Christ hath ordained for its own edification and government, and for the propagation of the faith and the evangelization of the world,' as set forth in that formulary (*i. e.*, Form of Government), clearly teaches that the church is God's Bible and missionary society." If the church, in its organized capacity, with its officers and courts, is the sole agency for the evangelization of the world, then the missionary societies, according to the overture, are unauthorized intruders, and the General Assembly, when it commended the societies, violated the principle embodied in its own Form of Government.

The error which lies in this argument of the overture has been pointed out by the Rev. Dr. G. D. Armstrong, in the *Central Presbyterian*. As there will be some, doubtless, among the readers of these lines, who have not had the opportunity of reading Dr. Armstrong's article, we will state briefly the facts which he has brought out. In the overture, the declaration, "the doctrine that the church, *in its organized capacity*, with its officers and courts, is the *sole agency* which Christ has ordained," etc., appears as a quotation from the Form of Government. The Form of Government of our church never contained such a statement. The statement did appear in the revised Form of Government as it was proposed, and was before the church for review in 1866. But the church saw that the statement was not supported by the Scriptures, and changed it before the revised form was adopted. In our present Form of Government it reads, "The church, with its ordinances, officers, and courts, is the agency which Christ has ordained," etc. The words, "*in its organized capacity*," and "*sole*

*agency*," were stricken out. Had they been allowed to remain, we have no idea that the church would ever have construed them as directed against the missionary societies within the church. But their removal shows the broad and scriptural view which our church has taken of the work of Christ in the world, and it leaves the argument of the overture, as far as this point is concerned, without any scantling of support.

As the church had given her cordial sanction to the missionary societies, it was to extend and foster them that the Presbyterian Unions were formed. In some quarters an erroneous impression has existed as to the circumstances which led to the organization of these unions, and it may be well, therefore, to give briefly their history. In December, 1887, two ladies of the church, who have been conspicuous for their intelligent and efficient service in the foreign mission cause, wrote to the author of this article, the Secretary of Foreign Missions, calling attention to the vast amount of unused power among their sisters in the church. The number of ladies' missionary societies in the church was only about four hundred. There were, therefore, about eighteen hundred churches in which no society existed. It was evident that a large majority of the women of the church were doing little or nothing to send the gospel to their sisters in heathen lands. To evoke the power which thus lay dormant, and to enlist all the women of the church in the work of Christ for the world, the letter to the secretary proposed enlarged organization—presbyterial, synodical and general—for the ladies' missionary societies. This letter the secretary submitted to the Executive Committee, stating at the same time his own views of the matter. The Executive Committee, after carefully considering the case, instructed the secretary to draw up a paper embodying his views. This he did in the form of a letter addressed to the two ladies. In it he said:

"It is understood in this whole matter that the Executive Committee in Baltimore has no power to authorize the ladies to effect any organization. This they must do of themselves, and as all the work of our church is under the care and control of the proper church court, so it must be here. The Ladies' Foreign Missionary Society of a church falls under the jurisdiction of the Session; so the Woman's Foreign Missionary Presbyterian Committee would be under the jurisdiction of the Presbytery; and so on upwards." He also said: "As to the objects

of the women's committees, presbyterial, etc., they are: 1, To plant a Woman's Foreign Missionary Society in every church where there is not one now; 2, To increase the interest and promote the growth of the Women's Foreign Missionary Societies already organized; 3, To aid the Executive Committee in Baltimore in selecting and sending to the field suitable lady missionaries; 4, To support and cheer our lady missionaries in the field.

"In promoting these objects the Woman's Foreign Missionary Committees would engage, 1st, To forward the contributions of the Women's Foreign Missionary Societies to the Executive Committee in Baltimore, to be disbursed under the Executive Committee's direction. When the societies work for 'special objects,' the objects shall be those approved by the Executive Committee. 2d, The Woman's Committees shall not have power to designate or appoint missionaries. This belongs only to the General Assembly's Executive Committee. But they may at any time, after diligent and careful inquiry into the qualifications of a woman for the foreign mission work, make any suggestion or recommendation in her case to the Executive Committee which they may judge proper."

This letter the secretary submitted to the Executive Committee, and afterwards, in communicating the result to the ladies, he said, "I laid before the Committee the letter I had written you, and, though no formal action was taken, the members of the Committee present expressed their approval of it." The two ladies accepted the conditions of the letter. One of them, it is true, thought at first that the secretary had drawn the limitations of the enlarged organizations with too strict a hand, and he himself was inclined to think that a little more liberality on one or two points might have been safely allowed; but, after some correspondence, the final result was a full acceptance of the conditions stated. The whole correspondence was read before the Executive Committee. On the minutes of the Committee, December 13, December 20, 1887, and January 10, 1888, note was made of this correspondence "in regard to the formation of presbyterial, synodical and general committees of the ladies' foreign missionary societies of the church," and the record, after having been "carefully examined," was approved by the next General Assembly.

On the conditions that have been named, the Presbyterial Union of the Ladies' Missionary Societies of East Hanover Presbytery was organized. The ladies first submitted the constitution of the Union to the Presbytery. The Presbytery approved it, and the Union was formed. In much the same manner the Unions of Mecklenburg, Wilmington and Fayetteville Presby-

teries were formed. During the short time these organizations have been in existence we have heard but one testimony in regard to them; they have done good. We were told in Mecklenburg Presbytery that the meeting of the Union had encouraged the smaller missionary societies, and had led to the organization of societies in some churches in which there had been none. In East Hanover Presbytery the Union, according to the statement of "An Elect Lady" in *The Central Presbyterian*, "has been guided and approved by some of the wisest and best of that body." "We have done a little," she adds, "without organization; we hope to accomplish far more by that coöperation which can only thus be secured. Already the ladies of our country churches say that they are more interested, and their contributions are larger than before the formation of the Union."

Of the Union in Wilmington Presbytery, "P. H. H.," the pastor of the largest church in the Presbytery, writes in *The Central Presbyterian*:

"The Union was endorsed by Synod in 1888, and again in 1889, and by Presbytery in the report of the Agent of Foreign Missions last spring. . . . Having thus watched it from its beginnings, and seen the manifest tokens of God's blessing upon it, I feel that it would be an irreparable injury for the church to decide against this movement. There can be no objection against the *principle* of the thing, for it is simply bringing together the members of our churches, that intelligence may be diffused, enthusiasm aroused, and that the strong may help and encourage the weak. It puts woman in no unbecoming position (for all their transactions are without the presence of a man); they assume no ecclesiastical powers, and the whole control is in the hands of Presbytery. If the dangers exist that are alleged, it is all the more reason that the church should take hold of the movement, and organize and direct it. For the movement is the expression of an imperative need, and is the working of a power that cannot be cried down or throttled. The church tried that with Carey, and the result was irresponsible societies. Then she had to confess her sin and shame, and retrace her steps. Let her not make another mistake, but let her study this movement, nurse it tenderly and guide it wisely. 'Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it.'"

We have noticed the theoretical objection made to the presbyterial unions as to all societies in the church; we come now to consider the practical objections which have been urged against them. Some objections of this class have been so extreme in their character that they are not likely to exert much influence in the church, and it is not considered necessary to deal with them here.

The two principal ones have been referred to in the quotation just made from "P. H. H.," and they have been tersely stated by one of the opponents of the unions in a single phrase, "Woman control and woman preaching." It is alleged that the tendency of the presbyterial unions is to bring woman forward into a position inconsistent with "the modest sphere to which God has assigned her;" to put her on the platform or in the pulpit as a teacher in the church; and to give her a power which will not submit to the ecclesiastical authority under which she has been placed by the Divine hand. These are grave considerations certainly, and it is well for us to examine carefully the basis on which they rest.

Two writers in our church have in recent days undertaken to define the true sphere of woman. One of them was objecting to single women being sent as missionaries to the foreign field; the other was objecting to all women being allowed to take part in the presbyterial unions. They both fixed on the same text as supporting their views. It is the words found in 1 Timothy v. 14, "I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully." The first writer construed this as teaching that an unmarried woman, not advanced in years, should not go as a missionary; she had better marry. The other writer construed it as teaching that the "appointed sphere" of woman was only in the duties of domestic life and maternity. His emphatic words were, "*Here* let her abide." It may be that there are others in the church who, in a vague way, have supposed that the text does discourage women from attending a presbyterial union or going abroad to do missionary work. It may be well, therefore, to examine it for a moment.

If any one will turn to the passage in First Timothy, beginning with the third verse of the fifth chapter, he will see that the subject which the apostle is discussing is the provision to be made for the support of widows. The inspired writer points out first, that if a widow have children or nephews, it is their duty to support her. But there may be widows without children or nephews. If such a widow be sixty years of age, and be well reported for good works, let her be taken into the permanent support of the church.

But the younger widows are not so to be taken. The judgment of the apostle is that the younger widows had best marry, bear children, and guide the house. Though, he adds, every man or woman in the church who has a widowed relative should contribute to her relief, that the church be not charged. Such is the instruction of this passage. The text which has been quoted is correctly given in the Revised Version; "I desire, therefore, that the younger widows marry," etc. These words, like all other counsel given in the Bible, have their special value, yet it would not be safe to infer the whole duty of woman from a text which relates to the maintenance of young widows.

The domestic life of the married woman is a crown of honor to her, as she walks in the ways of God; but in the church, among women as well as among men, there are "diversities of gifts." Her "appointed sphere" is not circumscribed. On the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit was poured out on the disciples, fitting them for the great work of evangelizing the world, the gift of power came to women as well as to men; and Peter, as he explained the marvellous phenomenon to the assembled thousands, declared that this was the fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel: "And on my handmaidens will I pour out in those days of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy;" that is, speak for God under the limitations of his word. The apostle who wrote the words of counsel that the younger widows marry, taught also that it was by no means best that all women should be bound by domestic cares (1 Cor. vii.). He praised the "unmarried woman" who "careth for the things of the Lord." "He that giveth her in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better." In his missionary labors he had associated with him Euodias and Syntyche, Priscilla and the beloved Persis. By women married and unmarried was the work helped. And so to this day, wherever the Holy Spirit has been given richly to the church, woman has been found taking an active and important part in the missionary work for the world.

Shall not our own branch of the church, then, give thanks, not only for what her pious women have done in the missionary societies and in the mission field, but for what they propose still

further to do? Shall we fear to see the missionary societies send their representatives—women who are free to leave home for a time—to attend a presbyterial union, where plans for work and missionary tidings and prayer and praise fill up a few inspiring days? An English clergyman, who has had a wide experience in the “county unions” of the Church Missionary Society, justly remarks: “Every one knows how delightful it is to meet with others who are in hearty sympathy with one’s self on the questions which lie nearest the heart. One need not weigh one’s words; one is sure not to be misunderstood. It is pleasant to find others doing, and doing better than one’s self, the same sort of work. It is such a help to hear their hearty words, to see their zeal beaming in their faces. The very differences of temperament, of ideas, of methods, which are sure to be found where a number of persons meet together, add charms to the society where there is full accord on essential points. It is at once restful and stimulating to meet with those who are working for the same ends with hearty sympathy as to the main lines on which work is to be done. Those who live much alone, as do many of the friends of the Church Missionary Society, find such opportunities for meeting very helpful.”

But, it may be asked, when the women of the church come together in a presbyterial union, may they not be led to do something inconsistent with that meek and quiet spirit which is woman’s true grace? May they not be tempted in some way to speak in public, or even to preach? Has not “woman-preaching” been an outgrowth of woman’s missionary organizations, and shall our church do anything to encourage this?

In reply to these questions, we would say at the outset, that we regard it as of the first importance in this day that every one should understand clearly what things it is lawful for a woman to do in the work of the church, and what things it is not lawful for her to do. To us the teaching of the Scripture on this subject is not uncertain. The sphere to which God has assigned woman in the church, is one of subordination. “The head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man.” It is her honor to observe this subordination. As it is the dignity of a true citizen to be subordinate to the civil magistrate, as it is the pleasure



of a dutiful son to be subordinate to his father, as it is the grace of a church member to be in subordination to those who are over him in the Lord, so it is the honor of a woman to be in subjection to the man. For the man was she created, and she is the weaker vessel. In every Christian land the chivalrous consideration, the tender regard which man delights to show to woman, is linked with the appreciation of her comparative weakness, and of the beauty of that meekness which leads her to accept the place of subjection.

Because she is in subordination to man, there are some things which it is not lawful for her to do. In the assemblies of the church, where men and women are present, she is not to undertake to teach. For her to make an exhortation in a prayer-meeting, is to usurp authority over the man. Nor must she lead in prayer. The man is her head, and for her to lead him in prayer is to dishonor her head. In any church in which woman teaches or prays in public, the manhood of the man is lowered, and the refined grace of the woman is tarnished. And, as is well known, these evils are widespread now.

Do the presbyterial unions tend to create these evils? To us there seems something almost absurd in the question. The presbyterial unions, like the congregational missionary societies, are composed of ladies who meet without a man being present. If the man is not there, how can she usurp authority over him? If her head is absent, how can she dishonor her head? It was not through the woman's missionary societies that "woman-preaching" entered the church. It was through the social prayer-meeting that this evil came. The church that guards its prayer meetings at this point need have no fear. If at any foreign missionary meeting women have overstepped the boundaries of that "modest sphere to which God has assigned them," it will be found, we think, that they had first learned to do this in other assemblies of the church.

The writer mentioned not long since, in another periodical, his observations of a woman's synodical foreign missionary meeting in Baltimore. These ladies of the Presbyterian Church, North, met in the lecture room of one of the largest churches in the city.

They spent two days in listening to the reading of papers and addresses by ladies from the mission field, in discussions on methods of work, in prayer, and praise. Some of the ladies of our own church who attended the meetings, said that it was good to be there. No gentleman was present. A minister in the city, not knowing the character of the meeting, went to the church, but was stopped at the door and informed that it was a meeting for ladies only. On the evening of the second day, a public meeting was held in the main audience-room of the church. No lady appeared on the platform. The speaking was all done by men, one of the Secretaries of Foreign Missions, with a returned missionary and others, taking part. It was an excellent meeting. In all this was there anything to condemn? Was there not much to approve? Would any one object to our ladies doing the same?

We come now to the last class of objections made against the unions. They may all be summed up in one sentence. It is feared that the unions will engross too much power. The apprehension is expressed that they will practically control the Executive Committee and the church, especially in the important matters of appointing missionaries and disbursing funds. To this whole class of objections only a brief reply is needed. If any one has to deal with the ladies of our church in missionary matters as the writer has had to deal with them, he will find that they possess in an eminent degree two qualities of that wisdom which is from above. They are gentle and easy to be entreated. When mistakes have been made by them in missionary affairs, the error has generally been caused by the isolation of the worker. Some good lady has thought that some special object in the mission work should be at once set on its feet, and, without consulting the Executive Committee, has committed herself and others to the enterprise. The Presbyterian Union would tend to prevent this evil. The societies entering the union are pledged to consult with the Executive Committee before a special object is taken up by them, and the union would bring the influence of the Executive Committee to bear on all the ladies of the church, as it does not bear now.

In the selection of lady missionaries by the Executive Committee, the influence of the unions would in general be for good. They

would aid in promoting a wise choice. The Executive Committee regards the whole church as an advisory body in such cases. They seek the judgment of pastors, elders, ladies; of every one in fact who is competent to give an opinion, as far as may be necessary. There have been cases in which a single church has nominated a lady missionary to the Committee, and has offered to support her in the field. In these cases the Executive Committee has satisfied itself that the nomination was a good one, and has made the appointment. But it is easy to see that there is more danger of a mistake arising from a local partiality in a single church than from the general *consensus* of ladies who belong to a number of churches. And then, finally, the ladies who undertook to form these unions, and the church alike, are agreed that the responsibility of appointing missionaries, as well as of disbursing money, is vested with the Executive Committee, and it is to be hoped that in any case the fear of man, including woman, which bringeth a snare, will not prevent the Committee from doing what is right.

The resources of our church for the foreign mission work have as yet only begun to be developed. Not only are there one thousand eight hundred churches without a missionary society; there are eight hundred and fifty churches that last year contributed not a cent to this cause. In not a few quarters the ignorance that prevails in regard to this glorious work of the Redeemer is simply dense. In some of these churches, perhaps many, there are godly women who are longing and praying for a better state of things, and they need the sympathy, the counsel, the aid which a Presbyterian Union could afford. Or, if there be churches in which no interest whatever exists, the Presbyterian Union might do much to awake women to their responsibilities. In many ways these unions, wisely administered, may promote the Master's work in the world; and, after weighing as carefully as we are able all the objections that have been urged against them, we feel bound to state it as our own judgment that, if the church should forbid presbyterial unions, she would reject a very important and valuable element of power.

M. H. HOUSTON.

## VII. NOTES.

---

### SACRED SONG AS A PART OF SABBATH WORSHIP.

It is proposed, for brevity and definiteness, to discuss sacred song within the boundaries of the above title. As thus limited, sacred song may be defined to be the audible praise of God in his house by an assembly of worshippers, in poetic phraseology, with the accompaniment of melody and harmony, either vocal only, or vocal and instrumental combined.

By melody is meant that pleasing sequence and recurrence of a certain order of musical sounds which is commonly termed tune, and which may be carried by a single voice or instrument. By harmony is intended that agreeable concert of different but affiliated sounds, produced by a number of voices, sustaining the various parts of music, either by themselves or with the accompaniment of musical instruments. By melody and harmony, again, may be understood that liquid undulation of sounds which we style singing, and that recitative movement which, resembling, is yet unlike speech, and which we call chanting.

Although useful and appropriate, poetic language demands neither feet nor rhyme. "Paradise Lost" is a poem, Shakspeare a poet; yet in the one there is no rhyme, and in the other its use is a signal for failure. David's psalms are not cast in any poetic measure, yet they are the finest examples of the best poetry. And neither measure nor rhyme are essential to melody or harmony, as seen in anthems, which use his exalted utterances without the alteration of a word.

Sacred song is, then, the utterance of the musical sounds thus described, as the vehicle of praise to God. "Sing unto the Lord all the earth; shew forth from day to day his salvation." But while it is the expression of adoration mainly, if David's psalms are to be accepted as our guide and Paul's directions have reference to public worship, then it is proper to express by it almost any religious emotion, or to dwell upon any truth, which directly or indirectly excites in the worshipper the frame of mind whose final and highest utterance is praise. That canon of Scripture criticism, which has perhaps banished from our

hymn-book a few cherished hymns, as for example, "Sinners, this solemn truth regard," may have no warrant in either Old or New Testament Scripture. While, therefore, sinners may be admonished and saints exhorted, prayers offered and confessions made, in sacred song, its principal aim is the adoring mention of the divine glory. "Give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name; bring an offering and come into his courts."

Worshipping God in sacred song has a foundation in nature. Whatever is universal, or nearly such, must be natural, for it implies some ground in our common constitution. That the disposition to worship thus is almost, if not quite universal, will appear from the following incontestable facts: Music in both its forms, vocal and instrumental, is of ancient date. Authentic history does not attempt to fix the time of its birth. It was known as an art long before it was reduced to a science. Pythagoras has the credit of first expounding its principles, but it existed long before him. Among the ancient Greeks poetry and music were always conjoined. The poets sang, or recited in a kind of chant, their odes. Bruce pictures from the mural paintings on Egyptian tombs, harps with from thirteen to twenty-one strings, as large and as elaborate as, and of much the shape of our modern instrument. In the oldest book in existence, and in its most ancient part, Job, there is early mention of singing and musical instruments, as accompaniments of feasts. "They take the timbrel and harp, and rejoice at the sound of the organ." Indeed, the origin of music is so lost in the obscurity of the past, that the ancient Greeks, and the Egyptians, who have nearly the same tradition, ascribed its discovery, as they did all that was inexplicable, to the gods; holding that Mercury invented the harp, from a happy hint suggested by the musical sounds given forth to a blow upon the sinews of a tortoise stretched across its empty shell. Holy Scripture, which knows nothing of a mythical age, ascribes the invention of musical instruments—and instrumental music was probably posterior to vocal—to a grandson of Adam, Tubal Cain. It may be that music is as old as creation, and is in more than one sense "a divine art."

Not only is music ancient, but the power to make and enjoy musical sounds is almost universal as to nations and individuals. Alike among savage and civilized peoples we find it in existence, in various degrees of cultivation. Even among the tribes of Africa Du Chaillu found songs, and a rude harp strung with vegetable chords. As for individuals, the talent for music is almost as general. An amusing instance is recalled of its

utter absence in a minister, who never seemed baffled in his purpose of singing God's praise, no matter how new the tune; when, lo! the mystery was explained in the confession that he thought all the hymns were sung to one tune, as certainly he had hummed no more. A whole family was once known to the writer, the boys of which could not whistle "Yankee Doodle," as the girls could not sing "Hail Columbia." But these are exceptions, notable by their very rarity. Almost every one has the power of making some simple music; children sing their lessons, and sometimes their requests to their parents. Music pleases young and old. Witness the groups of children gathered around the hand-organ, the boys following the band through dust and mud. The influence of a patriotic song in producing uncontrollable home-sickness in the Switzer Guards is a well-known historical fact, as is the power of "Dixie," or "Star Spangled Banner," or "Marsellaise" to stir the soldier to deeds of valor. Luther's hymns shook Europe, and religious hymnology has produced greater effects than were ever ascribed to Orpheus of old.

But it is more to our purpose to remark that music, vocal and instrumental, has been generally used in the worship of all nations. Classic Paganism had its odes to the dwellers upon Olympus, the immortal gods. Nebuchadnezzar collected instruments and employed a grand choir of singers, and of musical instruments of every known kind, in dedicating his golden image. Nor is this to be wondered at when we remember that music has been ever and universally recognized as the appropriate language of human emotions, running through the entire gamut of feeling, from the tender strains of human love to the swelling notes which lift the soul into the immediate presence of the living God.

Now, it would be passing strange if the religion of the Bible, which sanctifies, ennobles, and glorifies every other part of our common nature, should have overlooked this. That it has not, will be seen in the inquiry which we now proceed to institute into the Scripture warrant for vocal and instrumental music as a part of the stated worship of God in his house. It will be necessary to divide the question, and first consider sacred song unaccompanied by instrument and its biblical authority.

The first mention of song as used in divine worship occurs in the Lord's challenge of Job: "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare, if thou hast understanding, when the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy." It would seem that those morning stars, the angels, the elder sons of

creation and of light, sang a dedicatory hymn when the foundation of our world was laid by the great Architect.

While there is no mention of song in either the patriarchal or tabernacle worship, the silence is not conclusive. As examples of sacred song in divine worship before the temple, we instance the songs of Moses and of Miriam and the women at the Red Sea. In the Davidic period the allusions to it abound; in fact, David made elaborate arrangements for a temple choir of Levites, whom he divided into twenty-four courses, who attended at the tabernacle night and day, and who, while thus engaged, were, like Hezekiah's, supported at the public charge—the first example probably of a paid choir. The most celebrated of these were Heman, Asaph, Ethan, and Jeduthun. In this tabernacle choir females as well as males were employed. The first mentioned are “the three daughters of Heman, who, together with his fourteen sons, were under the hand of their father for song in the house of the Lord,”—a family affair, and it is hoped harmonious, and a scriptural example, and perhaps the earliest, of a choir of male and female voices, and all under the control of a choir-master, the father of all the singers! We even read of a musical director, and to whom more than one of David's Psalms were dedicated in the formula, “to the chief musician; a Psalm of David.” The term “selah” is supposed, not without reason, to be a musical notation, directing the singers to raise their voices. Some of the Psalms in their structure seem to bear witness to their use in divine worship, as chanted by alternate sections of the choir. “For his mercy endureth for ever” sounds much like a chorus, while the artificial arrangement of the acrostical Psalms was probably intended to aid the memory of the singers in committing them for use in the tabernacle worship.

This part of divine worship was in the temple, and upon the basis of David's arrangement brought by his son Solomon to great perfection. That must have been a grand hymn of praise chanted at the dedication of the temple, “when all the Levites who were singers, all of them, of Asaph, of Heman and Jeduthun, with their sons and brethren, being arrayed in white linen,” in concert praised the Lord in the chorus which has come down to us, “For he is good, for his mercy endureth for ever.” During the captivity the use of song in divine worship is touchingly alluded to: “How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?” “Singing men and singing women” were among the exiles whom Nehemiah brought back to their native land. As for the Psalms, composed by various authors, but mostly

by David, they are not only full of allusions to sacred song, but call, not only upon Israel, but upon all nations, to praise God. "Let the people praise thee, O God, let all the people praise thee;" "O praise the Lord, all ye nations; praise him, all ye people." Our Lord, who was with his church in the wilderness, when he came in the flesh, took part in the temple worship, and closed his own sacramental feast by "singing a hymn," by chanting one of David's Psalms. And while we have no historical account of song as a part of the Sabbath worship of the New Testament, but read only of preaching and breaking of bread, the silence is no proof of its absence, for there are New Testament precepts which establish the duty, as they perhaps prove the practice. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs."

And lastly, sacred song enters largely into the perpetual service of the white robed ministrants before the throne. They "sing a new song," "the song of Moses and the Lamb." That which is a part of the worship of heaven needs no other warrant for its introduction into the worship of earth.

It is not without significancy that history, as, for example, Pliny's Letter, describes the early Christians as distinguished by the practice of singing hymns in honor of Christ, and Jerome gives us the interesting information that they sang everywhere, and certainly, therefore, in their assemblies. "You could not go into the fields but you might hear the plowman at his hallelujahs, the sower at his hymns, and the vine dresser singing David's Psalms."

And this brings us to our second point, the warrant for instrumental accompaniment to the voice in God's praise. There is no question as to its lavish use, not only on irregular occasions, in individual and national life, but in the divinely appointed services of David's tabernacle and Solomon's temple. When the ark was brought up from the house of Abinadab, the voices of the Levites were accompanied by the sound of instruments. "They played before the Lord on all manner of instruments, made of fir wood, even on harps and psalteries, and on timbrels and on cornets." In the lay of the exile we are told of the unused harp, hung upon the willow trees by the river, which the captive had not the heart to employ, could he have forced himself to strike its chords, in connection with the Lord's song in a strange land. In the temple worship there was a large use of instrumental music, beginning with its dedication, of which we have this graphic description: "Also



the Levites, which were the singers, all of them of Asaph, of Heman, of Jeduthun, with their sons and their brethren, being arrayed in white linen and having cymbals and psalteries and harps, stood at the east end of the altar; and with them an hundred and twenty priests, sounding with their trumpets; it came even to pass as the trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound, to be heard in praising and thanking the Lord with the trumpets and cymbals and instruments of music, and praised the Lord, saying, For he is good, for his mercy endureth for ever, that the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of the Lord."

We are told that even the wood of which the temple harps were made was imported at great cost from distant Ophir in ships of Tarshish—"algum trees." It is said that it was Asaph's place "to strike the cymbal." As many such instruments were used by the other singers, may not the meaning of this be, that he, as leader of the temple choir, with the "high sounding cymbal" "marked time?" We are, therefore, not surprised to hear the worshippers of the old economy called upon to praise God in language which recognizes at once the rightfulness and usefulness of instrumental accompaniment. "Sing unto the Lord with the harp, with the harp and with the voice of a psalm, with trumpets and with sound of cornets; make a joyful noise before the Lord the King."

So much for the use of instrumental music in the divinely appointed service of David's tabernacle and Solomon's temple. But now occurs the question, Is it lawful as a part of New Testament worship? And this by some is confidently denied. The silence of the New Testament must be admitted; but is it conclusive as to its absence? Is there any distinct mention of song as a part of worship in the historical account of the assemblies of the apostolical church? What if it be said in regard to other allusions in the epistles that "the songs and psalms" of these early Christians refer to the vine dresser at his labors and not to him as engaged in worship of the assembly? It may be that, in the first ages of the church, when its membership, according to Paul, consisted largely of "the poor of this world," and when it was the common lot to endure persecution, Christians left off a part of worship, never really essential, and which required more musical education and means than they probably possessed. If it be said that what is not commanded is forbidden, then another saying of equal authority may be quoted: a command includes permission to do what is necessary to carry out fully the will of the Lawgiver; and there are reasons,

presently to be given, which would seem to show that instrumental music is necessary to the fullest expression of the highest form of praise.

Again, if instrumental music was not detrimental to the spirituality of worship in the Old Testament, can it be in the New Testament?

When we study the scope and spirituality of the sacred lyrics of the ancient church, we can hardly be surprised that the most advanced Christian resorts to them for the expression of his highest emotions, or that one denomination of Christians professes to find their terminology adequate to the utterance of all evangelical sentiments,—a claim which would be stronger did they confine themselves, as they cannot, to David's Psalms in the original. The Psalms, why, they are full, not only of the gospel, but of him who is the substance of it, Christ; they are pervaded by what is usually considered a peculiar feature of New Testament times, the missionary element. True, the light-ship had not been sent upon its mission of illumination round the earth, and was for ages anchored to Mount Zion. But its position was in the very centre and heart of the old world, just between the two great kingdoms which divided with Israel the empire of the earth, Egypt and Assyria. Who will doubt that her beams penetrated the surrounding darkness, and that not a few of the heathen, whom the psalmist so often addresses and invites to praise God, "came to her brightness!" Where have we in the word more exalted conceptions of God, where more abundantly the very sentiments which lift the soul into the presence chamber of the King?

Now mark it well, that all through the Psalms, whether David chants these sacred lyrics all alone on the house-top, under an Eastern midnight sky, "the heavens declare the glory of God," or in unison with his fellow worshippers in the Sabbath assembly, it is in the one case to the sound of the harp, such as he played upon before the unhappy king, and in the others to the accompanying melody of harp and cymbal and cornet. Now, did these instruments aid or did they hinder his devotion? How comes it that what were *wings* to David's soul are *weights* to ours?

Again, the principle upon which he uses instrumental help is clearly stated at the very close of the collection, whose arrangement is doubtless providentially directed. David, not satisfied to praise God with his soul in its unity, summons all its powers to the work: "Let all that is within me bless his holy name." Not content with the united worship of all the faculties of one individual, he invites his fel-

low-men to take part with him: "O come, let us worship!" Not satisfied with one assembly, or even one people, he calls upon "all the people," and then upon "all nations," to engage in praise. Still unsatisfied, he sounds his voice into the very heavens, and bids the angels join him in the chorus of adoration: "Bless the Lord, ye his angels that excel in strength;" and then, to leave nothing out of the universal worship that he feels is due, he cites all nature to his help: "Kings of the earth and judges, young men and maidens, men and children, sun, moon and stars of light, dragons, and fire, and hail, and snow, and vapor, and stormy wind fulfilling his word, mountains, and all hills, fruitful trees, and all cedars, beasts, and all creeping things, and flying fowl;" and concludes with man's musical inventions: "Praise him with the sound of the trumpet, praise him with the psaltery and harp, praise him with the timbrel and dance, praise him with stringed instruments and organs, praise him upon the loud sounding cymbals, praise him upon the high sounding cymbals;" and then, to leave nothing out, he sums up the invitation in the all-comprehending command: "Let everything that hath breath praise the Lord; praise ye the Lord." Have we not here a scriptural warrant for the use of any and every proper instrument of music in the worship of God, especially of such as are suited to the expression of solemn joy?

Objections might be properly raised to some instruments of music, because of their utterly secular associations; for instance, the brass band, although it has one of the instruments employed by David—"the loud sounding cymbal"—but surely the bass viol, the cornet, and above all, the organ, have no such associations, or at least seem suited to the expression of sentiments of worship. It were hard to say for what purpose the last was providentially invented, unless for use in the high praises of God. You cannot render a waltz upon it without a sense of degradation of the instrument; it is, if such a term may be applied to a thing, distinctly religious. Perhaps it were well if our worship, so often cast in the minor key, were oftener set to the major key of exultant joy which marked the Old Testament worship, and which should be more appropriate to the service of the New, since now it commemorates the gladdest fact in all the ages, "Christ our Lord is risen to-day."

But it may be said that instrumental music, which confessedly formed so prominent a part of worship, private and public, under the elder dispensation, was a type of the joy of the Holy Ghost, and has therefore passed away with the other shadows of the law. Now it is

implied in this very statement, that if it be not a type, then it survives among the many other things of permanent value in the constitution of the church of the former dispensation. What proof is presented that it was designed to be a type of spiritual joy? Is there any scripture which may be cited in proof of the theory, or any marked resemblance between type and antitype, which, without it, shall prove the alleged fact? Christ is the authority for the belief that the brazen serpent was intended to be a type of the crucified; Paul, that the Jewish high priest is of Christ, the Son of God passed through the veil into the heavens; but of the assertion that the cymbal is a type of joy of the Holy Ghost, I find no scripture cited in proof. Without scripture I would know that Aaron was a figure of Christ; but where is the likeness between the blast of a cornet, or the strumming of a harp, and the joy the blessed Spirit inspires? Then, farther, is joy of the Holy Ghost the exclusive privilege of such as dwell under the gospel dispensation? It was David who prays, "Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; uphold me with thy free Spirit." Greater effusion of the Spirit undoubtedly marked the ascension of Zion's king to his throne; but the joy of the Lord was his people's strength under the law no less than under the gospel.

And, finally, in the worship of the heavenly temple there is a union of sacred song and instrumental music. "And I heard a voice from heaven as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder, and I heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps." Now grant, for argument sake, that this is figurative language, how is it to be explained if the New Testament worship, stripped of all instrumental accompaniment, is the flower of which the Old Testament service, with its cornets and cymbals, was the unopened bud that a New Testament writer describes the most perfect of all worship, that of heaven, in the terminology of the rudimentary instead of that of the mature?

But why believe that it is all metaphor? "The doctrine of correspondences" of Emanuel Swedenborg may be a foolish canon of interpretation, but here, modified, we may apply it. Surely as there is something in the heavenly worship corresponding to our service of song, there must be also in it something answering to the instrumental accompaniment of the Levitical Church, or else there is no meaning in John's wonderful pictures of the ceaseless service of the heavenly world; a figure implies a substance.

We have space for only a short reference to the cure of the abuses,

which are not just arguments against the legitimate uses of a thing, and which are much less than is supposed. For instance, among the ten Presbyterian Churches of New Orleans they do not exist. The cure is simple and accessible: it lies in *pastoral instruction* and *sessional control*. Let the pastor and his session assume, as they have, according to our Book, the undoubted right, if they have not already done it, and keep the firm control of the choir. Let them be careful to give the reasons for this exercise of ecclesiastical authority in the matter, and look to it that nothing is introduced into singing or music incompatible with the service of song and the associated worship of the sanctuary; that, as far as they can accomplish it, the singing shall be "a singing *unto the Lord*," and the playing "a playing *before the Lord*," and all the rival and sometimes antagonistic interests of the choir and congregation will spontaneously adjust themselves.

The exercise of this authority will work no injury to the music, vocal or instrumental; for pastor and elders may not be men of either musical taste or cultivation, but it is presumed that they are, or ought to be, men of piety. They may not be judges of time or melody, but they are ordinarily of propriety. If they cannot make music themselves, they can at least prevent its abuse. And where this authority is intelligently and firmly asserted, it will not be resented by any who have any fitness to lead the devotions of the sanctuary. Where this authority is maintained, pastor and session will hold themselves responsible for the right performance by the choir of their duties. They will have a committee of one or more on church music, who shall have direct supervision of this matter, and they will use their delegated authority in at least selecting a pious and competent leader and fit organist, and will require that some regard shall be had, not only to musical gifts, but to piety in the *personnel* of the choir. Then they will see to it that the instrument is kept in its right place. The organ will not be allowed to drown the voices of the singers, but be used mainly to assist articulate speech in sacred song. Nor will it be permitted to absorb too much of the time of the service, or to entertain in its voluntaries the theatre-frequenter with airs from his admired opera. While the organist praises God with "a joyful noise," he should be reminded that the Lord was worshipped of old with a "harp" that had "a solemn sound."

Then the minister and session will see to it that the choir knows and keeps its place. If this part of the service is to be done decently and in order there must be some appointed leader, and it is a matter

of indifference whether that leader be one or twenty, a precentor, or as in the temple, a choir. Let it be constantly taught and insisted upon that the choir's business is *not* to give musical *soirees* to a listening congregation, but to assist the people to praise the living God. Then they will understand that difficult tunes and melodies hard to catch are out of place; that while occasionally they should sing "a new song unto the Lord," it should be sung frequently enough for the congregation to learn it, but that most of the tunes should be such as are familiar and hallowed by a thousand associations. Then the session will require distinctness of utterance in its choir, and correctness of expression. The choir must not be permitted, through sessional neglect, to lay itself open to Augustine's criticism, "They minded more the time than the truth; more the manner than the matter; more the governing of the voice than the elevation of the mind."

And a pastor and session that understand and will do their duty, will insist that, as the province of the choir is to lead, it is no less the duty of the congregation to follow. It is by no means always the fault of choir-singing that congregations are so often silent. It is not uncommon to see an assembly of supposed worshippers sitting mute while a choir, in the use of tunes perfectly familiar, is doing their praise for them! This will not be if the sessional superintendent of the Sabbath-school requires a church hymn to be sung every Sabbath in his school; if they encourage singing schools in the congregation, and provide a sufficiency of hymn books for the use of the sanctuary, and if the pastor takes occasion frequently "to stir up the pure minds of his people" on this subject, and urge them to "praise the Lord with joyful lips." "Let the people praise thee; O God, *let all the people praise thee.*"

There are possibilities in this part of our simple service, vocal and instrumental, undreamed of, which will be realized when pastors and sessions shall strive to bring it to its highest perfection, so that hymn and organ shall mingle without a discordant note in that grand anthem, the first part of which is sung by the heavenly choir only, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing" and the last portion by an adoring universe. "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying: Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and forever." (Rev. v. 12, 13.) R. Q. MALLARD.

## ON THE EXAMINATION OF MINISTERS.

IN the *Form of Government* of the Southern Presbyterian Church, Chap. V., Sec. IV., Art. 4, it is required that "ministers seeking admission into a Presbytery shall be examined on experimental religion, and also touching their views in theology and church government."

Were we to suspend our reading of the article here, it would appear doubtful whether the ministers in question are those who are passing from one Presbytery into another, or ministers who are seeking admission from other denominations. But this doubt is settled by the next subsequent passage, for that speaks specifically of the reception of applicants from other denominations.

The constitutional rule of the church, then, is that a minister coming from another Presbytery, however good his standing, and however unexceptionable his testimonials, shall, on his application for admission into a Presbytery, within the bounds of which he proposes to labor, be examined as to the matters specified.

The question arises, and is irrepressible, and it has disturbed the thoughts of the present writer ever since the year 1837, when the rule by the *mandate* of the General Assembly was made imperative upon the Presbyteries. *Is this rule consistent with presbyterial principle?*

This question was not suppressed, when, in 1879, our Southern Church went beyond the Northern Church, and adopted this rule as a part of the constitution; as it was not satisfied when, prior to that, in the Assembly of 1834, a list of venerable names, such as that of Ashbel Green, was attached to a protest favoring the rule for examination.

The Assembly of 1834, in its action on a certain memorial, adopted a number of resolutions, the seventh of which was this:

"7. A due regard to the order of the church and the bonds of brotherhood require, in the opinion of the Assembly, that ministers dismissed in good standing by sister Presbyteries should be received by the Presbyteries which they are dismissed to join, upon the credit of their constitutional testimonials, unless they shall have forfeited their good standing subsequently to their dismissal."

The protest against this action, signed, as I have said, by Ashbel Green, *nomen clarum et venerabile*, and by other distinguished persons, contained the following:

"We do earnestly and solemnly protest against the seventh resolution, in which it is asserted that ministers dismissed in good standing by sister Presbyteries should be received by the Presbyteries which they are dismissed to join, upon the credit of their constitutional testimonials, unless they shall have forfeited their good standing subsequently to their dismissal."

We cannot bow to the authority even of venerable names, unless their opinions be sustained by convincing reasons. Their protest is based on these reasons, from each of which we dissent:

“1. This resolution is in conflict with the right of a Presbytery to judge of the qualifications of its own members, which we believe has never before been authoritatively attacked and impaired. It is in conflict with the acknowledged right inherent in the members of every society, civil as well as ecclesiastical, to judge of the qualifications of those with whom they are to associate.”

“2. It puts it in the power of a few corrupt Presbyteries to corrupt the whole church, by throwing their members into sound Presbyteries, one after another, till they become dominant in all.”

These are the only reasons, as far as we know, that have ever been advanced in support of the rule requiring the examination of ministers in the case under consideration. Let us look at them.

It is readily agreed that every *self-constituted, independent* collective body has the right to determine the terms of membership in it, and to judge of the qualifications of candidates for membership. That this is a right natural to, and inherent in, all such bodies cannot be questioned. It is correctly ascribed as a prerogative to the Presbyterian Church, taken as a whole, for the church as a society is such a body. But *a Presbytery is not such a body.*

A Presbytery is only a portion of the whole constituted into an organism merely for convenience. It does not, and it cannot, constitute itself; but is constituted by the next higher body, the Synod; as the Synod is constituted by the body above it, the General Assembly, which is the representative of the whole church.

The Presbytery is wholly dependent upon the Synod for its continued existence. The Synod can, for cause, make or unmake it at its pleasure. It can, at its pleasure (always for sufficient reasons), divide a Presbytery into two or more Presbyteries, or it can merge a Presbytery into a neighboring Presbytery, making, *by the power of its own will*, the members of the dissolved Presbytery members of the Presbytery into which it is merged; thus directly contravening the rule for examination, and acting upon the principle that a minister when ordained is made a minister of the church as a whole, and a member in particular of that Presbytery within the bounds of which his lot is providentially determined. They act on the principle that a minister passing from one Presbytery to another, and carrying with him his credentials, is of right entitled to membership in the Presbytery to which he passes. His credentials, in the case considered, are found in the action of the Synod; his credentials, in ordinary translations from



one Presbytery to another, are furnished him by the Presbytery from which he removes.

The protestors of 1834 affirm that the right of the Presbytery to judge of the qualifications of its own members on their application for admission into it "has never before been authoritatively attacked and impaired." In making this statement, the protestors were strangely oblivious of the constitution under which they lived. In that Constitution, Chap. XVI., Art. 3, it is ordered that "the Presbytery to which the congregation (to which the candidate is called) belongs, having received an authenticated certificate of his release (from his former Presbytery) under the hand of the clerk of that Presbytery, shall proceed to install him in the congregation as soon as possible." There is here no intimation of a previous examination; nor is there, in any place or connection in the book, any intimation of an examination being requisite. His credentials from his Presbytery alone open for him the door of the Presbytery into which he desires to enter.

The second reason assigned by the protestors is, that to disregard the rule for examination "puts it in the power of a few corrupt Presbyteries to corrupt the whole church, by throwing their members into sound Presbyteries, one after another, till they become dominant in all."

This statement, if made in ordinary times, would appear very strange indeed. Are there not ample provisions in our constitution for the arraigning, trial, and deposition of heretical ministers, or ministers unsound in the faith? There are abundant safeguards to this effect. But the times in which this statement was made were extraordinary times, and *the emergency of the conditions called for it.*

The whole church was in an abnormal state, the result of a previous unconstitutional arrangement. In 1801 the PLAN OF UNION was adopted, by which provision was made for the amalgamation, under certain circumstances, of Presbyterian and Congregational churches; which was equivalent to an attempt to amalgamate oil and water. The result was the formation of hybrid churches, in numbers sufficient to form at least four synods; and the leaven of disorder prevalent in these four synods was spreading throughout the whole church. Heresy, consequent upon a mongrel government, so extensively prevailed that no man knew what position in regard to false doctrine his co-presbyter held.

At length the adherents of orthodoxy reached an understanding with each other, and gathered sufficient strength to control the Assem-

bly of 1837, when, to save the church from absolute extinguishment, they resorted to the desperate, yet just and necessary measure of disowning, and of excising from the church, the four synods in which error in government as well as of doctrine was rampant. This extreme measure was justified (and it was sustained by the civil courts), on the ground that *under an unconstitutional act no rights can vest*. The Plan of Union was unconstitutional, and all its results were abnormal.

In cutting off these Synods, however, provision was made for the return to the church of all members who declared their adherence to the church on the basis of the excising act. But as many would probably come from unsound Presbyteries, seeking admission into the church, and themselves unsound in doctrine, to be assured that applicants truly held to the Westminster Standards, it was ordered that such be made subject to examination prior to admission. And, to make the rule appear less invidious, it was made universal in its application to all ministers passing from one Presbytery to another.

The excising act, as we have said, was justifiable, and necessary to the continued life of the church. Necessary, in order to eradicate from the church a deadly evil, that was sapping the very foundation of the church; an evil which originated in, and was fostered by the previous unconstitutional measure of 1801. And this act was followed by the extra-constitutional, yet, for the time, necessary measure of examination of ministers.

We have nothing to complain of the great and good men of that day, who thus, by a heroic process, saved the church. But we do object to the continuance of a revolutionary measure (this, of the examination of ministers) in peaceful times, when the church is in a normal condition. Our Southern Church, in doctrine and order, is pure and homogeneous. So far, it is in a normal state. What is necessary to the completeness of its normal condition is, that all its ministers stand, at least ecclesiastically, on equal footing as to piety and orthodoxy. All are members, *pares inter pares*, of the same one organization, the whole church; and are entitled to an unquestioning reception and welcoming into any portion of the church to which they may in an orderly way be called.

This rule for examination is, however, engrafted into the constitution of the Southern Church. We object to it because it tends to disintegrate the church. It places each Presbytery, as we have shown, in the attitude of distrust towards every other Presbytery, each on the

assumption that *it* is pure as to piety and orthodoxy, while it has no assurance that *others* are equally so.

I have shown that the right to examine intrants from sister Presbyteries is not inherent in any Presbytery. It is not a natural right. Yet it must be admitted that they all may be invested with this power by an act of the General Assembly when concurred in by the Presbyteries, or, as in our case, by a constitutional provision. But what a picture does such an act by the Assembly, or such a provision in our constitution present! The Assembly is itself composed of commissioners from all the Presbyteries. Yet it assumes to declare that none of the Presbyteries are trustworthy! That the members of each need to be examined by others before they be admitted to fraternity! It appears in the attitude of a Congregational Association, between the components of which there is no certain bond of union other than that of mere convenience or expediency. That its constituents *may* be pure and trustworthy is admitted; but it does not know it, and suggests that it would be well for each to be on its guard against all others. Hence, it is the practice amongst Congregationalists, when a minister passes from one church to another, to examine him before that church prior to his being inducted into office as pastor. This is not Presbyterianism. We are all *one body*, the parts of which are set off into organisms, only for greater convenience in working. In being thus set apart, *the truthness, the purity of the individuals is in no measure impaired.*

An essential difference between Congregationalism and Presbyterianism, then, is this: The Congregational Association is formed of independent constituents, that are associated only for convenience. The Presbyterian Church is one homogeneous body, and is set off into separate organisms only for convenience. Now, if the rule for examination prevail amongst the Presbyteries, the Presbyterian Church will just so far become Congregational. The individual churches will still be under the authoritative rule of the Presbyteries; but the Presbyteries will be to each other very much as so many Congregational Associations.

There are many practical anomalies that would necessarily occur under the prevalence of this rule. For instance, a Synod assembles; the members, coming from three or more Presbyteries, are on equal footing on the floor of the Synod; they concur in electing a moderator, and proceed to business as an authoritative body (the Congregational Association, with logical consistency, is merely an advisory council). The Synod having accomplished its business adjourns. Thereafter, one

of its members—say the moderator—is called, and accepts the call to a church in some Presbytery of the Synod different from that in which he previously had labored. He applies for admission into it, but is met with the demand that he be examined as to his piety, soundness in the faith, and in church government, before he can be admitted. Is not this preposterous? He is the equal of any member while in the Synod, but as soon as he becomes simply a presbyter he loses his standing, his equality! He is deprived of the confidence reposed in him while he is an acting member of the Synod, and is subjected to examination as if he were an alien!

The same thing might occur in regard to a member, or in regard to the moderator, of the Assembly; and the more glaringly so, as the Assembly is the highest court of the church. The Assembly is composed of commissioners, or representatives, from all the Presbyteries. They, on equal terms and by equal vote, determine rules for the guidance of the whole church. While in the Assembly they exercise, as in the Synod, perfect confidence in each other; but as soon as the Assembly is dissolved, and the members return to their Presbyteries, this confidence is dissipated! Any one of them, on passing from his Presbytery into another, must be examined. As a simple presbyter he is unknown, and must be examined.

Another anomaly: A Presbytery is composed, say, of comparatively young men. A man, venerable for age, for character, and for a half century's successful labor as a minister, applies for membership; but he cannot be admitted till he be tried—examined by those who are, by so many years, his juniors. It might be said that an exception should be made in his case. But no, that cannot be. The rule admits of no exceptions.

Another anomaly: A man has labored long in a Presbytery, and enjoys the confidence of all his co-presbyters. He is called into another Presbytery. But after a while, say twelve months or so, he for sufficient reasons returns to his former position; but before he can be reinstated in the Presbytery he must be examined. The rule admits of no exceptions, for the obvious reason that it would be invidious towards those who are examined. These are not imaginary cases. They all have actually occurred.

Other anomalies might be cited. It is not necessary. It is very manifest that the rule in question is not consonant with Presbyterian principle. It ought to be expunged from our constitution.

FERDINAND JACOBS.

## THE TITHE SYSTEM; ITS PRACTICAL WORKING.

It has been shown by others that the tithe system is still binding upon the church. The object of this article is to define this system, and to offer some suggestions looking to its adoption. The latter is needful in order to remove the objections which some make against it on the alleged ground of its impracticability.

There has been no little misunderstanding of the system on the part of those who have opposed it, probably growing out of the fact that the expressions, "to tithe," "tithing," "the doctrine of the tithe," "the tithe law," and "the tithe system," are frequently used in a technical sense. They would seem to imply simply the giving of a tenth, no more, and no less; in reality, however, they mean something quite different; they are perfectly synonymous with the expressions, "to give tithes and offerings," "to give at least a tenth," "to give not less than a tenth," and, in the case of the early Greek fathers, they are synonymous with the expressions, "to give first fruits," and "to offer first fruits." The tithe system does not profess to determine how much nor what percentage any one should give. Some ought to give a fourth, others a third, and others a half, or perhaps more; the circumstances of the giver, the needs of the church, and the Holy Spirit enlightening the understanding and warming the heart, must decide in each case what constitutes duty. Nearly all the advocates of this system repudiate the position that the tithe is the standard and measure of Christian giving. No one can give more than the sum total of his possessions; the Lord has forbidden any one to give less than the tenth of his ordinary increase; *between these boundaries* every man is free to decide for himself how much or how little he should give. All that the opponents of the tithe have written about freedom, generosity, and love in giving, find here their true application. The great practical difference between the present system of the church and the tithe system is this: The present system, denying that God has appointed any boundaries to Christian giving, enjoins its followers to look for their duty *between nothing and the sum total of what they possess*; and as a matter of fact they nearly always decide that duty, in their cases, is at some point between nothing and the tenth of their increase. Whereas the tithe system, affirming that there is a divinely-appointed minimum boundary, instructs its followers to look for their duty *between the tenth of their increase and the whole of their possessions*; and, as a consequence, they always give more than the tenth.

Should any one desire to practise this system, the first thing for him to do would be to ascertain the exact tenth of his ordinary income—this would secure him against giving too little; then let him take his own circumstances and the needs of the Lord's work into consideration, and decide how much he should give beyond that tenth.

It is easier to ask what constitutes the tenth of our ordinary income than to answer it. If the question were, "Is the tithe system binding?" we would have Carleton, Selden, Tillesley, Prynne, Montague, Milton, Leslie, Prideaux, Comber, Thorburn, Constable, Beattie, Hogshhead, Miller, and a host of others to help us answer it. But when the question is, "What constitutes our *exact tithe*?" we will find very little to assist us. Those who have treated tithing from an American point of view, have concerned themselves more with the proofs that the system is binding, than with illustrating its practical workings, while the European writers who profess to treat the subject do it from the point of view of the civil law, which is confessedly arbitrary. The Scriptures, however, have not left us without light.

Genesis xiv. 20, taken in connection with Hebrews vii. 4, shows that the law, as originally given to man, required the tenth of all spoils taken in battle to be devoted to religious purposes. Jacob, in Gen. xxviii. 22, understood the law to demand the tenth of all increase. Moses, in Lev. xxvii. 30-32, commands the tenth of all produce of the ground, and of all the increase of the flocks and herds to be given to the Lord, a prescription made the more emphatic by the fact that it was delivered to the people while they were wanderers in the desert. And again, in Deut. xvi. 17, we have these remarkable words: "Every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the Lord thy God which he hath given thee." The system of tithes and offerings was the only one with which the Jews were acquainted; it was therefore in reference to it that these words were written. In them the law is made to cover all increase received by the blessing of God. Solomon also refers to this law in Prov. iii. 9: "Honor the Lord with thy substance, and with the first fruits of all thine increase." No one could ask anything broader than this. Jesus, in Matt. xxiii. 23, endorses the view maintained by the stricter school of the Pharisees, that the most insignificant things were to be tithed, while Paul, in 1 Cor. ix. 11, mentions our carnal things. It is evident from these and other passages that *all* ordinary increase is to be tithed, and not crops and herds alone, as some would have us believe.

On the other hand, we have no account of the tithing of inheri-

tances, gifts, or original capital in any form ; it was always the increase that was tithed.

Taking, then, the whole case into consideration we find that all increase accruing from *labor*, and all increase accruing from *capital* was tithed.

The next question to be determined is in regard to the expenses to be deducted before tithing. This will ordinarily require more explanation than anything else connected with the system, and especially will this be necessary in the case of those who use their own labor upon their own capital. In one sense all that we have belongs to the Lord, we being simply his stewards ; but in another sense we are partners with him. Under this partnership-relation most persons will have two kinds of expenses ; those necessary to the management of the business in which they may be engaged, or *business expenses* ; and those necessary to the maintenance of themselves and families, or *personal expenses*. The business expenses should be borne by the firm, and consequently subtracted before tithing. The personal expenses, having nothing to do with the business, are part of the increase, and so, of course, should not be deducted. For instance, suppose the case of a merchant who rents a dwelling and a store-house, and employs a cook and a clerk. The rent of the store-house and the wages of the clerk belong to the business expenses and should be deducted before tithing, the rent of the dwelling and the wages of the cook belong to the personal expenses, and should not be. Those who have no business expenses ought to tithe the whole of their incomes.

Having now found out the things to be tithed, and determined the expenses to be deducted, we are ready to formulate our rule. *Our exact tithe is the tenth of all our increase, accruing either from our labor or our capital, or both together, with the exception of our necessary business expenses.* Any person of intelligence can determine his exact tithe by the application of this rule. It applies equally to farmers, ministers, lawyers, servants, and all other classes. In order to obey the tithe system, let the giver add to this whatever amount or percentage circumstances may require, and devote the whole to religious purposes. The words of the apostle in reference to this are : "But this I say, He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly ; and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully. Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give ; not grudgingly, or of necessity ; for God loveth a cheerful giver." It may be objected that a man having given the tenth, as *required* by the law, is not under

obligation to give any more. He has been honest with God, what more could be asked? We answer, first, that a person may be honest with his fellow-man, that he may pay every cent he owes, and yet be a miser; so, if the law only demanded a tenth, but furnished the opportunity to give more, it would be possible for a man to be honest with God, and yet be niggardly toward him. But, secondly, this objection is based upon a misconception of the law. It does not require the tenth as exhaustive of the duty of man, nor does it pretend to determine how much any one should give. It says to the giver, Do whatever is in your heart, but if you give less than the tenth you will be convicted of having robbed God, and of covetousness, which is idolatry.

Every man is a steward of the property which the Lord's blessing has placed in his hands. So much of this as circumstances require he must devote to the work of his Master, and do it in such a way that at the last day he will be able to render an account. This gives him the right to dispose of his tithes and offerings as he may deem best. Yet it ought also to be remembered that the Lord has appointed officers for the very purpose of administering the temporal affairs of his church. This appointment we cannot ignore. It would seem, therefore, that the greater part of our religious offerings should ordinarily pass through their hands. This is not always practicable. Sometimes cases demand immediate attention; sometimes it will be utterly impossible to do what we feel ought to be done through the officers of the church, and sometimes there may be a difference of opinion between the giver and the officers about the appropriation of the church's money serious enough to justify him in appropriating his own offerings. But these are the exceptions; the rule should be for every one to allow his gifts, in great measure, to go through the ordained channels.

The advocates of the tithe system do not wish to see it enforced by any penalties, ecclesiastical or otherwise. Nearly all the opposition which has ever been made to it has been on account of illegal methods of enforcing it. The sheriff is not the proper person to collect the Lord's revenues; other officers have been appointed for that purpose. This usurpation of the deacon's office by the state has done the tithe cause more harm than all the arguments of its opponents combined. When the question was, Is the tithe system the law of God? its defenders have always worsted their antagonists in the debate; but when the question was, Shall the state see that this law is observed? its opponents have always had the better of its advocates in the argument.



Nor should the church inflict any spiritual penalties in case of non-obedience. It should be preached, explained, enjoined, and pressed upon the consciences of the people as the law of God by ministers and courts. Those who hear the doctrine ought also to be solemnly warned against neglecting it. This will be sufficient; it will commend itself to regenerated hearts. The Lord has pledged himself to collect his part, saying, "There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty." Fire, storm, frost, drought, hail, and all the forces of nature are his servants; and he who would "rob God" of his tithes and offerings would do well to consider whether any strong man has ever allowed his house to be robbed in his own presence, unless the robber was stronger than he. All that the advocates of the tithe want is to have the doctrine preached; the Lord, with his providences, will attend to the rest. And unless both the Bible and experience fail, men will soon learn that the favor of God is worth more than tithes and offerings.

The pastor who wishes to introduce this system into his congregation will necessarily have to be governed by his own good judgment. If after the doctrine has been thoroughly proved and explained, he finds that the greater part of his congregation are convinced, he can ask them to adopt it as a whole. They should then abolish all other means of raising money, such as pew-rents, fairs, festivals, subscription papers, etc. Each person should be allowed to keep his own account, and to put his money into the collections without making any report of it whatsoever. The sum-total of the Sabbath collections would be all that even the deacons could know; for under this arrangement no one in the congregation could tell how much any other one was giving. Where there are two collections on the Sabbath, one of them could be used for the benefit of the congregation, the other for benevolent causes. Where there is only one, the collection on the first Sabbath in each month could go to benevolent objects, while the remaining three could go to the particular church. When there is a majority, or even a large minority, of the congregation opposed to the system, those who accept it can practise it themselves, and at the same time could very properly refuse to take part in any other means of raising money; that is, pay no pew rents, sign no subscription papers, attend no festivals, and observe no other humanly devised scheme. No enlightened church officers will object to this, for men give a great deal more under this system than under any other. Should any be afraid to venture on this plan we assure them from actual experience that there is no

danger. This is the Lord's system, and will of course work successfully. Convince a man that the Lord requires at least a tenth of his increase, that he incurs the divine displeasure if he does not render it, and if he is a Christian the case is settled so far as he is concerned. Some men will argue and debate with a deacon, or with themselves, until they are satisfied with giving about a third of what they ought to give; but there is no debating with him who has said of the tithe, "It is HOLY unto the Lord."

In conclusion, we would again urge that the tithe system only fixes the minimum limit of Christian giving. The representation which makes the exact tithe the whole of the system is simply a caricature. The advocates of the tithe claim that the Lord has been pleased to reveal in his word the least percentage of increase that any one can give, under ordinary circumstances, without incurring his displeasure. The opponents of the tithe deny that the Lord, under all ordinary circumstances, requires so much as the tenth, but maintain that the poor and those in straitened circumstances can give a less percentage with the divine approval. We challenge the opponents of the tithe to point us to a single incident or to a single passage in the Scriptures which clearly shows that the Lord has ever approved the giving of less than one-tenth. We can show where he has approved the giving of a tenth, and where he has approved the giving of more than a tenth, but to what passage can they point? Upon this the whole case depends. The core of the question is as to whether we *must* give as much as the tenth, or whether we *may* give less. Whichever of these positions can be established from the Scriptures is the truth. Unless, therefore, they can find the place wherein the Lord has approved the giving of less than a tenth, let them abandon their dismounted guns, and array themselves under the banner of a cause which at least can show that it has the divine approval.

G. A. BLACKBURN.

## VIII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

---

### CURRENT DISCUSSIONS IN THEOLOGY.

CURRENT DISCUSSIONS IN THEOLOGY. *By the Professors of the Chicago Theological Seminary.* Vol. V., 1888. Boston and Chicago: Congregational Sunday-school and Publishing Society. Do. Vol. VI. 1889.

We have examined these two volumes with interest and profit. Their convenient size, which enables one to hold them in his hand without fatigue, their excellent typography, and their contents, all alike ministered to our pleasure. The design of the books may be learned from the following extract from the Preface of Vol. V., viz.: "The aim of these discussions is to answer the question which every earnest student of theology and of ecclesiastical subjects may well be supposed to ask at the close of each year, viz.: What has been done in the different fields of sacred learning during the past twelve months, and what are the latest results of such studies?"

From this it appears at once that the task which the authors of these discussions have set themselves is no easy one. They aim at nothing less than to give a bird's eye view of the whole field of theological literature for each year. What this involves will perhaps be better appreciated by a glance at the Table of Contents. We turn to that of Vol. V., and read: "Part First.—Exegetical Theology. I. Old Testament. Present State of Old Testament Studies. Chapter I. Grammatical and Linguistic Studies. Chapter II. Textual Studies. Chapter III. Exegetical Works: Genesis, Numbers, Deuteronomy and Joshua, Samuel and Kings, Solomon's Song, Isaiah and Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Joel, Amos and Micah, Obadiah, Habakkuk, Targums on Ruth and Jonah. Chapter IV. Old Testament Introduction: (1), General Works on Introduction; (2), Monographs: Jeremiah, Wisdom Literature, Job, Proverbs, Maccabean Psalms, Isaiah, Joel. Chapter V. Old Testament History, Monographs and Ancient Histories, Egyptian History, Chaldea and Ancient Assyria. Chapter VI. Old Testament Theology."

The above is simply Part First, Section I. We have not space to give the rest of the Table of Contents so fully, but the scope of it may be seen from the following outline: "Part First—Exegetical Theology Continued. II. New Testament. Part Second—Historic Theology; The Most Recent Studies in Church History, with some of the more important results. Part Third—Systematic Theology, Theism, Apologetics, Dogmatic Theology and Ethics. Part Fourth—Practical Theology: (1), Recent Studies in Pastoral Theology; (2), Homiletics."

The several professors have divided the work among them, each reviewing that portion of the current literature which bears on his own department. Part First is from Professor Samuel Ives Curtiss (Exegetical Theology, Old Testament) and Professor George H. Gilbert (Exegetical Theology, New Testament). Part

Second from Professor Hugh M. Scott. Part Third from Professor George Nye Boardman. Part Fourth from Professor G. B. Wilcox.

What we have further to say, or rather what we must content ourselves with saying, may be summed up as follows, viz. :

*First*, The field mapped out, extensive as it is, has been worked up with remarkable thoroughness. This appears from the extracts given above from the Table of Contents. It will appear perhaps more clearly when the reader hears that in the department of Old Testament literature alone *sixty-four* books and articles from standard theological journals are passed under review; in that of New Testament literature, *forty-four*; in that of History, *one hundred and fifty*; in that of Systematic Theology, *fourteen*; in that of Pastoral Theology, upwards of *fifty*; that is, in all about *three hundred and twenty-five*.

*Second*, The books are not mere dry catalogues of current theological literature. They are eminently readable. Their style is excellent. It is clear and vigorous. Though necessarily brief, the criticisms are to the point. Passing by much that is familiar, they note when advances have been made, and also the departures from the "old paths" which are taking place.

*Third*, Their tone is in the main conservative and sound. We regret to say that the portions from the pen of Professor Curtiss form a notable exception to this statement. For instance, in one place he expresses himself as follows, viz. : "We find in the theology of ancient Israel the divine revelation, not only contained in earthen vessels, but also, as we have observed before, on account of its temporal and educational character, containing incomplete and even erroneous statements as to certain forms of religious thought" (Vol. VI., p. 72). Such views from such a source pain us. They will do incalculable harm if instilled into the minds of the students who frequent his lecture room. But we are glad to say Professor Curtiss seems to be alone, so far as his brethren in the faculty of the seminary are concerned, in holding such views.

*Fourth*, In our judgment our ministers would do well to buy these volumes as they come from the press. They will serve to keep one posted, and, as we say, "fully abreast of the times." They give from year to year "the present state of the question" in theological matters. They have, moreover, not only a present, but a permanent value. The classification of the material is so complete that one can almost at a moment's notice turn and refresh his mind upon any topic of which they treat.

W. M. McPHEETERS.

#### MEAD'S "SUPERNATURAL REVELATION."

SUPERNATURAL REVELATION: AN ESSAY CONCERNING THE BASIS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH,  
*By C. M. Mead, Ph. D., D. D., lately Professor in Andover Theological Seminary.* New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1889. Large 8vo. Pp. 469.

This work is, on many accounts, deserving of attention. The themes of which it treats are of immense importance. The style in which it is written is clear, neat and singularly free from literary blemishes; its tone is eminently fair, calm and dispassionate, and in those exceptional instances in which vigorous censure, and even condemnation, of the views considered are employed, we are inclined to think that the severity is for the most part justifiable. Its discussions are characterized by scholarly culture and a high order of ability, by philosophical acuteness and an an-

analytical power capable of making the nicest distinctions and detecting the subtlest tracery of thought.

The topics discussed are: The Origin and Grounds of the Theistic Belief; The Question of a Primeval Revelation; Miracles as Proofs of the Christian Revelation; The Relation of Christianity to Judaism; Inspiration; The Authority of the Scriptures; and the Conditions and Limits of Biblical Criticism. Some valuable disquisitions are appended: On the Validity of Consciousness; the Cosmic Philosophy; Personality and the Absolute; the Views of Leland and Watson [Richard] on the Primeval Revelation; the Certainties of the Agnostic; Beyschlag's Hypothesis as to the Miracle of the Loaves; Ritschl's Doctrine of Miracles; and the Book of Jonah.

The author does not merely state opinions; he argues. He gives his reasons for every position which he takes, and on that account one feels almost ashamed to attempt, in a little cramped notice like this, any comments upon his work. It looks very much like a species of injustice, resulting from the necessary brevity attaching to the undertaking. If it be possible we will, in the instances in which we are constrained to dissent from the author's views, endeavor to furnish if only the undeveloped heads of argument sustaining the difference. In order to do this it will be requisite to be very concise in noticing those points in regard to which we agree with the author. We take up the topics in the order in which they are treated in the work.

1. The first questions discussed are in regard to the Origin and Grounds of the Theistic Belief. The author divides these questions and devotes a chapter to each. We are not sure that it would not have been better to consider them together, as closely allied to each other, if not necessarily interpenetrating one another. The author thinks the distinction obvious and often overlooked. He states it in this way: How do men generally first come to have the notion that there is a God? and Why do they persist in cherishing the notion? Thus put, the questions are indeed distinct; but the real question is, Why do they hold the belief in God at all? The author himself substantially adopts this view of the question, as is shown by the fact that in discussing the origin, he also discusses the ground of the belief, and thus, as if by necessity, anticipates the separate and elaborate consideration of the ground. This, however, is by no means material. In the general views maintained we in the main concur. He shows that in the first instance children are indebted to parental instruction for the formed and definite belief in the divine existence. They are taught it. But this education supposes something to be educated, something which antedates it, and supplies the ground upon which the process of instruction proceeds. This is a native tendency or impulse, a fundamental aptitude in the mental constitution, adapting it to attain, upon empirical conditions, to a developed belief in God capable of being formally expressed in the affirmation: there is a God. This we understand to be the author's general view, and in supporting it he uses arguments which are clear, cogent, and, to our minds, convincing. He has, we think, ably refuted the hypotheses which derive the notion of God from dreams, animism, personification, self-deification, fear, deliberate deception, and that modification of Schleiermacher's theory of the feeling of absolute dependence which assigns the genesis of the belief to the felt limitations upon man's ability to gratify his desires, and to defend himself from the evils which threaten him.

In the prosecution of the theistic argument the author announces certain opinions to which we are unable fully to subscribe. He appears to make concessions which, to some extent, compromise his otherwise conclusive reasoning. We doubt the correctness of the view, in which he is sustained by some other distinguished thinkers, that all arguments for the divine existence are merely reasons given to justify our faith. (P. 51.) It strikes us that it would more exactly express the truth to say, that these arguments are the reflective construction of the spontaneous processes by which the native tendency or impulse to believe in the divine existence is developed into actual faith. On page 38 he says:

“From the mere existence of this idea of a moral law we cannot directly and necessarily infer the existence of a Divine Lawgiver,—a being whose power and will created the law. To such an inference the unanswerable objection at once presents itself that, if this Divine Being is conceived as a moral being, then he must be amenable to the moral law. He cannot have made the law capriciously. There must be an eternal and immutable reason for its requirements. The law must, therefore, logically precede divine volition, and cannot be the mere product of it.”

On this we remark: (1), The state of the question is needlessly confused by the use of the term *created*. The term *imposed* was the proper one. This justifiable substitution would render irrelevant the argument which follows. The affirmation the theist is entitled to make is: From the idea of a moral law we directly and immediately infer the existence of a Divine Lawgiver whose power and will imposed the law. (2), The native sense of responsibility, admitted by the author, necessarily infers not only the moral law, but a being who gives the law and administers it through sanctions. Responsibility to abstract moral law is inadmissible. Even subjection to physical force, upon the author's own views, infers a will back of that force. Otherwise, the position of the materialist and the agnostic is conceded. But granted a giver and administrator of moral law, the disjunction follows: Either he is finite or he is infinite. Finite he cannot be, for the vast number of subjects, and the hidden, subtle motives by which each is controlled, necessarily infer omniscience and omnipotence. But these are attributes, and necessarily infer an omniscient and almighty being to whom they belong. Such a being must be infinite. We necessarily infer a Divine Lawgiver and Ruler. If to this it be objected, that these inferences conduct only to a vast, finite being capable of ruling by law a vast, finite universe, on the principle of sufficient reason, we reply, that the admitted instinctive tendency to believe in a God is a tendency to believe in an infinite God, for a finite God is a contradiction in terms. Now, this native tendency, this fundamental law of belief, elicited into activity by the condition of the moral experience, develops into a formal faith affirming the infinity of the moral Lawgiver, Ruler and Judge. This is the necessary progress of the human faculties, when in normal exercise. (3), Either the moral law within us is originated by ourselves, or it is self-originated, or it is imposed from without ourselves. It cannot be originated by ourselves, for it is congenital; and, moreover, we would not, if we could, originate a law which inflicts torture upon us for its infractions. It cannot be self-originated; the hypothesis of the spontaneous production of anything has now hardly a corporal's guard to defend it. If it be imposed from without ourselves—the remaining supposition—it must be imposed either by an impersonal force, or by a personal will. Not the former, for to suppose that an impersonal force could impose moral law upon persons, or that they could be re-

sponsible to it, is absurd. The latter remains true; but if a personal will, a personal being to whom it belongs is necessarily inferred, and then with equal necessity his infinity is inferred, from the scope of the government and the power requisite to enforce it. It is scarcely necessary to observe that an infinite moral being cannot, like a finite, be under law. He has the grounds of his being and his character in himself. He himself is infinite righteousness, and contemplating himself as just, he loves himself with an infinite love. He is a law to himself in the sense that he is immutably consistent with himself.

Again, when the author, at one time, expresses the view that there can be no demonstration of the divine existence, or of any objective existence (pp. 29, 50), and, at another, that if the tendencies of the soul which lead to the conception of a supreme personal being are discredited as not demonstrating the objective reality of the God who is believed in, then a similar treatment applied to all fundamental and intuitive beliefs reduces us to pure Pyrrhonism or Nihilism (p. 57); we find it hard to reconcile the two utterances. We are constrained to yield our entire assent to the latter. If by demonstration is meant proof resulting in the highest degree of certainty, consciousness and the fundamental beliefs of the human mind are entitled to be regarded as demonstrative. Indemonstrable in themselves they constitute the ultimate ground for all possible demonstration. Doubt them, and you involve the exact sciences themselves in uncertainty, and the facts of scientific observation are not beyond suspicion. If we possess an instinctive tendency to believe in the divine existence, and that fundamental impulse is developed into formal shape by the facts of consciousness, we have as certain proof of the being of God as we have of the axioms of mathematics. Those axioms rest upon the same grounds. All knowledge is, at bottom, grounded in certain necessities of thinking and believing. In fine, demonstration itself must rest upon the trustworthiness of consciousness and of the fundamental laws of thought and belief. It is one thing to say that the ontological proof, by itself, cannot furnish a demonstration of the divine existence, and quite another to say that no demonstration of it is possible. Kant rejected the Anselmic, Cartesian and Leibnitzian argument from the idea of God to his objective existence. He argued that the concept of existence is no guarantee of existence. Very true; for concepts are based upon the imagination which may combine percepts into ideal forms that have no corresponding reality. But we venture to say that our fundamental beliefs are in a different category. If they are no guarantees of real existence, the root of our nature is a lie. We have no concept of God as infinite, for as we have no direct intuition or perception of him, we cannot image him. But we have an instinctive belief in his existence, and that belief is a demand for God rising from the very foundations of our nature. This innate belief, or tendency to believe, when developed by the conditions of experience, is a guarantee of his objective existence. Our conviction is, that the *a priori* or ontological argument and the *a posteriori* derived from experience, although each incomplete in itself, constitute, when taken together, demonstrative proof of God's existence. But as we may go into a wrangle about the meaning of a word, we will press this point no further than to say, that the fact of atheism does not invalidate the position we have taken. There are men who will deny everything, men who, if they had a partisan end to subserve, would deny the theorems of geometry. We knew such a man, a disciple of the socialist Owen, who refused to let us pray with him when sick, on the ground that he did not believe in our existence, or in his

own existence, or in the existence of God. But he did not die so. Finally he remarked that it was safer to believe in Christianity than to go into an untried state of being with no belief, and in his last hours pleaded with God for mercy. One is reminded of the dying infidel who prayed: "O God, if there be a God, have mercy upon my soul, if I have a soul!" What a struggle between perverse speculation and the irrepressible instincts of nature!

We cannot help thinking that in the progress of his argument the author has omitted to give due consideration to the fact of sin—a fact not depending upon the testimony of a supernatural revelation alone, but attested by experience and observation—and its deranging influence upon the conscious development of the innate tendency to belief in God's existence. It is here that skeptical and atheistic speculations have their root.

The author justly finds another ground of theistic belief in supernatural revelation, as affording God's explicit testimony to his own existence. To one who accepts such a revelation, this is absolutely decisive. To one who does not, the claim made by a professed supernatural revelation raises a question of infinite consequence—a question which he is bound to investigate in accordance with the laws of evidence that operate upon every rational mind.

2. The author's argument in favor of a primeval revelation we regard as not only able, but conclusive. He has, in our judgment, fairly overthrown the antagonistic theories advanced by A. M. Fairbairn, Pfeiderer and others. We would, however, take leave to suggest that, should a new edition of this work be issued, the distinction be clearly made between a primeval revelation to man in innocence, and a primitive revelation to man after the fall.

3. The author next considers the Christian revelation and its proofs. Without now pausing to inquire into the satisfactoriness of his views concerning the nature of this revelation and its general features, but admitting, with the author, that "it involves the assumption of a supernatural agency," we pass on to the great question of its proofs. In the general, there is no dispute about the demand for extraordinary proofs. The author concedes that they are miraculous. So far so good. But what is the nature of this kind of proof? That is, What is a miracle? In answer to this momentous question the author says that there is "overstatement on the one hand, and understatement on the other." Each must be guarded against. "It is an overstatement," he remarks, "when a miracle is spoken of as a violation, or suspension, or transgression of the laws or forces of nature." It is an understatement "to seek to *explain* miracles in respect to the mode of their occurrence, and to show their essential conformity to, or dependence on, natural law." In brief, the overstatement is that the miracle is *contranatural*; the understatement is that the miracle is *natural*. What, then is the true statement intermediate between these extremes? According to the author it is, briefly, that the miracle is *supernatural*. His own statements are:

"In general, miracles are to be defined as events produced by special, extraordinary, divine agency, as distinguished from the ordinary agencies of inanimate and animate nature." (P. 97.) "The latter [miracles] must be regarded as attributable to a special divine agency, distinct from the natural forces of the material universe." (P. 122.) "A miracle has by Christian thinkers been generally regarded as a work wrought by special supernatural intervention, and serving to attest the reality of a divine revelation." (P. 122, *f.*)



This definition, or description—we stickle not about a word—of the miracle we regard as defective. (1), It begs the question in dispute. The question is, Has God intervened? and the definition makes the fact of his intervention a proof of that intervention. (2), The term *supernatural* is too ambiguous to meet the requirements of the case. It may mean superhuman; that is, over and beyond the knowledge and power of man. But the devil is superhuman, and no events supposed to be produced by him could be competent proofs of a divine revelation. Or, it may mean over and beyond *known* nature; and then an event happening, in accordance with unknown laws of nature, in an unknown sphere, could certainly not be appealed to as evidence. How what is out of knowledge could certify knowledge, it is difficult to see. Or, it may mean above *all* nature, and then there would be an end of the question. Some writers who have endeavored to overthrow the proof from miracles have conceded that they may, in one or another of these senses, have been supernatural. This fact shows that to define a miracle as a supernatural event is not sufficient. That may be admitted, and the evidence of divine agency be denied. What is wanted is an event which will clearly and uncontestedly prove that God has intervened; and an event which contravenes the established known course of nature meets that demand. For it is inconceivable that *any* power but that of God could produce such an event. The inference to his agency is clear, and the designed connection of such an event with a revelation claiming to be divine proves his endorsement of the claim. Take the resurrection of the dead. It is true that it is supernaturally accomplished. But that is not enough. It contradicts the law that the dead remain dead—a law that has operated since the first human being died. That law could not be contradicted by any power, save that of God which imposed it. The dead man rises. It must have been God's power which raised him. The inference is obvious. Where is the "overstatement" here? Ought we to say that resurrection is merely over and beyond the law of death? That will not answer. The power that raises the dead *destroys* death: "the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." That surely is contradiction. Will it be said that there is no law of death? An inspired apostle speaks of "the law of sin and death." That is authority enough for speaking of the law of sin and the law of death. It is an "understatement" to say that the resurrection of the dead is simply a supernatural event. If it is not contranatural, there has been no nature that reigned from Adam to Moses and from Moses to us. We have not room to discuss the point. We leave it with the remark, that the view of the miracles held by Dr. Mead cannot account for the desperate assaults made upon them in the past by rationalists and infidels. It was the view that they are events which no power but that of God could effect, which induced the belief that were they real facts Christianity is demonstrated to be divine, and led to the effort to destroy their credibility, or their possibility, or their historical verity.

The argument in favor of the historical fact of the New Testament miracles is ably presented by the author. His refutation of recent skeptical theories is masterly.

4. The discussion of the relation of Christianity to Judaism exhibits careful study of the Old Testament Scriptures. It is marked by the author's acuteness, and is, in the main, in accordance with orthodox views. We think that he concedes too much to the position that the Old Testament prophecies were intended chiefly to make an "ethical" impression upon the generations contemporaneous

with the prophets. Their chief end, as it was that of Moses and the Psalms, was to reveal salvation by Jesus Christ.

5. Coming, in this too cursory notice of his views, to the author's doctrine in regard to revelation and inspiration, we are compelled to utter our dissent at two important points:

(1.) His distinction between revelation and the Scriptures is misleading. "The distinction," he says, "between *revelation* and the *record* of revelation is one which, though often overlooked, is legitimate and important." We regard the inspiration of the sacred writers as the revelation made *to them*, and the inspired records as the revelation made *to us*. It is confusing to limit revelation to the communication of truth to prophets and apostles, and it involves a departure from the *usus loquendi* on the subject. If the question be asked, What is revelation? the answer almost inevitably will be, the Scriptures. The order is, first, inspiration; secondly, revelation; thirdly, faith. Inspired men record the revelation which our faith receives. Faith cometh by hearing. Hearing what? The word of God as the revelation of his will. How did that revelation come? By inspiration. The very question is, Are the Scriptures, as a professed revelation from God, plenary inspired?

(2.) We strenuously object to the author's almost contemptuous rejection of verbal inspiration. First, in the absence of the original autographs, we must accept the testimony of the Scriptures themselves as admitted to be credible witnesses. But they speak of themselves as verbally inspired. Errors in copies and versions cannot invalidate this testimony. Secondly, the primitive church held the doctrine. This was the view of Justin, Athenagoras, Macarius, Chrysostom, Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, Irenæus, and Gregory Thaumaturgus. Their authority upon the question is worth more than that of the most learned modern critics. Thirdly, the theory of verbal inspiration is the only one which affirms the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. For, in the first place, we could not be assured that God's thoughts are accurately presented unless the language be his. In the second place, if the words are not inspired, it would be necessary that each writer should testify that he exactly presented the thoughts communicated to him. Fourthly, if all Scripture is not verbally inspired, we could not know what parts are and what are not so inspired. Our confidence in the whole Scripture would be shaken. Fifthly, the apostles were endowed with the gift of tongues. Of course the words were given them. Now that fact proves, in the first place, that in this instance there was verbal inspiration, and, in the second place, that the inspiration of words may consist with individual peculiarities of utterance. Peter spoke as Peter, John as John. What was true of their speaking might also have been true of their writing. Sixthly, if the Spirit could dictate thoughts he could dictate words. Indeed, to dictate thoughts implies the dictation of language, for it is impossible to conceive the disjunction of *accurate* thought from language. In view of such considerations we repeat it, that without an actual inspection of the original documents no critic has the right to deny their verbal inspiration because of errors in transcriptions or translations. He dogmatizes without facts. The tendency to give up the doctrine of verbal inspiration is an indication of danger against which the history of German rationalism should be a caution to the American church.

We have not space to say more. The two remaining discussions are on very important topics, and rather than express a bare opinion concerning them, we prefer not to notice them at all. Indeed, we regret the meagreness of what has been said.

JOHN L. GIRARDEAU.

## TERRY'S "COMMENTARY ON GENESIS AND EXODUS."

COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT. Vol. I., Genesis and Exodus. By Milton S. Terry, D. D., and Fales H. Newhall, D. D. New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1889.

Much of the money invested in commentaries is dead capital. Many ministers have bought such works as Spurgeon's *Treasury of David*, and Parker's *People's Bible*, and even so good a mosaic as Butler's *Bible Work*, only to discover that, while they abounded in pointed, practical remarks, suggested in a general way by the Scripture under consideration, they were not really exegetical and explanatory, and that when a difficulty was encountered in the text the student must look elsewhere for assistance in the solution of it. The same thing is true of Matthew Henry's great work, of the homiletic portion of the *Pulpit Commentary* (though the expository notes in the latter work are in some cases excellent), and of comprehensive commentaries generally, the most notable exception being the *Bible Commentary* (Speaker's), which is on the whole the best comprehensive commentary in the English language. In buying that, one purchases less padding than in the case of any of the others. The trouble with many of these homiletic commentators is, that they have never made a thorough study of the books which they presume to expound. They do not lack ability or piety, but scholarship. Common sense and spiritual insight are indeed indispensable to the ideal commentator, but knowledge of the facts is equally indispensable. And here it is that Spurgeon, Parker, and Matthew Henry often fail. Such works ought not to be called commentaries, but sermon books. Of course we do not mean to deny that they serve valuable purposes, just as other homiletic encyclopedias and books of illustration do; but ministers are deceived when they buy them to explain the original text in its historical sense.

And yet there is no diminution in the demand for commentaries. Multitudes of them are thrown upon the market every year, and they are purchased with avidity. Perhaps no class of religious works is more remunerative to publishers. Ministers know that occasionally a good commentary does appear, and they are willing to buy a bushel of chaff for the sake of finding one golden grain like Broadus on Matthew, or Perowne on the Psalms. But of course it would be far better to buy the wheat without the chaff: and it is the business of the book reviewer to inform the public when to invest so as to accomplish that end. This is the purpose of the present notice, to say to our brethren that among the many recent commentaries on Genesis and Exodus we have found a grain of wheat, the work of Prof. Terry, of the Methodist Church. We speak not so much to technical scholars as to working pastors, those who wish a scholarly, concise, and practical commentary, which makes no parade of learning, dodges no difficulties, does no preaching, makes no rationalistic concessions, and maintains a thoroughly reverent and evangelical tone throughout. The work on Genesis and Exodus is complete in this volume. It is called "Vol. I." on the title page, because it is the first in the series to be published under the general title of *Whedon's Commentary on the Old Testament*.

In his Introduction Dr. Terry gives a succinct but masterly defence of the integrity of the Pentateuch. Busy ministers, who have heard much about the destructive criticism of the books of Moses, but have been unable to get a clear idea

of what is meant by it, will find here a statement readable, strong, and sound, which covers all the essential features of this protean science from its birth to the present day, the theory of Documents, the theory of Fragments, the theory of Supplements, and the theory of Ethnic Development, the results of which the author sums up as follows:

"It will be conceded, by every one competent to judge, that the researches and discussions of the Higher Criticism have developed a more thorough and scientific study of the Old Testament. Philological and historical questions connected with Hebrew literature have been investigated with rich results to the cause of sacred learning. As to the origin and authorship of the Pentateuch, we regard the following propositions as fairly settled:

"1. The Pentateuch contains a number of passages which cannot, without doing violence to sound critical principles, be attributed to Moses as their author.

"2. The Pentateuch, especially the book of Genesis, contains documents of various dates and authorship, which have been worked over into an orderly and homogeneous whole

"3. The laws of the Pentateuch were either unknown or else very largely neglected and violated during most of the period between the conquest of Canaan and the Babylonian captivity.

"4. The books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers show different stages of legislation, and Leviticus contains a noticeably fuller and more elaborate priestly code and ritual than appear in Deuteronomy.

"We are frank to say that we regard the above propositions as simple statements of fact. But the divergent and conflicting opinions detailed in the foregoing pages admonish us that many unsound and illogical conclusions may be drawn from well established facts. It is one thing to recognize positive results of criticism, quite another to accept theories which the critics build, or assume to build, upon such results. Let us now enquire if these four propositions are inconsistent with the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch."

In discussing the second proposition, he says:

"That the Pentateuch contains ancient documents of various dates and authorship is readily conceded. The wonder is that any one should ever have disputed this proposition, especially in regard to Genesis. This ancient narrative recounts numerous events which, as the writer's own chronology shows, occurred centuries and millenniums before Moses's day. The only rational supposition is, that written documents and oral traditions were employed in its composition; and this hypothesis holds equally well whether we attribute the work to Moses or to some other writer. But sober students will be slow to commend, much less to follow, the attempts of critics to detect and dissect the particular sources, and determine the work of each writer, even to the divisions of single verses. This microscopic refinement of criticism will be likely to refute itself. There is not an ancient work extant which, if subjected to such a process, could not be shown to have come from a variety of authors; and not a few learned treatises of modern times might be greatly improved, in the judgment of wearied readers, if only shorn of much that exact criticism might justly pronounce redundant, obscure, or slovenly. . . .

"The real question of criticism, we repeat, is not about the facts, but about theories assuming to rest upon these facts. The critics of one school affirm the existence of an original Elohist document running through the entire Hexateuch, and they are positive that the Jehovistic and other portions are later supplements. But the most recent school has changed to the very reverse of this, and conclude that the Elohist was the final redactor of the whole. Why should we follow either of these schools? Why may not Moses himself have gathered up the different traditions and documents, and compiled the book of Genesis, and, in the course of forty years, have added the other books, which from time immemorial have been ascribed to him? Later editors have added here and there a sentence, and Eleazar or Joshua (comp. Josh. xiv. 1; xxiv. 26,) might very appropriately have appended the account of the great lawgiver's death, and, indeed, have compiled the whole of

Deuteronomy, using in the main the last sayings of Moses; but such admissions furnish no valid argument against the Mosaic authorship of the great body of the work."

The way being now cleared of objections, he gives a short but satisfactory statement of the positive evidences of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, under the three heads of Internal Evidence, Evidence from the Subsequent History, and Collateral Evidence. Having thus disposed of the analysis of the Pentateuch in his Introduction, he does not cumber the body of his Commentary with wearisome and distracting references to it.

The strangest position taken by Dr. Terry is the one which the reader encounters at the very outset, viz., his interpretation of the Mosaic account of creation. That the world is vastly more than six thousand years old, and that it was not created in six civil days, are propositions which no one will now dispute. But there is by no means such universal agreement as to how the language of the first chapter of Genesis is to be interpreted. Our author accepts the facts demonstrated by geology, and makes an ingenious and able attempt to preserve the literal meaning of the terms in Genesis, by adopting the view of Dr. John Pye Smith, that the account refers, not to the primeval, cosmic creation, but to the creation of the Edenic region, not of the world, but of that part of the world which God was adapting for the dwelling of man and the animals connected with him, and the days were literal days of twenty-four hours each. If any one thinks this view an absurdity, let him read Dr. Terry's argument and answer it if he be able. But, like every other interpretation of the creative week yet suggested, it is beset with serious difficulties, and we cannot agree with his any more than we can with most of the others. Prof. Terry presses the advantage given him by the analogy of the flood, which all now agree was not universal, but partial. It may be, as he says, that our eyes are too full of "star dust" to see clearly, but we cannot by any effort divest our mind of the feeling that the writer of the first chapter of Genesis meant to describe the creation of the universe.

Doubtless the same principle of interpretation which determined his view of the Mosaic account of creation decided him to accept Luther's view of the exclamation of Eve on the birth of Cain: "I have gotten a man, the Jehovah." We wish his loyalty to this principle had been strong enough to induce him to accept at their surface value the statements of the inspired writer concerning the length of the sojourn of the children of Israel in the land of Egypt. Moses says explicitly and repeatedly that it was four hundred and thirty years. It is particularly deplorable that a commentator, so clear-eyed and courageous as Prof. Terry, should resort to the same dismal jugglery by which the genealogy-worshippers and Ussherites in every age have endeavored to distort that statement, and make it mean two hundred and fifteen years. If the genealogies are complete, and the short period is correct, then each of the four sons of Kohath was himself the father of over two thousand sons, and we know not how many daughters. This reduction to absurdity is alone sufficient to condemn the short period, aside altogether from its point-blank contradiction of Ex. xii. 40.

There are in a few cases minute errors as to matters of fact. It is not true, for instance, that "since the Mohammedans possessed it, no Christian has been permitted inside the mosque of Hebron except the Prince of Wales and his attendants" in 1862. Twice since have Europeans entered it, the Marquis of Bute in 1866, and

the Crown Prince of Prussia in 1869. We disagree with him on some of his etymologies also. "Pharaoh" does not mean "the sun." It means "the great house," answering exactly to "the Sublime Porte" and "the Mikado." His explanation of the discrepancy between Ex. ii. 14, and Heb. xi. 27, is unsatisfactory.

The reader who observes what minute points these are will readily and rightly infer that we have no serious exception to take to this work. We agree with the author in nearly every case. His interpretation of the Messianic prophecies in Genesis, of the covenant name "Jehovah," of the plagues of Egypt, of the symbolism of the tabernacle, and his views in general concerning revelation, inspiration, miracles, and other great subjects, are almost exactly the same that we have taught for years in the class-room. The sensible manner in which he meets those difficulties which have been created by wrong theories of inspiration, is suggested by his remark that "we are not to expect Occidental rhetoric in Oriental documents."

This Commentary on Genesis will not take the place of Delitzsch with well-furnished Hebrew scholars, but for most ministers it will be more serviceable, while the commentary on Exodus we regard as vastly superior for most purposes to any other exposition of the book with which we are acquainted.

*Union Theological Seminary, Hampden-Sidney, Va.*

W. W. MOORE.

#### ROSS' "THE CHURCH KINGDOM."

THE CHURCH KINGDOM. Lectures on Congregationalism, Delivered on the Southworth Foundation, in the Andover Theological Seminary, 1882-'86. *By A. Hastings Ross.* Boston and Chicago: Congregational Sunday-school and Publishing Society. 1889.

These lectures are a valuable contribution in the department of Ecclesiology. In arrangement and style, the whole series is admirable. The first lecture treats of the manifestation of the kingdom under the patriarchal and ceremonial dispensations. The others are devoted to that of the Christian dispensation. "There is," says the author, "an earnest, pervading, prevailing, irrepressible desire of believers, begotten of the Spirit, to manifest in organic visible form the unity of the kingdom of heaven, which will sometime find adequate, normal, and ecumenical expression. The attempts to realize it have given rise to the following theories or doctrines of the Christian church, namely: (1.) Fellowship and unity on the principle of infallible primacy, which emerges in the Papacy. (2.) Fellowship and unity on the principle of apostolical succession, which emerges in Episcopacy. (3.) Fellowship and unity on the principle of authoritative representation, which emerges in Presbyterianism. (4.) Fellowship and unity on the principle of church independency, which emerges in Congregationalism." These statements furnish the ground-work of the course of lectures. The four emergencies are treated separately, and then compared. While much may be said by all in commendation of these lectures, those occupying a different stand-point will find some things in them from which to dissent. The objection is not that there is too much Congregationalism, but not enough of church government. The whole system is projected on too low a plane. The four forms of polity are regarded as historical developments emerging from religious experience, instead of from constitutive principles found

in the Word of God—an outgrowth of a craving of God's people for fellowship and unity. According to this the only mistake that any one has committed in relation to church government is simply an error of the judgment in choosing and adapting means to the accomplishment of an end. There are some who believe that something far more serious is involved: a misinterpretation of Scripture and of Scripture precedents. Moreover, fellowship and unity are not exhaustive of the ends of church government. But even granting this, Congregationalism would certainly be put to the worse when the historical test is applied. In the attainment of fellowship and unity, it does not occupy the first place among the four emergencies.

There are some assumptions in this course of lectures which may be noted. For example, "Presbyterianism as a polity does not date earlier than John Calvin." Some believe that it dates back to Moses and his bench of elders, that it existed in the synagogue and was incorporated into the Christian church in which, under apostolic direction, elders were ordained in every city, and in which authoritative representation was authorized when the synod of elders was called at Jerusalem and decrees were formulated which were sent down to the churches.

It is represented that the *jure divino* claim for Presbyterianism has been so shattered that it is being abandoned by Presbyterians themselves. To what extent it is being abandoned is not known. Some there are still who have the folly to hold to it. If the office of ruler in the church rests upon divine authority, and is not created by the society and limited by the same, then is it *jure divino* as far as it goes. The Papist claims it; the Episcopalian claims it; the Presbyterian claims it, and the Congregationalist ought to claim it. It is as little as any can claim this side of sheer Voluntarism. It is not contended that the form of government in the New Testament is developed into completeness in gradation of courts. If, however, there are found individual churches under the rule of a plurality of elders, and a case of jurisdiction over the whole by authoritative representation, then there is all that is essential to Presbyterian polity. In the early history of this country, Presbyterian churches existed more than a half century before the organization of a Presbytery, then more than a decade before the erection of a Synod, and it was seventy-two years after that before the organization of a General Assembly. So in the early history of the Christian church, the environment did not afford a development in details.

"It (Congregationalism) laid the foundation of this republic, and may even claim the form of its development," is a declaration that is simply reckless. Had this government developed according to Congregationalism, instead of a confederation of States, there would have been an indefinite number of petty independencies. To say that this government is founded upon Congregational polity and developed in form according to the same, involves the baldest State Rights ever heard of. It is only repeating history to say that Presbyterianism of the Scotch type exercised a dominating influence in shaping this government. Such was this influence at the time of forming the government that there were fears in some quarters lest Presbyterianism might be made the established religion. But no, this was foreign to Presbyterianism. The conflict in Scotland had been for the Crown Rights of Christ, the spirituality of the church and her independence of civil power. It was from this conflict and from its hard training came the material that gave type to early Presbyterianism in this country. On the other hand, early Congregationalism in New England sought to realize a theocracy—union of church and state. But aside

from all that has been said, and many other arraignments that might be made, much of solid worth must be awarded to these lectures. They deserve, and will have, a permanent place in the literature of the church. J. D. TADLOCK.

*Columbia Theological Seminary.*

McGIFFERT'S "DIALOGUE."

DIALOGUE BETWEEN A CHRISTIAN AND A JEW, entitled Ἀντιβωλιή Παπίσμου καὶ Φίλωνος Ἰουδαίων πρὸς μόνυχόν τινα: The Greek Text, edited with Introduction and Notes, together with a Discussion of Christian Polemics against the Jews. Inaugural Dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Marburg. Presented by Arthur Cushman McGiffert. New York: The Christian Literature Co. Pp. v., 94. 1889.

*The Dialogue Between a Christian and a Jew* is not in itself a very valuable work. It was written, in its original form, not earlier than the fifth century, nor later than the beginning of the eighth. The first limit is fixed by the fact that perpetual virginity is attributed to Mary; the second by a reference in the Venetian MS., which represents the oldest recension of the Dialogue to the length of time that had elapsed since our Saviour was upon earth, and also to that since the destruction of Jerusalem.

It need scarcely be said that when the Dialogue was penned the opposition of the Jews to the gospel had long ceased to be a matter of importance to the church. A refutation of any objections they might offer would, if the Jews themselves were the only parties to be affected by it, have been considered a waste of time. But, in the earlier time, when the Jews were antagonists not to be despised, the argument for the truth of Christianity, based upon the Old Testament, naturally took the form of a polemic against them. The conviction of the Jew, out of the oracles which he acknowledged as the word of God, however, was not the only end in view in literature of this sort. It was addressed to the Christians themselves with the purpose of strengthening their faith in their religion as something not new, but the more perfect form of that older system which had now passed away. The argument from prophecy, especially, was found valuable in confirming those who might be tempted to believe that, after all, the hopes of the Christian were a delusion. Now, the Jew as an interlocutor lent himself most readily to the purposes of the apologist, who used him to bring forward the objections in such form as to make the quotations from the Old Testament tell most effectively towards showing the utter futility of those objections. The *Dialogue Between a Christian and a Jew* was, then, a most convenient form in which to present the truth in certain aspects of it, and therefore it survived into a time when nobody cared whether Jews were convinced of the truth of Christianity or not.

One who should read through this particular Dialogue, edited by Dr. McGiffert, would find that the Jew plays his part until the author gets tired of him, and then suddenly he ceases to take notice of him, proceeding through more than half his apology and to the end with unbroken discourse.

The editor has done his work well, as indeed we were prepared to expect, when we read upon the title page that the Dialogue, as he has given it to us, was a successful inaugural dissertation for the Doctor's degree at a German University. The text is based upon the MS. preserved in the St. Mark's Library at Venice, and



which, although it is not the oldest MS. of the Dialogue in existence, represents, as has already been said, the oldest recension of it. There are extant two other MSS., one in the National Library at Paris, the other in the library of the Most Sacred Synod of Moscow. Of this latter MS., Dr. McGiffert was able, through the kindness of the librarian, to get a few of the variant readings; but the Paris MS he himself discovered, and he has carefully collated it with the Venetian. The Greek text, with the foot notes giving the variants, covers thirty-two octavo pages. Following this are several pages of notes, and an index of Scripture references.

That part of Dr. McGiffert's performance, however, which is of most general interest is found in the introduction (of 47 pages), containing two chapters, the first being entitled *Christian Polemics Against the Jews*; the second, *Dialogue of Papius and Philo*; i. e., the Dialogue Between a Christian and a Jew now under consideration. In section 8, being a part of this second chapter, there is given a carefully prepared and exhaustive analysis of the contents of the Dialogue, the perusal of which may satisfy the reader who has grown somewhat rusty in his Greek.

Chapter I., Sec. 1, is an interesting resumé of facts concerning early Christian polemics. In the course of these remarks we find evidences that the editor belongs to that school of critics which looks upon the New Testament as the product of the post-apostolic age. For instance, on pages 8, 9, he says: "Dogmas vary from age to age. But in apologetics based upon prophecy we have two unchangeable factors: Old Testament predictions, New Testament fulfilment. In the generations before the formation of the New Testament canon, the second factor was, to be sure, variable. The traditions as to the life of Christ were not yet absolutely fixed, and opportunity was given to alter and add to them at will, a process of which we can detect many traces in the writings of the second century."

Again, Dr. McGiffert reveals his point of view in what he tells us concerning the adoption of the Old Testament scriptures by the Christian church as a part of the word of God. Says he:

"During the early years of Christianity the Old Testament was the only book of oracles for Christians as well as for Jews. To it, and it alone, could they appeal for a written warrant for their teaching. They must find in it, then, not simply prophecies of the external life of the individual Jesus, but also the whole plan of salvation as understood by them. It must, in fact, be their gospel, and what Christ and his apostles taught must be found taught there. The part which the Old Testament played in the early church was thus prodigious. Had Christ come with a written gospel in his hand, as Mohammed came with the Koran, all would have been different. As it was, Jews and Christians had but one book, in which the Jews read one thing, the Christians quite another. But as in the course of time Christianity came into possession of its own independent book, as the writings of the disciples began to circulate and to be looked upon as possessing divine authority, the state of affairs was changed. And yet, though the church had by this time broken completely its Jewish bonds, and had become universal in spirit and in principle, though it was composed largely of Gentiles, to whom Judaism was far from sacred, still the Old Testament had during the earlier years gained, under the necessities of the case, so completely the stamp of a Christian book, and under Christian interpretation had lost so completely its Jewish character, that it was preserved as a most necessary part of the Scripture canon of the church. It is to the necessity laid upon the early church to make of it a Christian book that we owe its existence to-day in the canon. Later centuries, with their apostolic works and with their independence over against Judaism, would never have felt the need of so transforming it." (Pp. 4, 5.)

This can mean nothing else than that the early Christians, under stress, read into the Old Testament what would never have been found there had they been left to read the documents it contains under normal circumstances. The Old Testament has been *transformed* by the ingenuity of hard pressed defenders of the gospel into a Christian book! Such talk takes no account of such words as these as genuine utterances of Jesus Christ: "Search the Scriptures: for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me." (John v. 39.) For us these words are an end of controversy.

J. F. LATIMER.

*Union Theological Seminary, Hampden-Sidney, Va.*

HAWES'S "DOUBTS."

DOUBTS. *By Herbert H. Hawes, D. D.* Pp. 70. Richmond, Va.: Whittet & Shepperson. 1889.

This is another of those marrowy little books for which the earnest Staunton pastor is becoming distinguished. The present age is given to packing things in a small compass. The travelling-bag has almost superseded the portmanteau. The demand is for the maximum of worth in the minimum of space. People nowadays must have short meals, short visits, short-hand, short sermons, short articles, short treatises. The primer series is a notable outgrowth of this tendency. The tendency has been carried too far. What is on the whole the most productive reading must be carried forward on a somewhat large scale. Epitomes can never take the place of thorough and consequently extended discussions. Results are much, but results are not all; processes must also be taken into consideration. Great importance should be attached to details and to literary form and proportion. A cool *résumé* of Hamlet reads like a gazette. It is true that the statement of processes may often be judiciously curtailed, but it is equally true that the statement even of results in order to be adequate sometimes requires a certain liberality and amplitude. The *vale-mecum* can never entirely displace the portly octavo.

Still it must be conceded that the epitome has its uses; and high praise is due the man who within narrow limits has done what in less skilful hands would have called for a far wider area as the scene of operations. It is Macaulay that commended Goldsmith for having found out how to make a historical digest brief, and at the same time interesting. A perhaps unequalled specimen of this kind of writing is afforded by Green's *Short History of the English People*. The art has been cultivated by those who make *rifacimentos* of entire volumes for a single issue of a hebdomadal or daily journal. The three things chiefly aimed at are precision, clearness, and compression. In addition to these three things so much to be desiderated, Dr. Philip Schaff and Dr. Hawes give us a taste of the minutiae and a flavor of personal vivacity. The independence and individuality of our present author are stamped upon everything that has come from his pen. He likewise always betrays a competent knowledge of his subject, and the possession of what in most cases will be recognized by the impartial reader to be a just and logical mind. In one or two of his works there are indications of a playful humor and a shrewd mother-wit. In all his effusions there is apparent the desire to glorify God and benefit his fellowmen. Let us not shrink from saying, too, that the worthy controversialist of

Staunton is a fair as well as a brave antagonist. None more than he has the courage of his convictions, and he stands serene and undaunted in the midst of a host of violent adversaries.

This is clearly the author's master-piece, for it is not inferior to any of the rest in point of substance or style; is directed mostly against the common enemy of the church, and is on one of the highest themes that could be handled even by the giants of human thought, and the very theme of all others that is exactly adapted to the temper, disposition, queries, and wants of this latter half and quarter of the nineteenth century. The task he set before him was one bristling with difficulties, and we heartily congratulate him on the manner in which that task has been accomplished.

We confess that when we first took up this little volume we supposed we were invited to a consideration of the characteristic doubts of young converts and trembling believers. In this we found ourselves mistaken. Dr. Hawes would be the very man to write a companion volume on that topic. The doubts of immature and tempted Christians are in the main doubts respecting their own acceptance. The doubts considered in this compendious tractate are doubts respecting the fundamentals of Christianity itself. In the treatment of this subject, as has already been intimated, the author displays his familiar traits to unusual advantage. His mental movements are *sui generis*, and the successive steps of his argument can never be predicted or anticipated with confidence. Dr. Hawes lets himself alone, and is always Dr. Hawes, and nobody else; he never wears another skin, or tricks himself out in alien plumage. There is at times a refreshing boyishness about his manner, though it is united to the masculine grip and nerve that are always apparent in his diction, and are seldom wanting in his logic.

The discussion is embraced in ten chapters. These chapters are respectively headed: "The Value of Doubts," "About Testimony," "Doubtful Doubts," "The Struggle of the Disciples," "From Sepulchre to Ascension," "Testimony After Doubts," "Years Afterwards," "Modern Thought," "Who was He?" and "The Best Answer." We are disposed to think that one or more of these chapter-titles might be improved upon.

One strong point made is that the doubts which preceded the testimony of the disciples give that testimony unassailable value. The ground taken, after an examination of the narrative, is thus referred to:

"These men could not be made to believe what they have recorded, especially about the resurrection of Jesus, the foundation truth of all others, until each one had assured himself of the facts in the case by actual personal investigation. They did not simply abandon their doubts, nor suffer the persuasions of others to convince them. They speak their own personal experiences. Having personally ascertained the facts, they gave testimony. The world over, testimony of this kind and given in this way is accepted as the very best. Why not here?" (P. 13.)

Here is a strong way of putting things from the third chapter:

"The fact of Christianity cannot be disputed, more than one can dispute the fact of light when standing in the glare of a mid-day sun. There is, also, a *wondrous something* in its establishment, its irresistible growth, and in its wholesome and irrepressible influences. That its author was one called 'Jesus,' who claimed to be 'the Christ of God,' is known and accepted. But who was this Jesus?" (P. 21.)

There is a striking chapter on the struggle through which the disciples passed before they accepted the supernatural facts as a matter of their own private belief. Four things are set down as undisputed: First, Jesus of Nazareth really lived, and claimed to be the Christ of God; second, He was put to death by crucifixion; third, He was buried in the manner of that time; fourth, On the third day (by Jewish count) there was a report of his resurrection. The author then proceeds to prove that that report was well based. This part of the argument appears to us to be invincible, and is presented in a taking way. An interesting exposition is given of Matthew xxviii. 16, 17, especially of the clause "but some doubted." Renewed attention is called to the circumstance that these men were honest, prudent, careful to an extreme, and so suspicious of deception that "even at the risk of being deemed unreasonable and foolish," they would not allow themselves to be imposed on. "They were obstinate doubters to the extent of being afraid of favorable appearances." (P. 33.) The proofs of the resurrection of our Lord, which are given in this volume, are of course not new, but they are made to stand out in an uncommonly plain way before the eye of an untutored reader. The fifth chapter is happily closed by a quotation from M. Rénan: "It is useless to ascribe to them a disposition to be content with the minimum of proof; the proofs must needs have been very strong to overcome the crushing doubts occasioned by the death on the cross." (P. 39.) The disciples made sure that the resurrection was a fact before they believed it. Such careful honesty our author pronounces the world's hope. These intimate friends of years' standing would not believe one another; each must find out for himself. This, Dr. Hawes admirably says, shows two things: First, that they were not influenced by any "universal preconception in favor of miracle" in general, or of the resurrection in particular; and second, that there was no preconcert among them to "forge a story." This is in the sixth chapter, where the author makes this good point against the hypothesis of "fraud": that the world must then be growing blinder, as its ability to see through the "fraud" certainly grows less; for Christ was never so strong on earth as he is to-day.

But for the decisions of physical science as to what has hitherto been possible, the author holds that "modern culture" would presently be regarding the ascension of Jesus as an optical delusion, and be saying that he "only flew up out of sight, as an eagle is said to do." Thus, he sardonically remarks, "the colossal man" (of one of the European critics) and "the king of birds" would be placed on the same level as to their capacities. Another strong point made in this chapter is, that the truth of the claims of Jesus is the only thing that can account for the revolution that took place in the attitude towards him of the terrified and scattered disciples.

In the eighth chapter Dr. Hawes deals summarily and wisely with "Robert Elsmere." After quoting the most impressive passage in that entertaining romance, but feeble polemic, the caustic critic makes the assertion, that if the fishermen of Galilee could imagine a character so unspeakably transcending that of the "reconceived Christ" of the gifted and cultivated Mrs. Humphrey Ward, it was a great oversight on the part of all past generations that they did not catalogue the four evangelists as the eighth wonder of the world. (P. 55.) A powerful and unanswerable argument is drawn in the ninth chapter from Christ's superlative virtue taken in conjunction with his own claim of proper deity. The final chapter sums

up everything in a manner worthy of the preceding discussion. The closing words are these: "After their attacks upon the things of Christ, the world's great heart sees him as he was before, and turns to him as its 'all in all.' He says to Christianity and its hopes, 'Because I live, ye shall live also.'" H. C. ALEXANDER.

## MOSES AND HIS RECENT CRITICS.

MOSES AND HIS RECENT CRITICS. *Edited by Talbot W. Chambers.* New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 18 and 20 Astor Place. 1889. Pp. 408.

This collection of essays is a valuable contribution to the literature of the Pentateuchical controversy. No less than seventy-two works, many of them quite voluminous, are referred to, very few of which are accessible to the average student. We owe to Dr. Chambers, therefore, a debt of gratitude for this careful and judicious selection of essays, which cover the main points of the controversy, and put the results of modern scholarship within the reach of all. The Baptist, the Congregational, the Episcopal, the Lutheran, the Presbyterian (North and South), and the Reformed (Dutch) Churches are represented in this volume. One of the most interesting and valuable articles is the "Historical Sketch of Pentateuchal Criticism," by the editor, Dr. Chambers, beginning with *Astruck*, 1753, who founded his argument upon the recurrence of divine names, who was followed by *Eichhorn*, 1780, who based his theory on differences of style. In 1800, *Dr. Geddes*, a Roman Catholic divine, originated the "Fragmentary Theory." The "Supplementary Theory" was advocated by *De Wette* (1807), *Ewald* (1823), *Gramberg* (1828), *Stahlein* (1830), *Bleek* (1830), and *Tuch* (1833), who included the book of Joshua, and introduced the term *Hexateuch*. In 1862, *Popper*, a learned Jew, "gave to the criticism of the Hexateuch a direction which it retains to the present day. He maintained that the legislation concerning the building of the tabernacle and the consecration of the priests did not take its present shape until after the exile." He was followed by *Graf* and *Wellhausen*, who pushed this theory to the furthest extreme, and contended that the whole of the first Elohist, history as well as laws, is post-exilian. This is the present status of the controversy. "According to the prevailing view, different documents were used in the Hexateuch. There was a first Elohist and a second, a first Jehovist and a second, a Deuteronomist, and one or more final redactors, and the form which the work now holds was not settled until after the exile." On these main points the leading critics of Europe substantially agree, while they differ, sometimes widely, on minor questions.

Now, it is the object of the essay to examine the foundation of these claims, and "to set forth in a simple and lucid way the reasons for a conservative view of Pentateuchal criticism." Due credit is given to the critics for their learning, acuteness, good faith, and for the valuable results of their patient analysis. It is also admitted that there is a real basis for many of the distinctions drawn between the book of the covenant, the priest-code, and the Deuteronomic utterances. The Pentateuch may have been edited after it left the hands of Moses by the insertion of slight notes (*e. g.*, Gen. xxxvi. 31). Different documents may have been used by Moses in composing the narrative found in the book of Genesis, and the laws he set forth may have been modified and enlarged as circumstances required. In a work of so great antiquity difficulties are to be expected, but they are utterly insignificant when compared with those which attend the post-exilian theories. The

Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch then stands unchallenged. Each essayist treats of some special phase of the subject from his own standpoint.

Professor Gardiner shows that "the Hebrew religion is not a natural development." Professor Bissell gives a searching "Analysis of the Codes." The subject of Professor Green's essay is "Pentateuchal Analyses." Professor Schodde treats of the value of the "Testimony of the Pentateuch to Itself, Direct and Indirect." Professor Beecher considers the "Testimony of the Historical Books, save Chronicles." Professor Terry, Illinois, confines his essay to the "Testimony of the Book of Chronicles;" and Professor Harman to the "Testimony of the Prophetical (and Poetical) Books." "The Bearings of the New Hypothesis on Questions of Biblical Theology, Inspiration, and the Authority of the Bible generally," is ably handled by Professor Dwinell, California. Professor Streibort, Ohio, discusses "Credulity or Faith, or the Difficulties of the New Hypothesis." Professor Hemphill has a carefully prepared essay on the "Validity and Bearing of the Testimony of Christ and his Apostles." The closing essay is by Professor Osgood, Rochester, N. Y., on a "Reasonable Hypothesis of the Origin of the Pentateuch."

These essays are obviously the productions of scholars who have made a special study of their themes. They evince profound learning, thorough investigation, keen critical analysis and logical acumen. A great mass of information and argument is condensed into a few pages. The editor of this volume has rendered good service to the cause of truth, and left the most hard-worked minister without excuse for lack of familiarity with the Pentateuchal question. It should have a place in the library of every student of the Bible. The arguments are arrows which every intelligent Christian may easily handle, and he should have his quiver full of them.

G. R. BRACKETT.

#### "CHRISTIANITY AND AGNOSTICISM."

CHRISTIANITY AND AGNOSTICISM. A Controversy, consisting of papers by *Henry Wace, D. D., Prof. Thomas H. Huxley, the Bishop of Peterborough, W. H. Mallock, and Mrs. Humphrey Ward.* Pp. 329, 12mo. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1889.

This volume is made up of a reprint of eleven separate papers, all of them originally published in *The Nineteenth Century* during 1889, with the exception of the first, by Henry Wace, D. D., Principal of King's College, London, which was read at the Manchester Church Congress in 1888, and published in the proceedings of that congress; and the tenth, by W. H. Mallock, which first appeared in *The Fortnightly Review* for April, 1889. As here collected in a small volume, these papers furnish a pretty thorough discussion of agnosticism in its latest phases; and certainly no complaint can be made by its advocates of the refusal of a full hearing, since of the three hundred and twenty-nine pages of the volume, two hundred and eighty-two are given them, while only forty-seven have been occupied by the advocates of Christianity. That the discussion is an able one, the names of the persons who have taken part in it is a sufficient guarantee. Anything like a "review" of this book is impossible in the narrow limits allowable in such a "notice" as the present. I shall therefore satisfy myself with two extracts from the papers of Professor Huxley, in which I think the reader will be interested, with a few words of comment thereon.

L. Professor Huxley, who claims, and in so far as I know, fairly claims, to be author of the title agnostic, gives the following account of its origin:

"When I reached intellectual maturity, and began to ask myself whether I was an atheist, a theist, or a pantheist, a materialist or an idealist, a Christian or a free-thinker, I found that the more I learned and reflected, the less ready was the answer, until at last I came to the conclusion that I had neither art nor part with any of these denominations, except the last. The one thing in which most of these good people were agreed was the one thing in which I differed from them. They were quite sure they had attained a certain 'gnosis'—had more or less successfully solved the problem of existence, while I was sure that I had not, and had a pretty strong conviction that the problem was insoluble. And with Hume and Kant on my side, I could not think myself presumptuous in holding fast by that opinion. Like Dante—

"In the midway of this mortal life  
I found me in a gloomy wood astray."

"But unlike Dante, I cannot add—

"Gone from the path direct."

"On the contrary, I had and have the firmest conviction that I never left the *verace via*—the straight road, and that this road led me nowhere else but into the dark depths of a wild and tangled forest. And though I have found leopards and lions in the path; though I have made abundant acquaintance with the hungry wolf, that with 'privy paw devours apace and nothing said,' as another great poet says of the ravening beast; and though no friendly spectre has ever yet offered his guidance, I was and am, minded to go straight on, until I either come out on the other side of the wood, or find there is no other side to it—at least none attainable by me.

"This was my situation when I had the good fortune to find a place among the members of that remarkable confraternity of antagonists, long since deceased, but of green and pious memory, the Metaphysical Society. Every variety of philosophical and theological opinion was represented there, and expressed itself with entire openness; most of my colleagues were *ists* of one sort or another; and however kind and friendly they might be, I, the man without a rag of a lable to cover himself with, could not fail to have some of the uneasy feelings which must have beset the historical fox when, after leaving the trap in which his tail remained, he presented himself to his normally elongated companions. So I took thought, and invented what I conceive to be the appropriate title of 'agnostic.' It came into my head as suggestively antithetic to the 'gnostic' of church history, who professed to know so much about the very things of which I was ignorant; and I took the earliest opportunity of parading it at our society, to show that I had a tail, like the other foxes. To my great satisfaction the term took; and when the 'Spectator' had stood godfather to it, any suspicion in the minds of respectable people that a knowledge of its parentage might have awakened, was of course completely lulled. That is the history of the origin of the terms 'agnostic' and 'agnosticism.'" (Pp. 36-38.)

On the above I remark:

1. Professor Huxley explicitly acknowledges, after years of earnest study, free from every possible restraint of creeds and the prejudice of early education, that in his judgment neither human science nor philosophy has "successfully solved the problem of existence;" and "his conviction that the problem is insoluble"—insoluble, he must mean, by the methods he has tried. How imperative, then, the necessity of a revelation from God, when human reason fails so utterly!

2. How sad the result of taking human science and philosophy to solve "the problem of existence," when the utmost they can do is to lead their disciple "no where else but into the dark depths of a wild and tangled forest, where no friendly spectre has ever yet offered his guidance;" and the best a man can do is "to go

straight on, until he either comes out on the other side of the wood, or finds that there is no other side—at least none attainable by him.” Surely if there be a God, and that God “our Father in heaven,” it is most reasonable to suppose that he will help us by a revelation from on high, and not leave us to perish by exhaustion, or by the “leopards and lions” which Professor Huxley saw in the depths of that tangled forest.

II. In combating the positive philosophy, as set forth by Mr. Harrison, who would have us “worship humanity, that is to say, to adore the generalized conception of men as they ever have been and probably ever will be,” Professor Huxley writes:

“I know of no study which is so unutterably saddening as that of the evolution of humanity, as it is set forth in the annals of history. Out of the darkness of prehistoric ages, man emerges with the marks of his lowly origin strong upon him. He is a brute, only more intelligent than the other brutes; a blind prey to impulses, which as often as not lead him to destruction; a victim to endless illusions, which make his mental existence a terror and a burden, and fill his physical life with barren toil and battle. He attains a certain degree of physical comfort, and develops a more or less workable theory of life in such favorable situations as the plains of Mesopotamia or of Egypt, and then for thousands and thousands of years struggles with varying fortunes, attended by infinite wickedness, bloodshed and misery, to maintain himself at this point against the greed and ambition of his fellow-men. He makes a point of killing and otherwise persecuting all those who first try to get him to move on; and when he has moved on a step, foolishly confers *post-mortem* deification on his victims. He exactly repeats the process with all who want to move a step farther. And the best men of the best epochs are simply those who make fewest blunders and commit the fewest sins.

“That one should rejoice in the good man; forgive the bad man, and pity and help all men to the best of one’s ability, is surely indisputable. It is the glory of Judaism and of Christianity to have proclaimed this truth through all their aberrations. But the worship of a God who needs forgiveness and help, and deserves pity every hour of his existence, is no better than that of any other voluntarily selected fetich. . . . I could just as soon bow down and worship the generalized conception of a wilderness of apes.” (Pp. 51, 52.)

This representation of “the evolution of humanity as set forth in the annals of history,” given us, not by enemy, but by one *facile princeps* among the advocates of that doctrine, I would commend to the careful consideration of any among the readers of THE QUARTERLY who may be disposed to adopt the doctrine for themselves.

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG.

#### BIXBY’S “RELIGION AND SCIENCE AS ALLIES.”

RELIGION AND SCIENCE AS ALLIES; OR, Similarities of Physical and Religious Knowledge. By James Thompson Bixby. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co., 175 Dearborn street. 1889. Pp. 226.

This unpretending volume contains much more solid thinking and strong writing than at first appears. It is well compacted, and needs careful reading to do it justice. Though there is much on the religious side with which we cannot agree, yet Mr. Bixby evidently has a well digested knowledge of the various sciences, and a specially clear and correct conception of the proper logical methods to be pursued in scientific research. He is particularly happy in showing that, on the religious side, substantially the same logical methods hold good as on the side of science. This constitutes the really strong point in the treatise.



There are eight chapters in the book, with the following titles: Introduction; I., No Necessary Antagonism between Science and Religion; II., Causes of the Actual Antagonism; III., The Claim of Religion; IV., The Claim of Science; V., The Faiths of Science; VI., Scientific Results; VII., Positive Scientific Proofs of Religion; VIII., Conclusion.

No attempt will be made in this short notice to allude to the contents of each of these chapters. Only a few salient points may be noticed.

1. In the first chapter the position that there can be no *necessary* antagonism between science and religion is very well wrought out. In the nature of the case there must be inherent harmony between true scientific results in any department and sound views regarding religious truth. Perhaps Christian apologists have sometimes been a little too suspicious of scientific research. The true position to take is to assume that there is no *necessary* antagonism between scientific and religious truth; and if there be *actual* antagonism, either our scientific conclusions are in error or our understanding of religious truth is incorrect. The relation assumed to exist between them, therefore, should be irenic, not polemical.

2. The conceptions of religion as set forth by our author are exceedingly defective. In regard to revelation, inspiration, the miracle, the authority of the Scriptures, and the idea of Jesus, we are compelled to take issue with Mr. Bixby. The conceptions are purely naturalistic, and hence a higher conception must be maintained, even in the debate with science. The following statement regarding Christ, made on page 58, will serve as a sample: "I gladly recognize him as the loftiest spiritual seer and teacher the world has seen; the best historic embodiment of spiritual perfection that we have. But we must own, if we are clear-sighted and frank, that in Christ himself we do not yet obtain an oracle exempt from the limitations of humanity and the conditions of earthly knowledge." Such an idea of Christ is entirely inadequate to determine the conception of religion.

3. The large place given to "faith" by our author, on the scientific side, is a very important point, and in many respects the part that faith plays in scientific research is very fairly stated. This is a fact often overlooked in discussions concerning science and religion. The scientist sometimes claims that he reaches his conclusions by the pathway of knowledge alone, and has no need of faith at all; and in like manner he insinuates that religion must rely almost entirely on faith—even credulity. Mr. Bixby very properly points out that science has her faiths as well as religion, and many pertinent illustrations drawn from several sciences fortify his position. Knowledge and faith both have their functions, alike in the field of science and in the sphere of religion. Hence religion and science are in substantially the same position, so far as reaching certainty is concerned.

4. That in many ways science and religion pursue the same logical methods of reaching their conclusions, is a position well taken and well defended by Mr. Bixby. Of course, there are limitations of a certain kind connected with those transcendent supernatural truths which our author ignores to a great extent in setting forth his conception of religion. These limitations are to a large extent overlooked by our author; still, the general soundness of his position is not impaired thereby, though the conclusions reached require to be somewhat modified.

5. In this treatise we observe that there is an illustration of what we often find in writers who have paid special attention to scientific research and become proficient therein, but have not studied with equal care the facts and claims

of religion. In such cases, we often find that scientific experts may stand exposed as mere novices in matters of religious knowledge and biblical interpretation. If such men propose to enter the religious sphere, they should qualify themselves for doing so by as careful a study of the truths of religion as of the facts of science.

In like manner the Christian writer should be equally careful in entering the scientific department. He, too, should qualify himself for doing so by a diligent study of the sciences, else he may make great blunders which will only reveal his ignorance. The only man who is truly and fully qualified to discuss the relations between science and religion is the man who is fairly well acquainted with the facts in both departments. Notwithstanding all that may be said in approval of this book, it is evident that the author does not meet on the religious side these conditions on the religious side.

F. R. BEATTIE.

*Columbia, S. C.*

COBBE'S "SCIENTIFIC SPIRIT OF THE AGE," ETC.

THE SCIENTIFIC SPIRIT OF THE AGE, AND OTHER PLEAS AND DISCUSSIONS. *By Frances Power Cobbe, Author of "An Essay on Intuitive Morals," "Religious Duty," etc.* Boston: Geo. H. Ellis, 141 Franklin street. 1888. Pp. 243.

This little treatise consists of six well-written essays; and, like some volumes of sermons, takes its title from the first of these—"The Scientific Spirit of the Age." The branch of scientific research whose "spirit" is discussed is physical science, and biology is made prominent by the scholarly author. The opinion of Sir James Paget, to the effect that nothing could be better fitted to advance human prosperity than science, is effectively criticised. The point is well taken that scientific research does not largely call into exercise the higher range of human faculties, but merely calls forth the highest exercise of the lower range of these faculties. Miss Cobbe also argues effectively to show that the spirit of modern science is injurious to art, and especially to poetry as the art of arts. The effect of the scientific spirit on ethics and religion is shown to be hurtful, if not wisely guided. Some strong womanly things are said in this connection. She concludes that "while science has given us many precious things, it is, in its present exorbitant development, depriving us of things more precious still."

The second essay is a vigorous critique of our modern system of education, inasmuch as it almost totally ignores the education of the emotions. A strong plea is made for reform in this matter. It may be doubted, however, whether as much can be done for the education of the emotions in the school-room as in the home. A true home is the best nursery for the emotions.

The third discussion is an exceedingly interesting sketch of what is termed, "Progressive Judaism." The history and destiny of the Jews, now "scattered and peeled," are absorbing themes, and Miss Cobbe has warm sympathy with them. The three parties found at present among the Jews are sketched, and their respective opinions stated—the Orthodox, the Older Reformed, and the Newer Reformed Jews. Though this discussion is fraught with profound interest, and breathes the warmest sympathy with God's ancient people, there often appears a lack of appreciation for evangelical Christianity, as is evident from passages like these: "Now Christian theists have hitherto wanted a rallying point, and have been taunted with the lack

of any historic basis for their religion." "Why (it will be asked by many) should not this Reformed Judaism afford such a rallying point, and the old rocky foundations laid by Moses support a common temple of Christian and Jewish theism?" There is here an entire failure to recognize the close historical connection and organic relation subsisting between the Old Testament and the New.

The fourth discussion deals with the topic, "Thoughts about Thinking," and the fifth with the subject, "To Know; or, Not to Know;" but our space compels us to pass by both without remark, though they are worthy of some notice.

The last essay, in a really brilliant way, sets forth the respective merits of "Town and Country Life." The advantages and disadvantages of each are so skilfully stated and so well balanced that the reader has great difficulty in discovering the preference of the author, and still greater difficulty in deciding what his own preference should really be.

Altogether, these six essays may be read with profit and pleasure, though one may not be able to agree with all that this gifted author writes.

*Columbia, S. C.*

F. R. BEATTIE.

TOMPKINS'S "THROUGH DAVID'S REALM."

THROUGH DAVID'S REALM. *By Edward Staats DeGrote Tompkins.* With two hundred illustrations by the author. Troy, N. Y.: Nims & Knight. 1889.

This volume is a notable triumph of artistic book-making. From the aesthetic point of view it is well-nigh faultless. The figured cloth binding of salmon, pale green and gold, the glazed paper, the wide margins, the soft pictures, and the perfect print, together make up a dress which would attract attention amid the most sumptuous collection of gift books. There are two hundred excellent illustrations from sketches by the author, who, we had as well say at once, is more skilful with the pencil than with the pen. In other words the casket is richer than the jewel.

The text seems to have been written in the same impromptu way in which the sketches were drawn, but there is a carelessness about the former which the latter never show. Take the following as examples of the slipshod style: "Above the shops is to be seen portions of the arch and pediment still remaining;" "Some views of it, one especially where the column is leaning against the wall, is extremely attractive;" "There exists to-day, fortunately, a few traces of the old city." These would suggest that the fundamental defect of the style is the author's lack of acquaintance with some of the simplest rules of English grammar. Happily, however, such glaring offences are rare; and on the whole, Mr. Tompkins has given us quite a readable account of a thirty days' tour "through David's realm," beginning at Jaffa, touching Jerusalem, the Dead Sea, Nablous, Samaria, Esdraelon, Nazareth, the Sea of Galilee, Baniyas, and Damascus, and ending at Beirut. The work has no special merit apart from its dainty vesture. It cannot be named with such a book as Dr. Henry M. Field's *Among the Holy Hills*. That has permanent value. Every one who has read it desires and expects to read it again. But for this a single reading will suffice, though it is pleasant enough at the time.

The author is at his best in his descriptions, but even these lack the solidity and depth which a faithful study of the best authorities on Palestine would assuredly have given. He quotes such authors as Oliphant, Prime, C. D. Warner,

and Geikie. These cannot equip a man for visiting the Holy Land, much less for writing a book on it. Excepting a single reference to Dean Stanley, no good authority on Palestine is quoted. It should be stated, however, that the author writes on the theory that "the most interesting part of a book of travel is that which deals with commonplace every-day occurrences." But his reflections are quite as commonplace as the events. We feel constantly that he fails to get at the heart of things. And his facetious passages have a very mild flavor of humor indeed, the best witticism in the book being one that he quotes from a young Englishman in the party who gave the name of "Baalbek" to the horse he was riding, "because he was a great ruin."

Mr. Tompkins speaks of "Kohite Levites" when he means "Kohathite." We would remind him also of the fact that the name of the most perfect specimen of Greek architecture is not the "Pantheon," but the "Parthenon." The book would be a more agreeable one if the author had not recorded so many instances of his loss of temper over the little annoyances that fall to the lot of all travelers in the East. He is very severe on Cook & Sons, whose agent had furnished the party with a drunken dragoman named Leighton, and in the last chapter he gives the following sound advice to all who contemplate a visit to the Holy Land:

"I should most strongly advise any one desiring to see the whole country, and it is well worth one's time and trouble, to enter at Jaffa quite independently. Use Cook's landaus and his other facilities, when convenient, but do not be tied down by his regulation tour. It is not more expensive, and it will insure much more pleasure and much more attention from Cook's employees. But after the money is once paid down, two hundred dollars for the thirty days' tour, there is then nothing more for them to expect. I should suggest that one remain in Jerusalem certainly a week, perhaps two, and thence make excursions to Hebron, Bethlehem, Mar Saba, and the Jordan, returning to Jerusalem. A few days there will give the needed rest. Then take tents, or perhaps by this time there will be hotels established by the way, and go up to Nazareth. This will be a four days' ride. At Nazareth good accommodations can be had in the Convent. Thence it is an easy matter to go to the Sea of Galilee, and return by way of Mount Tabor. Then ride over from Nazareth to Haifa in time for the steamer which touches there once a fortnight. At Beirut it is an easy matter to take the diligence to Damascus, one day's ride, or to hire a private carriage, which, while a little more expensive, is far more comfortable. Remaining in Damascus at least a week, on his return let one make a detour to Baalbek, where there is a good hotel. Thus one can see the whole country and have but four nights in the tents, something greatly to be desired. While tents are very well at first, and comfortable when the weather is pleasant, they become very wearisome after a time, and are wretched if the weather be wet, as it is quite apt to be. A delicate person runs great risks by living in them, and the monotony of the journey over Hermon and up through the Lebanon mountains is almost unendurable.

"With Cook it is a matter of money. After his party is once formed, and the tents started on their northern journey, it is cheaper for him to send his parties through to Damascus. This wholesale way of travelling has made them the scoff of writers, although, in fact, excepting the arbitrary route laid out, and perhaps the chance of one or two disagreeable members, I am convinced that one has more real comfort than when travelling with a private dragoman. In proof of this I would cite the Hungarians, who, although very wealthy and going with their own dragoman, an accomplished Egyptian, joined our party because of the advantages offered. The sum of the whole matter is not to allow one's self to be completely under the control of Cook."

*Hampden-Sidney, Va.*

W. W. MOORE.

## WALLACE'S "REPOSE IN EGYPT."

THE REPOSE IN EGYPT. A Medley. By Susan E. Wallace, author of "*The Land of the Pueblos*," "*The Storied Sea*," "*Ginevra*," etc. With illustrations. 7 x 5 in. Pp. 391. Cloth, \$1. New York: John B. Alden. 1888.

Mrs. Wallace is a skilful writer. She may indeed be most widely known as the wife of the author of "*Ben Hur*," but, that unique performance excepted, she has written quite as well as her gifted husband. This volume is a striking proof of her versatility, and is refreshingly unlike all other books of travel. It is not a piece of hasty job-work, reeled off after a flying trip through the countries described, as too many books of travel are, but a collection of carefully prepared papers which were contributed at different times to various periodicals of high grade. Any lack of continuity resulting from this manner of composition is more than compensated by gains in other directions. For instance, this is a delightful book for an odd half hour alone, or for reading aloud in the evening home circle. It is not a rehash of Baedeker or Murray. Nor is solid information in any shape its chief object. The author advertises the reader in the preface that "the papers here collected contain little to reward the lover of useful knowledge, their purpose being to amuse rather than to instruct. Yet when truth is offered it is on high authority, or the result of patient investigation, that no mistake of mine may mislead the reader with whom I love to journey." As the wife of the American Minister to Turkey, she enjoyed exceptional advantages for the study of Eastern lands and peoples, and we have here the very atmosphere of the Orient. The title is taken from a three weeks' pic-nic on an island in the Nile, out of reach of mail, or telegraph, or any other turmoil of occidental civilization. While most of the book has to do with Egypt, its river, its ruins, its cities, its people, there are some deeply interesting chapters on such subjects as Mecca and Mohammedanism, the Bosphorus and Wedding Customs in the East.

W. W. MOORE.

*Hampden-Sidney, Va.*

## HOGUE'S IRREGULAR ATTIC VERBS.

THE IRREGULAR VERBS OF ATTIC PROSE. Their Forms, Prominent Meanings, and Important Compounds, together with Lists of Related Words and English Derivatives. By Addison Hogue, Professor of Greek in the University of Mississippi. Second Edition. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1889.

Prof. Hogue's book is just what one would expect from his well-known reputation as a practical, wide-awake, painstaking, and scholarly teacher. For many years Prof. Hogue has been studying the best methods of making clear the devious ways of Greek irregular verbs; his own teaching has been unusually successful, and his book, the outcome of scholarship, marked teaching ability and special study, will be especially welcome to teachers. Almost damp from the press, it has already been adopted in leading classical schools. Indeed, the schools have long needed such a work. Veitch, of course, is a standard work of reference, but only of reference. A student cannot learn Veitch; it would not even be desirable; but Prof. Hogue's book can be learned from back to back with great practical profit.

A succinct and helpful summary of the formation of the regular verb is given in Part I, as a basis for the treatment of the irregular verbs, Part II. Then fol-

low in alphabetical order those verbs of Attic prose which show any irregularity of formation. Around each verb is grouped, clearly and concisely, valuable information, as indicated in the title of the book. In giving prominent meanings and important compounds, Prof. Hogue has exercised a judicious reserve very often where self-restraint was a difficult matter, and yet the treatment is sufficiently full to give the student a good working vocabulary for standard Attic prose. In connection with the several verbs many points of syntax are aptly stated; and especially useful are the illustrative examples with their admirably neat and idiomatic translations. These renderings will prove valuable, we think, for purposes of Greek prose composition; they remind us of those wonderfully apt translations of examples for which Dr. Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar is justly famous.

With reference to the forms themselves of the irregular verbs, Prof. Hogue has given us the pith of Veitch in a serviceable shape, has in many instances corrected Liddell and Scott, and has had due regard to Meisterhans' *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*. In matters of detail, for which we have no space, different scholars will sometimes disagree with his statements; but very few criticisms of matters of fact can be made. Perhaps Prof. Hogue has been too lenient with that "roving *condottiere*," Xenophon. Perhaps the simple verb "to have" should be given only one future in good standing. About such matters there may be differences of opinion, but the book as it stands is sure to meet with approval of all its leading features.

The English derivatives are a feature of the book, and will be useful, we think, to many students. We notice that the second edition has corrected one or two inadvertencies of the first edition in this line. Nearly fifty pages are devoted to a series of valuable indices; we have never seen a book more completely equipped in this respect.

We hope, as subsequent editions are called for, that the author will see his way clear to indicate the sources of examples, and to mention concisely, for reference, stock passages in which many peculiar forms and usages of a verb may be found bunched in brief space.

In conclusion we beg leave to record our opinion that the book is a substantial addition to the workshop of both teacher and student, and that it is worthy of its dedication to Dr. Moses D. Hoge, *clarum et venerabile nomen*.

W. H. Bocock.

## IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

---

A CRITICAL AND GRAMMATICAL COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS. *By Charles J. Ellicott, D. D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.* 8vo, pp. 342. \$2.75. Andover: W. F. Draper. 1889.

Dr. Ellicott's work, many years ago, upon the shorter epistles of Paul, led scholars to look with unusual interest for the appearance of his commentary on the greater epistles. That expectation is met in the volume before us; but we are disappointed when we read the intimation that the learned author regards this as his last contribution to exegetical literature.

The Commentary on First Corinthians is constructed upon the same plan as his previous work of this kind, now so familiar to students of the Word. The only difference which the author himself notes is that long experience has brought with it a better mastery over materials, and that he has been led in this commentary respectfully to criticise rather than simply follow the many eminent expositors who have been consulted. As to the text, he acknowledges his indebtedness to Tregelles more than Tischendorf for his critical materials, while to Westcott and Hort he gives the palm for having done more than any others towards placing New Testament criticism on a rational basis and for having demonstrated the true critical value of the many witnesses to the various editions. By the careful use of the term "preponderating authority," modified scientifically by the adverbs *apparently, slightly, clearly, very clearly, greatly, very greatly, and vastly*, he has indicated his judgment of the facts of the case with each passage considered; and, in addition, has cited the judgment of the more eminent critical editors, like Lachmann, Tischendorf, *et al.* For the decision of the Revised Version he also manifests much respect. The Textus Receptus, or third edition of Stephens, has been regarded throughout as the text which has been worked upon in the construction of the text which appears in the volume. Departures from it are indicated and explained in the notes.

As indicating the author's method, his own words may be further used:

"The reader has before him an effort to ascertain, as far as possible by means of a close and persistent consideration of the grammatical form and logical connection of the language of the original, what the writer exactly desired to convey to the church of Corinth, and to all readers of this profoundly interesting epistle. Where grammatical and logical analysis might seem to prove insufficient, or leave open to us two or more possible interpretations, then, as in the earlier volumes of this series, careful use has been made of the best ancient versions, and of the writings of the early expositors who used, and who wrote in, the language of the original."

It need not be added that the book is not for general readers, but students, and to these it is, like its predecessors, the result of a marvellously well-furnished, judicious, reverent mind, and takes rank at once with the foremost works in its department.

COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS. *By E. P. Gould, D. D.* Pp. 226. COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE OF JAMES. *By Edwin T. Winkler, D. D.* Pp. 74. COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES OF PETER. *By Nathaniel Marshman Williams, D. D.* Pp. 112. COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES OF JOHN. *By Henry A. Sawtelle, D. D.* Pp. 85. COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE OF JUDE. *By Nathaniel Marshman Williams, D. D.* Pp. 23. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society 1889.

The two thin octavo volumes containing these commentaries belong to that admirable series, several times described in our pages, called "An American Commentary on the New Testament," issuing, under the editorship of the accomplished President Hovey, from the presses of the Baptist Publication Society. Like their predecessors in the series, they are thoroughly adapted to the purpose proposed, viz., furnishing to ordinary as well as critical students of the Word a work which places in their hands, in untechnical language, the best results of thorough scholarship. The natural leaning to a denominational interpretation of some passages, as 1 John v. 6, will not impair these volumes for general use. In the discussion of such exegetical problems as "The spirits in prison," etc. (Dr. Williams coincides here with the interpretation of Dr. Hovey in his *Biblical Eschatology*, elsewhere noticed), the various commentators commend themselves to evangelical Christians. The series is a credit to the denomination.

NOTES ON DIFFICULT PASSAGES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. *By Rev. Elias Riggs, D. D.* Pp. 259. Price, \$1.25. Boston: Congregational Sunday-school and Publishing Society. 1889.

The purpose of the book is exactly expressed by its title. It attempts to expound only those passages in the New Testament which present special difficulty to the ordinary reader. Dr. Riggs is well fitted for this task, not only by his familiar acquaintance with Greek, but also by his long residence in the East as a missionary of the American Board. Contact with Orientals gives new meaning to many a passage of Scripture. Dr. Riggs' expositions have the merit of being lucid, helpful, and in doubtful cases are not dogmatic, but fairly state the different views which are held. Bible students will feel indebted to him for the new light which he casts upon different passages and for his candid discussion of abstruse texts.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. *By the Rev. Alfred Plummer, M. A., D. D., Master of University College, Durham, etc.* Crown 8vo., pp. x., 435. \$1.50. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1889.

This fine addition to the series known as "The Expositor's Bible," is perhaps more characterized than any of the volumes that have preceded it by the denominational relations and tenets of the author. Nevertheless it is full of erudition and ability, and apart from its Anglicanism is a model of exposition. And even in connection with the advocacy of prayers for the dead (2 Tim. i. 17, 18), baptismal regeneration (Tit. iii. 5), and the "historic episcopate" (1 Tim. iii. 1-10), it is noticeable that the author relies more upon arguments drawn from human sources than divine, thus seeming to confess his own conviction that his case is not thoroughly made out from the Scriptures which he expounds. He candidly acknowledges, practically, that in one's determination of the nature of church government, history is of equal weight with apostolicity.



Taken altogether, the series to which this book belongs will be found one of the most admirable ever conceived. It now embraces ten or twelve volumes, and furnishes some of the best expositions with which we are familiar.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL, and other Critical Essays, Selected from the Published Papers of the late Ezra Abbot. 8vo., pp. 501. Boston: Geo. H. Ellis. 1888.

The twenty essays gathered and bound together in this handsome volume are, most of them, already well known. Their appearance in this permanent form will give pleasure to all who admire the scholarship and judiciousness for which, far above others of the same faith, Dr. Abbot was known. He was one of the foremost scholars of his day, and as a biblical critic, conscientious and thorough, he enjoyed in unusual measure the confidence of orthodox as well as Unitarian readers. The essays embodied in this volume embrace such studies as the Authorship of the Fourth Gospel (a treatise that commanded the special admiration of Dean Alford, and this is largely quoted in his commentary on John), The Comparative Antiquity of the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS. of the Greek Bible, The late Prof. Tischendorf, The late Dr. Tregelles, Westcott and Hort's Edition of the Greek Testament, The Gospels in the New Revision, etc., etc., as well as special studies of given texts, like John i. 18; John viii. 44; Acts xx. 28, etc.

THE DOCTRINE OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM: An Exposition of its Nature, Subjects, Mode and Duty. *By Rev. J. W. Etter, D. D.* 12mo., pp. 308. Dayton: United Brethren Publishing House. 1888.

The author is a minister of the United Brethren Church. His object in this work is not controversial. The style is not polemic. The orderly setting forth of the nature, design, obligation and subjects of baptism, and special emphasis of the obligation, are the features of the work. The author, with the church which he represents, regards the mode as being a matter of indifference, a position which he defends by showing that modalism cannot be proved from the word *baptidzo*, from any Scripture instance of baptism, or from the early history of the church. The work is of special value in its enforcement of the duty of baptism.

BIBLICAL ESCHATOLOGY. *By Alvah Hovey, D. D., LL. D.* 12mo., pp. 192. 90 cts. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1889.

The author rightly describes his work in the title, *Biblical Eschatology*. He deals with his subject from the standpoint of revelation, which he accepts as the only trustworthy source of knowledge respecting the life to come. It is, he declares, "the only testimony worth having." It is his task to ascertain and explain, not to defend or enlarge. When the treatment is controversial, it is made so by the necessity of opposing certain interpretations of Scripture and of defending others. The discussion is given under the following heads: Natural Death, Resurrection of the Dead, Condition of Human Souls Between Death and Resurrection, The Last Judgment, The Final State of Believers, and the Final State of Unbelievers. While highly commending premillenarians for their enthusiasm, devotion and learning, and for their evangelical and missionary labor, he believes that the position of post-millenarians is beset with fewer difficulties. In the interpretation

of the famous passage, 1 Pet. iii. 19, he believes the preaching to have been that of Noah himself. From some of his positions there will be dissent, as especially his explanation (pp. 38, 39) of the terms of biblical psychology, as "natural" and "spiritual" in 1 Cor. xv. 44, and his advocacy (pp. 172-176) of the possibility of salvation to adult heathen who know not the name of Jesus. With the exception of a few points like these, the book may be justly regarded as a valuable contribution to the literature of the subject.

ON THE REVISION OF THE CONFESSION OF FAITH. *By Benjamin B. Warfield, D. D.*  
Pp. 91. Paper, 30 cents. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1890.

A collection of five papers, written during the summer of 1889, and belonging to what the author calls "the first stages of the discussion concerning the revision of the Westminster Confession." The author's position in regard to this matter is too well known, and from these very articles, which appeared first in *The Independent*, *The Presbyterian Banner*, *Herald and Presbyter*, and *The Presbyterian Review*, to need fuller notice from us, and especially as it was somewhat fully set forth in the notes to the October, 1889, QUARTERLY. One who wishes to be thoroughly familiar with the earlier phases of the great discussion which is now absorbing the attention and thought of the Northern Church, and in the opinion of many threatening its unity, will find no better presentation of the anti-revision side than that given in these clear, direct, logical and convincing papers.

THE PSALMODY OF THE CHURCH: Its Authors, Singers and Uses. *By Rev. William H. Parker.* 8vo., pp. 241. \$1.50. Chicago: Hack & Anderson. 1889.

We had a few minutes' leisure lately, and thought we would glance through the pages of this book, preliminary to a full examination at some future time. We were amazed when we found that, so far from laying it down, we were reading chapter after chapter, with growing delight as well as instruction, and punctuating our transition from one subject to another with the unuttered remark, "Well, everybody should read this!" It is a simple, but fascinating History of Psalmody, from the time of the early Egyptians to the present day, interspersed with incidents and anecdotes and specimens of sacred lyrics selected with rare discrimination, and calculated to interest most deeply. Music and Psalmody, Old World Psalmody, Hebrew Psalmody, Psalmody in the Apostolic Church, Psalmody in the Early Primitive Church, Old English Psalmody, Diversities of Opinion, Puritan Psalmody, Hymn-Books, etc., etc., are among the many subjects which are considered or illustrated. The book is bright, readable, instructive, full of information and suggestion. It is a pleasure to recommend it.

PROPHETIC LIGHTS. Some of the Prominent Prophecies of the Old and New Testaments, Interpreted by the Bible and History. *By E. J. Waggoner.* 8vo., pp. 180. San Francisco and New York: Pacific Press Publishing Co. 1888.

This book's main design seems to be to prove that Christ's second coming is near at hand. This it does by the study of the prophecies in the light of history, and by attempting to show the literal fulfilment already accomplished. The author claims that prophecy is history told in advance, and that in the same manner as we can understand history when written by man, so we should not think it a thing im-

possible to understand the history when written in advance by the Spirit of God; that the difficulty supposed to lie in the interpretation of symbols is all a mistake; that the Bible itself furnishes the explanation of all the symbols used in prophecy, and that by simply substituting these explanations for the symbols, the prophecy may be read literally; that by applying these explanations to the symbols in the prophecies already fulfilled, we are assured that those that still remain will be as exactly fulfilled. He then follows the usual track in applying the prophecies to the great eastern empire, the empire of Rome, the papacy, and various historical events of a local and even recent nature, to arrive at the conclusion that the time of the end is near at hand. The book presents no specially new views or interpretations.

RUTH, THE CHRISTIAN SCIENTIST; or, The New Hygeia. *By John Chester, M. D., D. D., author of "Earthly Watchers at the Heavenly Gates."* 12mo., pp. 343. Boston: H. H. Carter & Karriek. 1888.

TROPHIMUS; or, a Discussion of the Faith-cure Theory. *By William Gribbon.* Pp. 37. Paper, 6 cts. New York: W. N. Jennings, 103 Walker street. 1889.

A physician and a theologian, the author seeks in the book first named to construct a story in which the views of both the friends and the opponents of the new Christian science, or mental therapeutics, are fully set forth. As closely connected with the Christian Science notion, the Faith-cure doctrine is also expounded. The writer announces it to be his purpose to steer clear of the extreme of ill-advised panegyric and bitter ridicule. He evidently sympathizes strongly, however, with the new notions, and would ascribe many wonderful cures to them. The book will be a useful one to those who desire to see the ablest presentation of that side, and the best exposition, perhaps, which can be given of the doctrines of so-called Christian Scientists and Faith-curists.

TROPHIMUS, while plain and unpretentious in make-up and contents, will be found a thoroughly practical answer to the faith-healing notion. It cites the case of Trophimus, whom Paul left behind him sick at Miletum, and shows that there is, from the beginning, a clear-cut controversy between Paul and the Faith-curists. For a short, keen, sharp, but always good-natured, discussion of the subject, we know of none better to place in the hands of those who are foolish enough to be deceived into support of the false doctrine. Some of its interpretations are not of the best, but there is a sound common-sense in the author's reasoning which compensates fully for any small defects.

THE BIBLE STUDENT'S HANDBOOK: An Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures. 8x5 inches, pp. 266. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell. 1889.

This little volume touches on almost everything embraced in larger works, on the books of the Bible, their writers, versions, the evidences of their truth and authenticity, and on the history, chronology, ethnology, biography, geography, zoölogy, science, music, manners, customs, etc., embodied and described in Holy Writ. It is necessarily greatly condensed, to cover so much ground; but by the use of very fine type, closely set, a very much larger amount of matter has been compressed into these pages than one would first think. The book is admirably suited to those who wish a handbook, brief and portable, and at a very low price.

FORMATION OF CHARACTER. Twelve Lectures Delivered in the First Presbyterian Church, New Orleans, La. *By B. M. Palmer, Pastor.* 16mo., pp. 222.

Dr. Palmer's felicity of expression and grace of style were never more marked than in these familiar lectures to young men, delivered at the request of a large company of them, and without any thought of their subsequent publication. They are elegant, forcible, eloquent, and full of the richest spiritual fervor. The subjects, all treated practically and scripturally and most beautifully illustrated by a wealth of metaphor and simile, are: Youth, The Formative Period, Elements which Enter into Character, Influence of Piety in Forming Character, Obligation Arising from a Pious Ancestry, Obligation Arising from the Trusts of Life, Obstacles to Piety in the Young, Choice of Amusements, Sin of Profane Swearing, Sin of Sabbath Breaking, Intemperance and Sins of the Flesh, Sin of Gambling, The Scriptures our Rule.

A REASONABLE FAITH. Plain Sermons on Familiar Christian Evidences. *By Arthur Crosby, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church of San Rafael, Cal.* 16mo., pp. 191. San Rafael: Marin Printing House. 1889.

In type bold and clear, and pages that will not discourage the reader by their size, these sermons, declared by the writer to be no new or original or brilliant treatment of old themes, more than fulfils what he leads us to expect. They are fresh and clear, and appeal directly to the common sense of the reader. The subjects presented are: No Mystery, No Faith, A Message from Heaven, The Everlasting Kingdom, What think Ye of Christ? The Three Witnesses, The Experimental Proof, Sin, Regeneration. The last two sermons are intended to show the practical effects which should result from the conviction of the truth of revealed religion.

BEACON LIGHTS OF THE REFORMATION; or, Romanism and the Reformers. *By the Rev. Robert F. Sample, D. D.* With an Introduction by the Rev. John Hall, D. D., LL. D. Pp. 452. \$1.50. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work. 1889.

The rise of Romanism, John Wyclif, Savonarola, John Huss, Martin Luther, Zwingle, Calvin, Cranmer, John Knox, and the Present Status of Romanism, are the general subjects of these pages. The field covered is familiar and often traversed, but we recall no single work which is at once so popular and so strong as this in its portrayal through biography of the progress of the Reformation and of the course of Romanism to its present status. The last chapter is of special value, as giving not only a just and charitable estimate of that which is good in the Roman methods and life, but also a warning of the danger arising from its change of method. We are reminded that "Rome never changes," and that, shorn of its temporal power, it still seeks its recovery and adheres to the principles involved in its restoration; that, having lost its supremacy in Europe, it seeks it in the Western empire, that and our safety lies in close adherence to the principles of the Reformers. It concludes by giving a hopeful view of Protestantism, and showing the marked decadence of Rome in various countries of the new world as well as of the old. We most heartily and without qualification recommend the book as a clear, succinct history, vivacious and interesting, and calculated to do great good.

**LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF PREACHING.** *By the late Rev. John Ker, D. D., Professor of Practical Training in the United Presbyterian Church; author of Sermons, "The Psalms in History and Biography," etc.* Edited by Rev. A. R. MacEwen, M. A. Introduction by Rev. Wm. M. Taylor, D. D., LL. D. 8vo., pp. xv., 407. \$1.50. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1889.

Of the twenty-one lectures in this volume, the first eight deal with the history of preaching up to the Reformation; the remainder treat of the history of German preaching after the Reformation, including Luther. It seems to have been the author's purpose to survey the whole field of preaching, especially in the French, Scotch, and Puritan pulpits. The volume before us, we are told, was made up of the lectures comprised in it only because they were more closely reduced to writing than the others. While not a work on Homiletics, this volume will be most helpful to all preachers by showing how important a part preaching has had in the development of the church and by what methods it has been enabled to hold its place and accomplish its work. Coming from one who was himself a master in the art as well as full of the spirit of preaching, the Lectures will be a stimulus to the mind and heart. The descriptions are terse and graphic, and the comments and studies just, evangelical, and suggestive.

**THE BEGINNINGS OF ETHICS.** *By Rev. Carroll Cutler, D. D., formerly President of Western Reserve College.* Crown 8vo., pp. xiv., 324. \$1.25. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1889.

As is indicated by the title, the book treats rather of ethical origins than of the details of ethical philosophy and practice, and is genetic rather than constructive in its method, showing how ethics arises psychologically and logically out of the nature of the soul, and the necessary assumption of its thought and action. The nature and field of the science are first considered, an outline of psychology is next given; then, having arrived at conscience, the author presents fairly and discusses the various theories of its nature, as Cudworth's, Clarke's, Reid's, Stewart's, Bentham's, Paley's and others, the sentimental theory, the evolution theory, etc. We know of no treatise as brief where one can find as much information and as sound reasoning. The special feature of the book is the manner in which the author leads one to Christian conclusions; it is an introduction to Christian ethics as based upon the Bible. It contains in small compass much that is of value to the student, and is a useful contribution to the cause of practical righteousness as well as of philosophical truth.

**WILFRED.** *A Story with a Happy Ending.* *By A. T. Winthrop.* 12mo, pp. 298. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1889.

A new edition of a book first published in 1880. The story is both fascinating and pure, and can be safely placed in any young person's hands. In plot and incident it bears such a strong resemblance to that very popular book, *Little Lord Fauntleroy*, that the publishers ask special attention to the fact that it was first printed from manuscript five years before that work appeared. We think it quite as interesting a book, and decidedly superior in naturalness and general spirit.

ALDEN'S MANIFOLD CYCLOPEDIA OF KNOWLEDGE AND LANGUAGE. With Illustrations. Vol. XIX. *Homage—Infancy*.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ , pp. 632. Cloth, 50 cts.; half morocco, 85 cts. New York: J. B. Alden. 1890.

The nineteenth volume of this frequently noticed publication maintains the character of the work in every particular, as a cheap, popular, useful and valuable combination of the unabridged dictionary and encyclopedia.

PENS AND TYPES; or, Hints and Helps for those who Write, Print, Read, Teach, or Learn. A new and improved edition. *By Benjamin Drew*. 12mo., pp. 214. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1889.

We wish every writer of manuscript intended for publication, as well as every printer, could read this little book. Its hints and helps, its sensible advice and instruction, faithfully followed, would greatly lessen the drudgery of publishing, as well as make writers' reputation safer. It is not right that all the blame of poor typography should fall upon the compositors. Let *writers* read this book, every one of them. They will be wiser and more considerate men. The chapters are on Writing for the Press; Proof-reading; Style; Punctuation; Orthography; Capitalization, etc. The success of the first issue has called for this enlarged and improved edition.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM; or, Modern Critical Theories as to the Origin and Contents of the Literature and Religion Found in the Holy Scriptures. *By Rev. F. R. Beattie, Ph. D., D. D.* 12mo., pp. 56. Toronto: William Briggs. 1888.

One will be surprised to find how much the author has put into this compact treatise. It is a remarkably clear setting forth, first, of the meaning of the term "Higher Criticism," and then, after a careful distinction between the various schools, of the principles and methods of the extreme critics, or critical school proper, represented by such names as Graf, Kuenen, C. Baur, Colenzo, and Robertson Smith. The topics discussed are, The History of the Movement, an Exposition of its Principles and Methods, a Critical Examination of the Movement, and an Estimate of its Important Results.

As fully as the length and purpose of the paper, prepared for a ministerial association and published by request, will admit, he discusses these questions, and from the standpoint of the stoutest orthodoxy, willing always to give the meed of praise where it is due, and not sparing a ringing indictment in those matters where the advanced critics have reached conclusions antagonistic to the essential principles of the Christian faith. The monograph should be widely disseminated. It contains in a nut-shell the leading points with which all intelligent Christians should be familiar.

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 13.—JULY, 1890.

---

I. CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS.<sup>1</sup>

You have called me to the discharge of most responsible duty and exalted service in this honored school of sacred learning. I sincerely pray that your call and my acceptance may unite in being an outward expression of the mind of the Spirit and of the will of God in regard to the way in which Christ's cause may be served and his name honored by means of this institution. Having hope that such is the case, it will be the earnest and undivided effort of my life, so long as I remain in your service, to perform the duties of this high office to the best of my ability, ever seeking the needed wisdom and promised grace which Christ's servants may claim.

You have also informed me that a short time prior to my election the scope of the chair whose work is committed to my trust was so enlarged as to include the entire field of Christian apologetics. This, in my judgment, is a very important change, and it makes exceedingly useful modifications of the work pertaining to this chair possible. Its incumbent will now be in a position to deal with several great topics not embraced in the field of the relations of science and revelation; and he will at the same time be able to construe many things which emerge in the discussion of these relations under the category of Christian apologetics. In this way the work of this professorship may be made wider in its scope and more systematic in the treatment of its materials than was possible under its former designation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Inaugural address by F. R. Beattie, on the occasion of his installation as Professor in the Theological Seminary at Columbia, S. C., May, 1890.

In view of the fact just stated, it has occurred to me that there is here suggested a suitable theme upon which to base the words that it is my privilege to speak on this occasion. That theme may be thus stated: CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS: ITS FUNCTION, SCOPE AND SPIRIT. Discoursing upon this theme, I shall endeavor to give a mere outline of what seems to me to be the import of the task placed in the hands of the modern Christian apologete.

If the exegete be the professed interpreter of the Scriptures, and if the theologian be the systematic expounder of the doctrines of Christianity, the apologete will be the acknowledged defender of the Christian system, while the preacher may be exegete, theologian, and apologete all in one. The defence of the Christian faith is a divinely imposed duty of the church. Paul regarded himself not only as the herald of the cross whose great aim was to preach Christ crucified and Christ risen, but he also claimed that "he was set for the defence of the gospel." Before Jew and Gentile alike, Paul was ever ready to convince gainsayers and to defend the truths of the gospel and the honor of his Lord with a courage and fidelity which put to shame much of the commending and defending of the gospel of Christ in modern times. In like manner Jude exhorts Christians "to contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints"; and Christ's appeal to his miracles as proof of his divine mission confirms the position that his followers may always make the same appeal in defence of the gospel.

In the very nature of the case there will ever be need for this defensive work. So long as the evil heart of unbelief remains in men, and so long as the enmity which refuses to be subject to God's holy law operates in human life, there will be such a natural antagonism to the Christian system as will always render its defence and vindication most necessary. Even though apologetics cannot change the heart or generate true faith—divine grace alone can effect these things—yet it is of much practical use in removing bandages from the eyes of the understanding, and in rolling away stones from the doorway of the tomb of faith, that the soul dead in trespasses and sins may hear the voice of the Spirit and live.



Much as apologetics has been needed in all ages, there, perhaps, never was a time when its defences were more necessary than at the present day. True, this is an age of intense religious activity of a practical kind in evangelistic and missionary labor, but it is also a period of skeptical questioning and scornful doubt in regard to many of the great verities of the Christian faith. Even the reality of the supernatural, which, in its various manifestations, is the inner fortress of the Christian system, is under fire from several quarters, and the conflict promises to be sharp and decisive. In this conflict the Christian apologete will require his very best weapons, and he must use them with the utmost wisdom and courage.

Christian apologetics, as a department of theological study, has to deal with the great questions which lie at the very foundations of the Christian system. It must present the grounds upon which Christianity claims intelligent acceptance, and set forth the evidences which justify a well-founded belief in its contents. The Christian apologete, as the accredited defender of religious faith, must face the problems of the existence of the divine Being, of the nature of man and his relation to God, of the Scriptures as a supernatural revelation, of the unique personality of Jesus Christ, of the reality of sin and its guilt, of the nature of redemption as the remedy for sin, and of the momentous issues of the eternal world. Such are some of the things which the apologete must deal with and defend.

And are these not questions of immense import? Is Christianity true, and are its claims to be divine valid? Is there a personal God who made me and all things? Am I under such moral relations to God that I cannot shake myself free from responsibility to him? Are the Scriptures not only true, but also an authentic and authoritative revelation from God? Must I believe, save at my terrible peril, what the Bible says concerning the dire effects of sin on my being and its dread results on my destiny? Have I good reason to accept the statements of Scripture in regard to salvation from sin, and that, apart from a saving interest in the divine Redeemer, I am without God and without hope in the world? Is there a future state of reward and punishment for

men with unending existence therein, either of unspeakable joy or of unutterable woe?

Simply to ask such questions is to reveal the tremendous issues alike for the individual and the race which are wrapped up in the destinies of the Christian faith. If Christianity be true, and its redemption so necessary for man's present good and future welfare, the duty of examining its grounds with the utmost diligence is imperative. And even if the Christian system be false and its divine claims turn out to be invalid, we should inquire most carefully into the reasons given for this conclusion, lest we be found guilty of the folly of casting lightly away the priceless treasures of that Christian faith which has so long had such a deep hold upon the living experience and dying hopes of such multitudes in all ages.

Everything of interest and value in the blessings of religion, both for this life and for that which is to come, is staked upon the results of such inquiry. Even though it be quite true that the reality of the facts and truths of Christianity is not ultimately dependent upon man's vindication of them, yet the acceptance or rejection of these facts and truths determines their practical effect on man's life and destiny. A great mistake will be made, therefore, if we undervalue the benefits of a reasoned defence of the truths and claims of the Christian system. If it be an extreme opinion that the contents of Christianity can be fully measured by human reason, it is also an extreme opinion which holds that the truths of the Christian system are incapable of reasoned defence and vindication. If there be a God, the human mind rightly demands reasons for believing in the reality of his existence; and if Christianity be a matter of supernatural revelation, the mind of man very properly calls for the evidence which renders it credible. If evidence be the measure of assent, and if rational belief rests on valid reasons, the position stated must be true, and Christianity is capable of a reasoned defence and vindication at the hands of the Christian apologete. The view that Christianity cannot be defended by arguments or supported by evidence must lead either to a mysticism, which makes the subjective consciousness the test of revealed truth, or to an agnosticism, "which first throws the

intellect into bankruptcy and then pensions us on an allowance of faith."<sup>1</sup> In these circumstances our theological seminaries do well to provide for such instruction in Christian apologetics as will present in reasoned and systematic form the grounds, the evidences, and the defences of the Christian faith. In this age of severe sifting of opinions, of complete recasting of systems, and of the disturbing of old foundations, the services of the Christian apologete, wisely rendered, may be of much value to the rising ministry of the church who must act their part in this busy, restless age. The intellect needs its helm, faith requires her anchor, and hope must set her sails for the voyage upon which Christianity seems now to be entering; and if the apologete can in any measure help to train men to guide the good ship safely on her way, his work will indeed not be in vain in the Lord.

Before proceeding further some simple explanations are necessary. The term *apologetics*, as also the word *apology*, is derived from the Greek verb *απολογεισθαι*, which means "to defend one's self," or "to plead one's own cause." The word *apology*, now often used in the sense of "making reparation," primarily means "a defence," "a pleading" or "an answer." The technical term *apologetics* denotes the systematic defence of a person, or the scientific pleading of a cause. As applied to matters of religion, Christian apologetics is the science of the defence and vindication of Christianity, or of the pleading of the cause of theistic belief, of the Bible, of Christ, and of Christianity.

This technical use of the term is of comparatively recent origin. In ancient literature we find the term *apology*, but not *apologetics*. In the *Memorabilia* of Socrates, Xenophon uses the term *apology* in describing his defence of his master. In the New Testament the term *απολογία* occurs several times. In Acts xxii. 1 it is translated *defence* in connection with Paul's speech made on the temple stairs. In 1 Cor. ix. 3 it is translated *answer* in relation to the response given by Paul to certain accusations made against him and the cause he represented. In both these cases, however, the underlying idea is that of defence or vindication.

---

<sup>1</sup> President Patton, in *Inaugural Address*, 1880.

In early Christian literature the term *apology* is used by Justin Martyr, who was put to death about the year 166 A. D. Justin wrote two *Apologies* for Christianity, in which he seeks to remove certain objections and misconceptions from the religious beliefs and practices of the early Christians, and at the same time to explain the contents of the Christian system in such a way as to commend it to the Roman Emperor and people. In like manner much of the Patristic literature was apologetic, and consisted in defences against Judaic tendencies, pagan philosophy, and heathen polytheism. In mediæval ages the polemic features of the Christian literature were prominent, and the apologetic fell naturally into the background. In modern times apologetics has by various reasons been brought to the front again, and so we find the missionary and apologetic features of apostolic ages reproduced in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

But even at the present day, so far at least as the English tongue is concerned, it can scarcely be said that we have a systematic apologetics in any single treatise, which disposes the materials of defence in systematic order about the entire fortress of the Christian system. The field of course is very wide, and we have many excellent treatises on special topics in it, but these treatises are *apologies* rather than *apologetics*. In saying this I do not undervalue in the least the splendid work done by the English apologists of the last century, with Butler at their head; nor do I disparage in any way the invaluable results of recent labors in the fields of theism and of the evidences of Christianity. I simply mean that the treatises in our own tongue are particular apologies intended to ward off at special points certain definite attacks made upon Christianity, and not thorough-going and systematic defences of the Christian system against all possible assaults.

The Germans during recent years have given us several professedly systematic treatises in apologetics. Those by Sach, Delitzsch, Baumstark, and Ebrard deserve mention. Still the formal and elaborate mode of treatment followed by these authors, together with certain serious defects both in regard to the method of discussion and the materials employed, render these systematic treatises less suitable for the English-speaking student than might at

first be expected. Ebrard's work is perhaps the most satisfactory of them all.

With these explanations made, we are now prepared to discuss the *function* or aim of Christian apologetics. This is clearly a very difficult question. What is Christian apologetics? What purpose is it to serve? The diversity of opinion on these points will be made very evident by the recital of some of the definitions of apologetics given by able writers. Schleiermacher says that "apologetics is a preparatory discipline having to do with the fundamental principles of theology." Häunell defines the science as "the common ground of the church and theology." Drey, an able Romish writer, says that "apologetics is the philosophy of the Christian revelation and its history." Sach regards apologetics as "that branch of theology which treats of the ground of the Christian religion as divine fact." Lechler, again, defines apologetics as "the scientific proof that the Christian religion is the absolute religion." Baumstark is more definite, and says that "apologetics is the scientific defence of Christianity as the absolute religion." Finally, Ebrard, in a brief and compact statement, says that "apologetics is the science of the defence of the truth of Christianity."

In view of such a diversity of opinion it seems a hopeless task to attempt to make plain what the function of Christian apologetics really is; and, in the face of such learned opinions as those quoted, it may appear somewhat bold to propose another definition. Still, it is evident that some fuller description of the import of apologetics is needed, if its true function is to be understood. The following descriptive definition is suggested, with this object in view: Apologetics is that branch of theological science which presents a reasoned defence and vindication of the essential truth, the supernatural origin, the divine authority, and the inherent sufficiency of the Christian system of doctrine, worship, morals, and redemption as the only adequate religion for mankind, together with the systematic refutation of all antagonistic systems.

This description of apologetics indicates in general that its function is to meet all attacks made upon Christianity, and at the same time to fortify it on every side with sure defences. It may

be too much to claim with Ebrard that a complete apologetics should anticipate all possible objections against the Christian system, and provide for their entire refutation; still, Christian apologetics should be more than mere desultory dealing with objections and attacks made from time to time. We need not only these particular defences, but we also need a *theory* of defending—a plan of campaign. We require not only separate apologies, but we also need an apologetics which shall constitute such an orderly systematic presentation of the grounds and contents of the Christian system as shall serve at once to confirm the faith of the believer, and baffle the assaults of the antagonist. In this way will the native strength and glory of Christianity be best exhibited, and its defences will always be at hand for the most effective use.

Looking now a little more closely at the definition of apologetics just given, its three-fold office will be observed. Each of these must be briefly noticed.

In the first place, Christian apologetics discharges the office of *defence*. The Christian system seems doomed to suffer fierce and determined assaults. The reality of sin in the human heart, and the antagonism of enmity engendered thereby, will ever be a fruitful source of opposition to Christianity, so that the apologete will always be required to stand as sentinel on guard about the citadel of religious truth, and to defend the fortress of faith. As the attack is made he must sound the alarm and ward off the foe. As new weapons are forged against Christianity the apologete must construct new defences, or turn old ramparts into new breastworks; and as the assault is made now at one point and now at another, he must with sleepless vigilance and effective weapons be ready to do valiant service as the defender of the faith.

In discharging the office of *defence* the apologete has a weighty task. Does the attack come in the guise of a learned naturalism, seeking to destroy the throne of the supernatural, and to trample the crown of Deity in the dust, he must vindicate the reality of the supernatural. Does the assault don the garb of the philosopher, and approach with the assumed humility of the agnostic, in order to cast doubt upon the possibility and reality of man's knowledge of God, then the apologete must present a true doctrine of

cognition, which makes knowledge the friend of faith, and philosophy the servant of theology. Or does the movement against Christianity advance with the instruments of a false historical criticism in its hands, to undermine the real historical character of the Scripture narratives, then the apologete must wrest these instruments from the grasp of those who would unfairly use them, and show that this unfair use of historical criticism would bolt the door against the historian in every field. Or, again, is the assault armed with the weapons of science, falsely so called, found in the field or formed in the laboratory, then the apologete must be prepared to drive back the foe, capture his weapons, and turn them into armor for the defence of Christian faith. And if in any of these cases the anti-Christian onset is bold and blasphemous, full of hate and rage as well as heedless of sense and reason, the apologete must stand unmoved, ready to resist unto blood; and if at times he seems to be fighting in a losing cause, he must simply stand still and see the salvation of God, and to his great surprise he may behold the horse and his proud rider cast into the sea.

A second office of Christian apologetics consists in the *vindication* of Christianity. This may be regarded as the positive side of the work of the Christian apologete. He must not be content with merely driving back the foes of Christianity, and leaving it free from objection and safe from attack. This might only show the skill and courage of the defender, and not exhibit the inherent power and worth of Christianity. Hence, the second office of apologetics, that of vindication, is necessary to set forth in order the sure grounds, the abundant evidences, the excellent contents, and the grand results of Christianity. This method of fortifying the citadel of Christian faith by defences from within is of immense apologetic value. In this way the inherent majesty, worth, glory and divinity of the Christian system will be unfolded in a manner which will at once inspire its adherents with courage and hope, and strike its opponents with terror and dismay. Moreover, it will also be made evident, not only that Christianity is capable of defence, but also that it is well worth defending.

Here the apologete has noble work. He will unfold the Christian idea of God, as a Being possessed of all perfection, as self-ex-

istent and uncreated, as the personal and intelligent Creator, as the almighty and righteous Judge, as the merciful Father, whose tender mercies are over all his works, and as the gracious Redeemer, who has provided a complete remedy for sin of such a nature that divine justice is vindicated and sinful men justified, sanctified and saved. In this way Christian theism will be vindicated. The apologete will also open the sacred literature of the Christian system, and will find it speaking for itself in a way which at once reveals its divine origin. There he finds inspired historians relating events which happened when the nations of antiquity were young; he hears prophets filled by the Spirit uttering with faith and fidelity God's messages to men; he is captivated by the sacred poets singing in the loftiest strains the world has ever heard; he reads with ever deeper wonder the proverbs and parables, and he pores again and again over the simple four-fold story of that transcendent life of Jesus of Nazareth till it brings him to the gloom of Calvary, to the hope of the empty tomb, and to the glory of the ascension scene. In all this he finds himself among a literature unique and unrivalled. The apologete will further show something of the remarkable personality and beautiful life of him who is at once the living head and central figure in the Christian system. He will show us that there is but one Jesus of Nazareth, and that there can be but one. Guided by the apologete, we will look at that life from the cradle to the cross, and see what a wonder it was in that degenerate age; we will listen to his teachings, and in the light of his own time we can only ask, "Whence hath this man such wisdom?" We will consider his mighty works, his moral heroism, his self-forgetful devotion to his Father's will with amazement; we will reflect upon his sacrificial death, upon the miracle of his resurrection, and the mystery of the ascension, and find ourselves amidst the most remarkable events that have ever occurred in human history. Then, as the apologete unfolds what Christianity does for men in this life and in the next, as he describes in graphic words how it has spread and what it has endured, as he depicts what it has done to make the home sacred and to secure civil liberty, and as he announces the marvellous results of recent missionary labor everywhere, the value of the second office of



Christian apologetics—that of vindication—is most forcibly illustrated.

The third office of apologetics is that of *refutation*. By means of this office the apologete must in turn attack the systems opposed to Christianity; and his work here will not be complete till he has refuted antitheistic and anti-Christian theories of every kind. He must enter on an aggressive warfare, and only lay down his arms when the last enemy is driven from the field. As the Israelites of old were commanded to drive out the Canaanites from the land, and leave none save at their future peril, so the apologete must feel that he has a divine right to the whole of the promised land embraced within the borders of the Christian system. In modern times there is much of this aggressive work to be done, for there are not a few invaders making raids upon the Christian domain. Atheism need not long engage his attention, for while there are many practical atheists, there are but few who venture to maintain a reasoned atheism. As the devils believe and tremble, so bad men can scarcely help doing the same thing. Then materialism in its manifold forms, and pantheism in its several subtle phases must be put to flight, while the united forces of positivism and agnosticism, of pessimism and secularism, must be defeated by the weapons of refutation. At the same time, false ethical systems and erroneous scientific theories must be disarmed, while rival systems of religion and non-religious social theories must be brought to terms of unconditional surrender.

This, then, is the three-fold function of Christian apologetics. It defends Christianity from assault, it vindicates its inherent adequacy, and it refutes all opposing systems. These three offices are often interwoven in the actual work of the apologete. If Christianity be vindicated it is thereby defended, and if it be fully defended false systems will be so far refuted. Still the function of apologetics may be clearly presented in a three-fold way: *Defence, vindication and refutation*.

While discharging his high duty, the apologete must entertain proper conceptions of that Christian system which he professes to defend. His estimate of Christianity must accord with the lofty claims which it makes, otherwise he may prove an unworthy de-

fender. The Christian system must be regarded as far more than a complete philosophy, or a perfect code of morals. It must not be viewed merely as one of several religious systems, all of which are partially true. The general definition of apologetics already given sounds the key-note upon this point. In regard to doctrines, worship, morality and redemption, four things are to be held fast. First, the essential truth and historical reality of the Christian system, with its sacred literature, must be rigidly maintained against all mythological and rationalistic views regarding the contents of Christianity; secondly, that the Christian system is of supernatural origin and prescription must be argued at length against all naturalistic and evolutionary theories as to its origin and growth; thirdly, the apologete must contend earnestly for the divine authority of the Christian system, which binds its demands upon the consciences of men in such a way that they cannot be repudiated save at the extreme peril of mortal and immortal interests; and fourthly, the apologete must be prepared to justify the bold claim that Christianity is in all respects inherently sufficient to be an adequate religion for man, even sinful man. Its claim to universal dominion must be made good by showing its entire adequacy to meet its claims. That Christianity is thus complete, and that it endures no adversaries and brooks no rivals, is a position which the apologete must make good, and no lower ground dare he take and be true to his trust as the acknowledged defender of the faith.

Having thus explained the three-fold office of Christian apologetics, a rapid survey of the wide domain in which the materials of discussion chiefly lie must now be made. That domain may be divided into three great sections: First, there is what may be called fundamental or philosophical apologetics, where the great debate is between the theistic and anti-theistic theories of the universe; secondly, there is what may be termed historical or evidential apologetics, where the gist of the controversy is between the supernatural and anti-supernatural views of the Bible and Christianity; and thirdly, we have what, for want of a better term, we may designate polemical or irenical apologetics, where the main topics of discussion relate to the bearing of modern scientific research upon a divine revelation such as the Bible sets

forth, and upon a supernatural system such as Christianity is. A very brief sketch of each of these sections of apologetic discussions may give some idea of the *materials* which must engage the attention of the apologete in the discharge of his high office.

Entering the first section—that of fundamental or philosophical apologetics—we find ourselves at once upon the field of the older natural theology, as it has been enlarged by recent theistic discussions, and by expositions in the philosophy of religion.

At the very outset the attention of the apologete is arrested by a preliminary question of vital importance. That question concerns the reality of human knowledge and the office of faith in matters of religion. This may by some be regarded as but a distant outpost of the Christian system, still a moment's reflection will show that this question is one of the keys which hold secure the citadel of Christianity. An erroneous theory of knowledge or a false view as to the office of belief will be dangerous, if not disastrous, to the interests of the Christian system. A true psychology, carrying with it a sound ethical theory, and a valid philosophy of belief, are like great pillars resting on the rock, and upon these the apologete may build a bridge that will afford a pathway of intelligent commerce between the creature and the Creator. There are warnings all along the history of philosophy and religion which cannot be ignored in this connection. As we see Locke's moderate empiricism bearing the bitter fruit of atheistic materialism in France, and producing nothing but the blighted leaves of skepticism in Britain; as we notice Kant's critical rationalism running on through Fichte and Schelling into absolute idealism in the system of Hegel; and as we observe Hamilton's Philosophy of the Infinite pressed into the service of agnosticism by Spencer, the importance of a true theory of knowledge is strongly emphasized. In like manner, when we notice how the faith philosophy of Jacobi was unfairly used by Schleiermacher in the interests of subjectivism, and by the pietists on behalf of mysticism; and when we find the fundamental beliefs of our nature exalted above the moral and religious truths of divine revelation as they are by modern rationalism, the demand for a sound philosophy of belief becomes imperative.

On the field of psychology the apologete must reject all purely empirical theories of human knowledge. Whether it be a crude sensationalism, which denies altogether the *a priori* element, and explains all knowledge from the contents of sensation; or whether it be those more refined associational theories which admit a modified *a priori* factor, but explain it as the *product*, not as the *condition* of experience; or whether, again, it be those recent evolutionary systems which allow a certain *quasi* reality to the *a priori* conditions of cognition, but account for these by the law of heredity, which first gathers up and then hands down as an accumulating legacy the results of habit or experience, till in due time these results assume the qualities of necessity and simplicity, empiricism must be carefully guarded against. The great facts and transcendent truths of Christianity pertain to the supersensible world, and the door of cognition must be left open so as to give the human mind access to that region. Any theory of knowledge which shuts that door leaves us out in the bleak, trackless wilds of nescience touching the high truths of religion, and the result will surely be that, even though an irrational and unintelligent faith may hold on to these truths for awhile, that faith may first be perverted, but will finally pass away.

The apologete must also guard against purely idealistic theories of knowledge. Whether it be a thoroughgoing subjectivism, which admits no sort of knowledge of anything outside of the mind and its various states; or whether it be a pure phenomenalism, which allows the mind a knowledge of external objects, but asserts that these objects are purely relative and phenomenal, not real and abiding; or whether, again, it be a constructive idealism, which gives to the objects of knowledge only such objective reality as the act of knowledge itself endows them with, all such theories must be carefully canvassed by the apologete. Any theory which shuts cognition up within the barriers of the subject, or blocks the avenues of objective knowledge, binds consciousness as a helpless prisoner in the castle of solipsism, in whose dreary silent depths he can know neither the world, nor other men, nor God.

The apologete is thus no idle spectator of, but must be an active participant in, the debates now going on in regard to the

theory of knowledge. If he capitulates to the empiricist idealist on the field of psychology, he will be compelled, sooner or later, to surrender to the skeptic or the agnostic in the realm of religion. His first care, therefore, should be to take his stand securely on a sound psychology, which gives a place to the *a priori* element in human knowledge, and regards experience merely as the *occasion*, but not as the *source* of cognition. Such a theory will give abiding reality to the fundamental laws of thought and to the essential conditions of existence in the external world, and will find these correlated in cognition in such a way that the reality of neither is destroyed, and yet the knowledge of both is assured.

So on the side of the philosophy of belief equal care must be taken. Any theory which sets faith in antagonism over against reason, and tells us that we must believe what absolutely contradicts reason in its fundamental principles cannot be admitted. Any view which separates the sphere of faith from that of knowledge in such a way as to shut them off entirely from each other, and which says that we may believe what reason can give no evidence for must not be adopted. And any doctrine which so exalts faith above knowledge as to make it the sole instrument in matters of religion must be carefully guarded against. A true doctrine here will hold that faith and knowledge are supplementary to each in every sphere, but especially in that of religion. As all knowledge has at its roots an element of faith, so all true belief is rational, and rests on evidence. Knowledge and belief may follow different pathways, but they move in parallel lines, and both lead to certitude.

Having taken good ground in regard to these questions, the apologete is prepared to enter upon the wide field of theistic discussion. Theism may be treated either as a theory of the universe or as a doctrine of the divine existence. The former will lead to a theistic cosmology and the latter will result in a natural theology. Embracing both, theism may be defined as the doctrine which affirms the existence and continued operation of one infinite personal God, and presents this affirmation as the only adequate solution of the origin and constitution of the universe.

Theism on its positive side has to face two great questions. The one may be termed the psychology of theism and the other its ontology. The former will unfold the nature and origin of the idea of God in the human mind, and the latter will announce the reasons for believing in the existence of a Being corresponding to that idea. In dealing with the first of these questions, the apologete must make a careful analysis of the theistic elements of the human constitution, when such facts as these will be unfolded: A cognition of deity as the intellectual element, a belief in the existence of God as the faith factor, a sense of natural dependence and finiteness, a feeling of moral responsibility, and an instinct or sentiment of worship. He will then be able to show how it comes to pass that men can apply theistic predicates to natural objects, can frame the theistic hypothesis regarding the universe, and are capable of learning of God by means of a divine revelation.

When the apologete turns to the question of the *origin* of the idea of God in the mind of man, he has a delicate and difficult task to perform. Able and persistent efforts are made at this point by evolutionary psychologists and ethnologists to explain the origin and growth of the religious constitution and theistic endowment of man in a purely empirical way and from elements which are not at first theistic or religious, and the apologete must be prepared to combat intelligently all such theories. He must show that the view which originates belief in deity in the craft of priests or cunning of kings really takes for granted the thing to be proved. Then the positivist who discovers the origin of theistic belief in fetichism must be refuted by showing that, before savage man can call a stone or a carved image his God, he must have the notion of deity already in his mind. Then Herbert Spencer, who seeks to explain existing theistic belief by means of ancestor worship, growing out of a peculiar ghost theory, must receive some careful attention, as representing a great school of sociologists. The apologist, with equal care, must examine those subtle, idealistic, evolutionary theories of the Hegelian and Neo-Hegelian philosophy, which attempt to explain the origin of man's knowledge of God as a sort of God-consciousness, wherein man's knowledge of God is virtually God's knowledge of himself. At

this point special care is needed, for while the apologete may admit that man knows God because he is made in his image and likeness, he must be careful not to leave the door open for the entrance of a latent pantheism, which would surely reduce the numerical distinction between man and God to zero. The influence of primitive divine revelation in generating and perpetuating theistic belief and the knowledge of God must be carefully estimated. While the apologete must most cheerfully admit that supernatural revelation does much to give the well-defined knowledge of God which is found in Christian lands, and does everything to acquaint us with the provisions and conditions of the gospel, still he must distinguish carefully between the genesis of a belief and its perpetuation, and he must specially avoid taking any position which seems to assume that the consciousness of man was, prior even to primitive revelation, atheistic and non-religious. He must maintain that man, made in the image of God, was theistic by creation; and, because theistic in his very constitution, he was capable of receiving and being instructed by objective revelation whenever given. So, in regard to the part that education, tradition, reasoning or reflection has played in producing and developing the idea of God among men, the apologete must exercise great care. That tradition and education have much to do with perpetuating and purifying the theistic idea must be acknowledged freely by the apologete; yet, as he traces the tradition back, or reflects upon the conditions of education and reasoning concerning God, the query always arises: How did the tradition itself at first arise, and how is education or reasoning possible if men were originally devoid of the theistic capacity or of any knowledge of God? This is a delicate and difficult point of much interest.

The true view as to the *origin* of the theistic belief must distinguish between the way in which men in Christian lands *now* come to believe in God, and the way in which the belief arose in the mind of the *first* man; and it will assert that the idea of God is not innate in the sense that it is at first a fully formed idea or knowledge of God, but rather that theistic belief springs up naturally as the *a priori* constituents of the human mind are developed

under the conditions of religious experience. Thus by a native constitutional impulse from within the soul, rather than by any non-theistic influences from without, is the genesis of the idea of God to be explained. This view will further maintain that on the metaphysical side the final explanation of the origin of the idea of God is to be found, as Descartes hints, in the postulate of the *existence* of God. The native theistic belief of the human soul thus constitutes an abiding witness within, to the actual existence of God without the soul; and in the last analysis this belief may be regarded as God's testimony in the psychological sphere, to the reality of his being in the ontological realm.<sup>1</sup>

Turning to the *ontology* of theism, the apologete has to do with arguments for the existence of God, or the reasons for believing in God. At the outset he must grasp clearly what his task is at this point. What is meant by the proof of the divine existence, and in what sense can the existence of God be proved? Are those right who, following the Kantian criticism, say that the divine existence cannot be proved? If they are not right, wherein is their error? Here the apologete will be wise to take strong middle ground, showing that he does not undertake to prove the existence of God by a strict deductive or demonstrative mode of reasoning, and yet asserting that the theistic proofs are of real logical value in establishing the objective validity of the native belief in God. The apologete will not undertake to prove the existence of a God of whom he is entirely ignorant, or in whom he has no simple belief, but he will show that the native constitutional belief in the divine existence is a logical and rational belief, which rests on good reasons and is supported by strong evidence. The apologete will also show that the theistic proof consists of many branches, and that these must be viewed cumulatively. It is a cable with numerous strands, and not a chain made up of many links. Its argumentative force does not depend on the strength of its weakest proof, but on the combined result of all its lines of proof bound together in one complex inductive process, which may be termed the theistic inference.

---

<sup>1</sup> President Patton: *Syllabus on Theism*.



The apologete will find it difficult to classify the theistic proofs in a satisfactory way. The old division into *a priori* and *a posteriori* is good only so far, for many of the proofs embrace both factors. The following classification, though not free from defects, may serve his purpose: First, Those arguments wherein the materials of proof are drawn from the nature and contents of the human mind, and which may therefore be termed *psychical*. Here the argument from the native theistic belief, as the bridge between the psychology and ontology of theism, ought to be first considered; and then the proofs from the nature of truth and the conditions of certitude, from the notion of a necessary or all perfect being and from the idea of the infinite, would naturally follow in order. A second general class of theistic proofs would include those which are based on the principle of *causality*. Here the apologete must hold by a true doctrine of causation, which gives a place to the elements of sufficient reason and efficiency; and then he may proceed to unfold the causal arguments, setting forth the arguments for a first cause of the universe in its totality, from the facts of order, system and law in the universe, and from the instances of adaptation and design observed everywhere. The third general class of proofs may be termed the *moral* arguments, where the elements of reasoning are drawn from man's moral nature and the conditions of the moral government under which he is placed. Here a sound ethical theory, in harmony with the theory of knowledge already insisted on, must be secured; and the notion of *right*, the fact of *obligation*, and the idea of the *highest good*, will give the lines of proof. In connection with these proofs, those from human history, and from the universal prevalence of religious belief in some form, may also be unfolded. As these many strands of proof are bound together in one they form a strong cable, which the force of unbelief cannot break, nor the logic of atheism ever hope to untwine or destroy.

Having established theism on the positive side, the apologete must next enter on an active campaign against anti-theistic theories. In doing so he will take with him the armor and weapons gained in previous discussions. He may engage his opponents in the following order, commencing with the weakest: First, he may

go forth against atheism in its various forms. So far as reasoned or dogmatic atheism is concerned he will have little difficulty, as it is a purely negative system, asserting nothing, explaining nothing, proving nothing, and satisfying nothing. In dealing with the practical atheist the apologete had better turn missionary and preach the plain gospel to him. Next, positivism, as one of the allies or retainers of atheism, must be combatted, alike in the form of pretentious Comtism, and in its more refined phases in England and America. Then modern agnosticism, which is often only atheism in fine clothes and called by a lordly name, must be confronted. It must be attacked at two points: first, its theory of knowledge must be impugned; and secondly, its anti-theistic claims must be rebutted. Then materialism with its heavy artillery and earthworks must be assaulted. At three points must the conflict be waged: first, against certain subtle forms of semi-materialism, that would first put everything into its conception of matter in order to bring everything out of it; secondly, against psychological materialism, which leaves God, perhaps, but blots out the human soul, and construes thought emotion and volition under the categories of matter and mechanism; and thirdly, against pure or scientific materialism, which announces the double verdict, no soul and no God, and reduces all forms of existence and activity to the terms of matter and force, the apologete must wage an uncompromising warfare which knows no defeat. Next, the forces of deism, which admits the existence of God, but regards him as the absentee landlord of the universe, must be encountered, and both its naturalistic and rationalistic wings must be routed. Then that great monistic system which has always been set in strong battle array against true theistic belief, and which is known as pantheism, must engage the undivided attention of the apologete, as it seeks either to lose the identity of the universe in God or to hide God away in the universe. Its four legions—Hindoo, Eleatic, Spinozistic and Hegelian—must be in turn attacked and overthrown. Then, finally, the scattering hosts of pessimism, secularism and socialism are to be warded off, while the flying mercenaries of spiritualism, who love good pay and do their fighting in the dark, are to be driven away by the weapons of truth.

Returning victorious from this long campaign, the apologete will be ready to enter the second section of the wide field in which his great work lies, that of historical or evidential apologetics. Here the great conflict is between the supernatural and anti-supernatural views of the Scriptures, of Christ, and of Christianity; and the Christian apologete must take his place as a leader on the side of supernaturalism.

Useful preparatory work may be here done by the apologete in the field of comparative religion, or, as it is sometimes called, the science of religions. Much that is new and useful to apologetics will be found here, and not a little of value to mission work will be learned regarding these false systems with which the Christian missionary has to deal. It must be kept in mind also that many anti-Christian scholars are working in this field, and covertly seeking by a flank movement to take the royal crown from the head of Christianity, to break it in pieces and distribute its fragments among all religions, leaving the Christian with perhaps the brightest jewel in her hand, but without a crown upon her head. The apologete must defend Christianity as the only religion worthy to wear a crown. In a critical and comparative way he will study the religions of Islam and Egypt, of Phoenicia and Canaan, of Greece and Rome, of Assyria and Babylon, of Persia and India, of China and Japan, of Western Europe and America, and of Africa and the Isles of the Sea. By a comparison of the results of investigation in this wide field with Christianity, many valuable conclusions may be reached. Thus it will be discovered that the earlier religious beliefs are more monotheistic and purer than the later in every one of the great ethnic religions. It will also appear that the further back religious beliefs and practices in different systems can be traced, the more are they found to resemble each other, a fact which points to a common origin and to a primeval revelation. The study of comparative religion will also reveal the fact that the law of development in merely human or natural religions is *steady deterioration*. The light of primeval revelation grows fainter and fainter till whole races become shrouded in darkness. But with Christianity it is otherwise. The Christian system, together with antecedent Judaism, reveals a line of

continual expansion and growth till the light became the noon-tide brightness of the gospel day. The only reasonable explanation of the facts is that all onward religious movement is the result of special divine interposition, and that the divine causality in the form of the supernatural has ever operated in the line of Judaism and Christianity. Hence the Christian system has gone on from one degree of strength unto another, while other religions are like streams which have wandered away from the channel of the supernatural until lost in the deserts of religious ignorance.

The apologete having discovered the supernatural as the peculiar possession of the Christian system, must explain its nature and manifestations. As to its nature, he will show that the supernatural is more than the merely supersensible or superhuman; that it is more than the hypermaterial, and other than God's ordinary modes of working in nature and of ruling in human history. The apologete must vindicate the reality of the supernatural as involving certain unusual or extraordinary modes of God's operation in relation to nature and human history which have religious ends in view. Then the great fourfold manifestation of the supernatural in the sphere of human history must be unfolded at length. First, the supernatural as manifested in *word*, which gives revelation as we have it in the Scriptures; secondly, the supernatural as manifested in *act*, which presents the miracle; thirdly, the supernatural in a *person*, which exhibits the Christ of history as the divine Redeemer; and fourthly, the supernatural as manifested in a *kingdom*, which sets forth the church as a spiritual commonwealth.

Discussing the first of these, the precise nature of revelation must be explained. The supernatural communications which the apologete must defend and vindicate are those contained in the Scriptures; and thus the Bible and supernatural revelation are to be regarded as synonymous from this view-point. Then the real historical character of this revelation and of its written record must be held fast, against all opposing or minimizing views. Critical and reconstructive theories of the religion and literature of the Old Testament, which makes Mosaism only a natural national growth among the Jews must be carefully scrutinized. Advanced

Higher Criticism, with all its pretensions to high scholarship, must be met with equal and more reverent learning; and no view which destroys the historical integrity of the Old Testament Scriptures as the inspired record of a real supernatural revelation, and regards these Scriptures as merely the product of the natural development of Jehovism among the Israelites, can be allowed to stand. So in the New Testament, those legendary, mythical, and tendency theories of the narratives which rationalistic criticism advances must be driven entirely from the field by sober criticism.

Connected with revelation, the modern apologete will find a difficult question, which demands his serious consideration and vigorous defence. That question is the fact of *inspiration*. The complete discussion of this question belongs to the systematic theologian; still the apologete has his work to do defending the true doctrine and refuting some false views. The apologete must maintain that inspiration is more than natural genius or lofty intuition, and more than the mere effect of the Spirit of God upon the persons who received the revelation. He must also hold that inspiration is more than mere divine guidance in regard to the moral and spiritual elements of the Scriptures; and he cannot be content with any theory which gives us merely inspired *men*, but not an inspired *Bible*, or which professes to give us an inspired *Bible*, but not from inspired *men*. A true doctrine will argue in favor of the inspiration of the men as authors of the books, and of the Bible as the production of inspired men, so that the Scriptures constitute a perpetual revelation from God to men of successive generations. Then, further, the apologete must defend a doctrine of inspiration which is plenary, though not purely mechanical; which is dynamical, though not of degrees; and which is verbal so far as the autographs of the inspired books are concerned. This gives us from God, by the agency of the Holy Spirit, a revelation which is permanent, infallible, and authoritative.

Dealing with the second form in which the supernatural is manifested, the apologete must consider the Miracle in certain aspects. The true character of the miracle, as an event in the course of nature, not effected by the ordinary causes operating in

nature, but produced by direct divine agency, in order to attest the supernatural mission and message of him who works it, must be vindicated. The relation of the miracle to the uniformity of nature and to the divine agency must be explained in accordance with this idea of its nature. Above all, the position that the great purpose of the miracle is to attest or witness to the divine commission and communication of the person who performs it must be held fast, especially against the view which maintains that before the miracle can attest any doctrine to be of divine origin that doctrine must first have commended itself to human reason and conscience as good. Then objections against the doctrine of miracles must be answered. These will come from three main quarters—first, from the scientific, where certain false views of the uniformity of nature prevail; secondly, from the philosophical, where wrong opinions in regard to God's relation to the universe are held; and thirdly, from the critical or historical quarter, where erroneous positions are maintained in reference to the nature and office of reliable human testimony. The apologete will have some hard battles to fight on this field; but, as in the case of inspiration, he must hold his ground and defend the true nature and function of the miracle in the Christian system.

Discussing the third branch of the historical manifestation of the supernatural the apologete passes to a study of the Christ of history as the divine Redeemer. Here the field of apologetical inquiry is very wide, but our present sketch can be but brief. The real historical character of the Christ of history must be made good against all mythical and non-historical theories. Then the fact of his resurrection must be established in opposition to those who claim that his body was stolen, or that he did not really die on the cross, and of those who regard his appearances during the forty days as visionary. Then not only the historicity of Christ, but also his divinity, must be firmly settled against all naturalistic views. From prophecy fulfilled in him, from his miracles and teaching, from his moral perfection and exalted claims and corresponding character, an overwhelming cumulative argument may be framed. The character of Jesus could not have been invented, and the record of his life cannot be fiction. The only explanation of

the facts is the reality of the life, the teaching, the miracles, and the resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth. This may be made the Gibraltar of the Christian system.

The apologete will in the last place find the supernatural manifested in a kingdom, which is the church. He may here describe God's three kingdoms. First, his natural kingdom in the material universe; secondly, his moral kingdom in his moral government; and, thirdly, his spiritual kingdom connected, so far as man is concerned, with redemption, and embracing in a certain way God's moral kingdom. This spiritual kingdom is that which Christ claimed as his, and which he said was not of this world. The complete discussion of this fruitful theme belongs to another department, yet the apologete can render useful service by showing that the church is not a mere human institution, but is one of the forms in which the supernatural is manifested age after age. The apologete has a noble theme at this point. He may show that the church is supernatural in its origin, for God is its author; that it is supernatural in its Mediatorial King and Head, who is Jesus Christ; that it is supernatural in its constitution and laws, which are found in the sacred Scriptures; that it is supernatural in its executive, who is the Holy Spirit; that it is supernatural in its conditions of citizenship, which all root in regeneration; and that it is supernatural in its culmination in the kingdom of glory.

The result of the work of the apologete in this second great section of the field will be the defence and vindication of the supernatural, and the refutation of all anti-supernatural views of the Scriptures, of Christ, and of Christianity.

At this point the work of the apologete might be considered complete. Still, the vast advances made during recent years in the various branches of scientific research make further important demands upon his services. It will be necessary for him, therefore, to enter on the third great section of apologetical discussion, and consider certain vital questions which arise in the debates between physical research and Christian faith. The scope of the chair to which I am called gives a prominent place to the treatment of these questions, and its incumbent must at different stages deal

carefully with them. No complete sketch of his work can be given here, but only a few points of apologetic interest will be noted.

In entering this field the apologete will often be called to act in a judicial capacity touching the questions in debate between science and religion. He must define the limits of each carefully, and will be no party to a declaration of war between them. Sometimes, perhaps, the apologete has been too sensitively afraid of scientific inquiry, and sometimes the scientist has been too much prejudiced against religion. It may be true also that if some theologians knew more of science, and some scientists had more religion it would be much better for both. From true science and sound philosophy religion has nothing to fear. It is "vain philosophy" and "science falsely so-called" that are dangerous. False science in the hands of a bad man may be a great evil, and in the hands of even a good man it may be misleading; true science in the hands of a bad man may be perverted, but in the hands of a good man it may be full of blessing.

Entering on his work here, the apologete must carry with him the results of previous inquiry: First, he will regard the universe and study its facts from the vantage-ground of theism. As a scientist he will hold by theistic belief, being assured that a man need not become an atheist or an agnostic in order to pursue scientific inquiry. Nay, more, he will find that theistic belief helps rather than hinders science, and he should not be surprised to know that the man who is a sincere believer in Christianity will, other things being equal, be the best student of nature. Secondly, the apologete will also carry with him into these discussions his firm conviction as to the reality of the supernatural and its various manifestations. He will allow no negative or naturalistic views of nature to dominate him in his inquiry. As a scientist and as a Christian, he must stand on the ground of theism and supernaturalism.

The apologete should further assume that there must be inherent harmony between science and religion, so far as they deal with the same topics. If the apologete holds the theistic theory of that universe wherein the facts of science lie as the *ordinary*



products of God's hand; and if he maintains the supernatural view of revealed religion, wherein the facts of Christianity lie as the *extraordinary* products of God's hand, he may rightly assume harmony between science, which treats of the former, and religion, which deals with the latter, so far as they cover common ground or deal with the same facts. If there should be apparent discrepancy or announced opposition between science and revealed religion, the apologete may be sure that either the scientific conclusion is in error, or the interpretation of Scripture is incorrect. But even in this case, the apologete should scarcely regard it as the main duty of his office to be constantly defining the *modus vivendi* between the results of physical research and the doctrines of the Christian system, under the assumption that they are in essential opposition. A better knowledge of nature and a truer understanding of Scripture may banish the apparent antagonism. Thus the rising sun of advancing day, and the gentle breezes from the eternal hills, will scatter the mists from the valleys, and then more clearly will the true and hitherto hidden relations of nature and revelation shine forth.

Only a hint or two can be given in regard to the topics which arise for discussion in this field. In the department of Physics the debate gathers round two great centres—one is that of *matter*, and the other that of *force*. In regard to the former, science cannot tell us what its *ultimate* nature is, and as little can philosophy. As to the origin of matter, science can only lead us on to I point where we must choose between the eternity of matter and a doctrine of creation. The latter best meets the demands of the problem, for it is no harder to conceive *eternity* when connected with a personal God than when it is associated with crass matter. an regard to force, modern science, by its doctrine of the transmutation and correlation of many forms of physical force, is revealing a unity which before long bids fair to postulate a supreme personal will energizing in the forces of nature as the best explanation of the problem.

Then, in the department of Biology, several great problems connected with life and the development of its various forms arise. As to the nature of life, it will appear that, though related to

physical force and chemical action, yet its nature cannot be fully explained by physics and chemistry. Then, as to the origin of life, the apologete will show that all materialistic, cosmical and environment theories do not go to the root of the problem, and that spontaneous generation is now an exploded hypothesis. Science will here show that the question of the origin of life leads back and back till the postulate of a living God as the source of life is the only satisfactory explanation of the phenomena. Then as to the development of living things in their relation to each other, and the origin of different species, we find much debate and great diversity of view. The great question here is: Are all existing forms of vegetable and animal life derived or descended from a single germ, or from several primordial forms, or is each distinct type or separate species a creative product at first. Biological evolution seeks to explain the problem by means of a theory of descent, with various laws of variability, selection, competition, inheritance, etc., and to show how all existing living forms may have been developed by slow degrees during long ages from a few simple primitive vegetable and animal forms. No outline of the debate on the scientific side of this question can be given now, but it may be merely stated that the apologete, in the light of the facts of the case, will be justified in holding the position that the theory of descent, as the explanation of the origin of distinct species of living things, is not yet made out on the side of science, and that at the present day scientists are receding from the extreme views held some years ago. The apologete having defined biological species in a proper way, may firmly rest in the conclusion that the resources of the theory of descent have not yet been shown to be adequate to explain the origin of such species from other species. This being the case, the apologete may patiently wait till further evidence is adduced in favor of that theory, before he begins to ask what changes must be made in his interpretations of Scripture, and to what extent must the doctrines of the Christian system be recast. At the same time, he should be careful in his use of the terms which anti-Christian scientists use in an anti-Christian sense, and he should distinguish clearly between facts and hypotheses, so as not to be misled by unproved hypoth-

eses which are often too hastily taken to be established truths of science. In like manner, he must with equal care refrain from condemning unnecessarily any useful working hypotheses in the sphere of science, so long as they are regarded as mere hypotheses and kept in their proper place, and are in no way brought into conflict with Scripture statement.

So also in the department of Anthropology questions of great interest arise. First of all, the question of man's relation to the brute on the biological side meets the apologete. Here the conclusion may be adopted, that if the theory of descent cannot explain the origin of one animal species *out of* another, much less can it hope to explain the human from any animal species on the side of biology. In addition, many other topics, such as the unity and distribution of the races of men, their antiquity and primeval state, and the pre-Adamite theory, must be here considered. The questions of man's antiquity and his primitive state, as related to biblical statements, are the most important topics in this field at the present day.

Entering the department of Geology, which is so full of interest, the apologete is brought face to face with the cosmogony and geogony of Genesis, and must here handle wisely some difficult questions. The relations of Genesis, Chapter I. and Chapter II., the meaning of the first and second verses of Chapter I., their relation to the rest of that chapter, the Chaos in its relation to the subsequent Cosmos, the Hexæmeron or six creative days in themselves and in their relation to geology, and the Noachian deluge, are all great inquiries. The meaning of the six creative days is the broadest of all these questions; and here the apologete, while he may perhaps have the best reasons for holding to some general form of the *period* theory, yet should be unwilling to shut the door, either on the side of exegesis or geology, rudely in the face of the *literal* theory in some of its phases, for there are difficulties with both classes of theories.

The apologete may properly conclude his work in this department with some discussion of Creation and Evolution. A brief statement of the biblical doctrine of *creation*, as a great truth to whose threshold science at many turns conducts us, must be given.

Then certain explanations touching the term *evolution* and its use may be made. Its meaning may be explained and its various applications may be set forth: First, as it denotes the derivation of the finite from the infinite. This is found in some old emanation theories, and appears in the Hegelian philosophy. This may be termed *dialectic* evolution. Secondly, the term evolution is taken to denote the mode according to which the universe passes from its primitive unorganized state to its subsequent organized condition. This is represented by the Spencerian system, and is properly designated *materialistic* evolution. Thirdly, the term is applied to the process by which one living animal or vegetable form has been originated, and thus new species accounted for. This is Darwinism, and may be appropriately termed *biological* evolution. It will also help to clear the atmosphere of the discussion if the apologete will point out some important distinctions, such as that between evolution and development or progress, between evolution and growth, between evolution and birth or generation, and between evolution as a process and as a causal agency. The defects of certain analogies here, such as that involved in the statement that "the ontogeny of the individual is the type of the phylogeny of the species" must be signalized by the apologete.

In conclusion, I can only utter a word or two in regard to the *spirit* in which apologetical inquiry should be pursued.

In the first place, the apologete should be animated by a spirit of *confidence* and *candor*—confidence in the truth and strength of Christianity and candor in defending it. He must have faith in the good cause he defends, and impartiality in its defence. He must be careful never to leave the impression that Christianity has its weak points, and is in serious need of reasoning and pleading in its behalf. Being convinced of the abiding strength of Christianity himself, as he walks about Zion and tells her towers and marks her bulwarks, he should ever remember that the Christian system does not depend ultimately upon the cogency of his reasoning on its behalf, but is far stronger than his ablest advocacy of it can possibly be. In like manner, he should be very careful not to adduce uncertain speculations, or present doubtful arguments in its behalf, lest, when an antagonist has set aside such

speculations or refuted such arguments, he may hastily conclude that he has destroyed Christianity. At this point the apologete must be careful, confident, and candid in all his reasonings and pleadings.

In the second place, the spirit of the apologete must be *earnest* and *reverent*. The questions with which he deals are the most important that can engage the attention of the human mind, and the issues involved are of vast moment. No flippant spirit, no half-hearted manner, no irreverent word is fitting such a discussion. Think of the problems: God, the universe, man, sin, revelation, Christ, redemption, death, judgment, heaven, hell. Shall the apologete not feel, as he stands in the outer court of the temple of revealed religion, ready to defend the fortress of faith, that the place whereon he stands is holy ground? He should discharge his office with uncovered feet and bowed head, and he should not allow even the raillery of the enemies of Christian faith to tempt him to forget the solemnity of his service to the cause of truth.

In the third place, the apologete should avoid all *bigotry* and *prejudice*. Bigotry makes a man narrow and prejudice obscures his vision. This is true in the spheres of science, of philosophy, and of religion alike; and the scientist and philosopher are as much in need of exhortation in this matter as the theologian. But the apologete must be specially careful at this point, lest he be the means of wounding religion in the house of her friends, by showing a spirit of bigotry and prejudice which narrows his vision and weakens his hands. This does not imply that he is to have no strong convictions in regard to religion, or that he must be prepared to throw overboard at the mere bidding of the skeptic his belief in the Christian system only to recover it by argumentation from unsanctified hands. He is not to cast aside the heritage of religious truth to which he has fallen heir. He is to treat the skeptic as an invader who is to be driven back, not as a claimant who has any rights which deserve recognition. The apologete holds the citadel, and he must not make treaties with the skeptic at all.

In the fourth place, the apologete must conduct his work in a *practical* spirit. Defence, vindication and refutation in relation to the Christian system are not to be conducted for their own

sake. The apologete is not to be a mere speculating theologian, but an earnest worker in the interests of religion. The apologetical arena is not a tournament scene, where the combatants meet for tests of skill; it is rather a battle-field, with momentous issues depending on the outcome of the conflict. The apologete is not a soldier of the cross on parade duty merely, but he is a soldier in the active service. And after all his useful work is done, he must remember that the grace of God alone can renew the hearts of men, and that the Holy Ghost is the irresistible *apolegete* as well as the promised *paraclete*.

Finally, the apolegete should be actuated by a spirit of *loyalty* to the symbolic standards of the church in which he serves. If he serves in the Presbyterian branch of the household of faith he should hold fast by the views of Scripture truth exhibited in her Catechisms and Confession. Wearing the uniform of Presbyterianism, the apologete should be proud of it and loyal to her blue banner. Adapting Thornwell's words, he need not be ashamed of the *Confession of Faith*, of the men who formed it, of the men who adopted it, or of the martyrs and confessors who sealed its doctrines with their blood. The Calvinistic system which it states is a strong system, which has been the inspiration of heroes, of sages, of martyrs and philosophers; it is a faith which has founded states, immortalized kingdoms, and redeemed countless thousands from the thralldom of sin.<sup>1</sup> But the apologete in the Presbyterian fold may not only be proud of his position and loyal to the standards of his church; he may also rejoice that he occupies the strongest apologetic ground afforded by any doctrinal system when he holds firmly by the Calvinistic creed. Not only is that system the truest exhibition of all Scripture, and the best commentary on a genuine religious experience, but it also affords the strongest ground which the apologete can occupy in discharging his office. It puts him on the highest and strongest ramparts of Christian faith, with the battlements of the divine sovereignty behind him, with electing love on his right side and irresistible grace on the left, and the best apologetic weapons in his hands. Who holding any other doctrinal position can do as effective apologetic work as

---

<sup>1</sup> *Inaugural Address*, Oct., 1857.

he? And for coming conflicts just such a vantage-ground will be needed. "Infidel science will rout everything excepting thorough-going Christian orthodoxy, and the fight will be between a stiff thorough-going orthodoxy and a stiff thorough-going infidelity. It will be Augustine or Comte, Athanasius or Hegel, Luther or Schopenhauer, John Stuart Mill or John Calvin. Arianism gets the fire from both sides; so does Arminianism; so does Universalism."<sup>1</sup> These words, penned fifteen years ago, are true today; and by them the Christian apologete receives a warning which, from the Calvinistic standpoint, is a word of cheer to encourage him in the discharge of his duty. May the Presbyterian Church ever be true to her doctrinal trust, and faithful in her apologetic service!

F. R. BEATTIE.

*Columbia, S. C.*

---

<sup>1</sup> H. B. Smith, *Apologetics*, p. 194.

## II. THE APOCRYPHAL SCRIPTURES.

It seems strange that any believer in divine inspiration should attempt to palm off his own production as a part of the Word of God. It is only less strange that an unbeliever or a disbeliever should do so. Pious frauds of this kind have, however, been practiced from ante-Christian days down to the present time. Much of this impersonation of others is done in other fields of literature. The literary impostors of the eighteenth century exemplify it. All fiction, in drama, epic, or novel, is a phase of it. Daniel Webster essayed to reproduce the speech of the elder Adams on the Declaration of Independence; and, we may say, the disposition to counterfeit others is one of the most common of human passions. There are several motives which may prompt to this in literature. The most powerful, doubtless, is a pride of imitation, coupled with the pleasure of deceiving others. The love of money has also been known to operate. Some have tried to persuade themselves that they were serving both God and man in their attempted contributions to the sacred Scriptures.

These writings are called apocryphal, because the evidence of their inspiration is regarded as hidden, obscure, unsatisfactory. In Matthew's English Bible of 1537, and in Cranmer's of 1539, the apocryphal books of the Old Testament are placed together and are called the *Hagiographa*, the name given by the Alexandrian Jews to their third division of the books of the Old Testament. As the inspired books are known as canonical, the apocryphal were dignified as deuterocanonical; that is, canonical in a secondary or qualified sense.

### OLD TESTAMENT.

#### THE HIGHER APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS; DEUTERO-CANONICAL.

A broad distinction is to be observed in those books that pass among Protestants under the general name of apocryphal. They are to be divided into two classes, the first of which is variously



styled *Hagiographa*, *Deutero-canonical*, *Ecclesiastical*. The marks of this class (so far as it belongs to the Old Testament) are: 1, They are not found in the Hebrew or Jewish canon, and are not recognized by the Jews as inspired. 2, They are found in the old Greek versions, the Septuagint, in the old Latin version, and in the Syriac (?). 3, They are publicly read as a part of the service in some branches of the Christian church. They are: I. and II. Esdras, Tobit, Judith, The Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, with The Epistle of Jeremiah, The Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Holy Children, The History of Susannah, The Destruction of Bel and the Dragon, The Prayer of Manasses, and I., II. and III. Maccabees; and Additions to Esther.

The Eastern or Greek Church receives all of these, and makes no distinction between them and the canonical books. The Council of Trent, acting for the Church of Rome, at its fourth session, April 8, 1546, adopted, after discussion, the views of Augustine as opposed to those of Jerome, and accepted "as sacred and canonical" all of the above books except I. and II. Esdras, The Prayer of Manasses, and III. Maccabees.

The Anglican Church, in the edition of the *Thirty-nine Articles* of 1562, accepted the canon of Jerome, which is the Hebrew, and rejected the deutero-canonical as of inspired authority, but held them to be "read for example of life and instruction of manners, but not to establish any doctrine." This church includes in this class all of the above books except III. Maccabees, but no lessons are taken from the other two books of Maccabees. The sixth of the Articles of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country is of similar import with that of the Church of England. In the "Tables of Lessons of Holy Scripture to be read," as given in the *Book of Common Prayer*, authorized by the Episcopal Church of the United States, there are a score or more of selections from *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus*, but none from the other books of this secondary class.

The *Helvetic Confession* of the Reformed Church of Switzerland, March 1, 1566, accepts the Hebrew canon as alone inspired, but, like the Church of England, considers the deutero-canonical

as good to be read, but not for authority in belief. The position of the Reformed Church of Holland is the same.

The *Confession of Augsburg*, which is the doctrinal formulary of the Lutheran Church, has no rule on the canon. It is strange that no definite deliverance was made on this vital question. The Lutherans have no rule on the subject except Luther's Bible, in which the canonical books of the Old Testament are placed first, and, between them and the New Testament, are put the deuterocanonical; just as many of our old Bibles were printed.

The fifth of the *Articles of Religion* of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, recognizes none but the canonical, and does not even refer to the apocryphal.

The *Westminster Confession* (Chap. I., Sec. II.) pronounces in favor of the canonical, and, in the third section, says: "The books commonly called Apocrypha not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the canon of the Scripture; and therefore are of no authority in the church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved or made use of than other human writings."

As the Greek and Roman churches, constituting a large majority of the professed Christians of the world, receive these books as inspired and a part of the rule of faith, it is a matter of interest to examine the evidence which bears upon the question.

In favor of their inspiration there is:

I. *The Ancient MSS.*

The Alexandrian, the Vatican, the Sinaitic, and the Ephraem, four of the oldest and best, contain these books. A and B have *IV. Maccabees*, the Sinaitic has the *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Shepherd of Hermas*.

II. *The Versions.*

The Septuagint and the Italic form of the Vulgate have them. The Peshito Syriac, it is thought, did not have them at first, but they were added to it at an early day.

III. *The Early Catalogues of the Books.*

1. That of Melito, bishop of Sardis, 170 A. D., has the Hebrew canon only, and omits from it the book of Esther. 2. That of the Council of Laodicea, 365 A. D., has, in addition to the canonical, the book of Baruch, with the Epistle of Jeremiah. It

also omits Revelation from the New Testament. 3. That of the Council of Hippo, where Augustine was present as a bishop, 393 A. D., in addition to the Hebrew canon, enumerates Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, and two books of Maccabees. The third and fourth Councils of Carthage agree with that of Hippo. 4. That of Augustine accepts Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and the two books of Maccabees, as the Council of Hippo had done. 5. That of Innocent I., 405 A. D., is also the same, except that he rejects Esther.

IV. The fathers, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Augustine, and many others of these, are said to have recognized them as belonging to the canonical Scriptures. It is said in Kitto's *Cyclopedia* (from which most of these facts are gathered) that "the only copies of the Scriptures in existence for the first three hundred years after Christ, either among the Jews or Christians of Greece, Italy, or Africa, contained these books without any mark of distinction that we know of."

Against their canonicity it may be urged:

I. That all the arguments given in their favor amount only to this: that a great many, and probably a majority, of the early Christians accepted them. A majority still accept them, as has been stated. That this fact affords a presumption in their favor need not be questioned. It will impair its weight somewhat, however, to remember that these early witnesses are by no means unanimous, nor is their judgment such as the believers in the apocryphal books would be willing to accept in its entirety. They reject some books that all Christendom now receive, and they accept others which are as unanimously rejected. As Jerome, Hilary, and others disputed their canonicity in early days, so there are theologians of the Roman Church who contend that the Council of Trent meant to give only a secondary authority to these books.

II. They are now, and have always been, unanimously repudiated by the Jews. Philo never recognizes them, and Josephus expressly limits the number to the regular Hebrew canon. (*Contra Apion* i. 8.)

III. While they contain many truths well expressed, and are so far valuable, most of them give strong internal evidence against

their own inspiration. The books of Esdras, or Ezra, are four in all. *I. Esdras* is the canonical book of *Ezra*, and *II. Esdras* the canonical book of *Nehemiah*. *III. Esdras* is *I. Esdras* of the Apocrypha, and is a parallel history to canonical Ezra, with some interpolations from 2 Chronicles and Nehemiah. The most interesting thing in it is the contest between Zerubbabel and his two companions as to which of them should speak the wisest sentence. The first wrote, "Wine is the strongest"; the second, "The King is the strongest," and Zerubbabel, "Women are strongest, but, above all things, truth beareth away the victory." All the people shout, "Great is truth, and mighty above all things." The king, Darius, confirmed this decision and gave the reward of victory to Zerubbabel. *IV. Esdras* is *II. Esdras* of the Apocrypha, and is a collection of moral and prophetic statements. It is discredited by historical difficulties and many questionable utterances. It is certainly pseudepigraphal, as is *III. Esdras*. *Tobit* contains both historical and geographical difficulties inconsistent with its inspiration; but is condemned also by its superstitions as to Asmodeus, the evil spirit, who killed the seven husbands of Sara, and as to the efficacy of "the ashes of perfume" and the heart and liver of the fish in driving Asmodeus away. This book also makes Raphael, a holy angel, tell a direct lie in asserting himself to be "Azarias, the son of Ananias the Great."

Competent scholars assert that there are insuperable difficulties, both in geography and history, in the book of *Judith*. These discrepancies are seen by every careful and intelligent reader. To most persons, moreover, the book is discredited for moral reasons. Judith is set forth as a pious heroine of the true faith. She prays, she fasts, she prophesies, she consecrates herself to the deliverance of her people, sorely pressed by Holofernes, the captain of Nabuchadonozor. The means used by this champion of truth and virtue are lying, both in act and word, and an immodest exposure of herself to Holofernes, who fortunately becomes so stupefied in the drunken revel that he does not accomplish what he designed and what she knew was his purpose when she went voluntarily into his tent.

The *Additions to Esther* are quite unimportant, being a mere

enlargement or filling out of the canonical book. The fact that they are not in the book as received by the Jews, and that there is nothing in them which would offend Jewish prejudices, would seem sufficient to reject them. There is no special objection to them, except that, if Josephus is to be credited, they would make Mordecai one hundred and sixty-five years old.

*The Wisdom of Solomon*, from which lessons are read in the Episcopal churches of this country, is a collection of excellent truths, well expressed, and illustrated in God's dealings with the people in olden times. There seems no special objection to it. It is very much like the Psalms and Proverbs, but is probably pseud-epigraphal.

*The Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus*, is the other book from which the Prayer Book has selected readings for the holidays. It does not seem to be equal to the preceding, and, while like it in many respects, is much longer and more varied. It is mostly very good. Possibly our maidens would object to "Hast thou daughters? have a care of their body, and show not thyself cheerful toward them" (vii. 24); our sopranos and altos might be offended with this injunction, "Use not much the company of a woman that is a singer, lest thou be taken with her attempts" (ix. 4); we preachers might consider this lesson as somewhat personal, "Let thy speech be short, comprehending much in few words; be as one that knoweth and yet holdeth his tongue" (xxxii. 8); and the modern cook or housemaid would be highly indignant at this, "Fodder, a wand and burdens are for the ass; and bread, correction and work for a servant" (xxxiii. 24). It is quite remarkable that, in an extended account of the Old Testament worthies, there is no mention of Daniel or Ezra, while Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Nehemiah, Joshua, the son of Josedech, and Zerubbabel are celebrated.

*Baruch* is a penitential confession and lamentation; Jerusalem is introduced as a desolate widow weeping for the sins of her children, and she is comforted with the promise of the deliverance of her captives. *The Epistle of Jeremiah* is a strong, common sense dissuasive from idolatry, addressed by Jeremiah to the Jews at Babylon. This epistle is sometimes made a part of Baruch, and

both were, in early days, occasionally incorporated with the prophecy of Jeremiah. While many critics doubt that these books proceeded from the writers whose names they bear, there is nothing in either plainly inconsistent with its inspiration.

The additions to Daniel embrace the *Prayer of Azarias* and the *Song of the Three Holy Children*, the *History of Susannah*, and the *History of the Destruction of Bel and the Dragon*. Azarias makes for himself, his companions and his people, a confession of sin and a prayer for God's mercy and salvation. All three are then in the fiery furnace. The angel of the Lord comes down into the oven and "smites the flame of fire out of the oven, and makes the midst of the furnace as it had been a moist, whistling wind, so that the fire touched them not at all." The three now join in a song of triumphal praise. *Susannah* is the story of an innocent and beautiful woman, the wife of Joachim, accused and condemned by the men who had sought in vain to seduce her, and who were the regular Jewish judges among the captives. She is rescued from execution by the wisdom of Daniel in unveiling the plot of the conspirators. *Bel* is an idol, as is also the *Dragon*. The former consumed daily twelve measures of flour, forty sheep, and six vessels of wine. Cyrus, the king, was convinced from this that Bel was a real, living being, blessed with a hearty appetite. Daniel, upon the forfeit of his life, denied to the king that this food was eaten by Bel. Whereupon the test was made; the ordinary provisions were placed before the idol and the doors were locked, after Daniel, with the knowledge of the king, but not of the priests of Bel, had strewed the floor with ashes. The seventy priests, with their wives and children, entered the temple at night through their customary secret under-ground passway, and consumed the viands. In the morning, after all had assembled and the doors were opened, the king shouted the triumph of Bel; but Daniel laughed and pointed to the footprints of the men, women and children on the floor. The king protested, however, that, though Bel was an imposture, the Dragon was a living god who ate and drank. Daniel proposed to slay the Dragon without sword or staff; and when permission was given, burst the idol in sunder by means of "pitch, fat and hair" seethed and thrust into its mouth.

The destruction of these gods is represented as producing such an outcry that the king is forced to put Daniel into the lions' den. The account given of this differs from that in the canonical parts of Daniel: 1, In making it occur under Cyrus, instead of Darius; 2, In the reason which prompted the act; here it is the destruction of the idol, there it is Daniel's praying to Jehovah; 3, In the time of Daniel's remaining in the den; there it is merely over night, here it is six days; 4, In the circumstance that here, the prophet Habakkuk, who is carrying some food to reapers in Judea, is taken by an angel of the Lord by the crown and borne by the hair of his head to Babylon, where he gives the food to famishing Daniel in the den, and is then carried back to his home along the same aerial bee-line.

*The Prayer of Manasses, King of Judah*, is penitential and proper, and purports to have been offered by him when he was a captive in Babylon. This book was rejected by the Council of Trent.

There are altogether five books of the Maccabees, only three of which are deuterocanonical, the remaining two being rejected by all the churches. It is doubtful whether we now have *V. Maccabees*. The work that is so called is mainly an account of the pontificate of John Hyrcanus. It does not agree with Josephus. *IV. Maccabees* is found in both the Alexandrian and Vatican MSS., and is usually regarded the same as the *Supremacy of Reason* attributed to Josephus. It is an amplification of the sixth and seventh chapters of *II. Maccabees*, which give an account of the tyranny and cruelty of Antiochus Epiphanes and of the torture of Eleazar, the seven brothers and their mother. It is not consistent with *II. Maccabees*, and teaches the stoical doctrine of the equality of all crimes. *III. Maccabees* is received by the Greek Church, but is rejected by all others. Its history antedates that of *I.* and *II. Maccabees*, and is an account of the persecution of the Egyptian Jews by Ptolemy Philopator. *III. Maccabees* is one of the undisputed deuterocanonical books. Beginning as far back as Jeremiah and Nehemiah, it brings the narrative down to Nicanor's death, 161 B. C., only so far as the seventh chapter of *I. Maccabees* carries it. It professes to be an abridgment of a work in five volumes, pre-

pared by Jason of Cyrene. The letters in the book are inconsistent with the narrative, and in several particulars it contradicts the first Maccabees, to which it is quite inferior. *I. Maccabees* is a reliable history of the revolt of the Maccabees, beginning with their father, Mattathias, and continuing the history to the death of Simon, the last of his priestly, warrior sons. This is very interesting to all lovers of liberty, who rejoice at the enterprise, wisdom, courage and success of the patriot brothers. It is remarkable that the first four books of the Maccabees, so far from being successive to each other, are rather in an inverse chronological order. The fifth book really succeeds the first, although it restates some of its history.

Taking these books as a class, it is clear that most of them contain within themselves evidences of their lack of divine inspiration.

IV. The determining reason why they should be rejected from the canon is the fact that they were not recognized as inspired by Christ and the apostles. This is the true test of the Old Testament canon; it is not the belief of the Jews, nor is it the opinions of the early fathers, nor is it the decrees of equally fallible councils, but it is the unerring and inspired judgment of Christ and his apostles. The books which they received are inspired, and none others are. Let the question be decided on this issue. That the so-called deuterocanonical were not so recognized is shown, 1, By the fact that no one of them is quoted or referred to as *Scripture* in the New Testament. This is disputed, and a score of passages are brought forward from the New Testament, which are said to refer to similar passages in the Apocrypha. With regard to these it will be seen, (1), That in the majority of these cases there are passages fully as similar found in the Old Testament; (2), That the name of no one of these apocryphal books is mentioned in these places, nor anywhere else in the Old Testament or New Testament; (3), That there are direct quotations avowedly made in the New Testament from the Book of Enoch and the Anabasis of Moses, which no church receives, and also from the heathen poets, so that mere quotation is not sufficient; it must be quoted as scripture; (4), That but a single one of these



alleged quotations even remotely refers to the passage as quoted, or as of authority. In every case but this one, it is merely a similarity of idea or of expression that is relied on to prove the reference. The one exception is Matt. ix. 13: "But go ye and learn what that meaneth: I will have mercy and not sacrifice; for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance." It is alleged that this refers to the *Prayer of Manasses*. Now, as this seems to be the strongest case in the list, we must notice, *a*, That the *Prayer of Manasses* is not accepted by the Roman, though it is by the Greek Church; *b*, That the expression quoted is not found in the *Prayer of Manasses*, nor is there any similar language to be read there; the resemblance is solely in thought; *c*, That the idea similarly expressed is to be found in Prov. xxi. 3, and Micah vi. 6-8, while the direct quotation is from Hos. vi. 6. We may, therefore, confidently repeat our first point under this argument, that no one of these disputed books is referred to or quoted as scripture anywhere in the New Testament.

2. Not only is there the absence of any special reference to the *Apocrypha* on the part of Christ and the apostles, but also they form no part of the collection of books to which appeal was constantly made. In several places "scripture" or "scriptures" are referred to as the inspired volume. This seems vague. In other passages the appeal is to the "law"; in several others to "the law and the prophets"; and in one, to "the law, the prophets, and the psalms." It is hardly susceptible of doubt that all these expressions refer to the same collection of writings. It was called "scripture," because it was the written revelation of God; "the law," because that was regarded as the foundation and principal part of the whole; "the law and the prophets," because these were its two main divisions; and, finally, "the law, the prophets, and the psalms," because the collection was so divided by the Rabbis. They are all the same volume; and, historically, that volume is the Jewish canon, as received by Protestants to-day.

So much for the higher class in the Old Testament of the apocryphal writings, called deutero-canonical, and received as inspired by a part of the church.

## THE LOWER APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS, OLD TESTAMENT.

This class embraces those books not received as canonical by any church.

I. *Books not mentioned in the Bible.*

They will be simply enumerated: A *Book of Elias*, in existence in Origen's day and condemned by him; *IV. Maccabees*; *V. Maccabees*, what is so-called is mainly an account of the pontificate of John Hyrcanus, was originally written in Hebrew, has fifty-eight chapters, does not agree with Josephus, begins with the attempt of Heliodorus on the treasury of the temple, and brings the history down to Herod's murder of Mariamne and their two sons; the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*; the *Assumption of Moses*, still in existence; the *Ascension of Isaiah*, still in existence; the *Apocalypse of Daniel*; the *Book of Zohar*; the *Testament of Judah*; the *Testament of Benjamin*; the *Additions to Job*; and the *One Hundred and Fifty-first Psalm*. All of these are referred to in the patristic literature.

II. *Books mentioned in the Bible, but now lost.*

These have all long since perished, and are supposed to have been the original memoirs or official annals, to which the inspired writers had access, and from which they gathered much of their material. There are three of these that may merit a brief special notice.

The *Book of Enoch* is the only one of this class to which any reference is made by name in the New Testament. Jude says, verses 14 and 15, "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." There is in the possession of the Christian world to-day a book which claims to be the one from which Jude quotes. Our first historical acquaintance with it is as found in an Ethiopic manuscript of the Scriptures coming from Abyssinia. It was regarded canonical by the early Abyssinian church, and was placed immediately before the Book of Job in the Old Testament. It could not have been written by Enoch, as it brings the history down to the time of Herod. It is

thought to be the composition of a Jew, probably a Christian Jew, of the first century. It teaches the Trinity, Christ's eternity, that he is to be worshipped, and is the Supreme Judge; that there is to be a future state of retribution and eternal punishment. Tertulian is the only one of the fathers who considered it canonical.

The *Book of Jasher* is mentioned, Joshua x. 13, and 2 Sam. i. 18. There is no work extant which is claimed to be the book thus referred to. Several explanations have been given of the name: 1. That it means "Of the Upright," as will be seen in the margins of our Bibles. 2. "Of Songs." 3. That it was the first word in the book, and gave name to it according to the Jewish custom. 4. That it is the name of the author. Josephus says that it was one of the books of the temple, but does not regard it as one of the sacred twenty-two. (*Antiq.* v. 1-17.) Theodoret thinks that all of Joshua was taken from it. Jerome considers it the same as Genesis; others identify it with the Pentateuch, and others still think it was a treatise on archery. There are two rabbinical works that bear this name.

A work purporting to be the "Book of the Wars of the Lord," referred to in Num. xxi. 14, was in existence during the life of Augustine, and was stigmatized by him as apocryphal.

The remaining books of this class will be merely mentioned: *Book of the Acts of Solomon*, 1 Kings xi. 41; *Chronicles of the Kings of Israel*, 1 Kings xv. 31; *Chronicles of King David*, 1 Chron. xxvii. 24; *Book of Samuel the Seer*, *Book of Nathan the Prophet*, *Book of Gad the Seer*, 1 Chron. xxix. 29; *Prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite*, the *Visions of Iddo the Seer against Jeroboam*, 2 Chron. ix. 29; *Book of Shemaiah the Prophet*, of *Iddo the Seer concerning Genealogies*, 2 Chron. xii. 15; the *Story (Commentary, margin) of the Prophet Iddo*, 2 Chron. xiii. 22; *Book of Jehu*, and *Book of the Kings of Israel*, 2 Chron. xx. 34; *Story (Commentary, margin) of the Book of the Kings*, 2 Chron. xxiv. 27; *The Sayings of the Seers (Hosai, margin)* 2 Chron. xxxiii. 19; *The Lamentations*, 2 Chron. xxxv. 25.

#### THE NEW TESTAMENT—THE ANTILEGOMENA.

The books written after the coming of Christ may, of course, be divided into the two classes of canonical and non-canonical.

All that were received as inspired by any one of the apostles, and no others, belong to the former class. The fathers, however, at the suggestion of Eusebius, divided these into two sections: 1. The *Homologoumena*—that is, those universally confessed as inspired. These are all now found in our Bibles, except, 2, The *Antilegomena*: Hebrews, James, II. Peter, II. and III. John, Jude, and Revelation. This latter class were so named because in the first centuries there were some Christians who disputed their canonicity. *The Epistle to the Hebrews* was discredited because it was anonymous. Though the popular belief settled to the conviction of a Pauline authorship, concealed because of Jewish antipathy to the apostle of the Gentiles, still many critics to this day consider it the work of another hand, most probably of Luke or Barnabas. The doubt as to *James* arose from the fact that its authorship was questioned, inasmuch as the salutation differs from that of the other epistles, and the author does not call himself an apostle. Luther denied its apostolic authorship, and held it to be “a right strawy epistle,” because chiefly of its seeming opposition to the doctrine of justification by faith. *II. Peter* has perhaps been more seriously questioned than any other book of the New Testament. The testimony of the early church is less favorable to it, and the remarkable resemblance of its central portion to the *Epistle of Jude* makes many now doubt that Peter wrote it. *II. and III. John* were less known to the early church, partly by reason of their shortness, but mainly because they were addressed to private individuals. *Jude* has been, and is yet, doubted, on account of the quotation, verse 9, from the *Anabasis of Moses*, and, in verses 14 and 15, from the spurious *Book of Enoch*. Suspicion was cast upon *The Revelation* by virtue of the encouragement it was thought to give to error in the Chiliastic controversy, and for this reason Dionysius, Origen’s pupil, and bishop of Alexandria, denied that John wrote it. Calvin takes no notice of *II. or III. John* and of the *Apocalypse*, attributes *II. Peter* to one of Peter’s disciples, and accepts *James* and *Jude*. Tyndale, the great English translator, was at first in doubt as to *Hebrews*, *James*, *Jude*, and the *Apocalypse*, but finally seemed satisfied as to all but the last one. Luther made a marked difference between these four

books and the rest of the New Testament, placing them together at the end of his translation and distinctly denying the apostolic authorship of all of them. The Council of Trent accepted both the Homologoumena and the Antilegomena of Eusebius, and adopted as the papal canon of the New Testament the twenty-seven books which are found in our ordinary Bibles. All of the Protestant churches have acquiesced in this decision, so that there is no ecclesiastical disagreement as to the canonical books of the New Testament. There are, however, many critical students in all of the churches who seriously doubt, if they do not deny, the canonicity of II. Peter and Jude.

#### THE EARLY APOCRYPHAL NEW TESTAMENT.

One is greatly surprised to find the large number of books which were put forward in primitive times as of apostolic authorship and inspiration. Of these there have come down to us, or have been noted in history, nearly fifty spurious gospels, fourteen books of Acts, thirteen Epistles, and seven Revelations. Some fifty-five of these frauds have been translated into English, and are now to be found in many private libraries. Indeed, in an American publication of these fabrications a list of some seventy other books is given: "Apocryphal Pieces not now extant, mentioned by Writers in the first Four Centuries." A list is here given of those which the writer has in two volumes; one the T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, collection, and the other bearing the imprint of Benj. B. Mussey & Co., Boston.

*Gospels*: "History of Joseph the Carpenter," "Gospel of the Infancy," "Protevangelium of James," "Gospel of Thomas," in three forms, two Greek and one Latin; "Gospel of the Nativity of Mary," "Gospel of Marcion," "Gospel of Nicodemus," in six forms, three Greek and three Latin; "Paradosis and Death of Pilate"; *John*, mutilated and altered, as used by the Templars; "Book of the Apostle John;" *Pseudo Matthew*; "Letter of Pontius Pilate," "Report of Pilate," in two forms; "The Death of Pilate," "The Narrative of Joseph," "The Avenging of the Saviour."

*Acts*: "The Holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, containing the

Story of Perpetua," "Paul and Thecla;" *Barnabas; Philip;* "Philip, when he went to Upper Hellas," "Martyrdom of the Holy Apostle Andrew," "Andrew and Matthias in the City of the Maneaters," "Peter and Andrew," "Martyrdom of Matthew the Apostle," "The Holy Apostle Thomas," "The Consummation of Thomas the Apostle," "The Martyrdom of the Holy and Glorious Apostle Bartholomew," "The Holy Apostle Thaddaeus," "The Holy Apostle and Evangelist John." Here may be placed the *Διδασχί*, or "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," unless it may be more appropriately classed with the Epistles.

*Epistles*: "Jesus Christ and Abgarus," "Paul and Seneca," "Paul to the Laodiceans," "1st and 2nd of Clement to the Corinthians," "General of Barnabas," "Ignatius to the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Romans, Philadelphians, Smyrnaeans, and Polycarp," "Polycarp to the Philippians."

*Revelations*: "The Shepherd of Hermas;" *Paul; John;* "The Assumption of Mary," in three forms.

Of these *Gospels*, one needs to read but a few pages that he may see how different from the genuine and how inferior they are. As I open the Boston compilation my eyes rest upon the second chapter of the *Gospel of Thomas*, and I read, "Besides this, the son of Anna the scribe was standing there with Joseph, and took a bough of a willow tree and scattered the waters which Jesus had gathered into lakes. But the boy Jesus, seeing what he had done, became angry and said to him, Thou fool, what harm did the lakes to thee, that thou shouldst scatter the water? Behold, now thou shalt wither as a tree, and shalt not bring forth either leaves, or branches, or fruit. And immediately he became withered all over. Then Jesus went away home. But the parents of the boy who was withered, lamenting the misfortune of his youth, took and carried him to Joseph, accusing him, and said, Why dost thou keep a son who is guilty of such actions? Then Jesus, at the request of all who were present, did heal him, leaving only some small member to continue withered that they might take warning." It will be further observed that "the Lady St. Mary" and Pilate are as conspicuous in these fabrications as is Jesus.

In the various *Acts*, all of the original twelve are remembered

except the two Jameses and the two Judases. Though aside from the present inquiry, it must strike every intelligent reader of the New Testament that the title *Acts of the Apostles* is a misnomer for the book to which it is prefixed. Except Peter and Paul, the other apostles are not much more than mentioned. As to Peter, fully two-thirds of the chapters say nothing about him, and he drops out of the narrative when it is half written. Paul is more prominent; but the book is not a history of the life and work of Paul, for it closes abruptly when it brings him to Rome. The book seems designed to give an account of the introduction of Christianity into the centres of civilization. This was Dr. Addison Alexander's judgment, if I am not mistaken.

There is one work classed with the *Acts* which merits a particular notice; it is the *Διδασχί*, or "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." This is thought to be the book referred to by Eusebius, Athanasius, Nicephorus, and Clement of Alexandria, and, though not a production of the apostles or of the apostolic age, is supposed to have been written early in the second century. This early authorship is inferred "from the entire absence of reference to doctrinal matters, the specific teachings of heretics, and the hierarchical constitution of the church." We notice, in Chap. IV., "If aught thou hast, by thy hands thou shalt make atonement for thy sins"; Chap. VII., "And touching baptism. thus baptize: Having first declared all these things, baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost in living water. But if thou have not living water, baptize in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. But if thou have neither, pour on the head water thrice, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit"; Chap. IX., "Let none eat or drink of your eucharist save those baptized in the name of the Lord"; Chap. X., "And when you are filled give thanks thus" (this has reference to the Lord's supper); Chap. XI., "Let every apostle who cometh to you be received as the Lord. He shall not overstay one day, though, if need be, the next; but if he remain three days, he is a false prophet"; Chap. XV., "Choose for yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, men meek and not avaricious, and true and proved, for they too perform for you the functions of prophets and teachers."

These extracts seem to show, 1, That the *Αἰθαγγί* is not inspired; 2, That baptism by pouring was practiced when it was written; 3, That deacons were regarded as prophets and teachers.

There are several of the apocryphal *Epistles* which may merit a passing notice. In the first mentioned, Abgarus, king of Edessa, invites Jesus to visit him, and Jesus replies, declining to do so, but promising to send one of the disciples after his ascension. There are eight letters purporting to be from the philosopher, Seneca, to Paul, and six replies from the apostle. Seneca writes as a Christian, and is very cordial and free. Paul is very cautious and prudent, seeming to fear that his letters might betray him. The *Epistle to the Laodiceans* is quite short, and professes to be the one to which allusion is made, Colossians iv. 16. There is nothing specially objectionable in it, and it imitates the style and sentiments of Paul. The *Epistle of Barnabas* is the most famous of this collection. Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen seem to have regarded it as both genuine and canonical. It is, however, undoubtedly neither (though found in the Sinaitic MS.), as J. E. Ryland, in Kitto, has conclusively shown. It is full of puerile absurdities; for example, speaking of the hyena, it says, "That creature every year changes its kind, and is sometimes male and sometimes female." It teaches baptismal regeneration. The conclusion reminds us of the beginning of the *Didache*, and both are founded upon the favorite Jewish conception of the two ways. It is strongly anti-Judaic, foolishly so, and abounds in the wildest allegorical interpretations.

The only one of the spurious Apocalypses which merits attention is *The Shepherd of Hermas*. This is in three books—I., The Four Visions, in which he is taught by "an old woman," who represents the church; II., The Twelve Commands, given by an angel in the garb of a shepherd; and III., The Ten Similitudes, in which the shepherd is again the instructor. It was probably not written by the Hermas mentioned by Paul, Rom. xvi. 14, but is the composition of a writer of the second century, a brother of Pius, the pastor of the church at Rome. Origen thought it inspired; Clement of Alexandria quotes from it, and Irenaeus speaks of it as scripture; Eusebius places it among the *notha*, or



spurious; Dean Stanley calls it "The Pilgrim's Progress of the Second Century"; but Mosheim pronounces it "a mixture of folly and superstition with piety." It favors immersion and baptismal regeneration; is wholly a moral essay, and has but a minimum of Christianity in it; inculcates repentance, and ignores almost every other important doctrine of the gospel; the least possible is said or made of Christ in it. An incomplete copy of it was found with the Sinaitic codex.

#### THE MODERN NEW TESTAMENT APOCRYPHA.

In the winter of 1856, the Rev. W. D. Mahan, a minister of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, entertained at his house, in De Witt, Mo., a German scholar, who had spent five years in Rome and was quite familiar with the library of the Vatican. His name was Whydaman. He told Mr. Mahan that he had seen and read in that library Pilate's report of the crucifixion of Jesus. At Mr. Mahan's request, he secured from Father Frulinhusen, "the chief guardian of the Vatican," a certified "word-for-word" copy of the MS. Mr. Mahan published an edition of it. In 1879, the Rev. George Sluter put forth another and better edition, with interesting historical and critical notes.

September, 1883, Mr. Mahan left his home in Central Missouri to go to Rome and Constantinople. He returned in about six weeks and published the next year a volume containing eight additional MSS., found in the libraries of the Vatican and of St. Sophia. They are: "Jonathan's Report of his Interview with the Shepherds of Bethlehem, also, Letter of Melker who was priest of the Bethlehem Synagogue when Jesus was born; Gamaliel's Report of his interview with Joseph and Mary in regard to their child Jesus, also, of his interview with Massalian, and Mary and Martha; Caiaphas' Report of the Sanhedrim, giving his reason for the execution of Jesus of Nazareth; Caiaphas' Second Report in regard to the resurrection of Jesus; Eli's Story of the Magi; Herod Antipater's Defence before the Roman Senate concerning his conduct at Bethlehem; Herod Antipas' Defence before the Roman Senate concerning his execution of John the Baptist and other charges; The Hillel Letters regarding God's Providences to the Jews."

As may be supposed, the book was received with great interest. It was eagerly bought and read. The editor wrote me that he was making twenty dollars a day from its sale. It circulated from Canada to Texas. The Wesleyan Publishing House, of Syracuse, N. Y., made arrangements for issuing an edition of the work. Ministers of the gospel regarded it as very valuable confirmatory evidence of the New Testament history. Some wondered that the industrious and curious students of Europe had not discovered these treasures before and given them to the world. A few of the more intelligent and critical shook their heads.

Of course, it was a mere bubble and was soon pricked. It was shown that these MSS., purporting to have been written by the contemporaries of Christ, were full of anachronisms, proving that their composition could not have been earlier than the thirteenth century; for example, passages in the Bible were referred to by chapter and verse. The editor was known to be grossly ignorant of even elementary English knowledge. It was found that some forty pages of *Eli's Story of the Magi* were taken verbatim from Gen. Lew. Wallace's *Ben Hur*. It was shown that Mr. Mahan had published a "Hebrew History of Baptism," which he had taken in whole and in part from a Methodist writer. It was finally proved, to the satisfaction of most persons, that the editor had never visited Rome or Constantinople, but had manufactured his MSS. somewhere on this side of the Atlantic. Mr. Mahan was arraigned by his Presbytery and deposed from the ministry.

This brief survey ought to convince us all that the Protestant church has wisely sifted the wheat from a great quantity of chaff, and rightly holds that the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament and the twenty-seven of the New Testament are the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

J. A. QUARLES.

*Lexington, Va.*

### III. THE CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND THE SABBATH.

WHAT is the legitimate province of the civil government in reference to the Sabbath? To what extent may the civil government enforce a Sabbath law?

These are interesting and important questions. They are questions attended with no little difficulty, and yet they call for practical solution. The following discussion is submitted as a contribution towards the solution of these questions, in the hope that it may tend to produce, though in never so small a measure, a public opinion which will secure the enactment and enforcement of a good Sabbath law in all the States of the Union.

In seeking to determine the province of civil government in reference to the Sabbath, it will be desirable at the outset to have clearly in mind what is the Sabbath law of the Bible, and what are the essential features of that venerable institution as they are set forth in that law. A careful study of all the passages in the Bible will make it clear that God's Sabbath law consists:

1st. Of a requirement separating one day in seven from common uses, and expressly devoting or sanctifying it to God. This is the prominent feature of the law, noted in almost every mention of it, and marking the Sabbath as God's day.

2nd. The law forbids all ordinary labor, or the doing of anything which would secularize the day and prevent its devotion to God. This prohibition, however, is not absolute. The people of Israel were to assemble together on the Sabbath for religious worship; the daily sacrifices, instead of being intermitted or diminished, were doubled; the "shew-bread" in the tabernacle was changed, and works of necessity and mercy were allowed. It is evident, therefore, that the work prohibited on the Sabbath by God's law is the work which is designed to gather, as in the case of the manna, any man's personal or family share of the common bounties of God's providence, or, in other words, *money-making work*.

3rd. A third feature of the Sabbath, as instituted by God, regards it as a blessing to man. God blessed and hallowed the day for man's sake. Man is required to give the day to God, but God gives it back to man charged with a blessing of love.

If the question be, Does it fall within the legitimate province of the civil government to enforce a Sabbath law having these three features? the answer should be, within limits, Yes.

Reasons for the affirmative answer will first be given, and then the limits within which it may be wise for civil government to enforce these requirements will be pointed out.

I. All but avowed atheists will agree in asserting that government is an ordinance of God, and that governments, even those "of the people, and by the people and for the people," derive in the last resort their authority from God. It follows that it lies within the legitimate province of civil governments to enforce, as far as practicable, all those great principles which underlie what is called the moral law, by which is meant those laws which spring out of man's relations to God as Creator, and to each other as the creatures of God.

It can be shown that the Sabbath law belongs to this class of laws. It is a law given by God as Creator, not as the Redeemer or Saviour of men. It is a law given by God to man as man, to the race, to all men, at all times and under all circumstances; not to the Jew alone nor to the Gentile, but to both alike. The proof of these statements is not confined to the Bible, nor to any special view to be taken of particular passages of the Bible. The Sabbath law is based on man's necessities, it springs out of the relations which exist between man and God his Creator, and between man and man. The truth of this last statement is recognized by those who never saw the Bible. No people have ever lived sufficiently advanced in knowledge to have a literature, however rude, who have not observed religious festivals. With any recognition of their duties to God has come also the appointment of regularly recurring days for the performance of their religious duties. A Sabbath law in its essential features is a law written on the hearts and consciences of men. Testimony on this point is very abundant. Thus Plato, in the second book of his *Discourse on Laws*

says: "The gods, taking pity on the wearisome natural condition of men, appointed for them a series of rests from their toils, viz., regularly recurring festivals to the gods." Richard Hooker, than whom no one of his day was more competent to speak on the subject, has said: "Even nature hath taught the heathens, . . . first, that festival solemnities are a part of the public exercises of religion; secondly, that praise, liberality and rest, are as natural elements, whereof solemnities consist."

As to the fact that the Bible regards the Sabbath as resting on a moral foundation in its essential features, it is only necessary to note its place in the Ten Commandments. Confessedly all the other of these commandments are moral, binding man as man to his duties to God and to his fellow-man. On this point men and councils, as wide apart as the poles on other points, are agreed. The Council of Trent says in its catechism: "This precept [the fourth commandment] agrees with the others, not in what is ritual and ceremonial, but inasmuch as it comprises something that appertains to the moral and natural law." In a notable work, dedicated to Archbishop Laud, Dr. Francis White, Bishop of Ely, says of the fourth commandment: "The common and natural equity of that commandment is moral, to-wit: that God's people are obliged to observe a convenient and sufficient time for public and solemn divine worship." Dr. J. A. Hessey, in the *Bampton Lecture* for 1860, says: "The moral element contained in the fourth commandment, viz., the obligation to serve God at some time, is quite enough to warrant its admission into a moral document."

If, then, there be a God, and civil government be an ordinance of God; if, moreover, the observance of a regularly recurring season for rest and religious worship be a moral duty, all of which we have seen to be confessed by men generally, then it is within the legitimate province of civil government to enact and enforce a law appointing such a season. There are limitations to the extent to which government may go in enforcing the religious features of a Sabbath law; but our conclusion is a sound one, even if the duty enforced by the law be regarded as a religious duty; for it is not a duty which pertains to any special form of religion; it is not a Christian duty, nor a Jewish duty, nor a heathen duty; it is

a religious duty, because man is a religious being—a duty owed by all men to God.

2. In confirmation of the preceding argument, and as a separate and independent argument to sustain the general contention, it is to be noted that a Sabbath law, as a police regulation, is essential to the highest welfare of the people.

This consideration should be conclusive, even for those who, in their jealous regard for the rights of conscience, deny that civil government ought to enforce a Sabbath law as a religious duty. It is not necessary to present in detail the facts and arguments which go to prove that a Sabbath observance is essential to the highest welfare of a people. This is acknowledged by all who, having examined the subject, speak their honest convictions. Thus, Blackstone in his *Commentaries*, has said:

“Besides the notorious indecency and scandal of permitting any secular business to be transacted on that day (Sunday) in a country professing Christianity, and the corruption of morals which usually follows its profanation, the keeping one day of the seven holy, as a time of relaxation and refreshment as well as for public worship, is of admirable service to a state, considered merely as a civil institution. It humanizes by the help of conversation and society the manners of the lower classes, which would otherwise degenerate into a sordid ferocity and savage selfishness of spirit; it enables the industrious workman to pursue his occupation in the ensuing week with health and cheerfulness; it imprints on the minds of the people that sense of their duty to God so necessary to make them good citizens, but which yet would be worn out and defaced by an unremitted continuance of labor, without any stated time of recalling them to the worship of their Maker.”—Vol. IV., p. 45, side page 64.

It would be difficult more clearly to express in so few words the necessity for the Sabbath, both as a religious and as a civil institution. Similar testimony was given respecting the economical advantages of the Sabbath by Lord Macaulay, in a speech delivered in the House of Commons in 1846 on the Ten Hours' Bill.

“For my own part,” the learned historian said, “I have not the smallest doubt that, if we and our ancestors had, during the last three centuries, worked just as hard on the Sundays as on the week days, we should have been at this moment a poorer people, a less civilized people, than we are. . . . While industry is suspended, while the plough lies in the furrow, while the exchange is silent, while no smoke ascends from the factory, a process is going on quite as important to the wealth of nations as any process which is performed on more busy days. Man, the machine of machines, the machine compared with which all the contrivances of the Watts and Arkwrights are worthless, is repairing and winding up, so

that he returns to his labors on Monday with clearer intellect, with livelier spirits, with renewed corporeal vigor."

Further testimony, however, on this point is rendered unnecessary in view of the formal decisions of the courts of the country. With one accord, they assert that it is within the legitimate authority of the State legislatures to enforce the observance of the Sabbath as a day of rest from ordinary secular labor. It has been objected to the Sabbath law before the courts that such a law was essentially and necessarily an enforcement of a religious duty, and consequently an infringement of the rights of conscience. California at one time sustained this objection, but subsequently the courts of that State adopted the views enunciated by Judge Scott, of Missouri, in the case of the State against Ambs (20 Missouri Reports, p. 214). In that case it was argued by counsel that "the whole system of laws designed to enforce the observance of the Christian Sabbath is unconstitutional, because (1), They interfere with the rights of conscience; (2), They impose a form of religious worship; (3), They give a preference to one religious sect over all others."

Judge Scott, in delivering the opinion of the court, said: "It cannot be maintained that the law exacting a cessation from labor on Sunday compels an act of religious worship. Because divines may teach their churches that the reverential observance of the Lord's day is an act of religious worship, it by no means follows that the prohibition of worldly labor by the General Assembly is an act of worship." In conclusion, he said: "We are of the opinion that there is nothing inconsistent with the constitution as it was understood at the time of its adoption, with a law compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest."

It may be asserted that, while there is nothing in the *State* constitution to prevent the enactment of a Sabbath law, yet such laws are repugnant to the constitution of the United States. So far as the writer of this essay has been able to ascertain, this point has not been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, nor even raised. A somewhat similar plea has been set up in regard to laws prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicants, and it has been declared by the Supreme Court of the United

States that, "as a measure of police regulation, looking to the preservation of public morals, a State law prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors is not repugnant to any clause of the constitution of the United States." (*Mugler vs. The State of Kansas.*)

The court went further than this, and, in response to the assertion that a State had no right to pass a law prohibiting any citizen from making for his own use, or for export, or storage, any article of food and drink, not endangering the rights of others, declared that while this might be true in the case where the food or drink made and used privately did *not* endanger or affect the rights of others, yet to the State legislatures was committed the authority to determine whether such private making and using of such articles would in any case injuriously affect the public. "And so," said the justice, "if, in the judgment of the legislature, the manufacture of intoxicating liquors for the maker's own use, as a beverage, would tend to cripple, if it did not defeat, the efforts to guard the community against the evils attending the excessive use of such liquors, it is not for the courts upon their views as to what is best and safest for the community to disregard the legislative determination of the question."

It seems from this that, in the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, there is nothing in the constitution of the United States to forbid the enactment of Sabbath laws by the State legislatures, if such laws are needed, in the opinion of the legislatures, for the preservation of the public morals and the public welfare; for the learned justice adds: "If the public safety or the public morals require the discontinuance of any manufacture or traffic, the hand of the legislature cannot be stayed from providing for its discontinuance by any incidental inconvenience which individuals or corporations may suffer."

It may, therefore, be regarded as authoritatively settled, that it is within the prerogative of the legislature to pass any Sabbath law which may be thought necessary, or even desirable, for the public weal. To secure such a law, it is necessary only to form and maintain a general public opinion that it is needed.

3. There is a third reason why in our own country especially



the civil government should enforce a Sabbath law. A very large number of the best citizens consider it their religious duty to observe a Sabbath. They may differ widely in their views as to the manner of its observance, but they regard the Sabbath from an economical standpoint as an inalienable right, and its observance from a religious standpoint as a moral and religious duty which conscience requires them to perform. It is clear that government should protect them in the enjoyment of this right and in the performance of this duty, unless their manner of observing the Sabbath should become a nuisance to their neighbors. It seems also to be clear that the only way in which the right of citizens in this regard can be protected is by some general law requiring a cessation of labor from all. If labor of every sort is to go on seven days in the week; if men at will may work and require others to work under penalty of loss of pay or patronage, how is it possible for those who desire to observe a Sabbath to do so? It is not a sufficient reply to this question to say, let those who wish to do so observe the Sabbath and suffer the loss which their absurd views entail. The public should not be compelled to forego their business and their pleasure for the sake of a fanatical minority. For, in the first place, it has been shown that, however it may be regarded by the public, the public welfare is promoted and not injured by a Sabbath observance. And then, in the second place, without such a law, those who desire to observe the Sabbath cannot do so without serious detriment to their interests. Their public assemblies for worship are liable to be interrupted by the clash and clamor of business and pleasure. Their opportunities to compete with their neighbors in honorable business are seriously interfered with. On the one hand, a Sabbath law would put all on precisely the same footing in this regard, and so do injury to none. On the other hand, a failure to enforce such a law, brings special and very serious injury to a large and important class of citizens, and at the same time is injurious to all, without exception.

This view of the subject was taken in 1885 by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in the case of *Mohney vs. Cook*. In delivering the opinion of the court the judge said:

“The declaration that Christianity is a part of the law of the land is a summary description of an existing and very obvious condition of our institutions. . . It is perfectly natural, therefore, that a Christian people should have a law to protect their day of rest from desecration. Regarding it as a day necessarily and divinely set apart for rest from worldly employments and for the enjoyment of spiritual privileges, it is simply absurd to suppose that they would leave it without legislative protection from the disorderly and the immoral.”

Some persons, among Christians as well as among infidels, may dissent from the views expressed by this court, especially in the assertion that ours is a *Christian* country, and that as such it is bound to protect the Sabbath as a Christian institution. It may be admitted that the language of the court, strictly construed, overstated the case; yet it is valuable as the expression of an authoritative opinion respecting the truth of the proposition now urged, viz.: Government should protect in every practicable way, the rights of those citizens who regard the Sabbath as a privilege of which they are not to be deprived, and its observances as a duty which their consciences require them to discharge.

The foregoing discussion may be summed up as follows: It is within the legitimate authority of the civil government, and it is its duty to enforce the Sabbath law, because—

(1.) The observance of that law is a moral duty obligatory on all men.

(2.) The observance of that law is necessary to the public welfare.

(3.) The rest from toil which that law enjoins is one of the inalienable rights of man.

(4.) The observance of such a law is regarded by many as a religious duty, in the performance of which they should be protected by government.

II. It remains to indicate the limits within which civil government may attempt to enforce God's Sabbath law.

1. The first limitation has regard to the Federal government. It is not within the province of that government to enforce a Sabbath law, except as to the District of Columbia, the Federal officials, including the army and navy, and the mail service.

This limitation grows out of the distribution of powers between the States and the Federal government. Sunday laws, whether

regarded as moral or as economical, lie in that department of legislation known as the "police powers." These are concerned about measures designed to protect the public morals, the public health and internal public safety. These "police powers" have been allotted to the State governments. Such is the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States. In the case of *Mugler vs. The State of Kansas*, Mr. Justice McLean's opinion is quoted by the court with approval to this effect: "A State regulates its domestic commerce, contracts, the transmission of estates, real and personal, and acts upon internal matters which relate to its moral and political welfare. Over these subjects the Federal government has no power." Mr. Justice Grier is also in the same connection quoted with approval, when he says, respecting the police power, it "is exclusively in the States."

This, then, is the first limitation of the authority of civil government in our own country to enact and enforce a Sabbath law. This authority belongs to the State, and not to the Federal government, except as to those subjects and objects which are immediately within the control of the Federal government, viz., its own officials and the District of Columbia. In regard to these, the authority of the Federal government will be limited in the same manner and degree as the authority of the State governments is limited within their jurisdiction.

2. In regard to these general limitations, which define the power of the civil government in all its departments, it may be remarked that it is not within the province of civil government to enforce the religious observance of the Sabbath in any manner or to any extent. This may be conceded even by those who maintain that a Sabbath observance of some sort is a religious duty, and that the State ought to enforce it on this ground. It is one thing to base a Sabbath observance on moral and religious grounds. It is a quite different thing to prescribe any particular mode of Sabbath observance. It is enough for the government to require, on what is deemed sufficient grounds, a cessation from labor. Such cessation is enough to mark the day as a special day, as a day separated from other days and devoted to God. To go further than this, and to prescribe acts of worship by which

the day is to be observed, would be repugnant to that religious liberty which is guaranteed to every citizen. No intelligent Christian now believes that it is possible to make men religious by acts of the legislature or by decisions of courts of justice. All attempts of this sort would be as utterly futile in the future as they have been in the past. All the ends respecting the Sabbath contemplated in God's ordinance of civil government, as far as they can be secured at all, will be secured by a law which enforces cessation from labor on one day in seven. The being and authority of God are thereby recognized, his day is honored, the welfare of the people is promoted, and abundant opportunity is afforded to all to worship God and to consider their eternal interests. The manner in which each one will employ his rest in worshipping God must be left to the individual conscience.

In times past some of the States have not observed this limitation; and some of the odium attaching to Sunday laws and the failure to enforce these laws to some extent may be attributed to this fact. If all the States should pass laws in conformity with this limitation, we might hope for more zealous and successful efforts to enforce them. They would at least be no longer obnoxious to the objection that they violate the rights of conscience, for all would conform to the description given of the Pennsylvania Sunday law by the Supreme Court of that State in the delivery of their opinion in the case of *Specht vs. The Commonwealth* (8th Penn.):

“It intermeddles not with the natural and indefeasible right of all men to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience; it compels none to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or maintain any ministry against his consent. It treats no religious doctrine as paramount in the State; it enforces no unwilling attendance upon the celebration of divine worship. . . . It intrudes not into the domestic circle, to dictate when, where, or to what God its inmates shall address their orisons. . . . Its sole mission is to inculcate a temporary weekly cessation from labor, but it adds not to this requirement any religious obligation.”

A more serious difficulty regards the extent to which government may go in prohibiting work or play on the Sabbath. What work is to be regarded as necessary; what plays or amusements are to be allowed, and what are to be forbidden? This difficulty is greatly enhanced by the requirements of our modern civiliza-

tion. The national and ceremonial legislation of Moses and his successors furnish little or no help at this point; for it is simply preposterous to assert that the underlying principles of the Sabbath law can have precisely the same applications in modern life as they had in Palestine in the days of David, of Nehemiah, or of Christ. The world's commerce upon the high seas, the immense traffic in live stock over long lines of railroad, the transportation of vast quantities of perishable articles of food over great distances to meet the ever increasing wants of teeming multitudes in large cities, cannot be dealt with in precisely the same way as the business interests of a people not much more numerous than the present population of London, occupying a country not larger than New Hampshire, and prohibited from extended intercourse with other nations.

It is agreed on all sides that "works of necessity and mercy" are to be excepted from the general operation of the law. But the question is, What are works of necessity and mercy? It has been held in Missouri, under existing laws, that a judge's charge to a jury was not a work of necessity, and therefore invalid. In Indiana it has been decided that selling a cigar to an habitual smoker was a work of necessity. These examples, which might be greatly multiplied, show how different are the views of men at this point. And it may be admitted at once that it is wholly impossible to define by statute every sort of necessary and charitable work. It may also be admitted that it is not within the legitimate authority of the state to invade the privacy of the home in order to dictate what domestic work may or may not be done therein, or what amusements may or may not be indulged in. The civil government must be content to prohibit, (1), all labor other than that which is strictly domestic, or otherwise necessary and charitable; (2), all labor on the part of its own officials, except in times of great public exigency; (3), all public games and sports; (4), all public assemblies, except those which are religious or funereal, or for moral instruction; (5), to require railroad and other companies, whose business makes any work necessary on the Sundays, to employ a sufficient number of persons to allow each one day's rest in seven; (6), to leave it to the courts to determine in every

case presented whether any alleged violation of the law is within or without the exceptions.

This last is, of course, the normal function of the courts; and a series of decisions might be obtained which would enable every one readily to decide for himself what works were to be regarded as merciful or necessary. For example, the courts would decide respecting the necessity of Sunday mails and Sunday trains loaded with coal, iron, and other imperishable articles of freight. They would determine whether the selling on Sunday of tobacco, intoxicating drinks, soda water, confectioneries and other luxuries, was necessary or charitable. They would determine under what circumstances the selling on Sunday of the common articles of food, drink and clothing was necessary; whether excursions to health resorts on Sunday were necessary or charitable. They would indicate the difference between a horse-race and a base-ball game on the one hand as a public sport, and on the other hand, a game of whist in a gentleman's parlor. When these and other points of a similar nature were settled, the law could and would be enforced as well as other laws which are designed to restrain the selfish passions of mankind.

If the laws now practically obsolete could be erased from our statute books; if substantially the same law were passed in accordance with the limitations which have been indicated in this essay by all the States and the Federal government; if there could be obtained a series of judicial decisions indicative of the principles upon which "works of necessity and mercy" were to be determined, we might hope to see the Sabbath as a civil institution resting firmly on moral and economical foundations, enshrined in the affections of the people, and promoting the highest welfare of the whole country.

In order to secure the enactment and the enforcement of such a law, it is of prime importance that the masses of the people should be taught to regard the Sabbath, not as a tax and a burden imposed by puritans and fanatics, but as a right and a privilege which they should highly prize. They should be taught that the Sabbath is an institution designed for, and adapted to, man as man; that it is properly a civil institution enforced by the State, because

it is necessary to the moral, intellectual, social, and material welfare of all. They should be taught that every blow at the Sabbath is a blow at their property-rights, as well as at their religious liberty. When the people come to understand and appreciate that the loss of the Sabbath means a loss of money, a loss of power, a loss of pleasure, as well as a loss of religious privilege, they will demand and secure from the State the enactment and the enforcement of a Sabbath law.

There should be a combination of every practicable teaching agency to impress these truths on the minds and hearts of the people. The secular, as well as the religious press; the public, as well as the private schools of the country, should join with the family, the Sunday-school and the pulpit, in promoting a sound public opinion respecting the Sabbath. The pulpit need not fear to urge the economical advantages of the Sabbath. It has abundant scriptural authority for so doing. For, while the Bible presents the Sabbath as a gift of grace designed for the religious sanctification of God's people, while a sacrificial element is added to the other religious features, it would be a total misconception of the Bible view to place the Sabbath on the same plane with fasting or other acts of self-denial. So far from presenting the Sabbath as a renunciation of any good of any kind, the Bible uniformly represents it as a delight and a blessing. (Isa. lviii. 13, 14; Psa. xcii.; Hos. ii. 11.)

In this connection it may be wise to add a word of warning and encouragement to God's people. In the nature of the case the main work of forming and maintaining a correct public opinion respecting the Sabbath rests with the ministers and professors of religion. They should remember that the Sabbath cannot be successfully maintained unless it is firmly fixed on a religious foundation. State legislation may be made efficient, but it can never be made sufficient for the preservation of the Sabbath. The economical ground, broad and strong as it is, will not sustain it, unless it is also environed by the sanctions of religion. Men are too covetous; the greed of gain is too powerful a motive. As soon as men learn that they can take their own pleasure on God's holy day, doing their own ways, and speaking their own words, they will conclude

that they can work for themselves or others as it may be most profitable. With the Sunday excursion, the base-ball match, the open museum, will come also sooner or later the open warehouse and shop, the clink of the mason's trowel, the ring of the blacksmith's anvil, and the cries swelling up from men whose brows are pale with care, whose lips are parched with the heat of ceaseless toil, whose limbs tremble from exhaustion, whose hearts burst with unutterable anguish.

To prevent this, it is all-important that the Lord's people keep the Lord's day holy. If they secularize it, they need not hope that others will sanctify it. There is need, pressing need, for clear convictions, for consistent practice, for noble example. God's people must show, even at the cost of self-denial, by their careful religious observance of the Sabbath, how much they prize it. They must make the holy day of the Lord honorable.

The Sabbath has been practically overthrown in more than one Christian country. In the United States every effort is being put forth to abolish it by men who have no regard for anything which impinges against their own profit or pleasure. All that is venerable and all that is sacred is attacked without scruple, and, if possible, destroyed without shame. No institution, however beneficent, can be left to take care of itself. Sooner or later under repeated assaults it will go down, if not strenuously defended. The constant attrition of water drop by drop will wear away the hardest stone. The Sabbath, like all other institutions, notwithstanding its antiquity, notwithstanding its sacred and firm foundations, will not long successfully resist the attacks of its foes, unless it be stoutly defended by its friends.

E. C. GORDON.



#### IV. GOD'S COVENANT WITH MAN.

FOR a church whose standards are as definite in most things as ours there is a singular confusion concerning the covenants, both in the standards and in the opinions held by individuals. This confusion gathers especially around the use of the terms Old Covenant or Testament and New Covenant or Testament. We note the following particulars:

I. The *Confession of Faith* states that the covenant of grace is called Old Testament at one time and New Testament at another.

II. A second view of the matter, and one which many probably would be inclined to assent to, at first thought at least, is that the covenant of works is called Old Testament, and the covenant of grace New Testament.

III. A third view, and one which has most effect upon views of the nature of the church, is that all that we call the Old Testament Scriptures is Old Testament; and so of the New.

IV. A fourth view, and one that we propose to defend, though it does not seem to have attracted much attention, is that the terms "old covenant" and "new covenant" in Scripture signify only the covenants which are expressly so called in Heb. viii. and ix.

I. The language of the *Confession* can hardly be justified, except on the principle that a part contains or implies the whole. The Eden covenant or the Abrahamic may be said to contain the whole covenant of grace, or all of its promise to man; but the law or Mosaic covenant is expressly declared<sup>1</sup> to be an addendum to the covenant of grace, as exhibited in the Abrahamic covenant, not to add anything to the provisions of grace contained in it, but for the more efficient administration of them for the time being. In 2 Cor. iii., the old and the new, the old being specified as the Mosaic, are contrasted as covenants of ministration merely, and not as containing the substance of the covenant of grace.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gal. iii. 19; Rom. v. 20.

II. Why is the covenant of works called Old Testament or the old covenant? It arises, doubtless, from a likeness between it and the Mosaic covenant, in that both have the character of law: obey and live; he that disobeys shall die. But there are great differences—

1. We may say, in the first place, that the covenant of works is nowhere distinctly called a covenant; not that this is an objection to giving it the name, but as showing an improbability that it should be freely referred to by the writers of the New Testament as the old covenant.

2. The covenant of works and the old covenant are not between the same parties. In this matter perhaps the title of Chap. VII. of the *Confession of Faith* is liable to criticism. The covenant of works was with man. The covenant of grace, as from eternity between the Father and the Son, did not include the race of man, nor were the particular covenants in which it is revealed, including that expressly called the old covenant, with man, but with the church of Jesus Christ.

3. The covenant of works is not old in the sense in which the Mosaic covenant is called old; *i. e.*, having fallen into disuse and its place taken by another. This is the only sense in which *oldness* is predicated of any covenant. Of all God's covenants with man the Mosaic is the only one laid aside as an old garment. The elect are taken from under the covenant of works and placed under that of grace: "God having from all eternity elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace to deliver them out of the estate of sin and misery, and to bring them into an estate of salvation by a Redeemer." What of the rest of mankind? It is hardly necessary for us to argue against the Arminian view that all mankind are delivered from the condemnation of Adam's sin, and that those who perish do so only for an unbelief which it is in their own power to avoid. The alternative is that the non-elect are still under the covenant of works, held under its condemnation. The covenant of works is an everlasting covenant.

4. The old covenant of the Scriptures had a human mediator, a priesthood, sacrifices, an elaborate ritual of service, while the new has only the divine Mediator, the divine priesthood, and the

one sacrifice of Christ. The covenant of works had none of these things. But the covenant of grace had its priesthood and sacrifices from the beginning of its revelation. There was no time in its history till Christ came that it answered to this description of the new covenant.

5. There is a confusion of names. We speak of the Old Testament church. The church was never under the covenant of works; and even if we adopt the theory we are combatting, there was no Old Testament church till the time of Moses: but the church was New Testament from Adam to Moses, then both old and new till Christ, then new only again, and the Mosaic covenant itself, as belonging to the covenant of grace, is both old and new. The covenant of grace is new, while one of its subordinate covenants is old.

What covenant did Christ refer to when he said, "This is my blood of the new covenant"? That the covenant of grace, as a whole, stands in the blood of Christ is, of course, true; but does it follow necessarily that it is of this that he speaks? He stands at the point of transition of the church from the Mosaic dispensation to that which prophecy had declared should supersede it, the only new covenant of which the Scriptures speak and that which the minds of the disciples must have turned to if they searched the Scriptures to find what covenant he meant. It is reasonable, also, to suppose that the blood of the new covenant stands in implied contrast to the blood of the old, the same contrast explicitly presented in Hebrews. The blood of the passover belonged to the old. Christ's blood in contrast is that of the new. But, as already said, the covenant of works had no sacrifices, and the only possible contrast in this respect of the old and new was between the Mosaic covenant and that which superseded it. And since all the blood ever shed in sacrifice belonged to the covenant of grace, then, if this is identical with the new covenant, this appellation, "blood of the new covenant," does not distinguish the blood of Christ from that of other sacrifices. In this view all the blood ever shed in sacrifices was blood of the new covenant. In a word, the contrast between the old and the new breaks down at every point when we attempt to apply it to the covenant of works and

the covenant of grace, and the only thing to show an identity is that there is a certain likeness in the substance of the covenants between the Mosaic and that of works.

No one can doubt that in the "better covenant" of Heb. vii. 22 and viii. 6, the "new covenant" of chaps. viii. and ix., and the "blood of the covenant," x. 29, at least the primary reference is to the new covenant expressly mentioned and described. In the "blood of the everlasting covenant" of xiii. 20 it is a fair presumption that the reference is still to the covenant with which the book is so largely occupied. It may be thought that it would be more impressive if the apostle here speaks of the covenant from eternity between the Father and Son for the redemption of the elect; but it is perhaps more to the purpose to suppose that this is one of the points of contrast between the old and the new. The old stood in meats and drinks and divers washings, administered by human priests, and was temporary. The new stands in the blood of Christ ministered by the Spirit, and is everlasting. And be it remembered this contrast is possible only between the covenants expressly named. There is no such contrast between the covenant of works and the covenant of grace. One had no ministration, and the other has both ministrations and sacrifices, and both covenants are everlasting.

All the special covenants belonging to the covenant of grace, except the Mosaic, are alike everlasting. There is nothing, therefore, in the use of the term "everlasting" to raise a presumption that the covenant of grace as a whole is meant.

III. The opinion we have been discussing does not, perhaps, have much influence directly upon church theories; but this extension of the terms old and new to cover the whole breadth of the covenants may do something to give color to, and at the same time may be pillowed up by, another view: that all that is contained in the Old Testament Scriptures is properly and in the Scripture usage Old Testament. It is sometimes said that names are things. Hardly has there ever been a more notable, yet less noted, instance of a name crystallizing into a thing than this. The universal practice of speaking of Old Testament times, Old Testament saints, the Old Testament church, etc., as covering the

whole time from Adam to Malachi, or to the coming of Christ, has led to the almost universal acceptance as a fact of what is implied in the use of the name, and naturally to the application to the whole of what the Scriptures say of the old covenant. In this is entrenched the denial of the unity of the church, the claim that the Old Testament Scriptures are not binding upon us, and, to a large extent, the rejection of infant baptism. They who contend for these things are not far wrong in their argument; the difficulty is in the false premise. Take, for instance, the Abrahamic covenant; argue as conclusively as you please the perpetuity of it, as long as you allow an opponent to call it Old Testament, he has ground on which to plant his batteries for reply. Bring the most positive and direct statements to prove your position, he can bring equally positive ones in reply. "In that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now, that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away."<sup>1</sup> "There is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before."<sup>2</sup> "If that which is done away is glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious."<sup>3</sup> The law "was added until the seed should come."<sup>4</sup> "One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled."<sup>5</sup> "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances."<sup>6</sup> All these things are spoken of the Old Testament. The argument in this light is perhaps a more evenly balanced see-saw than we have been accustomed to consider it. But show him that the Bible calls nothing Old Testament but the Mosaic covenant, that these sayings have no reference to anything else, and the ground is cut from under his feet. Restrict the term Old Testament to its scriptural use, and there is not a syllable in the Bible to show a transitory character in any of the special covenants, except the Mosaic, belonging to the covenant of grace.

We believe we risk nothing in saying that our people generally do not know how to meet these things, how, with such strong statements showing a transitory character of the Old Testament, it is yet claimed that it, or even parts of it, are binding upon us. To

<sup>1</sup> Heb. viii. 13.    <sup>2</sup> Heb. vii. 18.    <sup>3</sup> 2 Cor. iii. 11.    <sup>4</sup> Gal. iii. 19.    <sup>5</sup> Matt. v. 18.

<sup>6</sup> Eph. ii. 15.

many believers in infant baptism it is a real puzzle, one which has never been solved for them, how the Abrahamic covenant belongs to a transitory dispensation, and is yet itself everlasting. In our works on infant baptism this question is not commonly distinctly stated. The writers are content to give the positive evidence on their own side, holding it sufficient. One popular work states the puzzle and tries to meet it in this way. The book is in colloquial form, and the Baptist being asked what his idea of circumcision is, answers that he regards it as belonging to the Mosaic dispensation, and as having passed away with it. The seal of the Abrahamic covenant belonging to the Mosaic dispensation! Yet the author tacitly admits the correctness of the position, and answers that circumcision is an unfulfilled law. We think it must have occurred to some readers of the book, that if the Baptist had "stood to his guns" and contended that, belonging to a transitory dispensation, it must have passed away with it, whether he could say just how it was fulfilled or not, it would have been hard to dislodge him; also, that the fair construction of Christ's words, "that one jot or tittle should not pass from the law till all was fulfilled," is that the law as a whole should stand till every part of it was fulfilled. That such an argument passes current among Presbyterians is sufficient to show the lack of apprehension of the true state of the case. The simple fact that circumcision does not belong to the Mosaic dispensation, is not Old Testament, and that the statements concerning the passing away of the old do not concern it in any way, is overlooked by many besides the author of *William the Baptist*. Some years ago a writer in the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, contending against the perpetuation of the Jewish Sabbath, asks why other Mosaic ordinances were not continued: the sacrifices, incense, circumcision; thus classing circumcision among Old Testament ordinances, and making its continuance in the changed form of baptism dependent upon that of the Mosaic law, and denying consequently any connection between circumcision and baptism. We know of no answer to these questions in the writings of our theologians that places the matter upon its true ground, by showing what, in the scriptural usage of the words, the Old Testament really is. Dr. Stuart Robinson, in his *Discourses of Redemp-*

tion, meets the question somewhat indirectly in answer to what is a question with many, and an assertion with many others, that the ten commandments are repealed. We can hardly accept his solution of the puzzle, that "*nothing that Moses ever enacted has been repealed any more than the things enacted by Jesus or Paul.*" While others cut the knot for themselves by assuming the transitoriness of the permanent, Dr. Robinson seems to endeavor to solve the puzzle by assuming the permanence of the transitory. His language looks strange by the side of the passages we have quoted above concerning the passing away of the law. Surely something was repealed. What was it? The passages quoted seem, some of them at least, to refer to the moral law. In answering the question it is to be remembered, in the first place, that the covenant was made with the church, and neither its enactment nor its repeal affects the status of those who are outside of the covenant. In the second place, we are told that those who have not the law "show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness."<sup>1</sup> The law as thus written upon tablets more enduring than those of stone cannot be repealed without changing the whole nature of man and making him worthy of the parentage that evolution ascribes to him. The ten commandments can be easily formulated, as thus borne witness to by the conscience of man, from the Book of Genesis, all the things forbidden recognized as sins long before the law was written at Sinai.

What was the Mosaic covenant? The law is referred to as if it and the covenant were one and the same. But the covenant, the agreement between God and the people, was that they should be rewarded with life for obedience. "All that the Lord hath said will we do and be obedient," said the people. And God said to them, "Ye shall therefore keep my statutes and judgments, which, if a man do, he shall live in them." This covenant certainly has been repealed or passed away. There is now no such covenant between God and his people. It is hardly too much to say that for the church of God the law *as law* is repealed. "A law without a penalty is no law." In this full sense of law, a

---

<sup>1</sup> Rom. ii. 15.

command with a penalty attached, the people of God are not under law.

If it be asked, Do not the people of God suffer for their sins? we answer, Yes, but not as the penalty of law. There is a wide difference between chastisements administered by a father at his discretion for the good of the offender and the fixed penalty of law administered by a judge sworn to execute the law literally. The penalty of the law is death, and the people of God do not die for their sins.

Humanly speaking, the Mosaic covenant, as to its ostensible purpose, was a failure. No man but Jesus Christ ever lived by it. Nor was it possible that any sinner ever should live by it. "If there had been a law given which *could have given life*, verily righteousness should have been by the law."<sup>1</sup> God himself, speaking after the human manner, treats the covenant as a failure. "What more could have been done to my vineyard that I have not done in it? Wherefore, then, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes?"<sup>2</sup> "He said, Surely they are my people, children that will not lie; so he was their Saviour. . . . But they rebelled and vexed his Holy Spirit."<sup>3</sup> And so there comes to us as a wail of disappointment in the preface to the new covenant, "Which my covenant they brake, though I was a husband unto them." But love that will not brook disappointment cries out, "A new covenant will I make with them. I will put my laws in their minds, and in their hearts will I write them. I WILL be their God; they SHALL be my people." The new covenant promises to write the law as it had never been written before. Paul, in Romans ii. 15, says, not that the *law* was written in their hearts, but the *work* of the law "τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτόν." But now the law is written upon their hearts, and so written that it becomes as it were a part of their being. Obedience to the law and life are as inseparable under the new covenant as under the old, but the terms are reversed. The old said, "Obey and live"; the new says, "Live and obey"; and the measure of obedience rendered is the measure of the extent to which the new life has taken possession of the soul. Paradoxical as it

<sup>1</sup> Gal. iii. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Isa. v. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Isa. lxiii. 8-10.



sounds to many, the only proof any one can give that he is not under the law is that he renders a hearty, though imperfect, obedience to all the precepts of the law.

The real purpose of the covenant lay hidden in its apparent failure: its demonstration that no sinner could live by works of law. The covenant confessed its own weakness in this respect, in its elaborate provision for breaches of itself. And because of this "weakness and unprofitableness" it was repealed. It is not, as Dr. Robinson says, the mere accessories that have fallen away; the commandment itself is "disannulled."

IV. The evidence that the terms old and new testament, or covenant, as used in the Scriptures, are confined to the Mosaic covenant and that which superseded it, has been sufficiently presented in the consideration of the other points. Should the opinion be adhered to that the old covenant is the covenant of works, and the new the covenant of grace, it will not necessarily conflict with what is one main purpose of this writing, to show that the name old testament does not apply in any sense to the church from Adam to Moses; and hence that what is said of the transitory character of the old covenant does not in any manner attach to it.

There is a passage (Gal. v. 2, 3) that has been quoted to prove that circumcision and the law go together: "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing; for I testify again to every one that is circumcised that he is a debtor to do the whole law." Christ says (John vii. 22), "Moses gave unto you circumcision"; but, as though to guard against this confounding of things different, immediately adds, "Not that it is of Moses, but of the fathers." The law of Moses contained a rule for the administration of circumcision, but circumcision was not its child, nor its servant. How closely these things were related in the Jewish mind we see from Acts xv. 1, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses"; yet, in the fifth verse, there is a distinction made, "It was needful to circumcise them and to command them to keep the law of Moses."

Paul, in Romans and Galatians, shows that the Abrahamic covenant contains the Christ, and draws from it his doctrine of

justification by faith, showing that it contains the promise of life through faith alone to all the seed of Abraham for all time,<sup>1</sup> and that the Mosaic law, being unable to give life, had served a temporary purpose and passed away. But what of circumcision? If the covenant is for all time, what of its seal if believers are not to be circumcised? The answer is, that there is a new seal. Since Christ and salvation through him are the great promise of the covenant, baptism into Christ is the token of inheritance in the covenant. He notes some changes in the administration of the seal. A Gentile might attain to circumcision, but it was not his birthright as it was that of the Jew. The new seal is as free to him as to the Jew. A female could not be circumcised, but is baptized. A bond servant who had a believing master was circumcised; he is baptized whether his master is a believer or not. These things were not of the essence of the covenant. But there is another relation in the very heart of the covenant, bound up with the promise of the Redeemer, that is undisturbed. It was left for the wisdom of *some* of later times to make the discovery that under the new dispensation the Abrahamic covenant does not know the believer *and* his seed. Now since the Abrahamic covenant has a new seal, and circumcision is no longer called for, there is nothing left for it but to be what it was in the Jewish mind, and what the judaizing Christians wished to make it for the Gentiles, a badge of bondage to the law. He who submitted to it voluntarily placed himself under this bondage, made himself a debtor to do the whole law.

“But what,” it may be asked, “of the passover which we regard as continued in the Lord’s Supper? Does not it belong to the Old Testament?” The passover was doubtless designed to be

---

<sup>1</sup> So far as the writer is aware, this fact has not been used in the modern controversies concerning sacramental justification; yet there is no one passage which more completely annihilates all its pretenses. The declaration that the law cannot be a condition of justification, Galatians iii. 17, is only a particular deduction from the general statement that there can be no change in, or addition to, the terms contained in the Abrahamic covenant. By confirming that covenant God has forever stopped himself from making any such change. To make baptism or any other ordinance necessary to justification would be adding to the terms as truly making the keeping of the law necessary would have been.

prophetical; but it was so only in symbol. As far as its terms were concerned, its promise was fulfilled on the night of its institution. It was not like the Abrahamic covenant, everlasting in its terms. Hence it might have departed and left nothing in its place, and no question would have been raised about it. But if Christ chose, in reference to its prophetic character, to perpetuate it, he had full authority to do so. Yet its claims in this respect are altogether different from those of circumcision, and must rest entirely upon the statements of the New Testament writers.

In concluding this article we venture to present the following scheme of the covenants in their relation to each other.

I. The covenant of grace between the Father and Son from eternity.

II. The covenant of works.

III. The covenant of grace revealed—in prophecy and in certain covenants with the redeemed.

1. Covenants relating to the Mediator, the spiritual seed, and justification by faith.

(a), The Eden covenant.

(b), The Abrahamic, organizing the visible church.

(c), The Davidic, setting forth the kingly character of the Mediator.

2. Covenants supplementary and administrative.

(a), The Mosaic, or covenant of ministration by carnal ordinances: called old because, having fulfilled its purpose, it gave way to—

(b), The new covenant of ministration of the Spirit.

L. TENNEY.

## V. THE USES OF THE IMAGINATION IN HISTORICAL SCIENCE.

HISTORY is the life of humanity. Historical science, or history commonly so called, is the biography of the race.

While many others may be important, three things are requisite to the right study of history and its proper presentation to the minds of others. There must be a full and accurate *knowledge* of historical facts, in which, after all, history is grounded. There must be historical *faith*—a faith in God as a God of history. Let him call it what he may, a tendency to progress in human affairs, a drift in the universe that makes for righteousness, an evolution in nature and humanity that tends to their betterment, or the eternal and unchangeable decrees of Almighty God, the historian must trace through the tangled woof of history the golden thread of divine providence. He must have a soul, as well as a memory. If the undevout astronomer is mad, the faithless historian is blind. As well might a mole map out the contour of a continent as a historian, without faith in divine order, contribute, in any true and broad sense, to the right apprehension of any historical period.

Imagination is the third great requisite to the right study of history. This faculty, whose uses are numerous and elevated in all spheres of science and philosophy, cannot be wanting in the historian. Imagination lies at the basis of all true art. As the plastic power of the human soul, it enters in large degree into the composition of genius. It is an endowment essential to the poet, painter, and sculptor. Without it in high development no artist raises himself above the broad and populous levels of mediocrity. With it, in an unusual degree, he becomes, by a sort of delegated omnipotence, the creator of a new world of art and beauty. History is one of the fine arts. The mind of the historian, although confined to true statements, nevertheless recreates. His imagination, by an insight into their necessary constitution, reproduces

past existences. He is an artist in the highest and truest sense of that much-abused term. The imagination of the poet is, of course, more free and untrammelled than that of the historian. He can soar far above the region of fact and give "to airy nothing a local habitation and a name," yet he is great only as he sees into nature's heart and voices the truths all men feel but cannot speak. The historian must, indeed, hold himself within the bounds of well-authenticated facts; but there is room for reproduction and recreation even here. The historian is far more than a mere annalist, an exact and scrupulous narrator of past events. He does more than keep a diary of the days of yore. He grasps the spirit and life of past generations. He clothes the dry skeleton of fact with living muscle, and puts a soul into the inanimate form of recorded events. By this Pygmalion-like power the dead past is made to speak and become the instructor of the present and the teacher of after times. His imaginative faculty will not enable the historian to dispense with empirical knowledge, but will aid him in seeing and grasping truths which the known and carefully-weighed facts but partially disclose. As a painter uses the objects of nature to gather her ideals of beauty—ideals which he liberates from material conditions which obscure while they manifest them, and thus gives nature richer expression in the free heaven of art—so the historian uses his facts to gather the historic life back of them. He discerns the spirit that instigated the known fact, and applies it to the interpretation of the results of its own activities. He thus is enabled to discover unknown, yet necessary, facts, which may not have been rescued from the deluge of time. The facts transmitted us from the past are few in comparison to those that are lost. Voices do not always ring out clearly across the gulf of centuries. Half-buried walls are often the only relics of once flourishing communities—ruins of cities the sole surviving monuments of nations that once filled the world with the fame of their civilization. A single stone of an Egyptian tomb, a bit of papyrus in a mummy's case, contains, perhaps, all that posterity has received of the history of a dynasty. Many are the pearls of truth which the palsied hands of the ages have let slip and fall into the gulf of oblivion. To fill out what is wanting in historical fact,

and to take known and transmitted facts and reproduce them in their natural order and relationships, is one great use of the faculty under consideration.

To correct historical statements and divest facts of false coloring is another important office of the historical imagination. The facts handed down to us from the past are not only few in number, but are often colored and obscured by partiality or prejudice. From very crude ore is smelted the pure gold of historic truth. As memory fails to recall the scenes of our earliest childhood, or else recalls them colored with childish conceits and fancies, so history, the memory of a nation, in many instances fails to record the deeds which distinguish the beginnings of its national life, or else recalls them under the form of heroic legends and mythological fables. The imagination of the historian must be his guide through the intricacies of these fanciful records. By its aid alone can he unravel that strange web of history, philosophy, poetry, and religion that constitutes ancient mythology. Through its power he is lifted to the vantage ground of truth, high above the mist of prejudice, the haze of partiality, the clouds of fable, where he can view events in the clear light of reality.

Still greater, however, is the importance of the faculty in the essential aid it lends to the objective method of historical study. Not only is the historian called upon to supply the wanting facts of history and divest those obtained of false coloring; he is also compelled, in order to understand aright a historic period, to judge correctly of this past life. To do this, he must not view it from his own point of vision, but must transfer himself back and judge the age, the nation, the civilization, the character, from their own peculiar standpoints. He must initiate himself into, *relive* the life of the past he portrays, just as the scientist, by the aid of the imagination, which furnishes him with a working hypothesis, projects himself into the realms of future discovery. Only thus can the historian obtain that true point of view which is as essential to the comprehension of an era or an epoch as of a landscape or a battle. Recently an eminent military critic corrected an entirely false view of a great historic character by the simple application of this faculty. He put himself in the place of the dead hero,

and interpreted his conduct in the light of the knowledge he had *then*, not of the knowledge we *now* have, of the circumstances of the case. He thus was enabled to reverse a historic judgment. To judge correctly of the life of co-temporary nations we must rid ourselves of our prepossessions, and reproduce their environments. Only thus can we apprehend aright current events. Much more essential is the use of the faculty in lifting us across the chasms of centuries and placing us face to face, with eyes unblurred, before some great historic epoch, or amid the events of some slowly-moving era. Only as we are thus transported, our prejudices left behind, the habits of thought born of existing social conditions corrected, the wrinkles of judgment caused by our temperaments and our times smoothed out, can we reach any calm and clear understanding of past periods and peoples.

It is this last use of the historical imagination that makes it most useful to the Biblical and ecclesiastical student. In the department of historical theology the right exercise of this faculty has given us much of the hermeneutical progress of recent years. The various departments of Biblical criticism have been greatly enriched thereby. In the study of the Scriptures, the laws of grammar are not the only requisites to the understanding of the text. The ability to discover the meaning of a passage depends upon more than the mastery of Greek and Hebrew lexicons, or the application of the rules of a purely mechanical exegesis. The thoughts of the inspired author are behind his language. The environment of the writer gives tone and color to his thought. Words are fossilized history. The same words are not exactly the same in every period of sacred history. There are shades of difference in words spoken amid the dark shadows of Sinai, and on the sunlit slopes of Zion. To the proper understanding of the language of the books of Moses, and the lamentations of Jeremiah, or the Psalms and the Minor Prophets, it is needful to reproduce, both by careful study and the use of historical imagination, the distinct historic conditions and the varying circumstances of life to which these writings were addressed. If we are to put any blood into the pale, passionless faces of the conventional patriarchs and prophets and so make their utterances in their entirety signifi-

cant to us, we must place ourselves where they stood and where they spoke, under the direction of the Holy Spirit. They were not half-humanized spirits, sounding trumpets of truth from glittering mountain peaks. They were not holy machines—sacred, majestic blow-pipes of the divine afflatus. The “when” and “where” and the “who” of the inspired utterance affect not a little the “what” of the text. It in no sense impugns the divine character of Bible history to interpret its records with the same aid with which we interpret other historic records. If, as Luther says, “He only understands Virgil’s *Ecloques* who has lived with the shepherds, and he alone understands a poet who travels in the poet’s country,” then, surely along with faith and learning, a warm, sympathetic, living imagination is an aid in the true interpretation of the Scriptures. In this age of biblical criticism the works of Strauss and Kuenen, the investigations and assaults of the Tübingen school, have forced orthodox critics to the historical ground. Recent apologetes have met the attacks of the higher criticism by a still higher criticism, that has followed a thoroughly historical method and employed a truly objective imagination. The shot of the foe has thus served to strengthen the earth-works of orthodoxy. When, for instance, the adverse critics of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch urged the post-exilian composition of the priest-code of Leviticus, it was shown not only that the language was that of the classic period of Hebrew composition, but that its realism was that of the wilderness and the nomadic life. This whole Kindergarten system of religious instruction needed to its proper justification and unity, the wilderness tent, the rude, sensuous multitudes still mindful of the flesh pots and idolatries of Egypt. It demanded just such historic conditions as have been usually regarded as present at the time of the promulgation of a symbolic cultus suited to carnal tempers and transition times. A sudden change of style and sentiment in the Book of Amos, the introduction of certain lyrical passages, was made the ground of an argument for the presence of that Redactor whose hand is against every man’s hand in the sacred volume. This mechanical theory was met through a more careful study of the stanzas and the attendant circumstances of their expression.



These lyrical parts corresponded—they were fragments of some ancient hymn. They were the perorations of the preacher. By them the shepherd-prophet fixed the attention of his hearers, as he poured forth his simple yet forcible discourses, fragrant of the vineyards and fruit orchards, filled with the sighings of the summer breezes sweeping through the fig-trees and over the kintrodden hills of Palestine.

The Scriptures, filled indeed with passages which no way-faring fool need fail to understand, are no longer regarded as huge warehouses of proof texts. They are not simply the arsenals of wordy weapons with which irate polemics may arm themselves for combats as continuous as their lives. Men prophesy according to the proportion of faith and the peculiar conditions of a surrounding civilization. They take not a single morsel, but sublime portions of the holy word, and gather their richer meanings by the use of a true historic sense. The books of the Bible are, in large part, the inspired and infallible records of a historical method of revelation made first of all to a chosen people, and through them to the race. The Decalogue is, indeed, not an anachronism any more than the worship of golden calves and the idolatry of the things seen and temporal are anachronisms, yet the great Law-giver comes down the grim, granitic slopes of Sinai with the tables of the law in his hands, intended, first of all, for stupid, sensuous Israelites dancing about a golden calf at its base. The prophets were preachers of righteousness in their day and generation, preachers without pulpits and stipends, devoid of robes and mitres, yet forth-tellers, as well as foretellers, of truth. They represented the high-water mark of the spiritual life and theological thought of their times. Usually at odds with the priests, they, nevertheless, had an immediate, local, national work to do, and in doing this well, they did the work God meant they should, for all men, for all time. By the reproduction of their times and historic surroundings, with the aid of an objective imagination, we read the Scriptures with intelligence and profit, with greater correction and instruction in righteousness. Each part takes its own distinctive niche in the great temple reared through so many generations by so many reverent hands. The star-light of God's revealed word gradually gives place to the reddening dawn of

Messiah, and this again to the high noontide of the Sun of Righteousness, with healing in his wings.

God's supreme revelation of his truth is made in the facts of a human, yet divine, life that leads out from Bethlehem, through Nazareth, Capernaum, Jerusalem, to Calvary. This historic life has its historic setting. It touches the life of a co-temporary civilization. It has its period of popular favor; then, of gathering opposition from existing social, religious, and political forces; then, of tragedy, precipitated, as it was in many features determined, by local circumstances, as well as by the love that brought us redemption. The historic setting of the life of Jesus of Nazareth was that of a small portion of our humanity who dwelt over eighteen hundred years ago in a little corner of the great Roman Empire. It is, as we reproduce that life, that peculiar, provincial Jewish environment, and re-live the age of Jesus, that we fully understand the gospels. As we enter into the spirit of his co-temporary civilization, we discern best the divine order and supernatural character of the events of the life of Christ. Thus do we make clear the fact that he was not an evolution, the favored heir of the long entail of nature's best gifts, the bud and bloom of the life of his age and nation. Thus do we discover that he was from above, and not from beneath. Materialistic principles like those of Hume and Draper cannot explain his appearance and character. His holy, sinless life, saturated with the thoughts of the Invisible One, was in antagonism to the whole trend of his age. In touch with the eternities, he was not in touch with the spirit of the times; and his resurrection, lifting itself from the plain of human history, in its lofty altitude of conception and unapproachable magnificence of effects, appears but the natural and inevitable climax of so unique and superhuman a career.

It is to the quickening of the historic sense again that we owe the firm establishment of the authenticity and unity of authorship of the Acts of the Apostles. The statements of that most magnificent of epics dovetail with the facts of a co-temporary civilization. The reproduction of the diverse social, political, ethical conditions of the cities of Antioch and Ephesus, Rome and Athens, Corinth and Jerusalem, cause the pages of Luke the historian to glisten with verity as they glow with life.

The conversion of Saul of Tarsus, an event of such moment to the growth of the early church, is now never relegated to the murky regions of "pious delusions" and "allegories," but stands out in the clear light of historical fact, a mighty head-land in the history of Christianity. Plausible it may be, but not historical, when a truly objective imagination views the records, is the theory that the vision on the Damascus road was the effect, and not the cause, of Paul's mighty faith in the risen Christ. Suddenly there shone from heaven a great light round about the church's great apostle of progress, and the minor differences in the account of that event are not contradictory to one who stands with Luke in the back-ground of the narrative and enters at all into the thought and spirit of the writer. To understand the Epistles in their rich entirety is to understand also the spirit of a cotemporary civilization and to discover its touch on the life of the early Christian churches, as well as their sanctifying influence on human society. To reproduce the times and tempers of Timothy and Titus is the only method of entering into the significance of certain singular Pauline injunctions. We must see the pale-faced, timid, dyspeptic, withal pious and laborious pastor of Ephesus, to understand why he is "to take a little wine for thy stomach's sake and oft infirmities," and "to let no man despise thy youth." We must view Domine Titus amid his gossiping, gluttonous parishioners, gliding through life amid soft and balmy breezes and under sunny skies, in order to detect the wisdom of Paul's command, "Rebuke them sharply that they may be sound in the faith." And surely the visions of the Apocalypse become something more than inspired visions as a cultivated historical imagination brings before the mind's eye the "giant forms of extinct empires" and those "walled cities of the ancient realms" wherein human society in the days long since departed embodied their temporary stages of organized completeness.

Church history again, from the apostolic age to the present, is "a very valley of bones, very many and very dry," except as the historical imagination enters the dismal vale and breathes life. If times ecclesiastical could be studied objectively, and reproduced in accordance with their own spirit, there would be no encouragement for the false construction of historic eras and epochs in the

church's life. Holy apostles would not then masquerade as diocesan bishops, in contempt of all co-temporary civilization. The religious world would be spared the painful spectacle of seeing every denomination of Christians going back to the church fathers to prove the most diverse systems of polity and cultus from the customs and manners of the primitive church. Church history would cease to be an autophan. Good liturgists would not then solemnly assure us that St. Peter read a liturgy and St. Paul chanted a psalter on the street corners of old Antioch and in front of the pagan porches of Ephesus. Fresh historical research, employing the high faculty of historical imagination, has led in these days to new definitions of the one holy catholic and apostolic church. The far centuries of Christianity, almost lost in "the sun-lit haze of its dawn," have been interpreted in their own light, and not by the light of this late afternoon of the nineteenth century. Ecclesiastical events and customs are seen to have at one period a significance widely at variance with that which they possess at another and different historical era. The drift of the day, the tendencies of the times, are noted, and allowances made for abnormal and undue variations. Exaggerations in dogmas and usages are discounted. The church of Christ finds a historic justification for one mode of organization and cultus as it assembles in the dim seclusion of Roman catacombs. It is not to be too harshly criticized, perhaps, for a very different order and worship as it bowed itself before the bejeweled altars of mediæval cathedrals, nor yet lauded to the very heights of inspiration for its modes and manners as it knelt before the star-studded altars of God on the blood-stained heather of the Scottish hills. A quotation from Jerome or Ignatius, from Luther or Calvin, a decree of an early council, a creed or a confession of some perplexed and *perspiring* century, is the end of all debate only after we have stepped behind the declarations and examined the historic conditions that support them. Even in the most fossiliferous forms of rite and ritual, even amid the most azoic of the mediæval strata of ecclesiasticism, there is found, by the aid of a true historic method, some specimens of a life of faith kindred to our own, lived by those whose scarred bodies and tonsured skulls have long since crumbled to dust. Because of this historic repro-

duction, confessions and creeds which bear on them the marks of conflict, which were the battle-flags of contending hosts of God's elect, are no longer taken to spread the tables of modern love-feasts. They are treasured and revered for the uses they once had, and rational ecclesiasticism will not seek to mend their tattered folds for present needs. Old garments will not be patched to fit new ages, and old bottles, shrivelled in the smoke of past conflicts, made the receptacles of new wine. In this reproduction of past times and events in accordance with their own proper spirit, and thus, in the more complete unfolding of the truths of history, the historical imagination has rendered indispensable and transcendent aid.

One has recently said that "reason may alter principles, but cannot change history." The Christian faith, as it is founded on a historic basis, is beyond the reach of a destructive rationalism. The historical imagination becomes the able and valuable ally of faith, as it aids in more fully discovering and in more clearly interpreting the historic elements upon which Christianity rests. This century has perceived more clearly than any other the historic Christ, coming in the name of the Father of spirits and life, to establish a spiritual kingdom in which character should be capital, righteousness the only royalty, and the free and loving service of God and our fellow-men the supreme glory of the soul. The man of Nazareth and of Calvary thus stands nearer to us of to-day than he did to the multitudes of Capernaum and Jerusalem nearly nineteen hundred years ago. To imitate him, to perpetuate his blessed life, to enter into the divine mystery of his existence by a faith which sanctifies as well as saves, this, the church to-day, as never before, realizes to be Christianity. That historic character, at once human and divine, standing out in wonderful simplicity and unique grandeur from the dark back-ground of the race's history, is before men to-day, clearly-outlined, distinctly featured—receiving the reverence of all right-minded and reasonable, as well as regenerate souls—because to his life on earth have been now applied, what the past ages of the church's history so strangely failed to do, the principles of a true historical imagination.

## VI. SATAN: HIS CHARACTER AND OPERATIONS.

MEN'S conceptions of Satan have been as diverse as their ideas of sin. That grotesque creature of mediæval superstition, a thing of horns and hoofs and tail; the sublime creation of Milton; and the Satan of Robert Montgomery's poem, whom Macaulay describes as "a respectable and pious gentleman, whose principal fault is that he is something of a twaddle, and far too liberal of his good advice"—all these have nothing in common but a name. Any true conception of the devil's character and modes of operation must be derived solely from a faithful study of them as revealed in the Scriptures. The results of such study we shall now give.

God made all his angels upright; but, being endowed with free and mutable wills, many of them "kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation." Wherefore "God spared not them that sinned, but cast them down to hell," where they are "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." The peace and joy which these fallen spirits once experienced have been turned to gall and bitterness; their former love is now deadly hatred; evil has become their good, and they have transferred their allegiance from the Father of lights to the prince of darkness. There are therefore now two classes of angels, differing in moral qualities, inhabiting separate spheres, and actively engaged in different occupations: the one class holy, dwelling in the realms of light and bliss, ministering spirits of God; the other class, depraved and unclean spirits, usually abiding in regions of darkness and torment, ministers of sin, death, and hell. The latter are an innumerable multitude, "their name is legion;" but there stands one among them preëminent in wickedness, hate, and cunning: he is "the prince of devils." He it was who seduced our first parents into rebellion against our Creator, and who has ever since pursued their unhappy posterity with relentless malice and cruelty. He is the special object of our present inquiry: his character, power, influence, operations, and the extent of his empire.

## I. THE CHARACTER OF SATAN.

1. *He is totally depraved.* The names and titles by which he is designated indicate this. While all fallen angels are "evil and unclean spirits," he is preëminently "the wicked one," Beelzebub, "the prince of unclean spirits." He is Belial, the low, abject, depraved being, between whom and Christ there can be no concord; "the enemy," who surreptitiously sows evil tares to choke the good wheat, the enemy of God and truth and holiness; Satan, "the adversary" of the Lord and his church; Apollyon, the destroyer, who "walketh about, as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour"; the devil, the accuser and slanderer of God to men, and of the saints to God; the tempter, "beguiling the saints through his subtlety"; that crafty "old serpent which deceiveth the whole world." Our Saviour summed up his moral character thus: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do: he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there was no truth in him." There you have him; lustful, murderous, and false. We can gain some faint conception of the depravity of demons from the moral condition of fallen men who have long lived unrestrained by special moral influences. Here is Paul's characterization of the heathen: "Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips; whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways, and the way of peace have they not known." Now remember that all the evil passions of demons have run riot for countless ages, with no moral checks whatever, and conceive if you can the depths of Satan's depravity.

2. *He possesses vast intellectual powers.* Sin is a poison which weakens and perverts the mental faculties, but does not destroy them. Under its pernicious influence as Satan is, with all his splendid powers impaired, he is yet as immeasurably superior to man intellectually as man is to the brute. The Christian "wrestles not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

3. *He is subtle.* He is "that old serpent which deceiveth the

whole world"; who "beguiled Eve through his subtlety, corrupting her from the simplicity" of her first faith, alluring her on from implicit trust in her Heavenly Father to vague doubt, from doubt to positive unbelief, and thence to open rebellion, and all so craftily that, ere she was aware, "lust had conceived and brought forth sin, and sin was finished, and had brought forth death." From that time the serpent became the symbol of cunning and deceit—"more subtle than all the beasts of the field." Ages of constant exercise have still further developed the hellish ingenuity of the arch-fiend. That crafty old strategist can, if need be, to effect his vile purposes, "transform himself into an angel of light, and his ministers into the ministers of righteousness." O "the depths of Satan"! "Full of all subtlety and all mischief, enemy of all righteousness, not ceasing to pervert the right ways of the Lord."

4. *He is false.* He is a "lying spirit"; his name is "the devil," the false accuser, the slanderer; "he abideth not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar and the father it."

5. *He is malicious.* His chief delight is to make all other creatures as wicked and miserable as himself. He seduced a whole race of holy and happy beings, involved them in guilt and woe, and has ever since relentlessly pursued them with a course of systematic cruelty. He is the tempter, the deceiver, the slanderer; Apollyon, the destroyer of souls; the "great fiery dragon," frightful to behold, and cruel; "a roaring lion, walking about, seeking whom he may devour." Well do the Scriptures represent Cain and Judas as inspired by Satan: the one murdered his own brother, the other basely betrayed his Lord, and thus both "did the lusts of their father the devil, who was a murderer from the beginning."

## II. THE OPERATIONS OF SATAN.

These operations are inscrutable in their mode. We know not how one spirit can act upon another. Like the work of the Holy Ghost, Satan's influences are as mysterious as the invisible forces of nature; "the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or



whither it goeth." So is every operation of the evil one; we see its effects, but cannot comprehend its mode. We know this, however, that, in leading us into sin, he does no violence to our natures; he cannot coerce our wills, but must work along the line of our own natural evil propensities. Thus whatever we do at his instigation is truly and properly our own sin. "Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed." Of no avail was the plea of Eve: "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat."

Again, Satan's power and influence being those of a creature and his subordinates, are not infinite. They can be exerted only so far as the Almighty Sovereign of the universe permits, as in the case of Job.

1. *Satan's influence over unregenerate sinners.* Among these his power is almost absolute; he is "the prince of this world"; the unregenerate are his slaves; he is the strong man who holds complete possession of their souls until a stronger binds him and despoils him of his goods. Ungodly men "walk according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience"; they are "in the snare of the devil, taken captive by him at his will." They are "the seed of the serpent," "the children of the wicked one"; "are of their father the devil, and the lust of their father they will do." This subjection and service, however ignorantly rendered, is of the nature of worship. Satan is "the god of this world."

This dominion over sinners Satan secures and perpetuates in various ways; he promotes errors and fosters vain superstitions; he insinuates false notions of God and of his law and gospel, and thus deludes some with false hopes, discourages others with groundless fears, and excites within others discontent and rebellion; he "blindeth the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ should shine unto them"; he eradicates the seeds of truth when sinners hear the gospel: "then cometh the devil and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved"; he stimulates to evil passions and tempts to gross sins: for example, "the devil put it into the heart of Judas Iscariot to betray Jesus," and,

“Satan filled the heart of Ananias to lie to the Holy Ghost”; and he leads sinners to despair by persuading them that their guilt is unpardonable.

Satan makes good use of these, his servants, in his war against the church. Ofttimes he organizes them, and incites them to a combined attack. The ancient and modern philosophical and scientific schools of infidelity, Mohammedanism, the Papacy, and Mormonism, are some of the big battalions which he has successively hurled against the strongholds of Zion, and by which he hopes to crush her.

2. *His operations against the church.* We may notice the increasing distinctness with which the personal agency of Satan is brought out in the progress of divine revelation. As the kingdom of grace advances, he bestirs himself with ever-renewed zeal to counteract its blessed influences; the shorter his time, the more diligently and maliciously he puts into operation all his infernal machinations. Never, perhaps, was he more actively engaged than at the beginning of the Christian era. The fulness of times had come; the church was travailing in birth, ready to be delivered of a man child, who was to be her redeemer. “And behold, a great red (fiery, cruel) dragon stood before the woman for to devour her child as soon as it was born.” The blood of the innocents of Bethlehem was the first token of Satan’s malice against the Son of Man. Failing in this attempt to destroy the child, he pursued him with relentless hate: everything that diabolical craft could devise was employed to distress the Man of sorrows and to tempt the Holy One of Israel to sin. Sadducees and Pharisees, Jewish Sanhedrim and Roman proconsul, Herod and Pilate, all those ecclesiastical and political parties, continually at strife with one another, were so cunningly manipulated by the arch fiend that they laid aside for once their mutual animosities to combine against the “holy child Jesus”; “the kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers took counsel together against the Lord, and against his anointed.” But after all, just when Satan exulted in the thought that his victory and vengeance were complete, his victim escaped and triumphed over him: “the child was caught up to God and to his throne.” Then seems to have occurred that mysterious war between Michael

and the dragon with their respective angelic hosts. And the latter "prevailed not; neither was his place found any more in heaven. The accuser of our brethren was cast down into the earth, which accused them before our God day and night." And the heavens rejoiced thereat; but there was "woe to the inhabitants of the earth, for the devil was come down unto them having great wrath, because he knew that he had but a short time." Foiled in his attempts against the Lord of the church, and driven forever from the presence of God, Satan turned in his rage upon Zion herself; "he persecuted the woman which had brought forth the man child." "At that time there was great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem; and they were all scattered abroad; and went everywhere preaching the word." When Satan saw how God had provided places of refuge for his people, and had even made the persecution a means of disseminating the truth, he was infuriated: "the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed." He stirred up foes against the church outside of Judea, and the long and bloody persecutions under the Roman emperors bore witness to his malignant zeal.

We have spoken of one device of the devil for destroying the church or hindering her progress, namely, persecution. But he employs others more subtle and even more destructive. His favorite scheme is to foster heresies, seditions, and immoralities within the church herself, and thus to undermine her very foundations. He introduces "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ;" he is often himself a lying spirit in the mouth of these; through them he corrupts the pure doctrines of Christ, and substitutes that wisdom which is "earthly, sensual, devilish." "The Spirit speaketh expressly, that some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils." By fostering ignorance, pride and selfishness in professors of religion, the enemy excites sedition and schism in the church, and by inculcating false views of God's law and gospel he encourages immoral principles and practices. See how successful all these machinations were in the apostolic church; witness the judaizing doctrines of the Galatians, and the gross immoralities of the Corinthians.

But Satan's masterpiece in these respects is the Papacy. That grand monument of his consummate genius has been the work of ages, and now probably we have seen it in its perfection. Here you have "that man of sin revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is (practically) God; whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness." Through him "God hath sent men strong delusion, that they should believe a lie." "There was given unto the beast a mouth speaking great things, and blasphemies; and it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them; and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations." Can we not detect the hand of Satan in all this; is it not "the dragon which gave the beast his power, and his seat, and great authority?" And do not the deluded papists really "worship the dragon which gave power to the beast?"

All these devices against the peace, prosperity, and life of the church Satan is manifestly employing with great effect to-day. Heresies, schisms, worldliness, immoralities, and persecutions, still proclaim that the tempter and adversary is not yet chained. Thanks then to our almighty Redeemer for his assurance to his trembling saints that his church is founded upon a rock, and "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

3. *His operations against individual believers.* No organization is too great, no person too humble, to fear his insidious plots and furious onslaughts. Time was when he did not hesitate, "when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord," to show himself also among them in the very presence chamber of the Most High, and to accuse God's saints to his face. Thus he slandered Job; and Zechariah saw him in a vision standing at the right hand of Joshua the high priest, before the angel of the Lord, to resist him. But ever since our Redeemer has appeared in heaven as our advocate, there is no longer any room there for our adversary: "his place is no more found in heaven; the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night."

But on earth he still sustains his old character of "devil:" being no longer able to accuse the saints before God, he now slanders God to us; tries to persuade us that God is unreasonable in his demands, or that he is unjust in his chastisements, or that he is guilty of criminal partiality in the distribution of his bounties. Thus the tempter provokes us to repine, to murmur, to rebel against our loving Father and gracious King. Sometimes we can almost hear his voice whispering his blasphemies in our ears. Our Saviour's pure soul quivered with disgust and indignation at his foul suggestions: "he suffered, being tempted." "I am jealous over you," wrote Paul to the saints at Corinth, "with a godly jealousy. I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ."

We can now see that he whom we have just described is no adversary to be disregarded or despised. He is powerful, subtle and malicious. To contend with any hope of success, we need to be "strong in the Lord and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against wicked spirits in high places." "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour; whom resist steadfast in the faith." "Give no place to the devil," but at his very first approach cry out, "Get thee behind me, Satan." "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you."

The issue of the struggle is not doubtful; "we are more than conquerors through him that loved us." Our Saviour has himself engaged personally in the same conflict, and come off victorious: "he hath led captivity captive;" hath "spoiled principalities and powers, and made a show of them openly, triumphing over them." "Through death he hath overcome him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil; and delivered them, who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage." And now, as the mighty captain of our salvation, he leads us on to victory. He intercedes in our behalf: "Simon, Simon Satan hath desired to have

you, that he may sift you as wheat, but I have prayed for you that thy faith fail not." He sends his angels, "ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." And he imparts to us the Paraclete, who "helpeth our infirmities." "If God be for us, who can be against us?" Surely "the God of peace shall bruise Satan under our feet shortly."

It is the duty of the ministers of the gospel to reveal to the ungodly the true character of the prince they serve, the god they worship; to show them that they are practically no wiser or better than the heathen; that they are all equally "in the snare of the devil, taken captive by him at his will;" that they are not only Satan's servants, but his sons also, "of their father the devil"; and that they may look upon him as their spiritual type to whom their characters are becoming more and more conformed, whose image they will exactly resemble, and whose eternal misery they will share, in hell. Thus may we "open their blind eyes, and turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God."

E. C. MURRAY.

## VII. NOTES.

---

### ON THE LENGTH OF THE SOJOURN IN EGYPT.

GEIKIE, in his *Hours with the Bible*, repeatedly asserts, without any show of proof, that the children of Israel dwelt for more than four hundred years on the banks of the Nile. The same view is maintained in the Revised Version of the English Bible, in Exodus xii. 40, where four hundred and thirty years is given as the precise number. Several references to the subject in *The Old Testament Student* imply that, in the belief of the writers, that point is so well settled that no reasons need either be asked or given. So far as I can see, however, this is not, as many appear to regard it, a question of textual translation merely, or of simple historical interest. To me it seems rather to touch upon the very vitals of Biblical certainties; so that, if we come to accept the "long term" of four hundred and thirty years as a matter of fact, and set aside the "short term" of two hundred and fifteen years as an antiquated notion, it cannot fail to react most unfavorably on the trustworthiness of the Mosaic records and of the other scriptures as well.

Take, in the first place, Paul's plain and unqualified statement (Gal. iii. 17), that the giving of the law was four hundred and thirty years after the covenant with Abraham. Now, who may be supposed to know most about the matter, Paul or ourselves? If the recently prevailing opinion be accepted for truth, then what shall we do with the apostolic witness and authority of Paul? Was Paul misled by Moses?

Moses says (Ex. ii. 1) that "a man of the house of Levi went and took to wife a *daughter of Levi*"; which man and woman were his own father and mother. Again (in Ch. vi. 16-30), he informs us that "Amram took him Jochebed, *his father's sister*, to wife, and she bare him Aaron and Moses"—that is, that Jochebed, Moses' mother, was his father Amram's aunt, and his grandfather Kohath's sister, and his great-grandfather Levi's daughter. And so again, as if to leave no room for doubt or cavillation, Moses asserts, in Num. xxvi. 59, that "the name of Amram's wife was Jochebed, *the daughter of Levi*, whom

(her mother) *bare to Levi in Egypt*; and she bare unto Amram Aaron, Moses, and Miriam their sister."

This view, likewise, is consistent with all the other facts of the case as stated in the Bible. For example, Levi was some six years older than Joseph. Joseph was thirty years old when he stood before Pharaoh, and, after seven years of abundance and two of famine, Jacob and his family removed into Egypt; so that Joseph was then thirty-nine and Levi about forty-five. In the passage cited (Ex. vi. 16) Moses informs us that Levi died at the age of one hundred and thirty-seven; so that he lived about ninety-three years in Egypt. Aaron was eighty-three and Moses eighty when they presented their divine credentials before Pharaoh. Adding, then, the eighty to the ninety-three, we have one hundred and seventy-three years; which, by the "short term," leaves but forty-two years from the death of Levi to the birth of Moses; and makes the statement that he was the third child of Levi's daughter every way credible, without recourse to the interposition of that divine power which made Sarah a mother at the age of ninety. But if we accept the "long term" for truth and certainty, then there is a gap of two hundred and fifty-seven years between the death of Levi and the birth of Moses; and then what becomes of the credibility of Moses, not now as to what passed between Jehovah and himself in the burning mount, but as to the simple facts of his own family history?

Nor is that all. Moses again relates (Gen. xv. 13-16) that, in the covenant made with Abraham (which Paul asserts was four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law), Jehovah told him that his "seed should be a stranger in a land not theirs, . . . and they shall afflict them four hundred years"; adding, "And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace, and be buried in a good old age; but in the fourth generation they shall come hither again; for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." Gesenius explains the "four generations" in the one passage as the equivalent of the "four hundred years" in the other; the Hebrew "DOR" (meaning a lifetime), like the Latin "*seculum*," standing for the round period of one hundred years. Now, since Joseph lived seventy-one years in Egypt after the whole family removed there, and as it was long after the death of Joseph before the "bondage and affliction" began, "four hundred years of bondage and affliction" cannot be made out by the long term any more than the short one; and furthermore, it is perfectly legitimate to understand verse 13 as a loose mode of stating that "they shall bring them into



bondage and afflict them till a period of four hundred years *from now*," the reason given in the passage itself for the delay being that "the iniquity of the Amorites is *not yet full*." As, therefore, four generations, or four life-times, means, in round numbers, four hundred years (which corresponds with the more specific number given by Paul), the promise to Abraham was that, after four revolving centuries had passed, his descendants should come out of bondage into the land of promise. But if now we agree to accept the long term, and make it *sic* revolving centuries instead of four, what becomes of the divine faithfulness, as well as of Mosaic trustworthiness?

It will probably be objected to this that two hundred and fifteen years was not sufficient time for the prodigious increase of the Israelitish people from seventy males into a nation of six hundred thousand fighting men. But the objector seems wholly to overlook the fact that Abraham, who had three hundred and eighteen young men, or servants, born in his house, must have had at least five hundred or six hundred males in his encampment; that Isaac's servants, or dependents, were so numerous that the king of the Philistines said to him, "Thou art much mightier than we"; that Jacob brought back with him from Padan-Aram men servants not a few, before he got this birthright share in his father's estate; so that with his seventy male descendants there went down with him into Egypt probably not less than one thousand five hundred males, circumcised Israelites every one of them; all of whose descendants were no doubt merged into the families to which they belonged; so that the one thousand five hundred males, rather than the seventy, was the stock out which the Israelitish nation was developed, in those days when masters and servants were alike reduced to the condition of Egyptian bondsmen.

Very strong confirmatory proof that the lineal descendants of Jacob formed but a very small part of the Israelites who came out of Egypt, is found in a passage which has perplexed commentators not a little, to-wit, Num. iii. 43. When Jehovah proposed to take the Levites, instead of the firstborn of all the tribes, there was found to be twenty-two thousand Levites from thirty days old and upwards; and by actual count there was found to be only twenty-two thousand three hundred and seventy-three firstborn of like age in the other eleven tribes; whereas the firstborn of a month old and upwards, corresponding to an army of six hundred thousand men, (allowing the incredible average of six or eight males and females to every family,) could not have been less than four hundred thousand to five hundred thousand.

one-half of whom may be supposed to have been males; ten or fifteen times as many. If, then, the twenty-two thousand three hundred and seventy-three be assumed to have been the lineal descendants of Jacob, and an average of even five all around for every family be allowed, the sons and daughters of Jacob would amount to only about eighty thousand or one hundred thousand: a number by no means difficult to be accounted for in the short term of two hundred and fifteen years, under the fostering hand of God. It deserves mention, likewise, that the zeal of the true-born sons of Jacob to keep the records of their lineal descent seems to point in the same direction.

But just here the advocates of the long term will no doubt aver that Exodus xii. 40, by the "only honest translation" that can be made of it, expressly declares that "the sojourning of the children of Israel, *which they sojourned in Egypt*, was four hundred and thirty years;" and that this is so certainly the only admissible rendering, that the revisers would not honor the old version with a place in the margin, as an alternative rendering. But we have Holy Writ for the assertion that "great men are not always wise"; and, I think, I can show it to be certainly so in the present instance, and prove, by a convincing demonstration, that of the two "the old is better."

Stephen says that Moses was born "when the time of the promise drew nigh which God had promised to Abraham" (Acts vii. 17-20): the fourth life-time, or the four hundred years expressly stipulated. Stephen certainly believed in the short term. Paul as certainly believed in the short term. The author of the First Book of Kings certainly believed in the short term. (See 1 Kings, vi. 1.) But what is more to our present purpose is that Moses himself just as certainly believed in the short term. To say that he believed and asserted the truth of the long term would, in addition to all other difficulties named, convict him of the absurdity of asserting that his mother gave birth to him when she was nearly three hundred years of age!

The genealogies also furnish us another very strong line of proof. The only genealogies of Moses and his contemporaries found in the Bible are the following, and they all, without a single exception, agree in making out the short term:

1. *Levi*, Kohath, Amram, *Moses* and *Aaron* (eighty and eighty-three years old respectively at the time of the exodus). (Exod. vi. 16-30; Num. xxvi. 57-59; 1 Chron. vi. 1-3.)

2. *Judah*, Pharez, Hezron, Ram, Amminidab, *Nahshon*. (Ruth iv. 18-20; 1 Chron. ii. 3-10; Matt. i. 3, 4.)

3. *Levi*, Kohath, Izhar, *Korah*. (Exod. vi. 16–21; Num. vi. 1.)

4. *Ruben*, Pallu, Eliab, *Dathan* and *Abiram*. (Num. xxvi. 5–10.)

Singular as it may seem, the genealogies of 1 Chron., chaps. i. to ix., are constructed on some such principle that, besides the two already given, the only other that can be made out with a tolerable degree of certainty, is the following:

5. *Judah*, Pharez, Hezron, Chelubai, Hur, *Uri* and *Bezaleel*. (1 Chron. ii. 3–20.) As Bezaleel seems to have been a young man, his father, and probably his grandfather, were contemporaries of the aged prophet, as well as himself. Hur was perhaps the same individual who, together with Aaron, sustained Moses' wearied hands while Joshua fought against Amalec.<sup>1</sup>

Now, if there be omitted links in the line of Moses, in spite of the repeated and explicit statements he makes of the names and ages of his ancestors, both paternal and maternal, pray why should the same thing be done in the case of all the rest? We know that single names are sometimes omitted in the genealogical lists, but the supposition is quite inadmissible that any such wholesale omissions can be sanctioned or allowed as the long term would imperiously demand. A writer in the *Old Testament Student* for November, 1887, (who assumes the long term to be unquestionably true,) estimates that "the Israelites *numbered thirteen generations* during their sojourn in Egypt." (P. 79, note.) Very differently reads the venerable Septuagint Version, which was a recognized authority in the days of Christ and his apostles. This old version distinctly states that "in the *fifth generation* the children of Israel went up out of Egypt." (Exod. xiii. 18.) Now, whether the seventy interpreters had a different Hebrew text from our own, or whether they mistranslated (if it be wholly a mistranslation; compare Exod. xx. 5, 6, and xxxiv. 7, unpointed Hebrew,) the difficult text we have, it may be reasonably supposed that they knew more about the matter in dispute than all of us put together: if they knew anything of their national history, they might be expected to know how long their fathers were in Egypt.

There are not wanting those who affirm that Moses had nothing to do, except in name, with the one set of statements relative to his personal history, any more than the other; but believing as I do, in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Since the above was written, I have found one more, the only other, I think, in the Bible; and, like the rest, it attests the truth and certainty of the "short term." 6. *Manasseh*, Machir, Gilead, Hopher, *Zelophehad* and his daughters. (Num. xxvi. 29, 32, 33; xxvii. 3.)

Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch (with unquestionable additions here and there by a later hand), as certainly as I do in the fact that the four Gospels were written by the men whose names they bear, I am shut up to the conclusion, that either the numbers in Exod. xii. 40 have become altered in the transcription throughout so many ages, or else that *Moses did not intend the verse to be taken in the sense given in the Revised English Version*, which definitely states (what without egregious absurdity he could never have meant to say), that the sojourn in Egypt was of four hundred and thirty years' duration.

Is there, then, any mistake about the numbers? There can be none; because, *1st*, All MSS. and all versions agree in the exact number; and, *2nd*, Paul gives that precise number of years as marking the interval between the covenant with Abraham and the giving of the law; and there can be no doubt that he got the figures from this very text.

The only alternative, then, is to allow that the passage is susceptible of, and was meant to have, a different meaning from that now claimed by some to be the "only admissible" rendering. This, I think, is implied in the very next verse, which goes on to say, "And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the selfsame day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from Egypt." As, therefore, the "selfsame day," or more generally, the "exact time," must have reference to God's faithful performance of some promise or engagement, it can only refer to the promise to Abraham, that in four centuries, or life-times, or after four hundred years, his seed, delivered from bondage, should return to the land of promise. To this period Stephen refers as the "drawing nigh of the time of the promise which God had sworn unto Abraham;" at the approach of which auspicious season Moses was born. Moses, then, was BORN WITHIN THE PERIOD OF THE FOUR HUNDRED YEARS; and there is the best of all reasons to believe that it is to the same period, more definitely stated as four hundred and thirty years, that Moses himself refers as the exact time at which God brought the people out of bondage, and put them *en route* for the land he had sworn unto their fathers to give them. If so, then it is doubly impossible that in the immediately preceding verse he could mean to assert that the whole period of four hundred and thirty years was spent in Egypt.

That the Septuagint fathers so understood it is seen in their translation of the passage. As they had no way of putting in italics the words they regarded as necessary to complete the sense, they cannot

be regarded in fairness as corrupting the text, any more than the Targum (or "translation") of Onkelos, in passages not a few. They render, "Now the dwelling of the children of Israel, which they dwelt in Egypt, AND IN THE LAND OF CANAAN, was four hundred and thirty years." They surely knew how long their fathers were in Egypt, and there can be no doubt of the fact that they inserted the words indicated in order to make the passage accord with *the known facts of the case*. Another expedient was adopted by King James' translators to accomplish the identical purpose; to-wit, that of rendering the passage thus, "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, *who dwelt in Egypt*, was four hundred and thirty years." The revisers, *assuming that the known facts of the case were just the other way*, rendered, "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, WHICH THEY SOJOURNED IN EGYPT, was four hundred and thirty years." This is what the advocates of the long term would call "the natural and proper rendering of the words." I propose to show that it is neither the one nor the other. Gesenius says that the word in question means "seat, dwelling"; and in this particular passage he makes it mean "time of abode." It can be proved, in spite of the authority of the great master, that this is not the natural and proper sense of the words either.

The word MOSHAV, rendered by the former "sojourning," and by the latter "dwelling," in the sense of "time of abode," occurs forty-four times in the Hebrew Bible, and in each case, except the one under consideration, it is rendered in the Old Version (and I believe in the Revised as well), as follows: "Dwelling," "dwelling-place," and "habitation," twenty-six times. Once, "a city to dwell in," but this is simply an English variation for "a city of habitation." Eight times it is rendered "seat" and "situation." Once, "assembly," or "consistory." Once it occurs in a passage rendered "for common use," "for the city, *for dwelling*, and for suburbs," where it can only mean "for dwellings." (Ezek. xlvi. 25.) Twice, "the sitting of his (Solomon's) servants"; of extremely difficult interpretation. It may mean their *seats*, or their *dwellings*, but it can hardly mean the act of sitting, about which there could be nothing extraordinary. Lange says it means "the civil officers who sat at Solomon's table," that is *sitters*. Once, "dwellers"; "all that dwelt in the house of Ziba." With the exception, then, of the last three cases, where the word is used in the concrete sense of "sitters," or "dwellers," it appears to have a purely local signification, to-wit, a "*sitting-place*," or "*dwelling-place*." To

assume, therefore, that the rendering "the dwelling which they dwelt," or "the sojourning which they sojourned," is the only natural and proper signification of the words, or the proper signification of them in any sense, is a wholly groundless assumption, without the shadow of a foundation, except in the accidental and misleading circumstance that "dwelling" may, in English, be either a noun or a participle, while MOSHAV is a noun only, and not a participle.

This passage, therefore, is a clear exception to all ordinary usage. The ordinary and proper sense of the word has no possible application here. "The dwelling-place of the children of Israel, which they dwelt," makes simple nonsense, and completely explodes the allegation that the rendering of the Revised Version, or that proposed by Gesenius, are the natural and ordinary sense of the words, and the only admissible rendering. The case is wholly an exceptional one, and we have to seek a meaning which MOSHAV never has in any other passage. What, then, shall it be?

MOSHAV is a verbal noun that means ordinarily "a dwelling-place," and not the act of dwelling; "a place of sojourn," and not the act of sojourning. Now it happens, curiously enough, that in verse 45, eight lines further down, Moses uses another verbal noun, a cognate of the word in question, to-wit, TOSHAV, as meaning a "foreigner," or "temporary resident," who, as such, was forbidden to eat of the passover. This word Gesenius defines, "an inhabitant," "a dweller, usually a sojourner, a stranger, living in another country, without the rights of citizenship."

Since, then, in this particular case we have to seek a wholly exceptional meaning to the word, what more natural than to suppose that Moses used the word MOSHAV to express the character and condition of a TOSHAV, whom he proceeds so soon to mention? As the word never means the act of dwelling, it seems quite as improbable that it should mean *the time of abode*; the more so as that would make Moses contradict himself and all the other teachings of Scripture in relation to this matter. The word by all its analogies seems to express a state or condition rather than an act; and if Moses had wanted to express the character and condition of a TOSHAV, it is very doubtful whether he could have found in Hebrew a fitter word to set forth that conception than MOSHAV.

It is to be observed, too, that the revisers have, in this one passage, given to the root form YASHAV a rendering never given to it elsewhere. The word occurs one thousand and fifty times in the Hebrew Bible,

and it is never rendered "sojourn" in the A. V. at all; nor is it ever so rendered, that I can find, by the revisers, in any other but this passage; and here it is evidently used to create a Hebraism for which Moses is not responsible, to-wit: "The sojourning which they sojourned." But if, on the other hand, MOSHAV is understood to indicate the character and condition of a TOSHAV, the passage would naturally read: "Now the sojourning life of the children of Israel who had dwelt in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years; and it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the selfsame day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt." This not only renders Moses consistent with himself (the first of all claims which a writer has on his translator) and with all other Scripture writers, but it obviates all necessity for the interpolation adopted by the seventy to solve the supposed difficulty, and brings the passage into harmony with the known facts of the case. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews may have had an eye to this very passage, understood in this very sense, when he speaks of Abraham and his children, Isaac and Jacob, as "dwelling as sojourners [the state and condition of TOSHAVIM] in the land of promise, as in a strange country." (Heb. xi. 9.)

Thus understood, Moses, instead of meaning to determine definitely the length of the Egyptian sojourn, as is claimed by the advocates of the long term, intended rather to cover the whole period during which Abraham and his seed had led the life of TOSHAVIM—the life of sojourners—without the rights and privileges of citizenship (whether as strangers in the land of promise, or as strangers in the land of Egypt), from the time of Abraham's vocation till they became a nation with a home and a citizenship of their own.

In the summer of 1887 I had the privilege of hearing Dr. William R. Harper make a grand exposition of the Ninetieth Psalm, which he contended that none but Moses himself could have written, in which he gave prominence to this very thought. "Lord, thou hast been our DWELLING-PLACE in all generations," he understood to be a pathetic reference which "the man of God" makes, in his old age, to the wandering, homeless life of himself, his people and all his fathers, from Abraham down to his own day. They had all alike led the life of TOSHAVIM; and in all that long period which Moses here asserts, if I understand him properly, to have been of four hundred and thirty years' duration, Jehovah had been their only and their safe abode.

The Spanish language, in virtue of its affinity with the Hebrew,

through the influence of the Arabic of the long Moorish domination, sheds light in a good many difficult passages of the Hebrew Bible, and, if I mistake not, this is one of them. In both, the relative ("que" in the one and "asher" in the other) refers indifferently to persons or things; while, as in all other languages, it must naturally refer to the nearest antecedent, unless special pains be taken to prevent it. The nearest antecedent in this case is "the children of Israel," rather than "the sojourning of the children of Israel." Why then should it not have this reference in Hebrew, when it can have no other in Spanish, if the words be translated just as they stand?

In English the case is not so apparent at first sight, owing to the fact that the same is not true of the relatives in common use, "who" and "which." But let us illustrate the point by the use of the less frequent relative "that," of which the same thing is true. A literal rendering of the passage would then read: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel *that had dwelt in* Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years;" which, with the substitution of "that" for "who," is just the common version of the passage; and I should like to be informed what there is to hinder it from being called a good, honest, faithful, and accurate version? In order to prove that it is not, and to displace it unceremoniously as unworthy even of a place in the margin, the revisers separate the relative from its nearer antecedent, and compel it to seek alliance with the more remote, by treating it as an objective case, and gratuitously supplying another nominative for the verb, thus: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, which [they] lived in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years." But as the English of this would be intolerable, they had to go yet a step further, and give to the verb a rendering it has in no other of the one thousand and fifty passages of the Bible in which it occurs—"the sojourning of the children of Israel which [they] sojourned in Egypt"—and then this is called the natural and proper rendering of the words! And all that is gained thereby, so far as I can see, is to make the passage contradict the uniform teaching of the Bible, in the Old and New Testaments alike, and force Moses to teach for historic truth and inspired verity that he was born of a woman nearly three hundred years old!

In conclusion, I would like, with becoming modesty, to inquire, if the sacred writer had intended to express just the sense of the Authorized Version, so ignominiously discarded by the Revised, how else could he have better done so than in the very terms of the Hebrew text?

H. B. PRATT.

*Tlalpam, Fed. Dist., Mexico.*



THE JESUITS IN CANADA.<sup>1</sup>

SOME members of the Jesuit Society came to Canada in the end of the sixteenth century, and a good many in the beginning of the seventeenth. The story of these early Canadian Jesuits is well known, and it contains not a little of the heroic. To enable the Jesuits to prosecute their work of educating the colonists and converting the Indians, grants of land in Canada were made to the society by several kings of France, as well as by others; these lands are known as the Jesuits' estates.

By the treaty of Paris, in 1763, the whole of New France came into possession of Great Britain. In this famous instrument the following words are found: "His Britannic Majesty on his side agrees to grant the liberty of the Catholic religion to the inhabitants of Canada. He will consequently give the most precise and most effectual orders that his new Roman Catholic subjects may profess the worship of their religion according to the rites of the Romish Church, as far as the laws of Great Britain permit." The Jesuit Society had been suppressed in old France in the year preceding the treaty, and it was, of course, an illegal society by the laws of England. It is doubtful, therefore, whether the society had, or could have, any legal existence in Canada after the country came under British rule. However this may be, the Quebec Act of 1774 (the year following the abrogation of the Society by Pope Clement XIV.) forbids the *Communities* of the Church of Rome to hold property; a provision which was not enforced against any of the communities except the Jesuits. This notorious body, now under the papal ban, was forbidden to recruit; while adequate provision was made for the maintenance of all who had been members of it as long as they should live. When the last Jesuit, Father Cazot, died, the sheriff of Quebec took possession of the estates in the name of the Crown, and for thirty years they were administered by the Crown in the interests of education in the towns of Quebec and Montreal.

In 1831, the Imperial government handed over the estates to the Province of Quebec; the proceeds to be permanently applied in support of education. The trust was accepted by that Province, and was administered according to the terms of it till the year 1888.

The Jesuit Society was reëstablished by the Pope in 1814, and in 1841 members of this mischievous community began to return to

---

<sup>1</sup> From *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, by permission.

Canada. They were not long in urging their claims to the estates which had belonged to their predecessors, and which, according to canon law, had escheated to the church, not to Britain, when the Society became defunct. Still earlier the Catholic bishops had claimed the property in the name of the church, and now the Jesuits lent their powerful and persistent aid in support of the church's contention. The Jesuits gained the ear of the Hon. Mr. Mercier, the premier of Quebec; and whilst on their side they secured for him the ultramontane vote, he, on his side, proceeded to enact a measure by which the Jesuits and the church should receive compensation for what he calls the "confiscated" estates. Nothing can be more remarkable, or more humiliating to any self-governing community—not to say any British province—than Mr. Mercier's correspondence with Rome and the act which embraces this correspondence in its preamble. The Quebec premier inquires of Cardinal Simeoni whether he "sees any serious objection to the government's selling the property, pending a final settlement of the question of the Jesuits' estates." The Cardinal replies that "His Holiness was pleased to grant permission to sell the property which belonged to the Jesuit fathers before they were suppressed, upon the express condition, however, that the sum to be received be deposited or left at the free disposal of the Holy See." This condition Mercier slightly modifies, thus: "The government would look on the proceeds of the sale as a special deposit, to be disposed of hereafter in accordance with the arrangements to be entered into between the parties interested, with the sanction of the Holy See." Rome agrees, and Father Turgeon, of Montreal, procurator of the Jesuits, is empowered to complete negotiations with Mr. Mercier. It was at length arranged by the Jesuit and the premier that \$400,000 should be given in compensation for the estates, which sum should be distributed by the Pope between the Jesuits and the other claimants as he should determine. Mr. Mercier now passed through the Legislature of Quebec a bill in which the sum named is voted to the church, while he takes power to sell the estates—the proceeds to be applied as the Legislature may approve. The Act, it may be stated, appropriates the interest of \$60,000 for Protestant education; which sum cannot but be regarded as hush-money, for assuredly the Protestants could claim no compensation for the Jesuits' estates.

This Act, as already said, had no validity until it should receive papal sanction. In due time this sanction was given, and the money voted to the Church of Rome was distributed by Leo XIII. among the

several claimants—\$160,000 going to the Jesuits, \$150,000 to the Laval University, while the residue was apportioned among the dioceses of the Province. Thus the Jesuit Society, which, as a necessary preparation for receiving this money had secured incorporation in 1887, was helped to a position of power and influence which its record of three centuries might well have forbidden it to reach in any British country, or, for that matter, in any land where its history was known.

The objectionable features of the Jesuits' Estates Act are so glaring that it is hardly necessary to direct special attention to them. It may be regarded as a violation of the trust under which these lands were received and accepted by Quebec; it disturbs the wise arrangement under which the revenues accruing from these estates were devoted to higher education; it distinctly elevates the authority of the Romish canon law above the law of the empire; and it recognizes in a way which compromises all true freedom the right of the Pope to interfere in our civil affairs. Whatever may be said in reply to the first two objections, the last two are of a kind to rouse the utmost indignation and antagonism of every Canadian who is not a slave of Rome.

By the Constitution of Canada, the Dominion Government has the power of vetoing obnoxious provincial legislation. So far from applying the veto to this measure, the central authority hastened to pronounce it valid; and, when a motion was offered in the House of Commons requesting the government to disallow the Act, it received the support of only thirteen members, one hundred and eighty-eight voting against it. Petitions from Quebec, Ontario, and other provinces, largely signed, were presented to the Governor-General and his cabinet, but all to no purpose. Under plea of maintaining provincial rights, the political parties vied with each other in protecting a piece of legislation which is a humiliation and a disgrace to a free people.

Before the House of Commons voted against disallowance protests against the act were heard from several places, and especially from Toronto, in which large and representative meetings with unanimity and energy uttered their voice in stern condemnation.

Had the Jesuits' Estates Act been the only instance in Provincial or Dominion affairs in which the Church of Rome had showed her hand, and in which the subserviency of political parties to Rome had been signalized, less importance might have been attached to the matter; but we do not traduce the parties in saying that the Church of Rome has been zealously courted by both, and that, while both Conservatives

and Reformers well know that Rome has her own ends to serve, and cares nothing for their politics, they will stick at little which may help them, for the time, to secure the Catholic vote. There are, of course, among our public men noble exceptions to this rule of subservience, but the parties as such are utterly weak whenever Rome is united in her demands. Our Protestant people have no desire to curtail the liberty of Roman Catholics, or to deny them any right which good citizens should enjoy. The Protestants of Canada would defend the rights of Roman Catholics as earnestly as they would their own; but we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that where Rome is in the ascendant, she is not content with equality, and that everywhere she keeps pressing legislatures and governments for favors and advantages. Nor can any one who knows the Encyclical and the Syllabus wonder that it should be so. The long-avowed theory of the Roman Church touching the relations of the civil and the ecclesiastical abundantly justifies her procedure, and announces beforehand what she may be expected to attempt whenever circumstances permit or invite her intervention in public affairs. Especially does she strive, on this continent, to influence public education.

It cannot be matter of surprise that the declinature of Cabinet and Parliament to interfere with an Act which—under whatever pretence of compensation—really bestowed the country's money to endow one of the most odious of religious organizations, should have excited very strong feeling throughout the Dominion. The result has been the formation of a body called the Equal Rights Association, with the view of opposing all legislation like that of the Jesuits' Estates Act, and of advocating the entire abolition of government grants, whether in Province or Dominion, to any sectarian or denominational object whatever. The separation of church and state (not the separation of religion from public life) is the main proposition in the creed of the association. For more than thirty years Canada has been nominally pledged to this policy, and were it not for the quasi-endowed position of the Church of Rome in the Province of Quebec, and the persistent efforts of the same church to draw upon the public treasury whenever she has the chance, there would be little difficulty in having the principles of the association consistently carried out. The action of the Church of Rome has thus made it a necessity that the Equal Rights movement should seem to be directed against that church; nor have the politicians been slow to brand it as a "No Popery" affair, as an ungenerous and wicked attempt to stir up ill-feeling in a country

where religious and racial differences demand the utmost mutual forbearance.

It is not here necessary to vindicate the new association against this charge. Enough to say that the politicians and newspapers that are constantly advancing the charge know that it is without foundation; they are not themselves deceived. The principles of the association have been so clearly propounded, and are so entirely in accord with liberal sentiment, that misrepresentation is the only convenient weapon against them. When the equal rights men laid down this platform, they were careful not only to disclaim all hostility to their Roman Catholic fellow citizens, but they emphatically asserted that they wished to stand on ground which Roman Catholics who desired nothing more than equality before the law might occupy in common with them. Nor is there any part of the constitution of the association which the true friends of liberty and equality should find fault with. Public money should not be given for the endowment of churches, nor for any directly ecclesiastical object, nor for the support of schools in which the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome, or of any other church, are taught; these positions so much commend themselves to the majority of our people that they cannot be directly or avowedly opposed.

The question between Romanist and Protestant in Canada is unfortunately complicated with the racial question. The Roman Catholics of the Province of Quebec are mostly French Canadians, and when their church is, as they imagine, attacked, the race instinct combines with the religious in defending an institution which is regarded as the symbol and the guarantee of their nationality. And here, again, the politicians malign the Equal Rights Association, for they encourage the French Canadians to regard the present movement as directed against themselves. There are indeed persons connected with the Equal Rights movement who have said regrettable things respecting the French people, their language and customs, but there is little excuse for taking any extreme utterance of this description as indicating the temper and aim of the Equal Rights Association. In Ontario and the other English Provinces of the Dominion the feeling towards the French Canadians is almost uniformly kind and considerate. The cheerfulness and courtesy of the French Canadian and his desire to cultivate good relations with his Anglo-Saxon neighbor are known and appreciated, and did his church not lead him as she will he would cause no trouble in the state.

It is too soon to predict the fate of the Equal Rights movement. It has spread to a considerable extent in Ontario and in some other parts of the Dominion. The political machine will crush it if it can. Already the two great parties have unmistakably signified that, notwithstanding their keen hostility to each other, they are ready at any point to combine against those whose chief offence is the advocacy of a doctrine which both profess to hold. The Association has important work to do, and we trust that in wisdom and charity it will steadily advance, and while not less careful of the rights of Roman Catholics than of Protestants, will vindicate those doctrines of freedom which the Church of Rome has put under the ban—rights essential both to political and religious well-being.

The Protestant churches, it may be said, favor Equal Rights. Certainly they pronounced with sufficient clearness and strength against the Jesuits' Estates Act. Christian people well know that in the triumph of evangelical truth alone will the solution of the problem now before Canada be found. Hence the duty of offering to the French Canadian a purer faith than he has at present; and if this duty shall be wisely and faithfully discharged we shall take the right road towards effecting necessary political adjustment and preserving in the confederation true amity between Saxon and Gaul. But the most complete recognition of this fundamental Christian view is perfectly consistent with the political obligation to resist the admission of false and pernicious principles into the life of the state.

We are not unaware that the Church of Rome has the same aim, and proceeds by the same methods, in the United States as in Canada, and we therefore count, in fighting this battle, upon the sympathy and moral support of our brethren south of the lakes.

*Toronto.*

WILLIAM CAVEN.

---

#### THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1890.

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States met this year, as all our readers know, in the First Presbyterian Church of Asheville, N. C. The retiring Moderator, Rev. H. G. Hill, D. D., opened the Assembly with an instructive sermon on the mission of the church, from Isaiah lx. 1-3. The Stated and Permanent Clerks were in their places, and the Assembly provided itself with additional officers by the election of the Rev. James Park, D. D.,

as Moderator, and the Rev. E. A. Ramsey and the Rev. W. A. Alexander as Temporary Clerks.

The business of the Assembly was conducted with dignity, earnestness, and dispatch, "without haste, without rest." There were no protracted discussions and no long speeches, but several spirited debates enlivened the proceedings. The good temper and kindly spirit that pervaded the whole body made the meeting most delightful. This was, no doubt, due in part to the pleasant way in which the Assembly was entertained. Who could fail to be in a good humor when all nature was in her loveliest garb, and when sky and mountain and valley seemed to conspire with the hospitable people of Asheville to give assurance of generous welcome. Beautiful for situation is this capital city of the western part of the Old North State. Seated upon her hills and girdled by the circle of her mountains, she delighted our eyes with ever-shifting scenes of mingled beauty and grandeur, and refreshed the hearts of the strangers within her gates by her cordial hospitality. The convenience and comfort of the Assembly had been in every particular anticipated by the thoughtful care of the pastor, Rev. W. S. P. Bryan, and his efficient committee of entertainment. It was a happy suggestion that moved the members of the church to tender the commissioners a reception and banquet on Thursday evening. This gave opportunity for the commissioners to make the acquaintance of each other before they entered on the business of the body, not to mention the fulness of welcome they would receive from four distinguished speakers on that topic, and the chunks of wit, humor and learning they would carry away from the addresses of seven wise men among the guests on assigned subjects. We commend an occasion of this kind for imitation at future Assemblies, though we fear few cities can boast so excellent a place of gathering as Asheville possesses in the Battery Park Hotel, and few churches so graceful a master of ceremonies as we found in Mr. Bryan.

The Assembly had the privilege of hearing others beside its own members. Rev. Dr. Alexander McLean, one of the secretaries of the American Bible Society, delivered an interesting address on the work of this beneficent and useful organization. Rev. Dr. George D. Mathews, of London, Secretary of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches, made two addresses, one on Sunday afternoon, another before the Assembly. Both were most excellent, and Dr. Mathews captivated all his hearers. Two of our missionaries were also present, Rev. J. Rockwell Smith, of Brazil, and Rev. Thornton R. Sampson, of

Greece, and one evening was given to stirring addresses from these brethren and the Rev. A. Pierce Saunders, who joins Mr. Sampson in his field.

Happily for the Assembly and the church, there were no exciting questions before the body. The subjects that might have been expected to arouse most interest and lead to most discussion were disposed of with little debate. Reference is had, of course, to the tithe and societies, on which the Chattanooga Assembly asked expressions of opinion from the Presbyteries. On the tithe, majority and minority reports were submitted from the committee. The majority recommended the reference of the subject to an *ad interim* committee, which should take in hand all the papers sent up by the Presbyteries and present a report for action to the next Assembly. The principal argument for this disposition of the matter was based on the desire to keep the subject before the church for further discussion. The minority suggested that the Assembly content itself with simply recording the statement framed by the committee, presenting a summary of the replies of the Presbyteries. The reason most strongly urged for this action was that the Assembly had asked for the judgment of the Presbyteries; that judgment had been decisively delivered, to the effect that the tithe is in no true sense of binding obligation, and that it was not wise to press the subject further on the church. By a close vote, the minority report carried. It will be seen that a discussion of the tithe on its merits was out of order, and in consequence the debate could not cover the propriety of affirming or denying the obligation of the tithe. The vote, therefore, on the reports before the house failed to indicate any judgment on the main question. The same committee, at a later sitting, brought in a report on societies, giving a summary of the responses of the Presbyteries, and recommending no further action than the record of this summary in the Assembly's Minutes. Without a word of discussion, the report was adopted. In this way the Assembly quietly and comfortably, and probably wisely, consigned to sleep the only live issues it could boast. It is hardly to be doubted that by this method of dealing with these questions the Assembly denied itself the pleasure of hearing many fine extempore speeches, carefully wrought out in the quiet of the study at home and laboriously lugged to this meeting, only to be ignominiously thrust again into valise or trunk and sadly lugged back home. Was not this the height of refined cruelty, especially when you remember that here, if anywhere in this round world, a man would feel himself entitled to speak "for Buncombe"?



The Revised Directory for Worship, which had been submitted to the Presbyteries for adoption or rejection, it was thought would receive final action at the hands of the Assembly. The Committee on the Directory, in view of the fact that a majority of the Presbyteries had rejected it, recommended the indefinite postponement of the whole subject. It was affirmed, however, in the discussion, though this fact does not appear in the committee's report, that a majority of the Presbyteries had expressed a judgment in favor of a revision, and, on this ground, the Assembly decided to continue the Committee on the Revised Directory, with the addition of three members. We hope the able committee, which has given so much labor to this revision, will not grow weary or be discouraged. The history of the efforts to accomplish the great improvements we now have in our Book of Church Order should keep them from despair. It must be said, however, that our ministers and elders have not shown the interest in this subject that its importance demands. If we may indulge in comparisons, surely methods of procedure in our church courts, on which we expended years of study, do not surpass in importance the appropriate conduct of the worship of God. It is beyond question a defect in the Presbyterian Church that many of her ministers do not give sufficient thought and care to the reverent, orderly, and edifying conduct of the public worship. What an unworthy conception of worship is betrayed in the not uncommon allusion to the prayers and hymns of praise and reading from the sacred Scriptures as "preliminary services"! If this committee can do anything to secure improvement in this direction, and if it can present us with a guide to worship more complete and more suggestive than we have at present, it will perform a work for which it will be had in everlasting remembrance.

The Assembly of 1888 raised a committee to consider and report on the subject of temperance to the succeeding Assembly. The committee was continued by the last Assembly, and made a long and carefully prepared report to this Assembly. After hearing the report, the Assembly ordered it printed and docketed for the consideration of the next Assembly. Quite a number of the members, however, regarded certain statements in the report susceptible of a construction favorable to the liquor traffic, and, on Thursday, a motion was made to reconsider the action of the Assembly, in order to refer the report to a committee which should condense its findings into a few propositions and give a statement in accordance with the historic position of our church on the questions involved. The motion to reconsider was carried, but the

Assembly, being evidently in no mood to enter upon the discussion of so large a subject, satisfied itself with thanking the committee for its report and reaffirming its past deliverances on the subject. The writer of this was out of the house when the committee's report was read, and is therefore not qualified to say anything of the contents of the paper. He favored the reconsideration, in order to satisfy the brethren who were troubled over the matter, and, seeing that there was no hope of securing any well-digested deliverance, voted for the final action. But he may be permitted to say that more consideration was due so able a committee, and that too much stress seems to have been laid upon possible misapprehensions and misconstructions of the truths stated in the report. As the report is not to be printed by order of the Assembly, it is to be hoped that in some way it may come before the constituency of the Southern Presbyterian Church and before the public at large, which is sorely in need of guidance in the perplexities of the issues, moral, ecclesiastical, and political, that grow out of the present temperance agitation.

A fate somewhat similar to that which befell the Temperance Committee was visited upon the committee appointed by the Chattanooga Assembly to consider the whole subject of licensure and the conduct of religious services by elders and candidates for the ministry. This committee presented majority and minority reports, which were referred to a special committee of the Assembly. This latter committee, among other things, recommended certain changes in the phraseology relating to the licensure and ordination of candidates, with the purpose of removing the stigma which is thought by some to attach to those who enter the ministry through the door of the provision for "extraordinary cases." There was a short and lively discussion, and the committee's report in this particular and as a whole was rejected. No substitute was offered, and therefore the questions at issue remain as before. On the general subject of modifying the requirements of our book for licensure and ordination, the remark may be ventured that it is scarcely just to class those who desire some modifications among those who desire to lower the standard of entrance to the ministry. It is true that there are pronounced advocates of a radical change in our present standard, but it is equally true that there are some who believe that the phraseology of our book, in its provision for the admission into the ministry of some who have not pursued a classical course of study, fixes more or less of reproach and inferiority on those who are received under this clause, and should therefore be revised. They desire no

change whatever in the character of preparation ordinarily required, but merely wish a more acceptable form of words. Furthermore, it cannot be questioned that some of our most intelligent and conservative men think it unwise to fix with so great rigidity the character of studies that must be pursued in order to entrance into our ministry. They maintain that our ministers ought to be educated, but they hold that it is neither right nor expedient to define education in the terms of our book, and thereby practically to exclude men who are in the truest sense educated men, but who have not followed the old-fashioned classical curriculum. No argument is here intended, but it has been thought a matter of some moment to utter an admonition against the injustice of classifying all who desire some modifications in this part of our book with those who are moving for changes that look to lowering the standard of education for the ministry.

Another committee, raised by the Chattanooga Assembly, to consider the perplexing question of the evangelization of the colored people, seems to have been gifted with prescience of the somewhat summary disposition this Assembly was to make of the reports of *ad interim* committees. At any rate, the chairman announced that the committee had failed to have a meeting, and suggested that the subject be referred to a special committee of the Assembly. This was done, and, on its recommendation, the Assembly directed the Executive Committee of the Tuskaloosa Institute and the Executive Committee of Home Missions, acting together, to appoint a minister, who might be termed a field secretary, for this work. This we regard as among the wisest and most important acts of the Assembly. The negro is the source, in one way or another, of most of our troubles in the South. Amid so much that is dark and ominous in regard to him and his influence on our destinies, we have one guiding star, and that is to be found in his need of the gospel and in our faith in its transforming and elevating power.

Probably the most spicy debate of the session grew out of the report of the Committee of Bills and Overtures on what might be called a conundrum proposed by the Presbytery of Wilmington, in form and language as follows: "Mr. P., an elder of the church at H., removes to the church at B. He is not elected to the eldership in the church at B. He now wishes to demit his position as an ordained, though inactive, elder. Can he do so? and if so, by what process can it be done?" Here was a nut to crack. The committee reported that, "under the circumstances described, there is no constitutional provision for demitting

the office of elder." The committee had, therefore, "given it up," but not so the Assembly. It pounced upon the conundrum with true Presbyterian instinct, and the style in which it attacked the momentous question and brandished that chosen weapon of Presbyterianism, the Book of Church Order, was worthy of a better cause. Various solutions were proposed. One was that the Presbytery was in this case the proper body to divest the elder of the burden of his office; another that it was the prerogative of the session of the church in which he had formerly been an elder, but of which he was not now even a member. Some proposed to cut the knot by boldly affirming that he had no office of which he could be divested, while other some averred that, granted that he was in a certain sense an elder, he was not elder "enough to hurt," and should bid his super-sensitive soul be easy. The final solution was, that "the General Assembly decides that, under the circumstances stated, the ruling elder may be divested of his office without process or censure. The session of the church of which he is a private member is the proper body to divest him of his office." This reply was based on the recognized principles of our polity, which affirm the perpetuity of office in the church, the right of divestiture without censure, the primary responsibility of a member of a church to the session of the church, and upon the explicit provision of the Book of Church Order, Chap. XII., Sec. III., Par. 236, of Rules of Discipline, wherein, after stating how a minister of the gospel may be divested of his office without censure, it goes on to say: "This provision shall in like manner apply *mutatis mutandis* to the case of ruling elders and deacons; but in all such cases the session of the church to which the elder or the deacon who seeks demission belongs shall act as the Presbytery acts in similar cases where a minister is concerned." In justice to the Committee of Bills and Overtures, it should be said that a member of the committee remarked privately that the copy of the Book of Church Order consulted by the committee did not contain this provision. It may therefore be stated that this provision did not exist in the Book of Church Order as adopted in 1879, but was added as an amendment in 1884.

On the whole, this does not seem to have been so favorable a season for overtures as in some previous years. The crop, however, was not to be despised. The most prolific source proved to be the statistical tables. The number of things desired by various Presbyteries to be set down in these long-suffering statistical tables was startling, and the only explanation conceivable for this high-wrought, *figurative* state

of mind throughout the church is to be found in the recollection that this is the year for taking the census, when the very demon of statistics is abroad in the land. Our old friend, too, that asks for the free distribution of the Minutes of the Assembly to all the ministers and to the sessions of vacant churches came up smiling, and the Stated Clerk of the Assembly came up just as smiling to make his annual speech and to tell us how the Assembly had once yielded to the oft-repeated blandishments of this seductive suitor, and completely swamped the treasury. But there are some overtures that have more lives than a certain domestic animal of which we have all read, and we feel confident that this overture will not be discouraged, but will make its appearance, and positively not its last, at the next Assembly. The object the overture desires to compass deserves serious consideration. It is a lamentable fact that comparatively few copies of the Minutes find their way into the hands of our ministers and elders, while it probably occurs to few private members to possess themselves of these records. In consequence of this, many of the suggestions and recommendations of the Assembly never come to the knowledge of the persons they are intended to affect. It is true that the Presbyteries have committees on the Minutes, whose duty it is to bring to their attention the recommendations of the Assembly, but this is not sufficient. Might it not be wise for either the Assembly or the Presbyteries to issue a pastoral letter, to be read in all the churches, in which, in brief space, all the important counsels and requirements of the Assembly could be presented?

In the briefest way possible sundry actions of the Assembly must now be mentioned. The American Bible Society was recognized as a valuable aid in evangelizing the world, was commended to the churches for an annual contribution, a place given this contribution in the statistical tables, and provision made for the appointment of a standing committee on the Bible work. The Home Missions Committee was authorized to begin the publication of a monthly periodical under the title of *The Home Missionary*, and one number per month of *The Children's Friend* was directed to be devoted to the subject of Foreign Missions. The schedule of collections adopted last year was continued, though strong opposition to it on several grounds was developed by overtures from Presbyteries and by members on the floor. A committee was appointed to raise our proportion of the expenses of the western section of the Executive Commission of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches. Delegates were elected to a Peace Congress, to be held in

1891, an act which hardly consists with the principles and precedents of our church. But time and space fail me for the mention even of all that the Assembly did. Enough to say that all the great interests of the church received most serious attention, and the spirit of missions at home and abroad was characteristic of the body. It was an earnest, conservative, and yet aggressive Assembly. Pleasant memories of the few days the body was in session will brighten the days to come. Apologies are seldom in place, but the writer of this sketch may be allowed to say to the brethren of the Assembly that he has been compelled to write *currente calamo*, and with little opportunity for the needful revision, of which there is so much "in the air." He could wish that so worthy an Assembly had found a more worthy chronicler.

C. R. HEMPHILL.

---

### THE NORTHERN ASSEMBLY.

THE General Assembly which has just closed its sessions at Saratoga will be memorable in the history of the Presbyterian Church. The great question before it was that of revising the doctrinal statements of the Westminster Confession of Faith. This had been precipitated upon the church by the surprising action of the last Assembly, in transmitting to the Presbyteries an overture on the subject. Widespread and acrimonious discussion ensued, extreme utterances were made, the Confession of Faith was assailed by its plighted defenders in terms common to the Arminian, the Socinian, and the Pelagian. How was it that this portentous revolution suddenly threatened us? Who would have thought, two years ago, when the Centennial of Presbyterianism was celebrated in Philadelphia, that we would so soon find the foundations of our standards shaken? Three causes have contributed to this. First, the character of the reunion of Old and New School. Fifty years ago, the Presbyterian Church was rent in twain by a controversy, largely doctrinal. Some of the now current questions were then disputed. The reunion was effected, not on doctrinal lines, but in a burst of political enthusiasm. A great and reunited country, it was said, has been secured, and now there must be a great and reunited church to go in and possess the land. But at length politics has receded before doctrine, and the issue is forced upon it, whether the church is at one in its faith. It is not intimated that either of the former parties is responsible for this. Members of

each are found on both sides of the present question. But it is suggested that doctrine was lightly regarded in the reunion, and has now returned "to plague us." She avenges herself of our neglect.

The second cause of our present discontent is that the doctrines of the Westminster Confession have been allowed, in a measure, to drop out of sight. For thirty years they have not been, so generally as before, preached from our pulpits, or taught our children and youth in the family, the church, or the Sunday-school. A generation has grown up in ignorance of these distinctive truths; a generation which has been fed not upon the "strong meat" of doctrine, but on "milk for babes," and that not "the sincere milk of the word," but diluted with the turbid water of human opinion. The result is that the people reject solid food; they have lost robustness of digestion; they clamor for the sweetmeats of sentiment, the syllabub of frothy declamation, and the confection of anecdote; their appetite is weak as their digestion; they want nothing strong, but only what is soft and smooth and sugar-coated. These strictures are not applicable to all our congregations, many of whom "hear the word gladly;" neither is it true that all ministers have omitted doctrinal instruction. But the stream of tendency is towards this stagnant pool. Some of us have suffered ourselves to be insulted in our pulpits, in the presence of our congregations, by peripatetic, so-called evangelists, as they ignorantly and insolently heaped ridicule upon "dogma," by which term they contemptuously style the glorious doctrines of grace. Seeing our passive acquiescence, the people have come to despise doctrine, and the fear is felt that the church may be honey-combed with disbelief of the Calvinistic system.

The third evil influence is "the spirit of the age." This spirit is the "prince of the power of the air," the same spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience and unbelief. "It is remarkable," says Thornwell, "that, in the nineteenth century of the Christian era, we have fallen on an age which corresponds in many particulars with the state of heathen speculation at the inauguration of the gospel. In the schools of Athens no subjects were too sacred for discussion, too profound for inquiry, or so sublime and mysterious as to awe the efforts of vain curiosity." At the same time the most flippant conceits, the most prurient gossip, and pleasures, whether refined or gross, were indulged in with unbounded license. The Epicureans and Stoics who encountered St. Paul are perpetuated still by two developments of modern civilization, the one luxurious, licentious, materialistic; the other skeptical, either cold and critical, or else ribald and scoffing.

Such an age is impatient of restraint on thought or passion, and, refusing to submit to God's word, brings all things to the test of its own crude opinions. But the present age has engendered a fouler brood than confronted Paul. The Athenian philosophers were strangers and open enemies of Christianity, while the most deadly of our foes are of our own household. It is not from avowed antagonists, but from secret traitors; not from opposition, but corruption, that the religion of Christ suffers most to-day. Calvinism, being the most stalwart form in which divine truth presents itself, must ever be the main point of attack and defence. If it can be dislodged from the faith of men, the overthrow of all weaker systems will be an easy task. Hence the spirit of the age, sensual and atheistic, masses its forces against this mighty bulwark. Faint hearts within the fortress tremble at the shout of its foes, and would yield to the challenge, "down with the blue banner." The Assembly of 1889 weakly gave way and precipitated the church into a controversy on some of the vital principles of its Confession. As reports came in that a large majority of the Presbyteries had declared for revision, the awful shadow of schism was projected upon our faith.

The General Assembly of 1890 will be memorable in history, because here the antagonistic forces first met on a broad field, and because the danger of "false doctrine, heresy, and schism" were, for a time at least, averted. The commissioners gathered with anxious hearts, some resolved to conserve the doctrinal standards in their integrity, others determined to relax the bonds of the Confession.

The first trial of strength occurred in the election of moderator. The anti-revisionists did not nominate one of their number, but contented themselves with dictating the choice of the other side. Next came the report of the committee appointed in 1887 and continued by the two subsequent Assemblies, "on methods of effecting changes in the Confession of Faith and the Constitution of the Church." The method proposed in this report seemed to the conservatives to make revision too easy; hence it was opposed by them, and thereupon occurred the longest and ablest debate of the sessions, (the speeches of Dr. R. M. Patterson and Mr. George Junkin, of Philadelphia, were notable), after which the report was sent back to the committee, enlarged by the addition of seven new members, among whom were several strong conservatives. This large committee of twelve reached a harmonious conclusion, and its report was almost unanimously adopted by the Assembly. The report declares: "That this church has always



emphasized doctrine as being the vital element in the body ecclesiastic, and that therefore changes or alterations in the Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms should be made under greater restrictions than changes or alterations in the Form of Government, the Book of Discipline, and the Directory for Worship." In order to provide in definite terms the proper method of such amendments to the several standards, the committee recommended that an overture be transmitted to the Presbyteries for their action, proposing that alterations in the Form of Government, the Book of Discipline, and the Directory for Worship may be proposed by the General Assembly, but shall require the approval of a majority of the Presbyteries. Changes in the Confession of Faith are much more carefully guarded. The General Assembly may propose them, but they cannot be transmitted to the Presbyteries until considered by a large committee for a year, and acted upon favorably by the next Assembly. Two-thirds of the Presbyteries must approve, and the following Assembly must enact the same before the proposed alteration can become obligatory. The provision of the adopting act is, however, left in force by which two-thirds of the Presbyteries may propose changes to the General Assembly, which body may approve and enact the same. In case one-third of the Presbyteries propose an amendment it shall be obligatory on the Assembly to transmit the overture subject to the above provisions. This skilfully drawn report, by its several provisions, satisfied all parties. Macaulay says that the Act of Parliament dethroning James II. was so adroitly drawn that each clause gained votes; some by its reference to the king's violation of the statutes of the realm; others to "the instigation of the devil;" still others by an allusion to papal influence; while many scrupulous royalists were secured by the statement of the fact that the king had abdicated. Thus in the matter before us some were won by the two-thirds rule, others by the Assembly's proposing power, others by its enacting power, others by the intervention of a committee and the delay of two years and the action of three Assemblies, others by the shorter method of proposal by two-thirds of the Presbyteries and enactment by one Assembly, others by the power granted one-third of the Presbyteries to demand from the Assembly the submission of an overture, and others finally by the application of the majority rule to changes in polity. All opinions were merged in the result.

Revision proper came before the Assembly on the report of the committee to which were referred the answers of the Presbyteries

to the overture from the last Assembly. Dr. Patton was chairman, and presented a careful analysis of the vote, from which it appeared that while a majority of the Presbyteries were favorable to revision, a still larger majority was opposed to such revision as would touch the Calvinistic doctrines, and a large majority opposed to any revision whatever. These figures had a thrilling interest when read amid the profound silence of the Assembly, and have a permanent historical value—one hundred and thirty-four Presbyteries voted for revision; one hundred and thirty-seven voted against doctrinal revision, and sixty-eight voted no revision. Thus each side was in the majority, and each in the minority. Revisionists had a majority in one view, but were in the minority in another. The current in the Assembly was in the orthodox direction. It was curious to notice the desire of members to have their Presbyteries counted as opposed to impairing the Calvinistic creed. Once—but once—a venomous hiss ran through the body—like that of the sacred geese that guarded Rome. It was provoked by a supposed attack on Calvinism.

The great Presbytery of New York, which had for months posed before the church in so arrogant an attitude, occupied a very small place at the Assembly, while Princeton came to the front in the person of President Patton, who, in an Assembly comprised so largely of able and distinguished men, was "*facile princeps*." No man so commanded the attention of the Assembly, no one exercised such a controlling influence over its deliberations. He was opposed to revision, but yielded to the voice of the Presbyteries in favor of it, yet resolved if possible to restrict it to matters not affecting the integrity of doctrine. Some staunch conservatives were opposed to compromise. Dr. Patton took the responsibility of advocating it. Like some great commander on the eve of a decisive engagement, he pondered deeply, as with an old friend he paced to and fro in the streets of Saratoga during the hours of the evening, preparing himself for the crucial test of the morrow. Few knew of the conclusion he had reached, and when he stood the next morning on the platform before the crowded house, the suppressed excitement of the Assembly was painful. That moment and the words that would wing his thoughts, had an awful significance. They would conduct to harmony, or they would rend the church. Seldom has one man committed to him such power for good or evil. It was, perhaps, the supreme hour of his life. He was equal to the great occasion. His speech was a model of terseness, clearness, and force. He offered a compromise which all could accept without

sacrifice of principle, to-wit: That those opposed to revision should bow to the will of the majority of the Presbyteries in favor of some revision, and that those desiring revision should submit to the majority of the Presbyteries which had declared against altering the doctrines of the church. The effect was electrical and overwhelming; the whole mass of members and visitors was moved by a common impulse; round after round of applause burst forth; all felt that Scylla and Charybdis were both evaded at least for that voyage, and that the vessel was sailing in the open sea. Other speeches from both sides followed in the same conciliatory tone.

The measure as ultimately agreed upon provided for a committee composed of fifteen ministers and ten elders, to be called "The Assembly's Committee on Revision of the Confession of Faith," which "shall consider the answers of the Presbyteries to the overture from the Assembly of 1889, and report to the General Assembly of 1891 such alterations and amendments to the Confession of Faith as in their judgment may be deemed desirable." Thus much was conceded to the revisionists. Then followed the stringent instructions to this committee by which the conservatives guarded the safety of doctrine. They were given in these terms: <sup>1</sup>

"Whereas sixty-eight Presbyteries have answered 'No' to the question whether they desire revision, and sixty-nine Presbyteries of those answering 'Yes' have expressly said that they desire no change in the Confession of Faith to be made that impairs the integrity of the system of doctrine taught therein, therefore,

*Resolved*, That this Committee on Revision be, and hereby are, instructed that they shall not propose any alterations or amendments that will in any way impair the integrity of the Reformed or Calvinistic system of doctrine taught in the Confession of Faith."

This was unanimously adopted, the Assembly thereby affirming its adhesion to the present doctrinal standards. It is sought to break the force of this utterance by reference to the action in a "consensus creed." This is not a "new creed"; that project was buried out of sight by the votes of the Presbyteries, only ten of which favored it. There is no purpose of favoring a substitute for the Westminster standards, or an alternate creed, but simply a convenient statement by the Reformed churches of their common faith, for use specially in mission work. This is evident from the report of the Committee on

---

<sup>1</sup> A later examination of the replies of the Presbyteries shows that *ninety-two*, instead of sixty-nine, expressly ask that no change be made that will impair the Confession's system of doctrine.—Ed.

Bills and Overtures, the adoption of which constituted the action of the Assembly on the subject.

*“Report on a Consensus Creed.*—All overtures on a new and Consensus Creed shall be referred to a committee of nine, who shall invite the coöperation of the Reformed Churches throughout the World holding the Presbyterian System to prepare a short creed containing the essential articles of the Westminster Confession, to be used as the common creed of these churches, not as a substitute for the creed of any particular denomination, but to supplement it for the common work of the church, especially in mission fields, and shall report to the next Assembly for its consideration, and that the Moderator of the Assembly be its chairman.”

Whatever may be said of the wisdom or practicability of this measure, and although extreme revisionists may regard it as a “sop to Cerberus,” the fact remains that the Assembly, in passing this measure, had in view, not the matter of revision, but of a closer union with those of its own household. At any rate, it may be consigned to the limbo where, in the opinion of some, revision is safely interred. One of the ablest anti-revisionists said publicly that while he disapproved of the appointment of the committee on revision, he would not oppose it for the reason that he felt sure nothing would come of it, because the committee, the Assembly and the church would never be able to agree on any particular terms of revision. Much more skeptical might one feel as to the agreement of all the Reformed Churches in any new formula. Some of them may decline to enter on the subject; negotiations between those consenting may be indefinitely prolonged, and finally end in their agreeing to do nothing. As the six famous physicians in consultation at the death-bed of Charles II. were unable to agree upon a prescription for his majesty other than “a glass of water,” so the learned doctors of this committee may unite only in a like limpid solution.

Dr. Henry J. Van Dyke, although strongly in favor of revision, but not of revision run mad, distinguished himself by his moderation, as well as by his trenchant power in debate. His amusing picture of “the revision train starting from Saratoga and stopping at Princeton for passengers, but not for refreshments,” was a little marred by the unexpected leap of Princeton to the conductor’s platform, and his cry of “show your tickets,” as well as by the loading of the train with Princeton ideas.

The mention of the honored names of Dr. Patton and Dr. Van Dyke transports me to “the times that tried men’s souls,” when I first knew them, and received kindness never to be forgotten. Entrusted

as they are, along with other wise men, with the future of revision, I do not doubt that they will add to their fame, and confer lasting benefits on the church, by confining alterations in the Confession of Faith to points which will not touch the doctrines they preach and love. They are skilful navigators, and though one may wish to spread too much sail, we feel safe while the other has his hand on the helm.

The Board of Publication was the innocent occasion of strife. A committee of five had been appointed by the last Assembly to act in conjunction with the Business Committee of the Board, and to report on the feasibility of its printing as well as publishing, and on other-wise cheapening production. The members of the special committee were supposed to be experts, but in fact only one of them had any knowledge of book printing or publishing, and he had failed of success, and is now earning his bread in a different business. It was intended that the two committees of the Assembly and of the Board should coöperate in the investigations in a friendly manner, and it was expressly ordered that they should make a joint report. Instead of obeying these positive instructions of the Assembly which appointed it, this committee of obscure and incompetent persons assumed from the outset an insulting attitude towards the Business Committee of the Board, which is composed of gentlemen of the highest character and of conspicuous business capacity. The latter were refused a full conference, and never saw the report of the special committee until it was presented to the Assembly, and scattered by the mails throughout the church. The members of the Assembly were button-holed and plied with malicious charges against the business management of the Board. Under the influence of these slanders the Assembly was prepared to accept the most damaging statements against one of its most useful institutions. It was a strange spectacle; a large number of the leading ministers and elders of Philadelphia were by this infamous report arraigned before the bar of the Assembly and denounced as incapable, if not dishonest. Had these charges been true, the Assembly should have felt shame and sorrow at the dishonor to the church. Instead of this, shouts of levity and derision welcomed the indictment. Even this report admitted that the book-keeping of the Board's business was most perfect and transparent. As soon as the Board could obtain a hearing, every charge was effectually disposed of, and the Board vindicated, while the authors of the libel were covered with confusion. Confident in its own integrity and efficiency, the Board requested the Assembly to appoint a committee, composed of eminent publishers and

other widely-known business men, which should investigate these charges. I venture the prediction, that they will not only be disproved, but that their reckless authors will be held up to the contempt of the public opinion which they have so grossly abused. I speak advisedly. It was demonstrated on the floor of the Assembly by a comparison of its books with those of other houses of the highest repute, that those of the Presbyterian Board are better and cheaper. Its periodicals are admitted on all hands to be superior to any others. The profits on them are very large. The books do not show so great a profit as yet, because the new style is in its infancy, and because of the limited market open to them. The denominational imprimatur excludes them from a wide circulation among other churches and the general public. When Presbyterians shall loyally sustain their Board, as do the people of other churches their book departments, the sales will rapidly rise to the paying point.

One of the large publishers of the country, who is familiar with the business of the Board, testified, that it is doing better, in a pecuniary aspect, than could be expected; that the church should be satisfied provided the Board kept out of debt; that for the past five years no publisher has made money unless he had a speciality. But the Board reports a profit last year of sixteen thousand dollars. The error is in looking at the publications of the Board as a financial scheme. A regard to the interests of the church requires it to publish many books which cannot be remunerative in dollars and cents, though highly so in more important respects.

Whatever criticism may be against the business department, nothing but praise was uttered of its missionary and Sabbath-school work. This is its great field of operations, and here it has marked success. Two-thirds of the profits of the business departments are annually contributed to this mission work. Last year these donations amounted to eleven thousand dollars. "Children's Day" is an interesting feature of the Board's work. This Board, instead of a deficit, as is the case with other Boards, shows a surplus. So far from fearing retraction, it is rapidly extending its agencies. It has one hundred and thirty-five missionaries already employed, and expects to add largely to this number. It organized last year twelve hundred and forty-eight Sabbath-schools, into which are gathered forty-seven thousand seven hundred and thirty-eight children, under the care of over five thousand teachers. Measures are taken to increase this work during the present year. In the strictures on the report of the partisan

committee, honorable exception should be made of Mr. W. H. Scott, who refused to sign the libels for which their authors are in danger of prosecution before the civil courts.

The Boards of Foreign and Home Missions were reported to the Assembly as suddenly plunged in great embarrassment. This serious condition is set forth in a circular-letter by the secretaries in these terms—

“The unparalleled falling off of gifts to both Boards towards the close of the (fiscal) year—a time when they have been accustomed to receive their largest amounts—took them wholly by surprise, and left them unexpectedly in their present embarrassed condition, the debt of the Home Board being \$80,000, and that of the Foreign Board \$60,000.”

“The simple fact is that two important Boards of the church, whose work belts the globe, are seriously crippled because of heavy debts carried forward from the year just closed.” It is difficult to account for this alarming state of affairs. That this great, wealthy, and liberal church should suddenly withhold its gifts from these two important and favorite branches of its work is a mystery. Several explanations are tendered. Some suggest “La Grippe,” which has laid its cold grasp on the pocket-books of the donors; others find a solution in the iniquitous “tariff bills” now pending in Congress. But the most probable cause is the revision agitation. The faith of the church has received a shock; its confidence in its ministers is shaken; doubt and dismay brood over it; paralysis has smitten it. The agencies of the church must suffer. Mutual trust is gone. Hence the fierce suspicions vented upon the Board of Publication, the mortal thrust at the Freedmen’s Board, by which the colored churches were virtually emancipated from its control, and allowed direct access to the other Boards, and the implied rebuke of several more of these agencies. To this cause we ascribe in part the failing fountains of sacred offerings.

Not only the Home and Foreign Boards suffer from this malign influence, but the income of most of the boards is reduced. From nearly all of them the lamentation is heard that the church no longer entrusts them with liberal contributions. What else could be expected from a church shaken to its foundations by doctrinal disputes? The revision controversy, as conducted up to the meeting of the Assembly, alarmed and disgusted the pious contributors from whom supplies had flowed to the Boards. When they saw the church tolerate ministers who renounced the system of truth which they were pledged to maintain; when they listened to the reckless ravings with which these

sacred doctrines were assailed; when they heard the pastor of a large metropolitan church declare that he had never even read the Confession of Faith, and that, if the Bible contained the doctrines of the Confession, he would tear the Bible to tatters; when they knew that a professor in a great theological seminary had for years attacked the Scriptures with the feline claws of a spurious criticism; when they perceived that there was not orthodoxy or courage sufficient in their Presbyteries to bring them to trial for heresy; when they caught the boastful shout of revisionists that Calvinism was doomed, is it any wonder that the springs of benevolence should fail in this arid desert?

The radical revisionists were balked of their purpose at the Assembly. The sword of Damocles, which they had hung suspended over the Confession, proved to be not the keen Damascus blade of truth, nor "the spear of Ithuriel which touched the toad that sat squat at the ear of Eve," but rather a blunted dagger or a clumsy rapier.

Whether the measure of orthodox success will restore confidence to the church at large, remains to be seen. She may "fear the gifts of the Greeks" and feel doubtful of measures in which revisionists acquiesced. This war is not ended. The present Committee on Revision may not agree on a report; two reports from it may be made to the next Assembly. This experiment of revision may not satisfy anybody. Fresh struggles may ensue. A long period of dispute and doubt may lie before the church. The radicals will doubtless put forth new efforts. About a hundred ministers annually come into the Presbyterian Church, mostly from Arminian churches. This number will be increased, while the hand of heresy within opens wider the door. They, too, may seek our fat livings, without deigning to glance at the Confession of Faith. Can it be that all this will revive the asphyxiated charities of the church? A preliminary test is ordered to be made by the recent action of the Assembly, viz.:

"That in view of the present emergency, a special collection be taken in all the churches on some Sabbath in June, if practicable; if not, certainly not later than October; and that all the undesignated subscriptions made at such time be divided equally between the Home and Foreign Boards."

The secretaries add: "Surely no argument is needed to enforce this recommendation."

One argument we believe to be needed, viz.: the assurance that agitation against the Confession shall cease. If the harmonious action of the Assembly be accepted by the church as the pledge of unity and



orthodoxy, a rich stream of contributions may flow in. On the other hand, if this be but a deceitful truce, during which the radicals are plotting schemes of renewed assault on the standards, an indignant church may still refuse its gifts. It does not help the zeal of Presbyterians to tell them that the Confession of Faith, on which their church has rested for two hundred and fifty years, is untrue to the Bible, unjust to God, and inimical to man.

Dr. Warfield, of Princeton, who worthily wears the mantle of his illustrious grandfather, Robert J. Breckinridge, made an able report on "Deaconesses," which elicited an animated discussion, and which was referred to the next Assembly.

Dr. Niccolls, of St. Louis, brought in a report on the proper methods of increasing the number of ministers, which raised the oft-mooted question of engaging the services of men as ministers, with less scholastic training. This matter also went over.

Dr. Herrick Johnson reported on the difficult subject of episcopal authority in the Presbyterian Church. The need has been long felt of some bond between vacant churches and unemployed ministers. The evils of the present method are glaring. The vacant churches are overwhelmed with "candidates." The unemployed ministers are driven to humiliating efforts to secure a field of labor. It would seem that the Presbytery is the custodian for both; but, in fact, it can do little for either. It has not the power of a Roman Catholic, or of a Methodist bishop; nor is it even the point of junction afforded by an an Episcopal bishop in this country. Whether anything can be done to remedy this defect is doubtful. The slight tenure of the pastorate, the restlessness of ministers and of churches, the "vacancies," and the "W. C.'s," are signs of the times. They indicate the levity, the unrest, the struggle of our age and country. According to this modern view, the minister is an "hireling," and preaching an amusement. With less provocation than the Athenians had for voting against Aristides, a congregation will demand a change of actors and scenery. Deeper than in external mechanism must be sought the power to effect the change in this direction which the report attempted to vindicate. When the preacher shall regard himself, and be looked upon by the people, not as a lecturer to entertain, but as the messenger of heaven to publish salvation, the present deplorable condition will have ceased to degrade the ministry, and to secularize the churches. Until then, the ambassador of God will continue to be supplanted by the purveyor of amusement, the question will still be asked at the close of

each sermon, "How did you like it?" and worldly-minded trustees will persist on "running the church on business principles."

There were other topics of interest broached at the Assembly, which the limits of this article exclude from notice.

This historic General Assembly concluded its sessions with a solemn religious service, which deeply impressed all present with a sense of fraternal unity, with fresh impulses of zeal, and with a more hopeful trust in God's gracious purposes towards the vast body of Christian people there represented.

When the excellent Moderator, Dr. Moore, uttered the words of dissolution, and the Assembly of 1890 expired, all felt that a page of history was turned on which were written words that are deeds, records that are facts, resolutions that are results. The memory of this Assembly will be long cherished in the Presbyterian, and even in other churches, for what it did, and for what it did not do; for what was said, and for what was left unsaid; for its loyalty to God, its fidelity to truth, its charity to man; for the friends it has won, and for the enemies it has made. *Salve et Vale.*

THOS. A. HOYT.

## VIII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

---

### PROFESSOR MOMERIE ON INSPIRATION.

INSPIRATION AND OTHER SERMONS. *By Prof. Momerie, M. A., D. Sc., LL. D.*  
Edinburgh and London: Blackwood.

One of the greatest evils in the chief departments of thought in the present age is the inordinate love of generalization, which leads its votaries to generalize on the basis of narrow inductions. It would be difficult to find a more striking illustration of this vice of our times than we have in this little volume of Prof. Momerie's. So far as it deals with the subject of inspiration, it consists of hasty conclusions and sweeping, wholesale generalizations, based on the most palpably inadequate premises. The aim of the author is to overthrow the immemorial doctrine of Christendom regarding the nature and extent of the inspiration of the sacred writers, and to establish in its stead the doctrine of a universal inspiration, of which all men are partakers in a greater or less degree. He considers it inconsistent with the relation of God as the creator of the world, to hold that he has limited the gift of inspiration to some while withholding it from others; or to hold that inspiration "has nothing to do with the productions of art, with the discoveries of science, with the meditations of the philosopher, with the labors of the philanthropist." He represents the advocates of a genuine, distinctive inspiration as believing that God "is a religious Being only, and never influences men except for the purpose of conveying religious instruction."

On reading these statements one is at a loss to imagine on what authority they are made. Can their author point to any theologian of repute who entertains such views, or to any of the historical churches of Christendom, Greek or Latin, Lutheran or Reformed, whose creeds can be adduced in justification of such charges? On the contrary, they hold and insist on all that Prof. Momerie here charges them with denying. They hold that the divine Logos, who under the economy of grace has been ordained as the Prophet of the church, and specially anointed of the Holy Ghost for the execution of his prophetic functions, is also the source of light to "every man that cometh into the world," and to the whole angelic host. He is the author of Gabriel as well as of Adam; and there is no true wisdom now possessed by man, or possessed by the sages of antiquity, which has not come from him "in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

Prof. Momerie endeavors to represent the orthodox view as the offspring of a narrow-minded, one-sided, illiberal, selfish and self-conceited conception of the divine character and relations; but the image he has conjured up has no existence save in his own imagination. It is true in this case, as it is in all others, that the orthodox view can embrace all that is true in the rival theories advanced by its opponents, while it adds to them elements without which they cannot be accepted as adequate accounts of the facts with which they profess to deal. The advocates

of the orthodox view of inspiration are under no necessity to deny the doctrine of the divine immanence, or to deny that it is by the presence and agency of Him who created all things, visible and invisible, that all created things consist. This they hold, but at the same time they hold that, above and beyond all this, the Scriptures, which are the only reliable source of information on this subject, teach that God sustained a relation to the sacred writers which he sustained to no others. They teach that, having bestowed upon them those gifts which he regarded as necessary to fit them for his gracious purpose, he by his Holy Spirit took possession of their entire spiritual being, utilizing all these gifts for the communication of his will to men, so that what they wrote or spoke God spoke, for they spake as the Spirit gave them utterance. This fact is a sufficient answer to the argument against verbal inspiration from observed diversity of style, which Prof. Momerie has here resurrected once more. It is just because the Holy Spirit took full possession of the men whom God had previously endowed with the peculiar gifts requisite for his purpose, and brought these qualities into action in the production of the sacred record, that the styles of the sacred writers are marked by the diversity which has been urged as an argument against a plenary inspiration, extending to the language employed. Those who advance this argument overlook the fact that these writers were created, and endowed, and trained by God with a view to the work they were to accomplish. Surely it must be manifest, on the slightest reflection, that in bestowing upon them diversity of gifts, his design was to produce diversity of style, and that uniformity of style, under such an arrangement, was intentionally rendered impossible.

But let us look more closely at our author's theory and at the arguments he advances in support of it. Strange to say, he finds the key which is to unlock the mystery of inspiration in the account given of the divine action in the impartation of life to Adam. In that account we are told that God breathed into Adam's nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul. "What the old Hebrew writer meant," Prof. Momerie says, "was simply that our being was derived from God's—that it was in kind identical with God's. Every man," he says, "is inspired; every man is himself an inspiration; he has been, so to speak, begotten by God; he is the outcome of God; his real nature is in germ divine."

In order to reconcile this theory of man's nature and origin with "the fact that there is such infinite diversity observable among men," our author emphasizes the phrase *in germ divine*. "The mind which any one possesses, to start with," he alleges, "is but the germ of what it may eventually become. Its development is different in different individuals, so different that we are apt to forget their common origin. When compared with men of genius, average men seem commonplace and undivine. It is the former only whom we should generally speak of as inspired. And even in their case we should not apply the word indiscriminately to all they said and did, but we should restrict it to the most remarkable of their achievements." (P. 2.)

These sentences put us in possession of their author's theory of inspiration, and place us in a position to judge of its claims. There is no mistaking of his idea, either as regards the origin or the extent of it. It has its well-spring in man's nature, and is as wide as the human race. Man, as man, is inspired because he is, in virtue of his origin and his relation to the fountain whence his being has flowed, himself an inspiration of the Almighty.

Such is the theory; what about the basis on which its author has founded it? Its sole foundation is, as already intimated, the passage in Genesis which represents God as breathing into man's nostrils the breath of life, and thus constituting him a living soul. It is true there are three additional passages placed alongside of it as constituting with it an apparent warrant for the doctrine avowed. It is, however, also true that the text from Genesis, as interpreted above, rules the other texts, and the ruling is such as to neutralize and set at naught their testimony—a testimony which, on any fair interpretation, is absolutely subversive of the author's doctrine.

Here, then, is the first illustration of the vice of a narrow and exceedingly misleading induction. He has taken a passage from the second chapter of the first book in the Bible, a passage, too, in which the subject he is treating of is manifestly not before the mind of the sacred writer, and he insists on making it the standard by which other passages, in which the subject he professes to be discussing holds a foremost place, shall be interpreted. It is surely unnecessary to criticise the exegetical principle underlying this procedure. The author speaks of "the evolution of the Bible." It may be asked, Is it in accordance with the theory of evolution to form our conception of the mature organism from what we know of the mysterious undeveloped germ? Is it by studying their primary life cells that biologists manage to describe with accuracy and classify the different forms of earth's *fauna* and *flora*? Are we accustomed to proceed as our author has done in this case, in the case of any other doctrine of holy writ? Do we frame our views of the God-head by what is revealed regarding the divine nature in the first or second chapters of Genesis? It is one of the strongest proofs of the inspiration of the sacred writers that there is nothing on record in the earlier books of the Bible—books composed in the very dawn of revelation—which is not found to be in harmony with the fullest disclosures of the subsequent books. We do not, however, begin with the earlier and obscure, and make them regulate our interpretations of the later and more lucid. A competent exegete will begin at the other end; he will take up those portions of Scripture in which the subject of his study is formally treated and expounded, and he will base his doctrinal conclusions on these. Having done this, he will take their clear utterances as guides in the interpretation of such references to the same subject as he may find in the earlier revelation.

This is just what our author has not done. He begins with Genesis—with the earliest sacred writing in existence—and from it, in the face of his own evolutionary principles, formulates his theory of inspiration. He makes Genesis regulate all that the New Testament writers have placed on record regarding the subject he has chosen to discuss. This is what he has done, and by doing it he has forfeited all claim to exegetical competence.

But what are we to think of the theology evolved from this "old Hebrew writer" by such exegesis? According to our author, it was no mere breath of his lungs that Adam received from his Creator. His being was derived from God's being, and was identical in kind with it, and was truly divine in germ. This is certainly an exalted view of man's nature—a little too exalted for acceptance by those who have anything like just conceptions of the divine nature and who take into account the history of our fallen race. It is true the author says that man's nature is only the same *in kind* with God's, but if, as he says, man's being was derived from God's being, it must be the same *in substance* with the divine essence. It cannot

be regarded, if we are to accept our author's account of its production, as simply *homiousios*, but must be recognized as *homiousios*, with the fountain whence it flowed. If we accept this account of man's origin, we must believe that the divine essence is capable of *fission* or *segmentation*, or that it can be broken up into portions and distributed among finite, moral agents, and that, as this process is still in progress, the divine essence is undergoing perpetual and incessant curtailment. Surely no one possessed of just views of the divine nature, and of the relations which God sustains to the creatures of his hand, will entertain any such theory when its irreverent implications are understood. The transformation or the transfusion of the divine essence into a finite, moral nature must be regarded as an impossibility, and is beset with all the insurmountable difficulties which attach to the doctrines of consubstantiation or transubstantiation.

Viewed in the light of human history, the theory wears a very offensive aspect. The portion of the divine essence imparted by the creative act to Adam rebelled against its fountal source, and from him have sprung a race of moral agents, who, although possessing portions of that same essence as truly as Adam did, give evidence of like alienation from God. Are we to believe that all these are simply so many incarnations of portions of the divine essence and inspirations of the Almighty?

Our author, as we have seen, has only reached his second page when he feels constrained to abate and modify his theory. "When compared with men of genius," he says, "average men seem common-place and undivine. It is the former only whom we should generally speak of as inspired. And even in their case, we should not apply the word indiscriminately to all they said and did, but we should restrict it to the most remarkable of their achievements."

Well, these are considerable abatements of the claims advanced for humanity. In the first place, while, according to the interpretation given by our author to his normal, regulative text, every son of Adam as truly as Adam himself, is possessed of a portion of the divine essence, which constitutes him an incarnate divine inspiration, it is only a certain select few, styled men of genius, "whom we should generally speak of as inspired." And, in the second place, "even in their case," we are to exercise caution and restrict the word inspired "to the most remarkable of their achievements"!

Now, these abatements are manifestly devised to help the theory through the ordeal of the crucial test of fact which the author must have seen looming even through, and in despite of, the haze of this semi-pantheistic speculation. We cannot, however, allow our theorist to subject his theory to such illogical shrinkage. He has laid down his fundamental principle in a literal interpretation of the divine action in the creation of man, and by that principle, with all its legitimate consequences, he must abide. That principle may admit of a greater or less degree of inspiration (if we can imagine one portion of the divine essence as better informed than another) according to the measure of the divine essence imparted in the particular case; but, in every case wherever that essence is, and in whatever measure possessed, there inspiration is, and cannot, without doing despite to the divinity enshrined within, be treated with indifference as unworthy of recognition, or hearkened to in some of its utterances or doings, while in its other activities no account whatever is to be taken of anything it says or does! Having got hold of the principle that inspiration implies the possession of the very essence of God, and

having seen that our author not only holds this, but claims that man, as man, possesses this essence, we must go through with these inseparable, cognate principles and hold, that every individual of the race, in all lands and in all times, has been possessed of the great gift of a portion of the divine essence—a portion constituting his personal being—and of its necessary adjunct, a truly divine inspiration. Our author must admit this or abandon his theory. He cannot be allowed to do what he charges orthodox men with doing, to play fast and loose with his own fundamental. He cannot be permitted to make his own selections out of the human family, and claim that the word “inspired” is to be restricted to these. His fundamental is irreconcilable with any such restriction, and, of necessity, carries with it the doctrine of a universal inspiration—the inspiration of the most degraded tribes of “the dark continent,” as truly, though not in the same degree, as the most enlightened nations of the earth.

But even with the limitation of the term “inspired” to men of genius, there is still a grave difficulty to be encountered. The men who have been recognized as men of genius, whether in ancient or in modern times, have not been of one mind in regard to things which it most concerns man to know. On the contrary, their speculations respecting the soul, the universe, or God, have been of the most conflicting character. Not only of the sages of Greece, or of Rome, but of the philosophers of modern times, even up to our own day, may it be said, that by their wisdom they knew not God, and have been in irreconcilable conflict with one another. Is it not manifest that these great facts, which are engraven as with a pen of iron on the face of human history, warrant us in rejecting the theory which claims for men of genius the high prerogatives of a divine inspiration?

There is, besides, a still more serious aspect of this theory which must not be overlooked. If all men are partakers of a portion of the divine essence or of a “*divine germ*,” as our author puts it, the question very naturally arises, how comes it to pass that in every instance in the history of our race, with the one exception of our divine Redeemer, this germ develops in a wofully wrong direction. Even the author of “*Ecce Homo*,” who certainly cannot be charged with any peculiarly orthodox leanings, acknowledges that holiness is so rare a characteristic of man that, in the whole history of the race, there have not been more than one or two, if any, instances of what could be regarded as genuine holiness.

Now, this one fact is fatal to the theory. A germ that uniformly develops in an evil direction must, in its native character, be evil, and consequently cannot, without grave offence against the Most Holy, be regarded as a portion of his essence. Our author seems to overlook this great and awfully momentous fact—a fact to which the word of God bears constant testimony—that man “is indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all spiritual good,” and is, as the articles of the Church of England put it, “very far gone from original righteousness (*ab originali justitia quam longissime distet*), and is of his own nature inclined to evil.” This could not be said in truth, if man, in his very essence, were neither more nor less than a portion of the immaculate essence of Deity. Had our author kept this teaching of the Bible, and of all human history, before his mind, he would never have thought of exalting our fallen nature into the exalted position claimed for it in this volume. He would have seen that men whose hearts are at enmity against God, and are not subject and cannot be subject to his law, are not in a position to think rightly of him, or to instruct others in regard to his attributes, or his relations to men. Any

one who will accept what the Scriptures and all human history teach regarding the native darkness of the human mind respecting divine things, must be constrained to confess that, apart from a supernatural revelation, such as this author utterly ignores, and apart from a supernatural agency, put forth on the original recipients of it in communicating the revelation received by them to their fellow-men, there had been no true knowledge of the one only living and true God possessed by our race.

Indeed, the fact is, that although men entered originally upon their career with accurate conceptions of God, they did not like to retain God in their thoughts, and changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the creator, who is blessed forever. The Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, gives a full sketch of the process of degradation through which men passed in their conceptions of God, and he assumes that his sketch was true, not only at Rome, but throughout the Gentile and Jewish world—true of all nations, however cultured; and, on the face of it, the verdict it gives out is that there is no recuperative spiritual capacity in men to recover the knowledge of God once possessed by them, but which, because they did not like to retain it, they have cast behind their backs, or trodden under foot. It is idle to glorify human nature as our author has done, and to claim for it an inspiration as extensive as the race itself. No man can hold with Paul in his estimate of man and at the same time accept Professor Momerie's estimate. Holding, as Christian men must, with the great apostle of the Gentiles, they must reject the speculations of any man who claims for human nature, in its fallen estate, and apart from the immediate and supernatural agency of the Holy Ghost, capacity to acquire such knowledge of God as will make its possessor wise unto salvation, or fit him for communicating, infallibly, that knowledge to others.

In these sermons, which are simply an attack upon the word of God, Professor Momerie adopts the usual very unfair and utterly unphilosophical method of discussion. He begins with the objections commonly urged against the orthodox doctrine, and from these he constructs his theory. Instead of collecting together and analyzing the great facts presented in the Scriptures, and the claims advanced by the sacred writers themselves, he culls out such apparent discrepancies as he thinks most striking, and parades these as proofs of the fallibility of the sacred record, and, consequently, of the lack of inspiration on the part of its authors. A scientist or a philosopher who would proceed in this fashion in dealing with the phenomena of matter or of mind would be disowned by the science of the age, and would find himself treated as a mere sciolist. Common sense, as well as common honesty, not to speak of science, demands a very different course. A truly scientific mode of procedure will take all the facts into account, and from these fully and fairly considered will evolve its theory. When this has been done it will take up those incidental features of the phenomena which seem at variance with the conclusions reached, and will weigh and estimate them at their proper value; but it will never allow the incidental, however unaccountable it may appear in the present state of knowledge, to overbear the concurrent testimony of the great body of facts by which the theory evolved has been suggested, and by which it has been confirmed and justified. The reverent student of the word will feel greatly strengthened in his conviction regarding the wisdom and the righteousness of this course when he calls to his remembrance the numerous alleged irreconcilable discrepancies that



have been satisfactorily explained by the progress of scholarly investigation. As it has been in the past, he will naturally conclude, so it may be in the future—increase of knowledge may solve problems over which a less competent scholarship has labored in vain.

As specimens of the discrepancies selected, or, as the author calls them, palpable contradictions, the following from the first two chapters of Genesis may suffice: "In chapter first the birds and beasts," he says, "are created before man. In the second, man is created before the birds and beasts. . . . In the first, man and woman are created together, as the closing and completing work of the whole creation; created also, as is evidently implied, in the same kind of way, to be the complement of one another, and thus created, they are blessed together. In the second (ii. 7, 8, 15, 22), the beasts and birds are created between the man and the woman. First the man is made of the dust of the ground, and is placed by himself in the garden; then the beasts and the birds are made and the man gives them names; and, lastly, after all this, the woman is made out of one of his ribs, not as the complement, but only as a helpmate for the man. The Biblical account of the creation, therefore, is erroneous, not only because it contradicts the teaching of science, but because it contradicts itself."

Now, it is a canon of fair criticism that a writer be credited with the measure of intelligence which his work displays. It is also universally acknowledged that the writer, or if you choose, the writers, of these two chapters must be credited with no ordinary measure of intelligence. The subject dealt with is one of the sublimest ever touched by man—the origin of the universe—and it is confessed, as confessed it must be, that although the account was penned away in the dawn of letters, there is not a sentence that is not in keeping with its august theme. Its merits and native grandeur can only be seen in its unapproachable majesty when it is placed side by side with the crude cosmogonies of the heathen, or the cosmogony of Professor Huxley, who evolves out of blind force the conscious intellect and will of man.

Bearing these facts in mind, are we to believe that a writer possessing the range of intelligence revealed in this narrative of creation would contradict himself within the compass of these two brief chapters, or that even a "redactor," gifted as this one must have been, would be guilty of placing two contradictory narratives in such close connection that their incongruity and mutual antagonism, if we are to credit Professor Momerie and Dr. Dods and Professor Huxley, must stare the reader in the face? Surely it is but due to the record to seek some explanation which may save the intelligence of the sacred writer from being sacrificed at the shrine of such ruthless, unbridled criticism. Such explanation is not far to seek. In the first place, as has been pointed out again and again, the account given in the first chapter is generic, while that given in the second is specific and detailed. The first tells us that God created man male and female after his own image and blessed them—the man and the woman. Here we have the general statement without any attempt at detail. We are not told, as Professor Momerie alleges, that he created them together, nor are we informed regarding the material out of which either of them was fashioned. For aught that this account states, they may have been created separately and formed out of different materials. If any other account says they were so created there is nothing in this account to contradict it. In the second chapter, the details, for which the general statement leaves ample room, are given,

and we are informed that the man was created from the dust of the ground, and that the woman was formed out of a rib taken from his side; just as Paul puts it, the woman *of* the man and *for* the man (1 Cor. xi. 8, 9). It is only those who wish to manufacture discrepancies who will find any material for their craft in these two accounts of the origin of our race.

But how are we to reconcile the account which represents the birds and beasts as created before man with the account which represents man as created before the birds and beasts? In view of the manifest intelligence of the narrator we are certainly justified in seeking and accepting any reasonable explanation before charging him with what Professor Momerie calls "a palpable contradiction." This explanation is at hand and is very simple. The ground of the apparent discrepancy is in the English translation and not in the Hebrew original. If, instead of rendering the verb  $\text{בָּרָא}$  in the imperfect, as our translators have done, we render it in the pluperfect, the discrepancy disappears, and the two narratives are in perfect accord. Instead of representing the narrator as saying that "the Lord God created every beast of the field and every fowl of the heavens and brought them to the man," the passage would then read, "Now the Lord God *had* created every beast of the field and every fowl of the heavens, and he brought them to the man." This passage is so rendered in Rabbi Leeser's translation of the Old Testament, and such change of tense in translating it is recognized by Bush and Delitzsch as grammatically just.

We have, moreover, an analogous case in the accounts given of the recovery of Hezekiah in 2 Kings xx. 7, and in Isaiah xxxviii. 21. In the former passage Isaiah is represented as giving instructions about placing the figs on the boil before the king's recovery, while in the latter the prophet's instruction about the figs is not mentioned until the narrative of his recovery, together with a copy of his song of thanksgiving, has been placed on record. This apparent discrepancy in the order of these incidents has been obviated by our translators, who have rendered the same Hebrew verb  $\text{אָמַר}$ , which occurs in both passages in the same Hebrew tense, by different tenses in English. In Kings the translation is, "And Isaiah *said*, take a cake of figs. And they took and laid it on the boil, and he recovered." In Isaiah the rendering is, "Now Isaiah *had* said, let them take a cake of figs, and lay it for a plaister upon the boil, and he shall recover." Indeed, in these two narratives we have a two-fold illustration of the way in which our translators have proceeded in turning Hebrew tenses into English. In Kings, as rendered by them, the eighth verse reads: "And Hezekiah *said* unto Isaiah, what shall the sign be that I shall go up unto the house of the Lord?" In Isaiah, the same verse with the same verb  $\text{אָמַר}$ , in the same tense is rendered thus: "Hezekiah also *had* said, what is the sign," etc.?

Now, by this simple and truly grammatical expedient, our translators have avoided the creation of an apparent discrepancy in these narratives of Hezekiah's recovery, and we have never heard of a Hebrew scholar who has ventured to question the grammatical propriety of their procedure. Their solution of the apparent discrepancy of these two narratives is ours in regard to the discrepancy which Professor Momerie has charged upon the accounts of creation as given in the first two chapters of Genesis. A change of tense in the translation is all that is needed.

## ELLIOTT'S OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY.

OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY: Its Nature, Organic Connection with Old Testament History, Messianic Prophecy, and New Testament Fulfilment. *By Charles Elliott, D. D., Professor of Hebrew in Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.* New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1889.

Three reasons conspired to lead the writer to open the book under consideration in this article with peculiar interest. One was the fact that Dr Elliott is an American. After reading translations of German writers the prospect of listening to one who would not only speak, but think, "in our own tongue wherein we were born" was exceedingly agreeable. When reading these translations one sometimes feels like a person who views things by moonlight from a murky sky; he is not quite sure of the size, character, or even of the reality of what he sees. The Germans, as all know, are great scholars and profound and acute thinkers. Their thoughts as they emanate from their own brains are doubtless clear and penetrating as the rays of the morning sun. But by the time they have been transmitted through the double medium of an opaque style and the darkened understanding of a translator they are frequently dismally vague and obscure. It is to the everlasting praise of German thinkers that with these two apparently insurmountable obstacles to contend against they have accomplished so very much for the enlightenment of mankind. Our English writers, many of them at least, are masters of style. This furnishes them a medium through which their thought can be transmitted without losing any of its original lustre and strength. Now it often happens in the case of theories, as in the matter of ghosts, that the surest way to dispose of them is to get them into the light, or to get the light on them. In other words, a clear statement of a theory is often its death warrant. We were prepared to expect good results from Dr. Elliott's book in this direction. There is also another quality of English writers from which we were prepared to hope for the best fruit in a work on Old Testament prophecy. We refer now to what a distinguished professor in one of our seminaries used to call "horse-sense." Unless we are greatly mistaken, German thinkers sometimes lack this homely quality. They are too profound, too acute.

Another thing which quickened our interest on opening Dr. Elliott's book was the following words in the Preface: "He has followed what is called the traditional view, instead of the critical subjective theory of Old Testament historical interpretation. Whatever difficulties may cling, in some instances, to the so-called traditional method are multiplied tenfold by the latter." (P. 3.) It is time for those who hold the "so-called traditional view" to bestir themselves and rally vigorously to its defence. The current in late years, even in England, and we fear in America, has set in strongly against it. Utterances such as have in the last decade proceeded from Cheyne and Driver in England, and Briggs in this country, ought to arouse every scholar competent to defend more scriptural views, and set him to work. It may be well to utter a caution here. Let those who have nothing in hand except blank-cartridges reserve their fire. The bigger the charge in such a case the greater will be the recoil and the heavier the damage to the conservative side, and, moreover, by such shots we encourage rather than dismay the enemy.

The third and principal thing which led us to begin our examination of this book with satisfaction was the following statement in the Preface, viz.: "This work

had its origin in a plan of instruction drawn up by its author for his pupils when he occupied the chair of Biblical Literature, etc., in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of the Northwest, now McCormick Theological Seminary, in Chicago, Illinois. It has occurred to him, on reflection, that such a work might be of some use to ministers of the gospel, theological students, and others interested in the topics of which it treats. The desire of being useful to these classes of readers is the author's motive for resuming the work and carrying his plan into effect."

It seems fair to infer from this that it was Dr. Elliott's purpose to write a text-book on prophecy. It was a labor in which every professor of Old Testament exegesis would have bid him God speed; for, with all that has been written on Old Testament subjects in general, and Old Testament prophecy in particular, a text-book upon the latter subject is still a desideratum. The writer of this paper had all along been looking to Dr. William H. Green, of Princeton, as the man who, by the soundness of his views, his ripe scholarship, native ability and years of experience as a teacher, was best qualified to give our theological professors and students the text-book on prophecy of which they have so long stood in need. He still cherishes the hope that that venerable master in Israel will yet combine in one homogeneous whole the admirable work of his later with the equally admirable work of his earlier years, and leave it as a parting gift to the church he has served so long and with such honor to himself. For, favorable as was our disposition when we began to read Dr. Elliott's book, we regret to be compelled to say that, whatever other ends it may or may not serve, it will not, in our judgment, serve as a text-book. It is as a text-book that we purpose considering and criticising it in what we have further to say.

Before passing the several parts of the book in review, it may be well to consider some of its general characteristics. First, then, a word as to its design or plan. Here we have little fault to find. Indeed, it strikes us as admirable. It may be gathered from the following language, in the Preface, viz.: "The work, as exhibited in the table of contents, is divided into four parts. The first treats of prophecy in general; the second, of the connection of Old Testament prophecy with Old Testament history; the third, of Messianic prophecy; and the fourth, of New Testament fulfilment." This is a very complete treatment of the subject. And just here, as the author himself seems to have felt, lies its danger. It could only be carried into successful execution by a master hand. It calls for a comprehensive and vigorous grasp of the subject, a discriminating judgment, rigidly excluding the irrelevant and unimportant, sharp analysis, and clearness and conciseness of statement. Dr. Elliott seems to be well-nigh wholly deficient in some of these qualifications. We recall no single instance in which he gives a clear-cut analysis of an adversary's position in order to put his readers in possession of its salient points. And, again and again, he elaborates familiar or unimportant matters *ad nauseam*. On the other hand, he frequently altogether omits, or treats in the briefest and most cursory manner, important topics. Of the justice of these statements evidence will be furnished as we proceed.

Again, a word or two as to style. While in the main lucid, it is, nevertheless, repetitious, prolix, prosaic. As one reads he often feels as though he were looking through a clear window out upon a barren landscape—the clearness of the glass only serving to render the dreariness and sterility of the prospect visible. As illustrating the tendency to repetition, take the following:

“The second mistake consists in introducing Old Testament prophecy in its concrete form and drapery into the New Testament. There are evangelical Christians who concur with the strictly literal Jewish interpretation of prophecy, which holds that there will be a restoration of the Jews to Palestine, and a reinstatement of the Mosaic ritual in a Christian spirit, and that Christian worshippers will come from every region of the world to Jerusalem. Like the foolish Galatians, having begun in the spirit, they expect to be made perfect in the flesh (Gal. iii. 3).”—Page 233

“The Jewish view proceeds entirely upon the strictly literal sense of prophecy, which it reads as history written beforehand. Christians who hold it are, many of them, men of the highest Christian character. Notwithstanding, it might be well for them to consider the question put by Paul to the Galatians: ‘Are ye so foolish? having begun in the spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?’ (Gal. iii. 3).”—Page 259.

This, it is true, is a glaring case. Still it is by no means the only, or the most conspicuous one. For while the repetitions are mainly in the ideas presented, there are a number of instances where almost the very same words recur.

We have said that the style is in the main perspicuous, and so it is. But some sentences are obscure and awkward. Witness the following, viz. :

“The small book of Obadiah fits into the total organism of recorded prophecy, in which we may distinguish, according to the relation between God and the world-power, four periods: (1), That in which the world is represented by the neighboring nations (Obad., Joel, Amos); (2), the Assyrian (Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, Nahum); (3), the Babylonian (Habak., Jeremiah); (4), the universal, eschatological (Ezek., Hag., Zech., Mal., Dan). In each of those stages the preceding is included anew. It lies in the nature of the case, therefore, that the historical dogmatical intimations in Obadiah were fundamental for the latter development.”

“The narrative does not state that Elijah fulfilled his mission to anoint Hazael, Jehu, and Elisha. It is merely said that he ‘cast his mantle upon’ the last-named. Different explanations have been given for the omission. It has been thought by some that Elijah executed literally what the Lord commanded him; but that for some reason, the anointing was not meant, but only what was meant by anointing,—that is, to bring them into the service of God.”

But while constrained to enter up this judgment in regard to the author’s style, as a whole, there are, we are glad to admit, not a few vigorous and graceful sentences and paragraphs here and there through the book. Take the following as specimens, viz. : “Material types of spiritual objects do not imply a material fulfilment,” (p. 60.) And again, “The ruling principle of Elijah’s life was his jealousy for the Lord God of hosts. (1 Kings xix. 14.) Israel had forsaken Jehovah’s covenant and fallen into idolatry. He stood forth as the representative of Jehovah’s claims upon his people, and the vindicator of his worship. His words were few, but they were words of fire. His bearing was that of a king; his acts were those of a hero.” (P. 131.)

Again, there are numerous excellent quotations in the book; but it is not always easy, or even possible, to tell when Dr. Elliott quotes with approval. Take the following:

“Dr. Riehm remarks: ‘Messianic ideas in the course of their development resemble the varying phases of a vital organism. As in the course of the growth of a plant individual leaves fall off and are replaced by new ones; as in the animal world every organ in the course of its development always takes the form in which during its intermediate stage it can best fulfil its design, so also does Messianic prophecy. Its concrete form was, at the time of its publication, so important to the historical circumstances of its time-originated relations that without the same its design must

have remained partially or entirely unfulfilled. But this importance is transitory; it is limited to the time during which these relations continue, and distinguishes the historical features of individual predictions only while the stage of development lasts to which it belongs." (P. 234.)

Here the reader is left to infer that Dr. Elliott endorses the remarks of Dr. Riehm. But, if so, surely this is curious doctrine for one holding "the traditional view."

But it is time to turn and examine our author's book somewhat more in detail.

Part First, which "treats of prophecy in general," is entitled: "Preliminary Observations." It is divided into eleven sections and extends over forty-three pages; that is, if we include the tables at the close. Here our author passes in brief review quite a number of interesting and important topics; such, for instance, as the "Names applied to the Prophet and their Meaning," "The Prophetic Institution and Order," "Schools of the Prophets," "Prophetic Inspiration," "Prophetic Style," "The Perspective of Prophecy," "Contents and Sphere of Prophecy," "Prophecy and Free Agency," "The Relation of Prophecy to History," "Different Views of Interpretation of Prophecy," "Canon of the Prophetic Books."

This, to our mind, is by far the best written and most valuable portion of his book. Had he devoted all his energies, first to the complete mastery of these topics, and then to a masterful presentation of them, he might have done great credit to himself, and would certainly have rendered a great service to the American church. We regret to say, however, that, whatever may be Dr. Elliott's mastery of this branch of his subject, his presentation of it is far from masterful. He has given us notes on these several topics rather than a discussion of them. His notes, moreover, are not by any means always well digested. The utter inadequacy of the treatment of the topics enumerated above must be evident to any one who is familiar with them, from the mere fact that they are disposed of in about forty "loosely printed" (pardon the solecism) pages. Dr. Green's article, in the *Princeton Review* for 1859, entitled "The Old Testament Idea of a Prophet," covers by itself nineteen pages. His article in the same *Review*, on "The Matter of Prophecy" and "The Fulfilment of Prophecy," cover respectively twenty pages and thirty-eight pages. The introduction to C. Von Orelli's Messianic Prophecy, which does not pretend to cover all the ground of Dr. Elliott's "Part First," extends over seventy-five pages, each of which has nearly twice as much on it, and more than twice as much in it as the pages in Dr. Elliott's book. These facts speak for themselves. If now we look more narrowly at this part of the book we will find:

First, That the treatment of many of the topics embraced in it is lacking in distinctness of outline, and in thoroughness. Take, for example, the section on "The Prophetic Order and Institution." The reader was certainly entitled to expect that Dr. Elliott would give a clear account of the present state of opinion in the world of scholars upon this important theme. He might fairly look for at least a brief statement and refutation of the views of such scholars as Kuenen, W. Robertson, and C. A. Briggs. Or, if not for this, certainly for a lucid presentation and strong defence of the sounder and more scriptural views held by those whom the book purports to represent. But we have neither the one nor the other. If the failure to state and refute erroneous notions upon the matter in hand be excused on the ground that the aim of the book is not polemical, then we reply that

this of itself is a serious defect. It is a time of war, as every one knows who knows anything about these matters. The enemy are arrogant and aggressive. They are, in many instances, distinguished scholars and brilliant writers. Any one who fancies that they may be safely ignored has made, in our judgment, a great mistake. They claim to be capturing all the younger scholars. If the title of what they claim be true, those who hope to compete with them must take the aggressive. But whatever excuse may be framed to justify Dr. Elliott in thus ignoring the arguments of his adversaries, we can think of none that will at all justify him in exposing conservative views to the assaults of their enemies by an inadequate statement and defence of them.

Take another example, viz., the mode by which God communicated his will to the prophets. It is disposed of in the following summary manner:

“The modes of communication between God and man are clearly stated on the occasion of the sedition of Aaron and Miriam: ‘And he said, Hear now my words: If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all my house. With him I will speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches; and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold.’ Here three modes are specified: (1), vision; (2), dream; (3), direct communication and manifestation. The highest form was the last, and was reserved for Moses; and in it he resembled Christ, of whom he was the type. The other two were lower forms, whose comparative rank it is impossible to determine. Joel specifies the second and third forms in the passage: ‘And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions.’” (Pp. 31, 32.)

Is this a satisfactory treatment of such a subject? Let the reader compare with this the very able and interesting discussion of the same question by Dr. Chas. Hodge, in the introduction to Ramsay’s *Spiritual Kingdom*, and then judge for himself. Again, “The Canon of the Prophetical Books” is disposed of thus:

“All these books were received into the Hebrew canon as possessing divine authority, and they are found in all the ancient catalogues. Ezra, according to tradition, collected and arranged all the sacred books which were admitted to be inspired previous to his time; and the work was continued, according to the same tradition, by the Great Synagogue, until the canon was closed by the admission of the Book of Malachi, the last of the Hebrew prophets”

But again, in the second place, we note the omission from this part of the book, of any suitable reference to several important topics. No book on prophecy can be complete which does not discuss the characteristics which distinguish Hebrew prophets and prophecy from the heathen prophets and prophecy. Such an omission is all the more inexcusable in this case in view of the fact that Dr. Briggs has recently advanced opinions upon this point which are likely to do great harm. This, however, is not the only omission of this kind. There is nowhere in the book a clear and philosophic discussion of the principle that should guide one in the study of the fulfilment of prophecy. We do not forget that the title of “Part Fourth” is, “New Testament Fulfilment.” Our statement holds in spite of this caption. Not to dwell too long on this part of the book, we notice only one more defect, viz., a tendency at times to confound theory and fact. This is a fault which we condemn very roundly and properly in the radical critics. “And reckonest thou this, O man, who judgest them that practice such things and doest the same,

that thou shalt escape the judgment" that thou metest out to others? Nay, verily. If it is a grievous offence for rationalists to draw upon their imaginations for their facts, it is a no less grievous offence for those who hold the "so-called traditional" views to do this. There is a marvellous tendency in men of all ages and of all schools to supplement and systematize their knowledge by facts furnished from the factory of the imagination. That conservatives are not wholly beyond the influence of this pestilent tendency Dr. Elliott has proved in his discussion of the "Schools of the Prophets." He says: "The first company or college of prophets of which we read, was at Ramah, where Elkanah, his father, lived (1 Sam. i. 19; ii. 11), where Samuel's house was (vii. 17), and where he died and was buried (xxv. 1). This college was founded in Samuel's lifetime, and doubtless by his agency; for when Saul's messengers came to Ramah to take David, they 'saw the company of the prophets prophesying, and Samuel standing as appointed over them,'" (1 Sam. xix. 19.) Now this language may represent a time-honored tradition which can boast of many illustrious supporters, and it *may be* that the tradition is correct; but what are the facts as given in the word of God? Briefly these: From the time of Joshua to that of Samuel, a period of something over three hundred years, a prophet seems to have been an exceptional figure in Jewish history, only two or three being mentioned. We come to the days of Samuel, and suddenly encounter two companies of prophets, not "sons of the prophets," but full-fledged Nebhiim—not "promising young men" gathered into a theological seminary, but men having the same title, and, so far as the record shows to the contrary, filling the same office as Samuel himself. Now, it may be easy to say, but it may also be difficult to prove, that these Nebhiim were members of a college "founded in Samuel's lifetime, and doubtless by his agency." Just as a matter of fact, there seems to be no impropriety in our still asking the question, "Who is their father?" As for the "sons of the prophets," they do not appear upon the scene for about one hundred and twenty years after the days of Samuel, in the reign of Ahab. They disappear with Elisha. If one will read the record as it is, he may find himself at a loss to understand how the expression "schools of the prophets" ever originated. If we were content to use this phrase as we do the phrase "schools of fish," there would be something to justify it. For we read that Obadiah "hid *an hundred* of the Lord's prophets by *fifties* in a cave," (1 Kings xviii. 13,) and again, that "*fifty* men of the sons of the prophets went and stood over against them [*i. e.*, Elijah and Elisha] afar off," (2 Kings ii. 7.) But is there anything in the record that will justify such a statement as this? "These schools were, probably, in their constitution and object, similar to our theological colleges or seminaries, which are sometimes called 'Schools of the Prophets.' Into them were gathered promising young men, and there they were trained for the office which they were destined to fill," (p. 30.) Now, is it perfectly clear that the expression "sons of the prophets" designates those in training for the prophetic office, as distinguished from those who, having finished their theological education, had been inducted into that office? If the reader will compare 1 Kings xx. 35, with 1 Kings xx. 38, 40, he will find that the person in one place spoken of as "one of the sons of the prophets" is immediately after twice called a "prophet." The same will appear from a comparison of 2 Kings ix. 1, with 2 Kings ix. 4. Not only are they expressly called prophets, but they exercise the functions of the prophet, as is evident from the passages just cited. Dr. Elliott cites Amos vii. 14, as the basis for the fol-



lowing statement, viz.: "It is probable that, generally, the inspired prophet had been educated in the College of the Prophets, and that he belonged to the prophetic order; but this was not always the case (Amos vii. 14)." Now, if it be true that no superstructure can be more secure than its foundation, then this part of Dr. Elliott's theory seems rather insecure. Let the reader weigh the language of Amos, and see if he can find a trace of a reference to "the sons of the prophets," to say nothing of a "college of the prophets." It reads: "I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son."<sup>1</sup> From this it seems that what Amos said was, "I was not a prophet, neither was my father a prophet," that is, I neither chose the office, nor had any bent to it. He does not say, I was not a minister, nor even a theological student. If we must needs speculate about these "sons of the prophets," the real questions which invite attention seem to be such as these: Why do we hear of them only in the reigns of Ahab and Jehu? Were they connected in any special way with the work of Elisha? How does it happen that so soon after Elijah had said, "and I, even I *only*, am left, and they *seek my life* to destroy it," we encounter three bands of these "sons of the prophets," one of which numbers as many as "fifty men," and all of which show themselves openly without any apparent sense of danger? These may be difficult questions, but they are at least suggested by the facts of the narrative.

The writer cannot leave this part of his subject without suggesting to his fellow-conservatives that, if need be, to confess our ignorance in regard to this and other points, and begin to take the exact dimensions of it, might be wiser than to put our trust in uncertain traditions, which are liable at any time to take to themselves wings and fly away. The following words of Professor Jowett, uttered in another connection, are worthy of being pondered here. He says: "Real uncertainties are better than imaginary certainties, and general facts more trustworthy than minute ones, in those fields of history of which we know but little."

We pass on now to consider more briefly Part Second of Dr. Elliott's book. This is the portion of the book upon which our author seems to have bestowed most time and least thought. It is the part of the book the title of which will excite most pleasurable anticipations and the perusal of which will produce the most painful disappointment. It exceeds either of the other parts of the book in bulk, and it exceeds all of them put together in heaviness. The title is delusive. It brings up before the eye of the mind fair and fruitful fields of inquiry which disappear one after the other as the reader advances in quest of them. It reads: "Organic Connection between the Prophecy and History of the Old Testament." What suggested it to the author one is at a loss to know. It would certainly never have suggested itself to the reader. We do not mean to deny that Dr. Elliott points out such familiar facts as that prophecy began to set forth the kingly functions of Messiah after the rise of the monarchy in Israel, but surely something more than this is involved in the "organic connection" of prophecy and history. But, to proceed to details:

<sup>1</sup> The Revised Version has in the margin, "one of the sons of the prophets"; but will the Hebrew, which is בְּנֵי-נְבִיאִים, bear that rendering? If by the latter clause he had wished to deny that he was one of a class known as "sons of the prophets," would he not have said בְּנֵי-נְבִיאִים? (See 1 Kings xx. 35; 2 Kings ii. 3, 5, 7, 15; iv. 1, 38; v. 22; vi. 1; ix. 1, in the Hebrew.

Our first stricture upon this part of the book is that there is no statement and discussion of principles. The author nowhere expounds what is implied in the terms, the "organic connection of prophecy and history in the Old Testament." The language is strong. It seems to imply a very intimate relation between prophecy and history. Is this relation genetic? If so, which is begetter and which is begotten? Does the history determine the form and scope of the prophecy? Does the development of prophecy advance *pari passu* with the movements of history? or has each its own law of development? what weight is there in the argument that Isaiah xl.-lxvi. could not have been written before the exile, because prior to that event there was nothing to suggest its portrait of the suffering servant of Jahveh, nothing to call forth its exquisite words of consolation? It is said that the former would have been wholly unintelligible and the latter unnecessary "in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah." It is said that it is far more probable that the messages of consolation were called forth by the immediate needs of those for whom they were in the first instance designed than that they were written two hundred years before there was a special need for them and preserved until the need actually emerged. Dr. Elliott himself admits that "history is the occasion of prophecy" (p. 56), and again that "predictions had their origin and took their form from the historical circumstances of the times in which they were uttered." (P. 56). Such admissions seem to justify the line of reasoning above indicated. Doubtless Dr. Elliott would utterly repudiate it. But he gives us no clear outline of his own position or that of the radical and progressive school. If it be said that he has done this in the very section from which we have just quoted (Part 1st, section 9), we reply that he ought to have further defined and confirmed his position by numerous and apposite illustrations. But, as a matter of fact, he had done neither the one thing nor the other.

Our next stricture is that this part of the book is overloaded with irrelevant matter. It is often very good matter—in many instances being long extracts from the Bible—but not pertinent to the subject in hand. He gives two pages (pp. 78-81) or more to telling us about the call and training of Moses. The whole matter might have been appropriately disposed of in two or three lines. Take another illustration of the same kind. Section 2 treats of prophecy "from the call of Abraham to the giving of the law." It covers eight pages; of these something like four are occupied with an account of the call of Abraham, and a page or two more with remarks about the settlement and sojourn of Israel in Egypt. Another class of irrelevant matter is the analysis of the several prophets. These analyses may be very good, but we see no reason for introducing them. There is no attempt made to determine the historic origin of the several parts of the prophecies.

While unimportant and irrelevant details are thus greatly expanded, many important questions are mentioned merely to be dismissed. Thus the question of the "Deutero-Isaiah" is disposed of in these eight or ten lines: "Rationalistic critics deny the Isaian authorship of chapters xl.-lxvi., and ascribe them to a 'Great Unknown,' in the last period of the captivity. This denial rests upon false assumptions of the nature of Biblical prophecy. It has its origin in the presupposition of the impossibility of a supernatural knowledge of the future, which requires the invention of the most ingenious and frivolous arguments to bring the prophetic writings into harmony with it. Matters of detail on this point are fully discussed in all critical introductions to the book, and in review articles." (P. 141.)

All of this may be true, but the writer is much mistaken if it is a wise or an adequate reply to the argument which Driver, with patient reference to chapter and verse, spreads out over seventy-nine closely printed pages. Whatever else may be said, when scholars like Driver, Briggs, Delitzsch, and Orelli give their verdict for a certain hypothesis, it is not wise or safe to meet them with the "pooh-pooh argument." We venture this opinion in the interests of conservative views.

Again, the question of the origin of Deuteronomy in the days of Josiah is handled thus:

"Various hypotheses have been formed concerning the finding of the book of the law by Hilkiah. Some critics think that by the book of the law we are to understand a portion of the Pentateuch, and that at this time Deuteronomy, or a part of it, was fabricated and interpolated by the priests with the assistance of the prophets, in the interests of the reforms now undertaken. Others have advocated the hypothesis that 'Deuteronomy was written in the year 625 B. C., perhaps by Hilkiah, as a reform programme, and was foisted upon Moses, although he was in no respect the author of it.' The so-called middle books of the Pentateuch (Exodus-Numbers) form a programme which represents the wishes of the priestly party and the scribes. The priestly legislation of these books 'obtained historical support by a pious fraud, since the whole regal history was re-written by the chronicler long after Ezra, so as to illustrate the working of this legislation.' These hypotheses are groundless and arbitrary. It is not inconceivable that the Torah, of which perhaps only a few copies existed, should have fallen into oblivion during the sixty years in which the worship of Jehovah had given place to idolatry throughout the whole kingdom. The contrary would be a matter of astonishment. The Torah may have been hidden by the priests in the temple, to prevent it from destruction in the insane attempts of Manasseh to reëstablish idolatry." (P. 161.)

The question of the priest-code of Ezekiel is dismissed in this fashion:

"What has been called the priest-code of Ezekiel may be viewed as a symbolical and ideal representation of the church and temple of the future in a glorified form; and any one, not under the desperate necessity of supporting an absurd hypothesis, or a foregone conclusion would plainly see that it looks back to the priest-code of the Pentateuch, and not the reverse." (P. 173.)

The question as to the genuineness of Zechariah ix. 14, is treated thus:

"A close examination by men of great Biblical learning and keen critical ability has shown that these exceptions are groundless; that the differences in style and language furnish no foundation for such a real distinction as would interfere with the unity of authorship; that the contents plainly presuppose the Exile; that the dependence upon earlier prophetic writers, and the entire historical basis of the prophecy, are unsuited to the historical circumstances before the Exile took place." (P. 184.)

It is hard to restrain impatience when an author who has wasted so much precious space upon immaterial and irrelevant matters presumes to attempt to shut off investigation and discussion in this style. These questions which he treats so cavalierly are burning questions for the younger students of Old Testament prophecy in America. They are not only interesting and important in themselves, but specially so because of the intimate relation they sustain to the whole matter of Old Testament interpretation. They are, moreover, entirely germane to the subject which the author ought to have had under consideration in this part of his book.

We will now glance very briefly at Part Third, "Messianic Prophecy," and Part Fourth, "New Testament Fulfilment." They are characterized by the same

defects which have already been noticed. Thus, in Part Third, there is no attempt to lay down any criteria for determining which prophecies are and which are not to be regarded as Messianic. There is much repetition from Parts First and Second, as, for instance, in the discussion of Genesis ix. 21-29 (pp. 192-'4, cf. Part Second, 68-70); Genesis xlix (pp. 195-204, cf. Part Second, pp. 76-78). There is a lack of proportion between the several parts. Thus, for example, the discussion of "the blessing of Judah" (Gen. xlix. 10) is extended over about ten pages, whereas "Messianic Prophecy in the times of David and Solomon" is treated of in three. Again, there is no attempt to render clear by illustration the several kinds of Messianic prophecy, as, for instance, the "Typico-Messianic" and the "Prophetic-Messianic." These two kinds of Messianic prophecy are mentioned, and, in general terms, distinguished from each other; but it would have added materially to the value of these abstract definitions had they been illustrated by several apposite examples. The only additional remark we have to offer upon Part Third is that we think that Dr. Elliott has done injustice both to himself and to this important branch of his subject by attempting to handle it in too limited a space. His treatment covers in all only forty-six pages. Dr. Briggs devotes over four hundred pages, and Orelli over four hundred, to the same subject. In consequence of his limited space, almost all that Dr. Elliott has been able to do has been to indicate "those passages which are generally held by orthodox theologians to be direct predictions of the Messiah's coming," and offer here and there brief comments upon them. He would have done much better, in our judgment, had he confined himself to the statement, discussion, and illustration of the principles which ought to regulate the study of this interesting and vastly important branch of prophecy.

The title of Part Fourth is "New Testament Fulfilment." We had hoped that under this branch of his subject Dr. Elliott would have given a careful discussion of the manner in which Old Testament prophecy is viewed and interpreted by New Testament writers. Some discussion of this sort, from a conservative standpoint, is much needed. Instead of entering this comparatively new and unworked field, Dr. Elliott spends his strength in this part of his book in proving that Jesus was the Messiah, was recognized as such by his apostles, and recognized himself as such in combatting the literalists and in assailing pre-millennialism. Much that he says upon these subjects is well said—very well said indeed; but, in our judgment, it is a grievous mistake that they should have been permitted to crowd entirely out the discussion of other themes of vital importance. Dr. Elliott writes as if Dr. Toy had not published his book on "Quotations from the Old Testament in the New," or as if no one would ever read it. He writes as if there had never been a question raised as to the correctness of the way in which the New Testament interprets the Old. Doubtless the New Testament writers need no vindication at his hands or the hands of any one else. But it is another matter as to the traditional views of New Testament interpretation. We had a right to expect that Dr. Elliott would clear these views from misrepresentations; that he would elucidate and defend them. We had a right to expect that he would deduce from New Testament interpretations of prophecy some regulative principles that would be helpful to us in our study of the Old Testament; but, instead of this, he sets his lance in rest, and, with the enemy battering at the gates, rides down those who expect the Jews to be restored to their own land and those who look for the pre-

millennial advent of Christ; he writes a book to prove that Christ is set forth as the Messiah in the New Testament.

We conclude with a few extracts giving Dr. Elliott's views upon some points in regard to which others who hold the "so-called traditional views" may not agree with him.

Thus he says in regard to the date of some of the Psalms:

"It is well known that the Psalms were not all composed by David. The Psalter is a pentateuch,—divided into five books, perhaps in imitation of the Pentateuch,—and the period of its composition extends, according to the opinion of some, from the time of Moses to that of the Maccabees." (P. 207.)

The position that certain of the Psalms are to be assigned to the time of the Maccabees may be correct, but, if so, it involves some very important corollaries.

The following strikes us as a somewhat singular statement:

"The standpoint upon which Balaam stood was one from which the type and the antitype could not yet be distinguished. The type covered the anti-type, and David passed for Christ. Nor was there any error in this; for David was the Christ (the Anointed) according to the standard of the age. But men in David's time found other predictions opening the designs of God to a greater extent." (P. 35.)

The following seems hardly to accord with the statements of Scripture:

"Was the establishment of the monarchy a rejection of Jehovah and against his will? The reason of the people for asking it was certainly displeasing to him. They said to Samuel: 'Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways; now make us a king to judge us like all nations.' (Vs. 5.) It was certainly very disrespectful to Samuel to suggest to him to resign an authority which he had wielded so wisely and so justly, and which the sequel of his history for many years proved that he was able to maintain. It was not only disrespectful to the prophet, but it was also an indirect rejection of Jehovah, who had appointed him to be judge over Israel. Here lay the sin of the people, and not in asking for the establishment of a monarchy."

We had always supposed that God meant what he said when he declared, "They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them." (1 Sam. viii. 7.)

W. M. MCPHEETERS.

#### WEIR'S "NATURE AND MEANS OF REVELATION."

THE WAY, The Nature and Means of Revelation. *By John F. Weir, M. A., N. A., Dean of the Department of Fine Arts in Yale University.* Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.; The Riverside Press, Cambridge. 1889.

A professor of art, and not a "clergyman," one should say, would be an unlikely person to undertake the exposition, in a general and somewhat particular manner, of the entire Bible. Mr. Weir is an exception to the prevailing rule. Nor is he wholly unfitted for the task he has imposed upon himself. He is a man of undoubted parts. He is evidently a man of genuine æsthetic sensibility and of fine culture, and we shrewdly suspect him to be a ripe scholar. The style of this book is in the main admirable, and has a refined charm that is continually making its unconscious appeal to the reader, and yet is elusive and intangible. In this, as in certain other particulars, the volume now under review reminds one of "Ecce Homo." We are disposed to challenge none of Mr. Weir's simple idioms, with the exception of the palpable phrase "back and forth," and only one or two of his

words, such as the adjective "temperamental"; the common, but hideous, adverb, "interiorly"; "sensitive" as a noun; the coined term, "supernaturalize," and the verb "voice" in the sense of "express," or "give expression to," all which may, nevertheless, have come to be very good American. As to its contents, we are clearly of opinion that this startling philosophical and exegetico-theological disquisition must stand or fall with the system of Emanuel Swedenborg, who, unless to the initiated, is, however, so far as we are apprised, not once mentioned or referred to in its pages. There are several mysterious quotations from some unknown source, or sources, which may or may not have been taken from the writings of the sage of Scandinavia. Mysterious references are also made to testimonies of "the seers and mystics." As to the rest of the book we are as far as possible from stigmatizing it as a plagiarism. On the contrary, it is in a high degree novel and individual; and the way of putting things is often gratefully fresh and breezy. And yet, if we are not laboring under an erroneous impression, nearly one-third of this otherwise daring production is in the form of exact verbal quotation from the Scriptures. We do not indeed know of a better compend than is here presented of Bible truth in the very words of the Bible itself—apart, of course, we mean from the author's own speculative commentary on the sacred text, much of which, with all due respect for Professor Weir, we could easily dispense with. Part of this is objectionable on the score of sameness, by reason of tedious repetition. The line from the Psalms, "a horrible pit and miry clay," is repeated over and over again on successive pages. Certain ideas, which recur too often, are regularly given in identical, or nearly identical, terms. The greater part of the author's curiously interesting lucubrations we could spare as being utterly unproved and unprovable, besides being, in many cases, thoroughly unsound.

There are many things in this remarkable book which, if taken apart from the context in which they stand, would be above criticism. Here is one of them: "Pushed to the extreme of literalness in the form of a *kaballa*, certain 'spiritual interpretations' falsely so called, are justly repudiated by the reason as worthless and misleading; for they are found to be even more pedantic than the strictest adherence to 'the letter' which killeth. Nothing is gained by substituting one arbitrary form for another, and the authority of 'the letter' will rightly have the preference over all the vagaries of opinion in scriptural exegesis. But the clue to a true method of interpretation may be found in the New Testament. . . ." (P. 8.) But unfortunately nearly everywhere, as here, our author, having begun well, goes on until he lands us in an intellectual and commonly a theological quagmire. Here he proceeds to subject everything "in the natural plane" to the supreme arbitrament of the human reason, and to resolve the whole account of the creation in Genesis into a mystical allegory. One of the most striking chapters in the book, though, is the first one, where he discusses this matter of "The Beginning and the End," or the correlation between the Outset in Eden and the Completion at the Last Day. He further discusses, and in successive chapters, The Seers and Prophets, The Old Testament in the Light of the New, The Son of Man, The Risen Christ, The Holy Ghost, The Manifestations of the Holy Ghost, and The Spirit of Truth. This treatise, however, cannot be properly estimated by pursuing any mechanical order in its examination. The right order of consideration is from the centre outwards. Certain things must be heeded and borne in mind from the start, and then the mildly oracular teachings of the book assume their just proportions. The writer

of this work is of course a "spiritualist" (he is indeed one in more senses than are obvious), and the work itself, like the entire system of thought with which it coheres, is an extreme protest against materialism. There are the usual references in this volume to lower and higher "spheres;" we thank the author for not referring to them as "*speres*." Our amiable author insists strenuously on the trichotomy, or as he styles it, *trinity*, of body, soul, and spirit in man—but only as one signal manifestation of the larger in fact all-pervading tripartite division of all being into the physical, or carnal, the psychic, and the spiritual "planes" or modes of existence. The physical, together with at least the lower portion of the psychic realm, make up what he styles "the *natural* plane." We are not prepared to deny that there may be a certain measure of occult truth in the idea of physical, psychic, and spiritual "planes" of existence; but this is only another way of saying that the truth, if it be one, is still occult. We are willing to accredit Milton's averment that

"Millions of spiritual creatures walk the earth unseen  
Both when we wake and when we sleep."

We are ready to go farther, and to surmise that with purged vision we might gaze upon them; but when it comes to seeing them with psychic eyes, or with organs of the "psychic body," we call a halt. Two-thirds of this seductive but delusive book, if we leave out the Biblical quotations, is as insubstantial as the cloud-capped palaces of which Shakspeare speaks; it is, in point of fact, a sort of *Fata Morgana*. We do not think our well-intentioned author meant to do any harm; his very heresies are the product of a disordered fancy. Dickens tells us that Mr. Tulkinghorn's ceiling was "covered with allegory;" but in the case of this, Mr. Weir's, new "House of the Interpreter," allegory crowds the entire mansion. We are tempted to whisper that Origen and Philo himself would have done well to look in advance to their laurels. With the possible exception of the brilliant and seductive section on "the Risen Christ," perhaps the most impressive, certainly the most ingenious, discussion in the book is where the author attempts to make out that the three men who appeared to Abraham were three manifestations of the Divine Trinity. Strangely enough, if we accept the plain terms of the sacred record, this would seem to end logically in tritheism. Yet the author of this speculation is, like Swedenborg himself, a patripassian, or what is usually denominated a Sabelian, holding as he does the doctrine that the Trinity is in strictness only one of mode. But the plain terms of the inspired narrative, when regarded in "the natural plane," are never of great importance to this writer and the class of theorists to which he belongs. Much of scripture, as Swedenborg also teaches, according to Mr. Weir certainly relates to what has no reality at all in the natural plane, and much besides may or may not indifferently be set down in the same category; and even where a literal meaning is to be admitted, that meaning is a trivial one in comparison to the spiritual. Like Swedenborg, Mr. Weir exalts the proper deity of Christ, and the so-called glorification of Christ's humanity. We think we have detected more than one hint in this volume at "the doctrine of correspondences." The incarnation was gradual, occupying long ages in its process, and that process is supposed to be reflected, rather than anticipated, in the Messianic and penitential psalms. That process is held to have reached its climax at the birth of Jesus of Nazareth.

The bloody sacrifice of Abel was accepted because it symbolized consecra-

tion of the life. The atonement is stripped of its vicarious character. It is expressly asserted that the Messiah displayed self-sacrifice even more in his life on earth than in his death. The author appears to be a Universalist or Restorationist. The resurrection is not strictly "miraculous, and not a resurrection of the material body, but of the psychic nature, or 'soul.'" The psychic is "the intermediate state." The total work of the Saviour of sinners is resolved into a mere laborious and protracted lifting of them up out of the animal or carnal stage of being into the psychical, and again out of the psychical environment and condition into the spiritual. This complex process involves at once "regeneration" and "redemption."

We greatly deplore the fact that our author's fine powers and elevated culture had not been put to better use than they are in the pages of this painfully unsatisfying treatise, which, like the prophet's roll, is in its most revolutionary utterances sweet to the taste, but bitter after having been swallowed.

H. C. ALEXANDER.



## IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

---

THE PARABLES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. *By Alfred Barry, D. D., D. C. L., Lord Bishop of Sydney, and Primate of Australia and Tasmania.* Published under the direction of the Tract Committee. 12mo., pp. 264. London and New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co. 1889.

The author first very beautifully compares the Old and New Testament parables as to their use and neglect, and rightly claims for the former a more careful study, not only for their own sake, but because they are the germ from which the latter took full perfection at Christ's hands. He next discusses the use of the term "parable," and finds in it a far larger variety of signification in the Old than in the New Testament. He applies it to anything taught by a "setting one thing beside another," and broadens the idea of the parable to "teaching by example." In his discussion of the limitation and main purpose of parabolic teaching, he has wisely indicated those lines upon which alone safety can be secured, and especially immunity from "spiritualizing," in the interpretation of the parable. Following the general definition given, he classifies the parables as narratives from real life, which he calls "the parable in its highest form"; the parable as fable; the parable as allegory; the parable as spoken or acted riddle; the parable of symbolic vision; the parable as proverb; the parable as figurative prophecy. In the first class he includes only the parables of Nathan, of the widow of Tekoah, of "one of the sons of the prophets," of the Lord's vineyard (Isa. v.), and of the sluggard and "the poor wise man" (Eccl. ix. 13-16). The fables of Joash and Jotham are reckoned under the second head. The titles of the other classes sufficiently indicate the author's grouping. The book is highly stimulating and suggestive, and follows a track along which we know of no other having gone. We should be glad if this brief notice will induce many to enter upon the study of this most interesting subject. This treatise will prove an admirable introduction and guide.

AN AMERICAN COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT. *Edited by Alvah Hovey, D. D., LL. D.* THESSALONIANS TO PHILEMON. EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS. *By Professor William Arnold Stevens.* Pp. 103. PASTORAL EPISTLES. *By H. Harvey, D. D.* Pp. 164. 8vo. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1890.

With this volume, the *American New Testament Commentary* is completed. Its several parts have been noticed from time to time, some at considerable length, in these pages. The latest addition maintains the character already established by this work. The entire Commentary is scholarly, yet popular, orthodox, clear, simple, yet profound. In the exposition of passages containing references to baptism, or church order, as one may expect, it is strictly denominational, and endea-

vors to strengthen the tenets of the immersionists. In this, however, it is rarely aggressive in an offensive way, but conducts the discussion calmly, quietly, and with the fullest possible show of exegetical reason and argument. The material part of the work is executed in the handsomest manner. The Revised Version is printed alongside the Authorized, and bold-faced type are freely used to make proper display of the passages considered. No Greek is introduced in such a manner as not to be understood by the ordinary reader, though the fullest use is made of the original in which the New Testament was written. One only objection, and that but a slight one, is the unequal size of the volumes in which the various commentaries are bound.

**JESUS THE MESSIAH.** *By Alfred Edersheim, M. A. Oxon., D. D., Ph. D.,* sometime Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint in the University of Oxford. An abridged edition of "The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah." Author's edition. 8vo., pp. xvi., 645. Cloth \$2. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1890.

The deservedly great reputation of the author's well and favorably known work on *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, created a demand and need for such an abridgment of it as would make it more accessible to general readers. This abridgment was in the mind of the author before his lamented death, something over a year ago, and has been faithfully executed, in the volume before us, by friends of Dr. Edersheim, especially Professor Sanday. In this abridgment one will naturally expect to lose much of that wonderful and profound knowledge of the peculiarly Jewish features or background of the story of Christ which has made the author's work one of the very few in this department that has been regarded as a really valuable contribution. The appendices and collateral references, and much of the purely rhetorical part of the larger work, are omitted. Nothing, however, essential to the subject, or adapted to attract and profit, has been left out, and the editor deserves the thanks of all students and readers. The mechanical part of the publication is a credit to the well-known American house whose imprint it bears.

**THE FOOTSTEPS OF ST. PAUL IN ROME.** An Historical Memoir, from the Apostle's Landing at Puteoli to his Death, A. D. 62-69. *By S. Russell Forbes, Archæological and Historical Lecturer, etc.* 12mo., pp. 92. London and New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons. 1889.

In this second edition, the author, a well-known student of archæology, has revised and enlarged the work given to the public and so favorably received in 1882. The work will be found a valuable adjunct to the study of the more elaborate lives of the great apostle, and as a thoroughly historical study, by one who has made it his business to investigate archæological questions upon the very ground where they are presented, will prove helpful and interesting.

**FOOT-PRINTS OF CHRIST.** *By Rev. William M. Campbell.* 12mo., pp. 375. \$1.50. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1889.

It is the author's object in this book, a series of sixty brief essays, to direct special attention to some of the imitable characteristics of the Saviour, that new

interest may be aroused and old interest stimulated in seeking a greater likeness to the perfect One. In performing the task set himself, he uses a style both vigorous and simple. Among the subjects considered, and fairly representing the general scope of the book and its eminently practical character, are such as these: The Boyhood of Christ; Honoring God's Ordinances; Dealing with an Inquirer; Steadiness amid Popularity; Tact in Using the Incidental; His Silence; "As He was Wont;" His Attention to Children, etc. The volume is a good one to put in the hands of every one who would be like Christ.

**THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.** A Course of Lectures Delivered before the University of Pennsylvania. By *George Dana Boardman*, author of "*Studies in the Creative Week*," etc. 12mo., pp. 378. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1889.

The universality and immortality of the Ten Commandments, their forming the broad basis of moral life, their enforcement by Christ and the apostles, their application to the present conditions of human life and activity, are in this course of lectures most clearly and powerfully upheld and illustrated. The author's style, albeit somewhat inflated, is marked by great eloquence, and glows with the warmth of his heart. The discourses are enriched with many pertinent literary allusions, and are the work of a keen analyst as well as sound thinker.

**THE LORD'S PRAYER—A Practical Meditation.** By *Newman Hall*, LL. B. With an Introduction by *Theodore Cuyler*, D. D., of Brooklyn. 12mo., pp. xiv., 391. \$2.00. New York: Scribner and Welford. 1889.

In the same lucid style, and with the same devotion to the person and work of Christ, with which he wrote that wonderful tract, *Come to Jesus*, the venerable author here expounds the Lord's Prayer. Besides his own views, he gives much also from such thinkers as Milton, Luther, Wordsworth, and others. His rich experience as the wise and successful pastor of the great congregation which he has served a lifetime adds greatly to the value of a work which is full of spirituality, instruction, and wise application. Dr. Cuyler rightly characterizes it as "a goodly mansion" into which he is bid "to invite others to enter and inspect its treasures, and to bear away things rare and profitable to their souls."

**A MANUAL OF BIBLE HISTORY**, in Connection with the General History of the World. By the *Rev. William G. Blaikie*, D. D., LL. D. New edition, revised and enlarged. 12mo., pp. 504. London: T. Nelson and Sons. 1889.

The author's purpose in this work is to enable students to grasp the whole course of history which it contains, and to indicate and apply the lessons which the history is designed to convey. With this end in view he tells us that it follows the stream of the Bible narrative, keeps in view the spiritual purpose of revelation and shows its gradual development, takes advantage of the results of recent exploration, etc., notices topographical and geographical features, glances at the parallel history and progress of the leading nations of the world, traces the progress of religious knowledge and of the revelation by which it was made known, and fills up the interval between the Old and New Testament, so as to throw light on the changes which took place between the time of Malachi and Christ.

THE KINGS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH. *By George Rawlinson, M. A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford, etc.* 12mo., pp. 238. \$1.00. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1889.

A singularly interesting series of chapters on the not often studied lives of the rulers of both the Jewish kingdoms after Solomon's time. Canon Rawlinson has wrought unto these pages a vast amount of that marvellous fund of information, scholarship, philosophic spirit and good sense for which he is noted. The prophetic writings, the local coloring, the life and manners of the time, and the feelings of those contemporary with the events described, as well as the more direct history found in the books of Kings and Chronicles, form the source of the author's history. The book belongs to that admirable series, already fully described, "The Men of the Bible," published in handsome form and remarkably low price by Messrs. Randolph & Co.

THE COUNTER REFORMATION. *By Adolphus William Ward, Litt. D., Professor of History in the Owens College, Victoria University.* Pp. 203. 80 cents. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1889.

It was a difficult task which the author set himself to chronicle in one little volume that counter movement which Protestantism inaugurated in the Roman church and covering the period between the middle of the sixteenth century and the thirty years' war. Huge volumes have been written upon it and the theme has not been exhausted. Professor Ward, however, has done his work well, and ably set forth the efforts of Rome to reëstablish herself after the disaster which befell her in the sixteenth century. The Council of Trent, the organization and indefatigable work of the Jesuits, the efforts to control kings and courts and ministers, the use made of Protestant divisions, and other leading features of Rome's work during this the period of her greatest revival are as fully described as possible within the limits of as compact a treatise as this needed to be for the useful series of which it constitutes a part.

HISTORY OF THE WESTMINSTER DIVINES. *By W. H. Hetherington, D. D., LL. D.* Fifth Edition, with Notes and *fac similes* of title pages of the original editions of the Confession of Faith; the Catechisms, Larger and Shorter; and the Directory for Church Government and Ordination of Ministers. Edited by Robert Williamson, D. D., Ascog, Rothesay. 8vo., pp. xx., 480. Cloth. \$2. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1890.

We "grew up" on this book, and are glad to see it as fresh and interesting as ever, as evidenced by the publication of a new edition in as beautiful style as this. Its appearance early in this year was timely in the northern parts of our common country, and it is to be hoped that many will study its pages more deeply and drink in its spirit more largely. The Westminster Assembly has wrought more good for the human race, contributed more generously to enlarged ideas of doctrine, and aided more powerfully the cause of human freedom in state, church and intellect than any body of men ever gathered together in counsel. Its history is the history of one of the great factors in human progress and spiritual development. May it never cease to interest and thrill.

THE PROGRESS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM, AS SHOWN IN THE HISTORY OF TOLERATION ACTS. *By Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.* 8vo., pp. 126. \$1.50. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1889.

This treatise is reprinted from the first volume of the papers of "The American Society of Church History," which was noticed in our number for October, 1889. The author has greatly enlarged it. It is a companion to his treatise on *Church and State in the United States*, properly preceding it and ending where that work begins. The two together form a brief history of religious liberty. The author wisely thinks that such a treatise can best be written from the American standpoint, for the reason that no other country so reaps the benefit of all the Toleration Acts and has so successfully tested, by a century's experience, the system of religious freedom on the basis of legal equality and a peaceful separation of church and state.

THE HUMAN MORAL PROBLEM. AN INQUIRY INTO SOME OF THE DARK POINTS CONNECTED WITH THE HUMAN NECESSITIES FOR A SUPERNATURAL SAVIOUR. *By R. R. Conn.* 12mo., pp. 69. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1889.

The author is a layman, and unfamiliar, except through reading and listening, with technical theological terms. This appears without his prefacing it. His object in this singular treatise is to show that even sinless souls, were there such, need a Saviour,—not to inquire whether such cases ever do occur, but to contend for a theory of salvation which will still hold if there shall ever be such a thing as a guiltless person. His discussion proceeds upon the assumption that there might be those who would grow into obedience as they grow into accountability and *never become sinners*, and who would yet need a supernatural redeemer; that even if Adam had stood the test of the covenant of works, he would yet have needed a Saviour; that the susceptibility and temptation prior to actual depravity manifest this need even in one who is as yet sinless; that perfect obedience to the moral law would still leave one in a condition calling for a redeemer, because it cannot remove that original liability to temptation which is fundamental in the human nature. The author's discussion is in the Socratic form, and consists of two hundred questions and answers. It may be observed throughout that he is trying to propound what he believes to be a new theory, and at the same time keep himself within the limits of the evangelical faith.

THE BROKEN HOME; OR, LESSONS IN SORROW. *By B. M. Palmer, Pastor First Presbyterian Church, New Orleans.* 16mo., pp. 166. New Orleans: E. S. Upton. 1890.

In his usual felicitous manner, the author tells the story of those great bereavements which have come to his own home, and has most tenderly and powerfully set forth the comfort that has filled his own soul. As a true pastor and with apostolic sanction, he has used those trials which have tested and strengthened his own faith as a means of helping others to turn to that One "who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God."

NEW TESTAMENT CONVERSIONS: A Series of Sermons. *By Rev. G. H. Gerberding, A. M., Pastor of St. Mark's English Evangelical Lutheran Church, Fargo, Dak.; author of "The Way of Salvation in the Lutheran Church."* 12mo., pp. 283. \$1.00. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society. 1889.

The author, in these discourses, treats of Conversion: its Nature, Necessity, and Efficient Agencies; the Woman of Samaria; the Prodigal Son; the Publican; Zacchæus; Peter; the Dying Thief; the Three Thousand; Paul; Cornelius; the Ethiopian Eunuch, etc. The sermons are striking and suggestive at times, but are sadly tainted by the distinctly announced doctrine, fully set forth in the sermon on the Nature, etc., of Conversion, of baptismal regeneration.

THE WORKING CHURCH. *By Charles F. Thwing, D. D.* 16mo., cloth, gilt top, pp. 154. 75 cents. New York: The Baker and Taylor Company. 1888.

Its topics are: The Church and the Pastor; The Character of Church Work; The Worth and Worthlessness of Methods; Among the Children; Among the Young People; Among Business Men; From the Business Point of View; Two Special Agencies; The Treatment of Strangers; The Unchurched; Duties towards Benevolence; The Rewards of Christian Work. The author is a well-known and successful pastor. He is competent to discuss his theme. An immense amount of valuable material is packed into small compass. The author's style is clear and vigorous, and his thoughts and suggestions as to practical work full of common sense. Each chapter is worth the price of the whole book. Its brevity, as compared with such works as *Parish Problems*, or Stall's *Methods of Church Work*, etc., will not prevent its ranking with these in usefulness and acceptability.

WHATSOEVER. *By Charlotte Arnold.* 16mo., \$1.15. RUTH IRVING, M. D. *By Alice A. Barber.* 16mo., \$1.15. RAG FAIR AND MAY FAIR, the story of "Me and Benje." *By Julia McNair Wright, author of "Almost a Nun," etc.* 16mo., \$1.15. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1889.

These books can be safely recommended to our Sabbath-schools and young people generally as wholesome, pure, elevating, and deeply interesting. If the libraries of our youth could be filled with such literature, we should have little fear of an early corruption of either their literary taste or their spiritual inclination.

SUPREME THINGS, IN THEIR PRACTICAL RELATIONS. *By Rev. E. F. Burr, D. D., LL. D.* 12mo., pp. 430. \$1.75. New York: American Tract Society. 1889.

The supreme Book, the supreme Creed, the supreme Evil, the supreme Good, the supreme Remedy, the supreme Person, and such topics are those discussed in this excellent collection of discourses or chapters on important and timely themes. Aside from its somewhat excessive use of the word "supreme," it is a book greatly to be admired for the attention it calls to that which is most worthy of man's thought as to the conditions, the needs, the hopes, the destiny of life, and the wonderful provision made for man's redemption and glory.

# THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 14. — OCTOBER, 1890.

---

## I. CHRIST AND HIS MIRACLES.

“His glory consists, not in being banished from history; we render him a truer worship by showing that all history is incomprehensible without him.”—  
RENAN.

It may be said, without disparagement of the labors of able men, that our learned treatises on the person of Christ and on his miracles fail to exhibit in a satisfactory manner a certain necessary relation between them, apart from which neither can be clearly apprehended. The confusion that attends, even to the present day, the discussion of these subjects is evidence of something wrong in our conception and method of dealing with them.

There is a troublesome feeling in many minds that the best and final word respecting the divinity of Jesus and the place and value of miracles remains to be spoken, and that, when it is spoken, it will discover a new line of thought touching the relation of the two things. It would be sheer egotism for a paper like this to propose more than a suggestion, when one takes into consideration the magnitude of the two-fold subject, and of the literature already extant; but it ought to be possible to set forth in brief, yet clear and satisfactory form the main features of a doctrine which, to our thinking, promises so much to faith in its conflict with science and philosophy.

It may be assumed that the deity of Christ is one of the best established doctrines of Christianity, in so far as the consensus of faith is able to secure a dogma. While it involves the profoundest mystery of religion, and rises beyond intellectual apprehension, it is yet in its relations seen to be indispensable. The religious

world is in more perfect agreement on that point than it has ever been in any thoughtful age since the days of Athanasius. The weak protests heard in unitarianism and agnosticism only serve to show how strong a front the Christian world presents, and at the same time to prove that mere intellectualism is not equal to the subject of a religious philosophy. Failure is written upon every theory of religion that omits the element of deity manifest in the flesh, that is, incorporate in history. And if there is room for dissatisfaction with much that has been said on the incarnation, it is surely time to dismiss as utterly futile for the purposes of philosophy every form of its negation. Those who still cling to the forlorn hope of a purely human history have no adequate conception at all of the signification of history. We may assume with equal confidence that miracles are a permanent feature of religion. Notwithstanding the various and persistent assaults that have been made upon them, there are no signs of their surrender. They rear themselves in the face of a naturalistic science, and assert their right to be; and while science may deny the claim, it has never been able to disprove it. What science has done, as it would see were it not as blind as the matter which it studies, has been to prove the possibility of the miraculous by its exhibition of the natural; for, if the natural were less inexorable, the miraculous would be impossible. The middle-age conception of God's relation to the world was the fatalest imaginable theory to the existence and the office of miracles. It is only by the help of the modern scientific formula of law that we are able to define a miracle and to contend for its legitimacy.

Here, then, are two dogmas to which the Christian world clings as essential to the integrity and continuation of its faith. And the conviction is just as strong in most minds that they are indissolubly connected in a vital relationship. But outside of this general consent we find certain elements of opposition which deny one or both doctrines or the relation between them. For example, some contend that the miracles of the gospel are so much dead weight upon the divinity of Christ, under which that doctrine threatens to break down. It is, however, worthy of note that this view leads sooner or later to the negation of Christ's di-



vinity. The logical, as well as the scriptural, relation between the person of Jesus and his miracles is such that no middle position of denial or compromise is tenable. It is doubtful if there was ever a humanistic theory of the Christ that did not have its origin in the denial of his miracles. These truths are so knit that they must stand or fall together. And it may be stated as a rule, that those who reject either the Godhood of Jesus or his miracles are thoroughgoing naturalists, and admit of no supernatural element in revelation, which shows us how entirely Christianity, in its historic form, is grounded on these dogmas.

As the antithesis of this conception there are others—it is well that the number is growing less—who risk the entire dogma of Christ's divinity on the evidential strength of miracles. Philosophical insight immediately perceives without, perhaps, being able to locate it, a radical error in this view. One who reflects feels instinctively that it is a reversal of the true order to put the miracles of Christ before his divinity. Practically, that was the method by which his claims were manifested to an unreflecting and unphilosophical age, but theology has erred in making that the form of its doctrine. Theology has often been quite too unphilosophical in its formulas. That has been the cause of many of its tribulations. Not only has it exposed itself to attacks from without, of which its foes have been quick to take advantage, but it has also introduced confusion within. There is no general agreement among theologians as to the order of defence of supernaturalism, and a large and growing number of Christians are really anxious touching miracles, since an improved spiritual insight has joined with philosophical criticism to teach them that the deity of their Lord is the first and greatest of all religious facts, without which all others whatsoever would be forever impossible.

Let us, then, get a distinct look at this, the central dogma of the Christian revelation.

We should forever be done with the notion of *proving* the divinity of Christ. As well might one speak of proving the creation of the world, or the advent of man upon it. These are not mathematical problems to be demonstrated; they are facts to be

accounted for. The theological world has too long indulged the *two and two make four* spirit, and men of science are stupid enough to imagine that a fact ceases to be a fact because it cannot be made to fit into a certain angle. One does not prove that the world was created; one accepts it as an important fact lying in the midst of a certain approximately ascertainable order. Nor does one undertake to demonstrate in the *two and two* style the origin or nature of man; one accepts man, and seeks to trace his development through a certain historico-natural train of events. Men should be as sensible in dealing with that greatest of all facts, God in history, the divine-man. We cannot prove in geometrical fashion that he was God, or human, or even that he lived; but we can trace him, and let him reveal himself in his divinity or no-divinity, or whatever he may be, or not be. For it should be remembered, that the attributes and relations of a fact are a part of it, and that it cannot be comprehended apart from them. The inquirer who refuses to note one or more attributes of an object, who denies that they exist when they do exist, will entangle himself, no matter in what direction he may pursue his object. And a complete theory of a fact can be formulated only by considering all the conditions and circumstances of its being. So, if Christ was in very deed and truth the Son of God, manifested in human flesh, then the facts of his being ought to be traceable. He was a historical personage. His history enfolds every element of his consciousness, every condition of his production, every achievement of his moral and intellectual natures, and every circumstance for testing the integrity of his claims. Suppose that Julius Cæsar had made claim to Godhood. The world would either establish or refute his claim by an appeal to his history. No other means would be desirable. The historical conditions of his life reveal the true nature of the man. One takes the facts of his history particularly, and then one coördinates them into a whole, and exclaims immediately: Impossible, Julius Cæsar could not have been divine; the history is all against it; his relation to history proves the falseness of the claim. There is just one character whose claim to Godhood cannot be summarily dismissed on historical grounds, and that is Jesus of Nazareth. One feels: well, here, to

say the least, is a claim worthy of investigation. And as one looks, the claim becomes more interestingly singular. Investigation deepens conviction, and, meanwhile, astonishment increases. The philosopher has in Jesus hit on a historical phenomenon of unique significance. He impresses one immediately with the universality of his historical relations. He cannot be put down as of any age or any environment. He overtops and includes all.

Now, here our narrow-minded theologian steps in, or our *two and two* scientist, and says, We will investigate this phenomenon; and forthwith proceeds to use the four gospels as comprehending the materials of his study. Conceive of an astronomer constructing his science of the heavens of the facts of our planetary system severed from its relation to the universe. But the theologian and the scientist who build or reject the divinity of Christ on miracles or on the gospels alone are guiltier of intellectual folly than such an astronomer. The gospels, the miracles, are but local incidents in the development of a cosmical history. Their office is to centralize the beams of historical light upon the point of chief importance. But a doctrine of the person of the Christ which comprehends no more than a criticism of the gospels, and accepts or rejects his divinity on the ground of miracles, is too unspeakably inadequate to need discussion, to say nothing of its unworthiness to rank as philosophy. It is to be hoped that the world will some day rate at their proper value such narrow critics of religion as Professor Huxley, with his *two and two* nonsense, and Mr. Matthew Arnold, with his literary dilettanteism. Inadequate views of truth are the bane of both theology and science.

In the whole range of human knowledge no subject presents such a magnificent field for the application of the inductive logic as the person of the Christ, and none promises more satisfying results; and certainly no objection can hold against the application of this method to history. The scientist ought to be the first to welcome such a study, because it falls in with the prevailing scientific spirit; indeed, is the only method agreeable to it. In a large sense, it may be accepted, without disputation, that the theory of evolution has complete possession of the scientific world. Evolution is nature's final generalization. It includes all the factors of

universal history. It aims to account in some way for every fact that has a place in the world's being and becoming. Why should the evolutionist sever such a dynamic fact as the Christ from all history, and judge of his merits and his claims by the isolated data of a few miracles, when a glance will discern his universal relation? It is a gross injustice to his miracles to put a strain upon them which should be distributed over all historical data. Under such treatment it is impossible to represent their true evidential function. Such reasoning will lose us all truth.

Nor should the theologian object to the philosophico-historical method in dealing with the central doctrine of his faith. No silly fears of naturalism should deter him from bringing the vital fact of his system into its universal relations. The development of history is the unfolding of the divine purpose. To the theologian's thinking it is more; it is God commenting on revelation. The divine word is interpreted by history. For this reason progress in theology is inevitable. The immanence of God's will in revelation is matched by its immanence in the world. Neither is stationary; they are not complete. Their exhibition is relative to man's knowledge. Their unfolding is with equal pace. When God speaks in history revelation repeats the voice, and *vice versa*. This is the only tenable view of revelation; it is the only true view of the world. There can be no antagonism between a true science and a loyal theology. The scientific spirit and the theological spirit are identical. The *odium theologicum* and the *two and two* disposition are childish irrationalities.

But it is our desire to indicate the way in which the divinity of our Lord reveals itself so as to become for the religious philosopher the chief amongst critical historical developments, and to rise above the contingencies that must ever beset living truths when dependent on temporary and local conditions. In the doctrine of the incarnation, revelation springs no new thought upon the race. It is a centre towards which all historical lines have been converging; towards which all developments have been silently and inevitably tending. The thought is incorporate in the constitution of the universe, and cannot be unravelled from it. He who looks upon the finished creation, with man standing at its head, and

says, "It is good," will one day say, "It is God." The prophecy of that far-off event lies dumb, but unmistakable, in the very rocks. The world's becoming is an ascent. In the insensate atom is inherent the law of upward progress. This law holds in its omnipotent grasp all the forms of the material world. Whatever may be contended as to the chasms which any or all the extant theories of evolution fail to bridge, there are no interruptions to the operation of this law. All temporary hesitations are but eddies, in which the current gathers new force. What does the student of nature conclude? In the first place, he concludes that God is immanent in the world. Deism is amongst the impossibilities of modern thought. Agnosticism will soon be in the same category. It is certain beyond question that every philosophy which separates God, the cause, from his universe must succumb to the pressure of scientific knowledge sooner or later. We have ceased to fear in our religious thinking the charge of pantheism. We are ready to strike hands with Spinoza and confess that he has been much and needlessly abused. He saw, or foresaw, a great and potent truth, the immanence of the creative will in the world. If the great Jew was unable to keep material essence distinct from spiritual, it was the difficulty of a pioneer who blazed an unknown way, and not a necessary infirmity of his philosophy. And it has been one of the most painful injustices of human judgment, so fraught with injustice towards the great, that men have failed to recognize in the Spinozan philosophy a true possible development of a divine personal will. Beginning with Spinoza, speculative philosophy has been incessantly endeavoring to get itself into line with the world's historical development and with revelation. The endeavor, while it may have been an unconscious one, has yet been a necessary one. Of all theologians the Germans have been the only ones to adequately recognize this truth. English and American thinkers have dismissed these profoundest penetrations of philosophic instinct with the contemptuous charge of pantheism. Dr. Hodge, in his *Systematic Theology*, disposes of some of the most far-reaching intuitions in theology with that flippant, but unsustained, charge. It is only of late that thinkers like Caird and Stirling are beginning to dis-

cern the true significance of these speculations, and to see that they are closely allied to that historical development which culminates in the incarnation.

In the second place, the student of nature concludes from the law of development that the world's becoming is limited only by the infinite. He observes the law pushing its way through all forms and across all obstacles. It passes from the rock to the vegetable; from the inanimate to the animate; from the non-living to the living. It pauses, takes breath, and appears again in the sphere of intellect, then of morals, and passes finally into the larger opportunity of spirit. The prophecy grows more wonderful as its fulfilment proceeds, until at last natural history is broadened into revelation, and as the necessary concomitant of this fact, the highest life of the world is transmuted into a still higher form by the incoming of life from above; by an incarnation of the creative and immanent will. The *λόγος* is made flesh. Here, then, is the foundation furnished by speculative philosophy for historical criticism to build upon, and it is worthy of note that modern science has supplied in the facts of the world an inex-pugnable basis for philosophy. If Mr. Herbert Spencer has gone entirely astray in philosophy, it is only because he first misapprehended science. And it is really melancholy to witness his effort to square the logic of science with his agnostic world-hypothesis. Agnosticism is an inverted pyramid.

So much for the natural basis which the Christian dogma of the incarnation finds in the constitution of the world as discovered both by the investigations of the scientist and the intuitions of the philosopher. It does not fall within the purpose of this paper to champion any form of speculative or scientific inquiry. It is concerned only with the inevitable trend of all. That must perforce appertain to and illustrate some cosmical principle. And when we discover that principle repeating and prolonging itself in the sphere of what is too often thoughtlessly called the supernatural, the inference is easy and indisputable. The same thought runs from beginning to end, and unifies the whole; identity is preserved through all forms; each step is a prophecy and a preparation. Nor are we interested in the philosophical nexus be-

tween that which is natural history and that which is limited human history; the junction between the divine will and the free human will. Our aim is to show that this latter dovetails into an order which contemplates its coming from the first. Its appearance is no surprise. Human consciousness is the meeting place of the natural and the supernatural, if unthinking persons will insist on the ordinary raw distinction between those terms.

We are brought, therefore, to another starting point, which is, after all, but a revolution of the historical kaleidoscope. We look out upon human phenomena and ask their testimony to the truth of the Christ. Let us remark that that Person said: *I am truth*. Was not that the statement of a universal relationship? What else can it mean? He is the centre of all facts. They end and rest in him. He is *truth*. The most superficial, the most naturalistic observer of history will admit that in the recorded life of the race, its struggles, endeavors and successes, its growth and civilization, a sense of the divine has been the most powerful factor. Every form of civilization, in its philosophy, its laws, its aims, has been determined by some conception of the divine. This ought to count for much in a philosophy of history. And surely of all childish and insufficient explanations the ghost theory is the most contemptible. But not only has the human consciousness always contained a sense of the divine in general; it has also cherished the belief that the divine incorporates itself in human form. From every point of the compass comparative theology brings facts to prove this proposition. Polytheism was man's first rude attempt to "prepare the way of the Lord." The apotheosis of men is but an inversion of the truth, caused by the limitations of a false theology; or perhaps it is rather the perception of a nearer phase of the truth of incarnation. The essential idea of the dogma is, the oneness of the divine and human. A crude knowledge effects the same by a divinization of the human; it inverts. It is, however, to be noted that every religion which apotheosizes man also embodies God in multiple concrete forms. Thus, in a two-fold way, does blind and groping man reach out towards the greatest of all truths, after which the whole round of nature yearns, and towards which it tends. The mistake of incarnation by apotheosis

is obvious. Lower life is developed by influences from above. Progress is always assimilation to a higher element. The higher descends and lifts the lower. The gods and goddesses of the ancients are not more offensive to our spiritual sense than to our modern scientific conceptions. Polytheism was not a sign of godlessness, but of godwardness. It is ever the cry of man for a sense of the divine presence. But it cannot stand now, after our knowledge of the world has been so enlarged. We must seek some other form of union between the divine and the human; some form accordant with the law of universal development. And the miracle of history is that it exactly meets the exigency.

In his great poem, *The Light of Asia*, Mr. Edwin Arnold has done philosophy an invaluable service. We need not pause to discuss its faithfulness to original sources, or its assimilation of foreign elements. It does, without doubt, set forth in terms of somewhat truthfulness one of the most astonishing and impressive developments of the religious consciousness of man. It may be taken to represent a group of oriental philosophies whose central idea is the same, the union of God and man. Buddhism is the perception by one of the world's subtlest philosophical races of the reasonableness of this universal truth. The Vedas have been likened to the Bible and Gautama to Christ. The comparison is in a sense just, and we need not occupy ourselves with the shallow opinions which find in the resemblance plagiarism on the part of some, or a fancied reproach upon Christianity on the part of others. The world will get past that thing some day, when superficiality ceases to be accepted as reason, and both infidelity and faith will find it disreputable to bolster themselves by trivialities. The resemblance noted lies in the very nature of things. They are developments of the same truth under different conditions. The difference between Christ and Gautama is in this: Gautama aspires, Christ realizes. The differences between Buddhism and Christianity, which are great and numerous, are the result of environment. The central thought, incarnation, is as true in Buddhism as in Christianity. It is true everywhere; as we say, it is an independent and universal truth. But whether it will be realized, and where it will be realized, are questions entirely of en-



vironment. Consciousness furnishes one element of the process, history or providence the other. The first will always be true; the last may or may not, as criticism is competent to determine. It is, however, of infinite value to the philosopher to find the consciousness of man constant and invariable in its testimony. And since all false things are witnesses to the true, he can only be thankful that providential circumstances are bent on differentiating the proper process from the abnormal. We have much to hope from the study of comparative theology, or as it were better to say, comparative religions. While the Ptolemaic astronomy could not continue beside the Copernican, it had yet much in common and much to contribute. Its very falseness was proof for the other. So it is in religions. They have many things in common; and if there is and can be but one true, the falseness of the false is a fact to be noted in favor of truth.

Now, this we say of these oriental religions, that they are a philosophical conception of incarnation. This is the thought that governed their development. With that thought abstracted they would cease to have interest, indeed, to exist. The question that remains to the student is, Do they represent a true evolution of the universal consciousness? His task is narrowed to a comparison of historical data.

It may thus be found that the essential dogma of the Christ runs through the universe; that it is a constant quantity from beginning to end; that is, constant in its nature. It first finds definite expression in the moral consciousness of man, and then begins to assume those characteristics that distinguish it from all other truths while it is also identified with them. The only possible evasion of the argument is by denying force to man's moral sentiments, and that is equivalent to eliminating his consciousness from philosophy. It is surprising with what coolness and utter disregard of results a materialistic science and an agnostic philosophy have done that. They find room for the most insignificant atom of matter, and assign it omnipotence, but yet can see no meaning in the moral facts of life. Man is everything as an animal, nothing as a God. That business is enough to make one lose one's temper.

There is another nexus in the development of this cosmical

truth which presents some difficulties, but need not detain us in the present discussion; it is that between its false developments and its true one, as seen in the history of Christianity. Where does the natural end and the supernatural begin? That question has never been satisfactorily answered. We are only getting now to see that it has been always very arbitrarily and wrongly answered. Drummond's book on the subject, if not entirely satisfactory, is astonishingly suggestive. To many it came as a revelation; to others already thinking along that line, it has proved helpful. The world will go on thinking in that way until a better doctrine of the supernatural is formed. This we remark, that the line between the Vedas and the Scriptures, while not amounting to a suture, as to the central thought, is so distinct as to the difference of environment under which the thought was developed as to make it possible to declare that the Vedas are false and the Scriptures true; the Vedas human and natural, the Scriptures divine and supernatural.

One thing should be ever borne in mind: If history did not pass from the dim yearnings of a falsely environed human consciousness into the clear light of a divinely illuminated faith, it would present a mystery whose grim depths would perpetually mock all man's efforts to understand his own destiny and the world around him. Then agnosticism would be the only possible theory of the universe, and man would stand like a bereft child crying upon the shore of an unknown sea. Agnostics have this merit: rejecting the supernatural, which is first and always, rejecting the incarnation, they are sensible enough to admit that knowledge beyond the laws which govern matter is impossible. We thank them for that negative proof of the truth. They have shut the world up to a dilemma, one horn of which is Christ, the other nescience—universal metaphysical negation. When men get their senses back they will not be long in choosing between those alternatives.

Under such natural and philosophical conditions as we have indicated the Bible makes its appeal to the world. Revelation does not descend upon history; it grows out of it; is part and parcel of it, its maturest and richest development. The Jewish people, amidst whom revelation grew, are one of the nations of

the world in which we live, and occupy the same generic relations towards us as the Greeks or Hindus. If one were asked to distinguish between them and all other peoples, one would never think of naming natural racial characteristics as differentiating marks. Their preëminent peculiarity is found in their sense of God. Of the Hindu it may be said, he endeavored to take hold upon God; of the Jew, God took hold upon him. Through all the vicissitudes of the race's life it has been held in the grip of God. They of all peoples were beset by the divine. Mr. Matthew Arnold has brought this out in such a way as to leave nothing to be desired; nothing save this, that he has belittled the Jewish conception of the divine personality. He has emphasized an effect at the expense of its cause. It requires no criticism to show the inadequacy of his opinions in this respect. Given the unique consciousness of the Hebrew race and the spiritual conditions under which that consciousness became historicized, and revelation is inevitable. And now what was the central idea of that history? What the one current in which its facts ran? Will any one deny that it was incarnation? All the vague notions which lie scattered in the race's consciousness are included here in a definite conception. The world has always discerned this. Here, as elsewhere, the great human instinct has in its first and immediate perceptions been faithful to truth. False premises have led the few astray. The Scriptures are the crown of history, and if an exaggerated conception of the supernatural has lifted them out of their proper relation to universal history, it is a pardonable and safe error. Surely that is preferable to the poor notion that cuts them down to the dimensions of an ordinary literature. In these writings the divine has first found the human. And in them the divine directs and empowers the human. The Scriptures can neither be demolished nor established apart from the people amongst which they originated. The skeptical critic has first to do with a race whose history is one of the most palpable and reasonable facts of the world in which we live. And his reckoning must include, not only the records of their past life, but also the facts of their present existence. In so far as the Jews are true to the idea which made them a people, they are yet a peculiar and unique

race—a continual witness for the Christ. Yea, their very disintegration, now transpiring so rapidly, is also evidence for us, for it proceeds in exact measure with their departure from that central idea. And while history shows us this on the one hand, on the other it displays that thought turned into other channels and fast fashioning to itself other peoples. The idea lives as the pivot of the world's life and the motive of its development. These are truths so obvious that the most superficial observer ought to see their force. If he does not, though he may claim to be guided by the "historical spirit," he lacks entirely the historical sense. Alas! for Carlyle; is it any wonder that his *French Revolution* has so soon fallen into desuetude, discredited of scholars, when his pitiful trash about the "Hebrew houndsditch" proves so irrefutably his insufficiency for historical generalization? No French Revolution, or revolution of any kind whatever, could be written to stand under the limitations of *his* mind. As he said of Emerson, the radiances that emanate from his mind are "thin piercing," and do not serve in any manner to illuminate. They are sheet-lightning, not sun-light.

Let one take one's stand at the beginning of the Hebrew Scriptures, and look down the vista which they open as it appears in history, law, worship, type and prophecy, and what is the figure which looms in the midst of the vast perspective? Could the final issue have been different from what it is? With no Christ resulting, no God-man, must not that astonishing phase of human life and progress present an unparalleled inexplicability?—a world within a world, but with no common law, no tangible relations? Every page and every paragraph contemplates beforehand the coming of the One. It is *all* prophecy. Its force is not dependent on this part or the other. Its existence has no law but the Christ. He rises out of it as the child of its womb. He is inevitable from the beginning. The Hebrew Scriptures are a great mosaic of life, and when its parts are all fixed in their relations the world looks upon the Christ. Is he divine? Certainly; he can be nothing else. He is the answer to all questions, of whatsoever nature. He is the end of all that has gone before; the beginning of all that comes after. If there is such a thing as deity, he is its embodiment, its outlooking upon its own world.

Now, let his career be traced until its physical limitations ended upon the cross where he died, or began to live, in conscious union with God, where was finished the testimony that sense and time could bear to his deity, and then let the study be continued in subsequent developments down to this present moment of our year 1890, and the grandeur of the argument for the power of the exhibition of his deity becomes overwhelming. He is indeed the miracle of history; its law, and its continual surprise. He is history, and history is God. Let us be done with the *two and two make four* conception of proving such a truth. If Professor Huxley desires to put this fact alongside his miserable crayfish, we will pity him, but also will say to him, Go your way; we desire to be forever quit of you and your science.

We have outlined a philosophy of history, a *rationale* of all facts and their energies. Such can certainly not stop short of the first cause of things, God. If there is within the human purview any fact that will correspond to the entire requirements of history, that will stand in universal relation to other facts, there we come upon deity. It would be idle to conceive that fact as anything else than person, or, better, personality. It is right here that Spinoza failed. As we have said, his philosophy does not exclude personality, but he stopped short of it. He was more occupied with the world's becoming than with the principle of its development. Here, too, Hegelianism fails, unless it be pressed on as by Caird, and perhaps Tennyson, who sees the agreement between personality and development:

"That God who ever lives and loves,  
One God, one law, one element;  
And one divine far-off event  
Toward which the whole creation moves."

Tennyson combines as no other living man the instincts of both poet and philosopher. Indeed, poetry and philosophy are very near akin. The insight of poetry is the result of philosophy. Neither poetry nor philosophy can go beyond the Christ. He is the goal of them both. But we only purposed to indicate the *rationale* of history. After all, common sense is the best critical guide in all investigations; and long ago the common sense of the

race penetrated to the heart of things and discovered it to be Jesus, and then common sense did what it only could do, crowned him as God. In these late days it has become necessary to justify common sense, to show that it did not work blindly, but in harmony with the truest principles that can control the thoughts of man; that hard reasoning common sense, with its intellectual honesty, is just now at a discount in our philosophical and scientific inventory, and it is necessary to set it in order again, and to call public attention to it. The world is near being carried away from its ancient orbit by a sense that is not common.

The reader will probably think this a somewhat tardy approach to the question of the relation of miracles to the personality of Jesus. If so, the foregoing thoughts have been necessary to a proper apprehension of the subject. It is an injustice to our Lord and to his miracles to make the latter the basis of our doctrine of his person. It is unnatural and unsatisfactory. But seeing him and discerning the impressive and unique relation in which he stands to history, a relation which displays his deity as any other historical fact is established, we are ready also to indicate a theory of miracles which puts them beyond the objections which have harassed their defenders, and at the same time gives them an evidential force, which is wanting to the ordinary conception. The disposition which has cropped out here and there amongst theologians, to throw miracles overboard, for that is what it amounts to, is the result of that false conception. When miracles are thrown overboard, a divine Christ must have already gone, *not* because he is dependent on them, but because *they* are made necessary by him. If he *is* divine, his miracles are a necessity. To disprove one is to disprove the other. No divine Christ, no miracles; no miracles, no divine Christ. Now, since the nature of his personality is established without the aid of miracles, it follows that these are the sequence of his personality. Is not that the order in which we test all phenomena? One says, that is a locomotive, therefore it will move; not, that moves, and is therefore a locomotive. Ignorance may reverse the proper order, but intelligence never. The locomotive ran in the mind of Stephenson before he had so much as constructed his model. When he looked upon his first complete

engine, he could say, even before the fire was kindled in its box, I know it will move; that is the idea of its construction. To ignorance the movement of a locomotive is a miracle. Mark Twain's old negro thought a steamboat coming down the Mississippi was the devil. To his faculties it could be nothing less than supernatural. The law of matter is inertia. In itself it is motionless. But ignorance does not take into its reckoning the forces of matter unknown to it. It knows nothing of combination. One low law fills its eyes; higher ones it cannot perceive. Above all, it is unable to discern the affinities of law by which new and strange combinations are formed, producing new results. Show it the results, and it will call them miracles, and form a theory of the supernatural to suit. It will not deny the results, unless it is the ignorance of a modern scientist.

When we come to deal with personality we enter the highest sphere of investigation. It is, in its lowest manifestation, a profound and irreducible mystery. But the one thing about it which first strikes the philosopher, and afterwards comes to be considered by him as the distinguishing mark of its individuality, is its relation to law. Personality looks out upon the cosmos, and holds itself apart from it. It studies the laws of the physical world, but refuses to hold itself amenable to them. The body comes under their control, but the perpetual, unceasing endeavor of the personality is to lift the incubus from its body. It is miraculously above all, for we maintain always that the miraculous is simply that of which we are ignorant. One puts forth his hand and lifts a book, or pushes a pen, as I now do; a miracle, if one is ignorant enough, is wrought. Personality does one other thing: it puts law against law—makes it defeat itself; it combines law in new relations, from which new effects are produced. And this is what makes man to be man. The human personality has as *its* individualizing peculiarity superiority to the laws of matter. Its sphere is a higher one. It looks out and down upon all that goes before it. "Subdue the earth," is the behest under which it operates; and that would be possible only as the laws of matter were subject to the law of will.

Could we expect anything less of man? And yet, is he not to

all ignorance beneath him a continual miracle and worker of miracles? If it were not so, he would not be man; he would be a stone, or tree, or brute.

Who will undertake to define the limits of personality? To Newton the theorems of Euclid were as intuitions. Shakspeare is to this day an astonishment. Man has a distinct sense of his own infinite possibilities. He feels himself imprisoned. There are fetters that keep him from his native freedom. He could work miracles if only he could get loose. Physical environment is the *bête noire* of his inner self. He must have the liberty of spirit. And so he hopes for immortality. But we have found the crowning personality of history in the Christ. Supereminent by reason of his peculiar relation to all things, not only does he recognize his own true character, but history recognizes him as its fulfilment and its goal; philosophy recognizes him; science does, or will, recognize him. He carries the triumph of person over matter to its furthest possibility. Standing on a higher altitude, he looks out upon the cosmos and, more than man, holds himself apart from it and superior to it. The occult in law and form ceases entirely for him, as it has already ceased in part for man. He puts forth his hand, and the motion of a world ceases for him, as the downward tendency of a ball has already been arrested by me. It is not a question of matter, but of mind. The explanation is not to be sought in the laws which govern material things, but in the scope and workings of personality. Here is a greater One, a centre and source of law, a final generalization. Here is law in its largest synthesis. Here a true cosmical relation is first realized. And from this personal centre new combinations are formed, complications inexplicable to ignorance, far superior to the simple operations which it cognizes. Ignorance has but one name for these mysteries—miracles. If he is God, as we have shown he must be, miracles are inevitable. Not to perform them would be to have his personality reduced to the common level; to prove that his claim is a lie, and he is not the One of history. If we should begin our investigations with a study of matter and its laws, we would be led inevitably to the same conclusion. These are but indications of personality above. Materialism is nescience. All



movement involves mind. Somewhere law is synthetized, as the movements of the body centre in the will. It is a misuse of language to speak of the philosophy of materialism. Matter furnishes only a part of the data even of science. The senses principally are concerned in the gathering of these data. After they have been collocated, then personality takes charge of them and uses them. It looks into, behind, and through; it searches for the energy that empowers all, and cannot rest until it finds will. Agnosticism is not a resting place; it is a confession of ignorance, and the human mind, however discouraged in its endeavors, can never be content with ignorance. It will go on and on, and, if baffled to the last here, will achieve immortality. But man has in himself a partial victory over matter. If his ego could be extended he might fully conquer it. One thing is certain, it must have a conqueror; that is philosophy's most inexpugnable result. The partial victory achieved by man is the promise of a perfect one to be found somewhere. Will some say, in immortality? But the Christ is no more incredible than immortality. Nay, he is its first fruits, its pledge. One who believes in the future life can more easily believe in an incarnate God. They are the same. "I am the resurrection and the life," is a profound philosophical truth. That he should have raised the dead, and risen himself, from the tomb, are the most credible of philosophical conceptions. Paul had that great insight when he addressed his impatient question to Agrippa. It is an illumination almost universal in the moment of death. "O death, where is thy sting! O grave, where is thy victory!" so said the Christ always. Right here now we come upon the relation of miracle to law. The skeptical world has blundered blindly since the beginning. It has never fully apprehended the significance of the problem. The influence of Hume's famous syllogism is one of the most astonishing facts of polemic literature. If it did not sound so egotistical, we would say that it is not worth the space it occupies on paper. This we must say, it has no philosophical force whatever. To say nothing of its imperfect generalization, it assumes that a miracle is a violation of law. That is enough to condemn a miracle with every thinking man. But the assumption is as false as it is unnecessary.

It is the substitution of ignorance for law. Others have sought to soften the skeptic's objection by contending that a miracle is only a suspension of law. That, too, is a gratuitous and unnecessary assumption. If we know anything of law, we know that it is never violated and never suspended. It is inexorable. The explanation of a miracle is to be sought in the relation of the divine personality to law. When I raise a book from my writing-desk here, I neither violate nor suspend gravity. My personality effects a combination which amounts to a higher law. When Christ raised Lazarus from the dead he effected a similar result in a higher sphere. No law was violated, and none suspended. His unique personality stood in a unique relation to the laws involved, a relation which included other and higher combinations—if we may use language which is pictorial rather than exact, for, at best, language can only be thrown out at such truths. If scientists could see this, as by their special study they are somewhat incapacitated for doing, their stock objections to miracles *per se* would cease. It would be evident to them that their whole trouble has lain in imperfect generalization. There might be yet some difficulties remaining for historical criticism to settle, but all *a priori* and all scientific law-questions would cease to have force; and miracles would stand in all eyes as part of the unexplored domain whose master is Will.

Nor can we refrain from a word of caution to those theologians who seem determined to force upon the world the anti-law theory of miracles. That is clearly amongst the impossibles of modern thought. It is not necessary to the credit or the function of miracles. It belongs to a past age, from which the world has got away and to which it can never return. We object to it on purely theological grounds. It makes God a blunderer in his own universe; it supposes the singular phenomenon of confusion in the divine will; but the divine will is the synthesis of all law. There can be no such limitations, then, as are implied in the anti-law doctrine of miracles. At the last, the theory is a denial that God is God, and that Christ is God; it imposes on the divine the weakness which attaches to the human. At one time in the world's history it was the only possible representation of miracles. One

cannot say that it was then false ; but it is now inadequate, and it is unnecessary. Knowledge and the human faculty of generalization have outgrown it. Once it was the whole truth, so far as man's perception went ; but now the best that can be said for it is that it is partial, and serves only to offend the modern sense of truth. We can no longer tolerate that the supreme Person of history should be forced into such a narrow mould. His deity implies far more than that conception can admit. We insist on his universality, but to say that a miracle is a violation or a suspension of law is virtually to deny it. Every miracle finds its reason in the grand synthesis of law, the will of God ; and there finally must every law of the universe of matter, with its effects, be traced. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." The whole controversy touching the relation of miracles to law has grown out of a misconception of the nature of law. It is not an attribute of matter, but of will. It cannot be defined in terms of matter ; it is something imposed from without on the physical world ; or, perhaps, one should say from within. The law of the movements of our body belongs not to the body, but to the will, the ego ; and we are inclined to think that the best definition of personality is, that it originates movement towards a rational moral end. That is universally true of man in relation to his physical environment. Matter is dead, *movementless*, until acted upon by will. One's body, constructed for motion, is incapable of movement until the will acts ; then it obeys. After the will has passed out of it, it is no better than any other inert clay. The characteristic property of a person is to start movement ; even mechanical and chemical energies are movementless until person furnishes them the necessary conditions of action. Steam must be generated ; the locomotive must be constructed ; their movement is secondary ; the primary cause is will. Within the range of man's personal relation to nature, every force, from the mightiest to the least, from his own muscle to the electric current, has movement which is secondary and subordinate. His will is the origin of every change. Now, within the scope of man's mastery of nature and himself, we do not think of referring the laws of the change around him to the matter which he governs. No one speaks of the law of the sar-

torius muscle, or of the eyelid; no one discusses the law of engine-building, or of telegraphy. These things lie in man's world, and are controlled by his will; every change which their effecting involves is originated in the will of man. In man's world of matter, the world which he controls, *there is no such thing as law*, but only will. We know nothing of any origin of movement outside of that.

Suppose one could occupy the position of the All-Person, God, would there be for him such a thing as law? Law is a sign of imperfect knowledge. Because we cannot see and comprehend the whole mystery of change and motion, we must classify and name the facts we do observe in order to have a partial knowledge. But in that larger realm, as in man's smaller, there is no movement but such as will originates. And with God, if our thinking is worth anything, law does not belong to matter, but to will. It is a vast assumption, therefore, for a philosopher to say that one thing or another is impossible. Renan, in his introduction to his *Life of Jesus*, assumes as a principle of historical criticism the impossibility of the supernatural. He says, "a supernatural relation cannot be accepted as such," and "it always implies credulity or imposture." That is, man's ignorance is the measure of God's working. His ignorance has made a hypothesis of induction necessary, and the energy that controls the universe is limited to its forms. The philosopher does for God what he cannot and would not undertake to do for himself: shuts him up. Man's will in its sphere is law, and it may yet accomplish aerial navigation, so that we shall

"See the heavens fill with commerce  
Argosies of magic sails ;"

but it is absolutely certain that God will never be able to raise a man from the dead. The human will is free, but the divine will is bound; its inexorable master is matter, as our scientist sees it. This may be philosophy, and it may be science; it may be reason also, but we must be excused for a certain dullness which prevents our seeing it as such. If one should admit for a moment that there is a God, with what infinite amusement he must look upon our scientists' system of law as the limit of his operations. Think of

it: "a supernatural relation cannot be accepted as such"; that is, the supernatural is impossible. So says Renan.

It may be inferred by some that the views set forth above disparage the evidential value of miracles. On the contrary, we contend that they increase their weight many fold. Miracles are necessarily dependent on a true doctrine of the supernatural. In the development of history they are incidental, not essential. Our Lord indicated their true place when he exhorted us to exalt faith in him above faith in his works. It was only after his disciples doubted him that he exhorted them to believe for his works' sake. The very form of the exhortation implies the superiority of his person to his works. But, if they were too ignorant and carnal to apprehend him, then they ought to be satisfied with his works. To religious philosophy in this day the great desideratum is a correct conception of the supernatural—its relation to life; and the want is growing greater. If the insistence upon the incidental has already proved unsatisfactory, and has imperilled the greatest of all truths, it will become still more so. Supernaturalism is identified with the person of our divine Lord. He is its strength and its historicization. We ought not to stake a truth, without which history is an inexplicable confusion, upon ancillary facts. As Christian apologists we take our stand upon the comprehensive fact of a divine-human historical character, and with that granite beneath us defy assault. We say to criticism, be it philosophical, historical, or scientific, before you succeed in overthrowing the Christian faith you must annihilate history. And when that is done, the earth, with all that is on it, will be reduced to uttermost chaos. Chaos was, must have continued to be, and would be again, without the Spirit of God brooding upon it. And from that first moment when order began to be, up through all developments, wrought the Divine Spirit, until he speaks, finally, to voice in audible, articulate form, the yearnings, hopes and aspirations of the moral universe in the Christ, God manifest in the flesh.

FRANCIS L. FERGUSON.

## II. IDEAL MAN, THE PRODUCT OF THE DIVINE SPIRIT.<sup>1</sup>

IDEAL man may be defined as perfect human character presented before the mind as a model for imitation. This ideal may exist in the mind as a mere conception, or discovered in the history of men as a realized fact.

The proposition suggested by the caption of this article is, ideal man, whether existing in the mind as a conception or seen in the history of men, is always the product of the Divine Spirit. Negatively stated, it is, ideal human nature does not originate in the inspiration of genius, nor is it the slow growth of natural forces, but is the product of the Divine Spirit.

Subject to the impulses of a capacity which allies him to the infinite, under surroundings of rich and exhaustless resources, and with attainments great, but manifestly defective, man ever strives for something more than he holds in possession. "Our species has not the aspect of one who has finished his journey, but of one still proceeding upon it; . . . humanity has always shown a brow darkened with care and dissatisfaction, an eye fixed on the distance, with staff in hand." With a sense of his dependence and weakness he is ever an imitator. The unattained, but desired good, shapes itself in the form of ideals, and after these, in his endeavor towards advancement, he thinks and labors.

The artist, brush and pigment in hand, copies from an ideal either of his own conception, or else from that upon the canvas before him; the sculptor chisels the marble after a model, born of his own genius, or the work of his master; the weaver throws the shuttle with an eye steadily fixed upon the pattern before him. So character is formed after ideals presented upon the lettered page, or,

---

<sup>1</sup>The substance of a baccalaureate sermon preached in the Southwestern Presbyterian University.

as is more generally the case, after those recognized in living men. Example most readily attracts and influences men. Thus the study of biography becomes an essential and powerful element in the formation of character. "Truth is best embodied and expressed in living men." A recent writer calls attention to this fact in the instance of Aurelius. That emperor and philosopher enumerates the sources from which he had derived the precepts and principles that entered as constructive forces in his character. "The entire list consists of persons. By his own testimony his character had been moulded by the influence of persons. The most potent forces that enter our life are the forces which spring from personal examples and contact." The same writer quotes from George Eliot: "Ideas are often poor ghosts; our sun-filled eyes cannot discern them. They pass athwart us in their vapor, and cannot make themselves felt. But sometimes they are made flesh; they breath upon us with warm breath; they touch us with soft, responsive hands; they look at us with sad, sincere eyes, and speak to us in appealing tones. They are clothed in a living, human soul, with all its conflicts, its faith, its love. Then their presence is a power. Then they shake us like a passion, and we are drawn after them with a gentle compulsion as flame is drawn to flame."

Thus it is well said, "if the Almighty designed ever to give a perfect and final system of instruction to mankind, it could be done only by placing in this world a perfect human nature. If mankind are to advance intelligently in excellence, they must have a true model before them. There can be no real progress in either the individual or the community without this; men must have a right model and seek to conform to it."

As to fact, a very large proportion of men have before them, often unconsciously, ideals in one or another form. Instances of aimless lives there are, no doubt; but the most signal failures in the formation of right character occur from either the want of a true and noble model, or the inability to realize that which is held in the conception.

The lesson most needed is not that found in the trite admonition, "Have a purpose in life," but rather in this: The

ideals should be worthy of self in your relationship to God and man.

Let us suppose a group of men intently discussing the last pugilistic encounter. We will be satisfied, after hearing them, that they have their ideal; but it is not such an one as would attract an Alexander Stephens, in his heroic endeavor to be worthy the applause of his fellow-men, or a John Stuart Mill, in his attempt to eliminate from himself that which he regarded as purely sensual, or a John Howard, in his heroic self-abnegation in the interest of suffering humanity. The ideal before those men will not lift men up to, or forward them upon, the high plane of moral or intellectual effort. Similar illustrations suggest themselves. The seeker after gold, the man of godless ambition, the butterfly of fashion, are found in the same category. In the prosecution of our subject another suggestion occurs. The ideal must be a comprehensive one, embracing all possible human characteristics and adaptive to men of all ages and all conditions, and each part of his character must be in harmony with every other part, and withal the ideal must be a living man.

Something like a perfect character is obtained by an appeal to history and fashioning from representative men a character mosaic. If we were master-workmen, able at once to discriminate and to arrange, we could select characteristics from individuals, notably from Bible characters, as the Bible is the most human of books; we could find the man of faith, the man of courage, the man of patience; but, after all, we would have for our pains characteristics, but not character; perfection, possibly, but not a living man.

Another preliminary thought is suggested. In the search for a worthy ideal, it is absolutely important that it be one of individual character. There is nothing that is inciting to high attainment in the sentiment, more a poetic fancy than sedate philosophy, which presents, at the close of centuries of sorrow and weariness, a perfect race wrought out or evolved from our humanity, while, in the meantime, the individual passes to death and corruption. Our sighs and tears are to produce an ideal man; he is to be the fruit of generations of sin and suffering, and our only recompense is to be found in contemplation of the future prodigy. Nature re-



volts against this fancy. There is in us that sense of personality which teaches us to hope for the highest attainment for the individual man.

“Man is not  
 One dying leaf in an illimitable forest,  
 One unregarded rain-drop in an unmeasured sea,  
 But he is a soul.”

It is “I” who hunger and thirst; it is “thou” to whom God speaks. The past is not a jungle through which is heard the gibberish of savages, but through it walk the forms of the good and great; the future is not a desolation to be skirted at last by a fringe of light, but the theatre for individual men under sublime possibilities.

True, the gospel develops in every heart a catholic spirit, which makes the world akin, and carries its benefactions to all people; but this spirit is obtained only after the call of grace has come to the individual man, and he has appropriated the blessed truth, “He loved me, and gave himself for me.”

We turn our attention directly to the subject—ideal man, the product of the Divine Spirit. That ideal, as a conception of the mind, as a realized fact, and as seen in the history of men, is the product of the Divine Spirit. As a revelation to the mind, and as realized in actual life, the ideal man is the workmanship of God. The order in which this revelation occurs is important. It seems to be: first, man in a perfect world; second, man formed in the person of Christ Jesus; third, man, new created and growing in meetness for a perfect life; fourth, perfect man, with perfect attainments, within a new heaven and a new earth. These are the products of the Divine Spirit.

I. The ideal man is the Adam of Eden, made a little lower than God, crowned with glory and honor and with dominion over the creature. He was after the image and likeness of God; in the similitude of God. From such an one we primarily derive our ideal. Our first conception of human perfection seems not derived from a promise or prophecy for the future, but rather from the man of history, from one whose life was a fact. In order of time ideal man is not, first, a hope, then a prophecy, a promise, and at

last a history; instead, he is, first, a history, and then a prophecy and a promise.

There is a golden age of the past. All history teaches this, and our civilization tracks us back inevitably to that period. There was a perfect age, whose lord was a perfect man. His body, "perfect in organism and functions; his mind, clear, comprehensive and self-confident;" his soul holy. His creation was the act of God. After successive stages of material creation, each of which point to him as the lord, there was a pause and conference between the divine persons; man was made.

He was endowed with reason. "God spake to him;" the logos both of reason and language was his. He was an ideal philosopher who generalized in science and, classifying, gave names to all that were brought before him.

"He was  
Erect in stature,  
With front serene and thoughtful,  
Self-knowing, magnanimous,  
To correspond with heaven."

We are conscious of a change; there came the condition of sin and death. The gold became dimmed; the image and likeness marred. The arch now inverted touches earth; the dome upon the temple is in ruins. But with all this, the past comes as a suggestion, and under a true philosophy of history there comes with it the ideal man. The chamber of the past holds upon the wall the portrait of our noble ancestor, who was called the "Son of God." God made man upright, and under the memories of what he was there is hope of a new creation. In this was announced the first evangel. This hope assumes many shapes, and is presented by the philosopher under many classifications. Forbearing to discuss these, in the fulness of time we are brought to the second great fact in the history of men: the man of Galilee is born. The first conception of the perfect man is in Adam; the second one is found in the person of the second Adam.

II. Jesus grew in stature and wisdom, in favor with God and man, and is the archetype, the exemplar, the light of men. A striking Scotch writer, Stalker, calls attention to a tendency of Christian thought to neglect the man Christ Jesus. Controversies

touching his divine nature have resulted in underestimating him as the "Son of man." Little was taught of his manhood, for fear there would be too much of the man and not enough of the divine. These discussions concerning his deity lessened an appreciation of the Son of Mary. The church has too readily surrendered to Unitarians the ideal man of Galilee. In all relationships of life, and under all circumstances, he is the ideal man; whether in the temple, alone upon the mountain in prayer, in the family, as a friend, a citizen, a teacher, a sufferer, he is the type of true manhood.

"Human nature appears anew in him in full splendor." "He remains the highest model of religion within the reach of thought." All ages, every class, and men of every degree of culture, find in him the absolutely perfect man. Under no possible conditions, whatever the advance may be, never shall there be a man or a class of men who may not find in him all excellence. "There is in him a blending of all moral traits: a harmonizing of all seeming contrasts." Courage meets humility; authority, gentleness; firmness, meekness; justice, mercy; command meets obedience—they all meet and blend in him. "In the galaxy of the greatly good, he is not a star a little brighter than the rest, but the sun in whose light the stars grow dim." He proceeded from God. As the ideal man, he is not of the conception of man. He is not the product of the age in which he lived. The century preceding him was totally unworthy of him. "The course of the world before Christ was constant degeneracy and decline. His advent was at the midnight of history." His, as an "actual character, could not by any possibility have been formed by antecedent or surrounding circumstances. It was not natural development which gave to him birth, for human virtue has not even yet developed to his standard. He was not the child of the centuries." "The century preceding him was totally unworthy of him; the century following did not understand him, and could not have invented his life. Eighteen centuries have not brought the advanced guard of humanity up to him." He was not the product of physical surroundings. Palestine, essentially, remains to us. Her skies, her streams, her sea, her mountains and her plains still exist. If they

produced the man of Galilee, why do we not find to-day some counterpart to him in the country of his birth? The confluence of physical forces did not give him birth. The conspicuous absence of such a character emphasizes the fact that the ideal man came not from beneath, but from above. It is not possible that he should have been the product of any one of the civilizations then in existence. The Jewish civilization at the period of his birth was barren of greatness. Divided into sects and parties, the one opposed to the other, Christ represents none of them, but antagonizes them all. As Messiah, he was in severe contrast to prevailing tenets. The Messiah was longed for and expected as a glorious earthly king. His declaration was, "My kingdom is not of this world"—one of those great first truths upon the understanding of which the social structure rests, and yet which is strangely misunderstood in this advanced day. The Jew rested in Moses, but Jesus taught that the law came by Moses, but truth and grace came by Jesus Christ. The Jewish mind was characterized by the spirit of exclusiveness, they claiming Abraham as their father; he taught that "God so loved the world" as to give his Son. "He was to them a stone of stumbling:" neither did his brethren believe on him. He was not the outgrowth of Grecian civilization. To the philosophers he was a root out of a dry ground; he had no form nor comeliness. The Greeks at his age had lost their manliness. "There had been noble natures among them—there remained not one. The mother of Pythagoras, Socrates and Plato had become barren."

Lastly, the Roman mind, proud in the history of the nation's achievements, and moulded in part by their own and in part by the polity of conquered nations, could not have produced such an one as the man of Galilee. It is no question that their development is marked and positive. According to the law, that like produces like, and every seed after its own kind, their character was formed from the proud and self-reliant martial spirit. One may read with interest the result of the law of evolution in that which was produced. And, as we are sometimes asked to study that age with a view of a return to its tenets, it is profitable to consider it well. Uhlhorn, in his *Conflict of Christianity with Hea-*

*thenism*, has rendered every man inexcusable who remains unacquainted with its spirit. Canon Farrar entitles a chapter in his *Cæsars* "The Rise of the Anti-Christ." The genealogy is compared with that of Christ.

We contrast Bethlehem, the babe, the wise men, and the angels' song, with Rome, her gods and orgies. The spirit of lust and blood produced its own in Nero. Let Christ the God-man stand in contrast with the man-god of pagan culture. Nero was the epitome of the age in which he lived, the consummation of pagan degradation. The days of ancient civilization seemed to have rushed at once into their scarlet flower. But as Adam in the garden is, as to order, primarily the ideal man of history, so Christ is the ideal man of the race.

III. In pursuance of the theme, ideal man, the product of the Divine Spirit, we are now to consider the creative power of God as exemplified in many sons that are brought to glory. We have dwelt upon the fact of Jesus being the exemplar, the model; but he is more than this; not only is he the ideal man, but in him all the fulness of the God-head dwells; he is the power of God to salvation to every one that believes. Through him is the pardon for sin, the righteousness of God; in him is the new creation; in him, to those who receive him, there is completeness. The first Adam was made a living soul; the second Adam a quickening spirit. The prayer of humanity is ever, "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." This prayer is realized in Christ, in our being born again after the image of him who created him; the being quickened from the dead, delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of his dear Son; the being conformed by renewing of the mind into the image of his dear Son, in the impression of that copy, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God, not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart. "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." To such ones the ideal man shall be fully realized, and that as the product of the Divine Spirit. The creative power of God touches fallen humanity, and strikes at the point where our humanity touches God, through the

ideal man, the incarnate Son; and under this touch man becomes, under promise of the highest perfection, a partaker of the divine nature. "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." The gifts of God are "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith and knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." The Spirit exhorts "that ye put on the new man, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness."

"The new man is renewed day by day after the image of him who created him." Well does Eadie, the delightful commentator, write: "The new creature is of God, and not of self-development. All creation is of God, and this is no exception. The new man is not the ethical symbol of a mere reformation which a strong will may achieve, nor is it any change of creed, party, or opinion, which is the result of personal examination and conviction. These are but as statuary compared with living humanity, for however close the resemblance, there is always, in spite of the highest art, the still eye and motionless lip. God's work is a living power, so compact and richly endowed, so fitted to our nature, so much a part of us as to be called a man, but at the same time so foreign to all previous powers and enjoyments as to be called the new man." The first man, in the image and likeness of God, and the second man, the Lord from heaven, alike came from God. Our ideal of perfect humanity is derived from them; and any progress toward perfection is the work of God. "For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth." We are sanctified by the Spirit. We are made meet for the kingdom. "They do not infuse this maturity in themselves; this transformation is not a natural process, nor do they ripen of necessity into purity and love. The Father meetens them, and from him are the blood that pardons, the Spirit that purifies, the truth which moulds, the hope which sustains, the charter which secures . . . the whole preparation that meetens for the heavenly inheritance."

Notwithstanding the immense strides made by science and the magnificent achievements of mind, the real development of man, (that is to say, that which underlies and gives incentive to all other,) has been the product of God's Spirit. The principles which underlie character, the themes which excite the mind, the substratum of faith upon which all is builded, the rock-ribbed ledge upon whose top there are reared the beautiful triumphs of art and genius, are gifts of God's Spirit. To man is given dominion over the creature. This is of the economy of God. Man has discovered the simple elements of the physical kingdom; he is a discoverer, but not a creator. Under the quickening influences of the gospel, that gospel that gives light to every man that comes into the world, the increase of knowledge and skill has been astounding. No man more joyously recognizes it than does the Christian; no man may more earnestly seek its furtherance than the Christian philosopher.

But if it were possible to eliminate from the sum total of man's acquisitions and achievements all that the gospel has taught and done, it is confidently believed that there would be no evidence of a true and substantial advance either in the character or condition of men. The world, with its crime, its sorrows, its corruption, its death, would, without the model and power of Christ, overwhelm the soul and paralyze the mind.

"The real fact is, that we may much better assert a law of natural deterioration than a law of natural progress; for, apart from some influence or aid of a supernatural kind, the deterioration of society under the penal mischief of sin would be universal." But it is not possible to eliminate the gospel, with its ideal and power, from the faith and lives of men. The effect would be vivisection in the spiritual world; there would be death in the very act. The test is impracticable. The element of truth taken from civilization the material would be destroyed beyond recognition; these threads of purple and gold torn from the woof, the fabric would be ruined.

But we may arrive substantially at the same conclusion by another method. Certain it is that no individual was ever cleared of sin by development. There is no instance upon

record where the individual, separate from the influence of the gospel, has reached high advantage in character, either for wisdom or holiness. "Among those who in our time and land are understood to be non-believers in historical Christianity, there are not a few whose characters cannot but abound in reverence and love; but of these I know not one who had not his nurture in a Christian family, and some of the most distinguished among them were in early life members of the Christian church. I doubt whether you can point to a single person that has grown up under the discipline of skeptical philosophy, whom you would designate as a fit example for those whose characters are now in process of formation." (Peabody.)

True, the scholarly Arnold sees in the *Light of Asia*, in his estimation, one to be compared to the Son of Mary; but, as the eye steadily fixed upon a specific object often bears upon the retina the image of that object, even when turned from it and fixed upon other things, it is not strange that the ideal man obtrudes upon the vision of the scholar when his eye fastens upon the philosophy of India; the vision of Christ shapes and colors the sage of the East.

As with the individual, so with nations. They have deteriorated, but none by the aid simply of natural laws have been permanently raised from barbarism to civilization.

"No savage race of the world has been raised into civilization, least of all into a state of virtue, by mere natural development. We have proofs enough that peoples advanced in culture may become savage, but no solitary example of a race of savages that has risen to a civilized state by mere development. We look for the Ninevites with as little hope as Ninus himself. The Assyrians, Babylonians and Medes also vanished. The Egyptians, Phoenicians, Etruscans, Romans, once the great powers of history and civilization, are extinct. What would our new prophets of development say, if they were told, when exulting so confidently in the glorious future of their own and all other nations, that a day will certainly come when the Anglo-American race is become an extinct race, Washington a contested locality, and the Constitution of the United States a hopeless search of the world's antiquarians? . . . Distant as such an expectation may be from our thoughts, and contrary as it



may be to the illimitable of which we hear so often, it is only that which has happened a hundred times already, and, Christianity apart, may as well happen again." (Bushnel.)

IV. We are thus brought to the final disposition of the subject which has engaged our thought.

We found an ideal man in the first Adam; we find in Jesus that ideal more than realized. Again, that men at present under the dispensation of grace have a vocation to follow Christ and subject to his Spirit, they are daily made to realize the beauty and perfection of his adorable character. This spiritual life, by virtue of a spiritual law, shall at last arrive at full attainment. "The kingdom of heaven is like a grain of mustard seed, which indeed is the least of all seeds, but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof. The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened." "We are babes" in Christ, growing up into the perfect stature of the fulness of Christ.

But in the development of the subject, two important questions present themselves for consideration: First, What is to be the result to that world which receives not the truth? Secondly, Do the sons of God in this life attain perfection? do they here arrive unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ Jesus?

We have anticipated the answer to the first. The world rests under blessing great and inestimable, given to it through the incarnate God. His church is the great conservative power among men. Man, under the light of the gospel, and led by revelation of the providence of God, ever finds new fields for labor, and in turn for triumph. He toils to bring all things in subjection to himself. But "the Christian life is the only life that will ever be completed. Apart from Christ, the life of man is a broken pillar, the race of man an unfinished pyramid. One by one in sight of eternity all human ideals fall short; one by one before the open grave all human hopes dissolve."

In answer to the second suggestion, the ideal is not perfectly realized upon this arena. We see as through a glass darkly, but

we shall be conformed to the image of the Son. These poor elements shall attain supreme beauty; this corruptible shall put on incorruption, this mortal shall put on immortality; we shall be changed from glory to glory; we shall be like him. From the first dawn of hope to corrupt humanity, individuals under the divine vocation have striven after the ideal. In every path of life spiritual heroes have struggled upward. In self-denial, courage, faith and patience, they have followed the glorious model; they have walked with God; they are called friends of God; but they lived under influences and in face of antagonists which sadly mar all character. Whether Abraham or David, Paul or Peter, Luther or Calvin, Knox or Wesley, they confess that they have not attained, nor are already perfect. This completes the development suggested by my subject: the full realization of the ideal man is the last process of the Divine Spirit.

Ideal man will be realized within the new creation. We look for a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. "The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. . . The creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God." The ideal man is seen as an historic fact in Adam of Eden; the man of Galilee, under process through the power of God, in as many as receive Christ the Son; and is finally realized under perfect environment within the presence of our God. To God be all the glory.

In conclusion, three lessons are impressed upon us:

*First*, The gospel which, true to nature, recognizes man as fallen, raises him from the depths, puts him under sublime possibilities, and restores such as seek to be conformed to his image to the sonship and heirship of God. That system which is contemned as debasing man becomes, indeed, his potent defender, claims for him an ancestor of high perfection, and casts out the fell spirit of pessimism. It presents the model for perfect lives, is itself an inspiration of hope, and stretches out an almighty arm to do for us that which we cannot do for ourselves.

*Second*, This generalization of truth under review is a triumphant answer to the miserable question suggested by the restless and

disappointed spirit of worldly greed, "Is life worth living?" Eliminate from human affairs the ideal man and the Divine Spirit, then the problem of life with its faulty ideals and broken idols rests in hopeless uncertainty. But to him who grasps these sublime truths life is ennobling, life is sublime in its endeavor and its results.

*Thirdly*, It ennobles individual man while it honors the race. Here is found, paradoxical as it may seem, the fundamentals of man's personal accountability. Before each man is presented the ideal man, and to each man comes the promise of the Divine Spirit. The individual is not a mere stepping-stone across which the race moves towards perfection and triumph; each man in Christ Jesus is a new creation. What magnificent possibilities lie before each son of Adam who turns the eye towards him and submits himself to the Lord of glory!

W. L. NOURSE.

### III. OUR CHURCH AND EDUCATION.

THE writer of this article does not expect to command universal assent to the positions which he may take upon the subject of the relation of the church to education. He will be satisfied if he can succeed in directing the thought of the church to this matter, and in securing the careful consideration of the educational policy which our church ought to pursue, especially in regard to those institutions of learning which are, to some extent at least, under her control. He has chosen to illustrate and fortify his positions by ample quotations from writers and educators of acknowledged eminence, especially from those of our own church, in the hope of adding thereby to the influence which he hopes to exert in the cause of Christian education under church control. The exciting and absorbing issues which have agitated the church for some years past have been adjusted with a greater or less degree of satisfactoriness, and the present seems an appropriate time to discuss the vitally momentous theme of the educational function of the church. This topic is especially practical and timely on account of the educational revival which is one of the characteristics of our day. This revival is seen in the establishment of chairs of pedagogics in our leading institutions, as well as in the founding of normal institutes of every grade, the object being the stimulation of the study of the science and the art, the history and the methods of education. The large number of publications relating to education, with which the press now literally teems, is another indication of the deep and wide-spread concern which the public now accords to this great interest. The articles of the religious and secular press, the contributions of magazines and reviews, the weighty publications of the National Bureau of Education,<sup>1</sup> the valuable volumes issued by eminent educators—all show the di-

---

<sup>1</sup> The valuable monographs on the history of education in the various States, now being issued by the Bureau of Education, entitle it to the hearty thanks of every student of education. See especially *Histories of Education in South Carolina and Alabama*, and *History of University of Virginia*.

rection toward which popular attention is largely directed. Even the *questio vexata* of the relations of religion and science lapses into relative insignificance if we estimate its importance by the place it holds in the literature of the day, when contrasted with the more commanding interest and larger place which educational questions receive.

It is well, therefore, to inquire, now and anew, What is the relation of the church to education? Has the church an educational function to discharge?

There are four chief theories as to the agent by whom education should be conducted: (1), There are many who hold that neither church nor state has the right to intrude upon the educational sphere, but that the parent under God is responsible for the education of the child, and through private enterprise, in one form or another, this duty is to be discharged; (2), There is a second class who maintain that education is a function of the state, which, under the supreme law of self-preservation, is obliged to provide for its future citizens such training as will fit them to discharge the duties which rest upon them as enlightened citizens of a free state;<sup>1</sup> (3), Others hold that, on account of the religious element which ought to be made prominent in all education, the church is the agent properly charged with this work, to the exclusion of both state and private enterprise; (4), There is a fourth class, whose doctrine is, that the parent, the church, and the state have each alike certain rights in education, which neither of them can afford to surrender to the others, and where an alliance between them cannot properly be formed, each ought to insist upon its rights, and, if necessary to their protection, engage directly and immediately in the work of education.

This is the view which the present writer would adopt as his own, for he sees no necessity in the nature of things for arraying the three classes of institutions, viz., those supported by the church, the state, and by private enterprise, in antagonism against one an-

---

<sup>1</sup> For able arguments for state education see Woolsey's *Political Science*, Lieber's *Political Ethics*, Dr. R. J. Breckenridge on "Denominational Education" in *Southern Presbyterian Review*, July, 1849; also Dr. Thornwell's letter to Governor Manning.

other. The highest results for education will be reached if they all harmoniously coöperate in the same good cause, stimulating each one the others to higher efficiency by the mutual example of honest and faithful work. It is foreign to the present purpose, however, to argue so large a theme as that; our present concern is to vindicate the right of the church in education, and to show that if it is necessary to the protection of this right, the church may not only rightfully enter the whole field of education, but that it then becomes its bounden duty so to do.

The right of the church in education springs out of the very conception of education. Let eminent educators tell us what the end of education is.

“The end of education is complete human development. This is attained by leading the several parts of man’s nature to a harmonious realization of their highest possibilities. The finished result is a noble manhood, whose highest exemplification, the ideal of all culture, is Christ. The elements of this manhood are a healthy body, a clear and well-informed intellect, sensibilities quickly susceptible to every right feeling, and a steady will, whose volitions are determined by reason and an enlightened conscience.”<sup>1</sup>

“The instrumental powers, the appetites, the desires and natural affections, and the intellect, are given us that through them we may build up a perfect body and a perfect mind. . . . Of the instrumental powers it only remains to speak of the intellect. The necessity of training, and, if possible, perfecting the intellect, if a man would do much for his own good or that of others, is admitted. To this every seminary of learning testifies. Its relative importance is doubtless over-estimated, since education has come to mean chiefly the training of the intellect. . . . We now pass to the governing powers. It is one thing for a person to improve his instrumental powers, as he might his knife or his reaper, and another to improve those which are more distinctively himself. For the education of these powers there are no institutions except those of Christianity. The church, with its Bible and ministry and the Spirit of God pervading all, is God’s institution for the education of these powers and training them up in the likeness of Christ, and so of God.”<sup>2</sup>

These extracts present the truth that man has a moral and religious nature, which needs development and training just as truly as any other part of his complex being. Both morality and religion ought therefore to be parts of the educational discipline through which he passes, but there can be no sound morality without religion.

---

<sup>1</sup> *History of Education*, p 2, by Prof. F. V. N. Painter. The most complete and philosophic exposition in the English language of the history of pedagogy.

<sup>2</sup> *Law of Love*, by Mark Hopkins ; Part II., Class I., Div. III., Chapter I.

“Everything religious in Christianity is made to furnish a motive to morality. We all condemn the fanatics who make religion sufficient without ethics. Some teachings of this sort are absurd and some disgusting. But, on the other hand, shall we think it wise to regard ethics as sufficient without religion? Is it not true that he who would divorce religion and morality is an enemy to religion, and at best only a mistaken friend to morality?”<sup>1</sup>

All that loud and noisy talk, which abounds in some quarters, about teaching morality without religion, is of a piece with the gilded pretentiousness with which weak eyes are dazzled and deceived. In order that the moral nature may be trained there must be distinct religious instruction and training, for all genuine morality strikes its roots in religious ground and can only live when planted there. Religion is, therefore, a necessary part of education, if the spiritual nature is to be developed, and the same reason which excludes it from the school would exclude it from the life.

“Those who do not accept the Christian notion of character, who do not believe in Christ as the object of man’s confidence, and the light and hope of his life, may see no propriety in connecting these influences with his training in youth. They would exclude religion and Christianity from the college for the same reasons, and no other, for which they would exclude them from the conduct of the life. Conversely, the same reasoning which would exclude them from a place in the college, would require that they be rejected altogether.”<sup>2</sup>

The mode in which religion is to be introduced into the school so as to become really and effectively a part of the education received there, is a grave problem, which, however, must be solved if there is to be such a thing as that complete education<sup>3</sup> which provides for the development of all the powers, including the spiritual nature to which religion is addressed. Much may be accomplished in this reference by the selection of teachers whose religious influence is strong and decided, and much may be done by definite effort to make religion a part of that “corporate life of the school” of which Dr. Porter has written so ably in the volume from which we have already quoted. But the one effective and decisive mode in which religion can be made a part of the

<sup>1</sup> *Jesus of Nazareth*. Dr. J. A. Broadus, pp. 39, 40.

<sup>2</sup> *American Colleges*, Ex-President Noah Porter, p. 212.

<sup>3</sup> See a valuable pamphlet on *Complete Education*, filled with suggestive thought, by Dr. J. B. Shearer, President of Davidson College.

life of the school is through the introduction of the Bible as a part of the curriculum of study. Those whose good fortune it has been to study under the guidance and inspiring influence of that eminent scholar, Dr. Philip Schaff, will remember the emphasis with which he repeats, "Christianity is a *book* religion." The influence and educative power of Christ's religion is inseparably connected with that sacred book which now, as always, is the inspired word of God, ever electric and aflame with divine energy. If our educational system, therefore, is to have any place in it for the training of the spiritual department of man's nature, the Bible must of necessity constitute an inseparable part of that system.

"By common consent man has a religious nature. Few, if any, will dispute a fact so self-evident. And now, if he has such a nature, should it not receive the most careful culture? And as this culture cannot be secured in the highest degree without the constant, prayerful study of the word of God, it at once becomes evident to all thoughtful persons that the Bible should be enthroned in the highest place in all our institutions of learning. It is, we believe, generally admitted that goodness, as an element of character, is worth more than cleverness, and yet our prizes are all offered for cleverness rather than goodness. In this way the heart is subordinated to the head, while intellectual achievement is honored at the expense of moral worth. This will all be changed when the Bible becomes the most important text-book in our colleges and universities."<sup>1</sup>

But the value of Bible study in the school is not simply confined to its influence upon the moral and religious nature, but the mental powers share as well in the stimulation and development which come from contact with the range of supernatural truth found in its sacred pages. As a mental tonic, and for purpose of intellectual discipline alone, the Bible deserves a central place in the studies of the school. One of the commonplaces of religious literature is the influence of biblical and theological studies in intensifying and strengthening the mental activity of the earnest student.

"The value of theological studies, in an intellectual point of view, does not consist so much in the amount of information as in the amount of energy imparted by them. The doctrines of theology, like the solar centres, are comparatively few in number; and while the demand they make on the memory is small, the demand they make upon the power of reflection is infinite and unending. For this reason theological studies are in the highest degree fitted to originate and carry on a true

---

<sup>1</sup> Editorial from *London Christian Commonwealth*, reported in *O. T. Student*, February, 1890, p. 121.



education. There is an invigorating virtue in them which strengthens, while it unfolds the mental powers, and therefore the more absorbing the intensity with which the mind dwells upon them, the more it is endued with power."<sup>1</sup>

Further than this, if education may legitimately claim as one of its subordinate ends the preparation of the scholar to understand the literature and history of the past, or to comprehend the living forces which underlie the movements of the present, the Bible must furnish him with the knowledge which is necessary for this task. All of the modern national literatures, and especially is this true of the English literature, derive their power from the supernatural and biblical elements which they have absorbed and transmuted into such forms as the peculiar character of the national mind dictates. Subtract from Milton, Shakspeare, Wordsworth, Dante, or Petrarch, Corneille, or even Goethe, the influences which can be distinctly traced to the Bible, and the residuum is very nearly *nil*. Moreover, the history of the world only becomes a philosophy when the central position of the religion of the Bible is recognized, so much so that the better class of secular historians cannot refrain from construing all historical movements by their relation to it;<sup>2</sup> and when amidst the varied currents and complex phenomena of our own times we seek for the deep and central forces which will explain the intense life of the present surging all around us, we must again go to the Bible to see at their fountain-head the streams of influence which are pouring themselves out into every channel of life. If one is to know his own times he must first know the Bible. So that upon the lower view of education, which makes it provide only for the necessities of practical life and the development of the mental faculties, the Bible has valuable and necessary functions to discharge; but we cannot (as we have already seen) legitimately confine education within these comparatively narrow bounds; and if it is to be faithful to its true mission of making a complete man,

---

<sup>1</sup> Shedd's *Theological Essays*, p. 28.

<sup>2</sup> For an admirable illustration of that true philosophy of history which interprets universal history in the light of its relation to Christianity, see Guizot's *History of Civilization*. Even Gibbon and Hume in their monumental works are compelled by fealty to fact to pay tribute to the religion of the Bible by recognizing its large and masterful place in the times with which they deal.

then it must provide, and provide first of all, for the moral and religious nature, which constitutes the real personality of the man; and it can do this effectively only by the use of the Bible studied and taught as a part of its discipline.<sup>1</sup>

But we must now pass on to notice that it is the function of the church to teach the system of truth found in the Bible, and to train that spiritual nature which has been committed to her charge. Nor can the church delegate this duty to any other agent without failing to perform the mission for which she was established in the world.

As Dr. Charles Hodge has well said:

“It is a conceded point that children ought to be religiously educated; that not merely natural religion, but Christianity, and not merely Christianity in general, but in the definite form in which it has been revealed by God for the salvation of man, ought to be inculcated on the infant mind, so that the rising generation shall be imbued with the knowledge of divine truth. Secondly, it may be assumed as conceded that it is the duty of the church to impart this religious education. This is one of the most important parts of her vocation. She received her commission to teach; she is, by the will and authority of her author, an institute of education, established to communicate and preserve the knowledge of God, of Christ, of the way of salvation, and of the rule of duty. Thirdly, this is a duty which the church cannot devolve on others. She cannot throw the responsibility on the state, for it is the very work God has given her to do, and she might as well look to the state to preach the gospel as to make disciples of the nations by teaching them.”<sup>2</sup>

The great work which the church finds incorporated in her charter as binding upon her, and which she alone has been com-

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Old Testament Student* within several years has had valuable articles and symposia upon the subject of religion and the Bible in the schools and colleges. Dr. Harper deserves the thanks of American scholars, not only for his service to the Hebrew language and to oriental study in general, but also for his earnest advocacy of the reintroduction of Bible study in our American colleges; for it is a movement to put the Bible in the place it once occupied.

“The American College in its origin used to teach Hebrew, dogmatic theology, Biblical history, and the English Bible. . . . It has been necessary in recent years to make great efforts to induce the colleges to restore Hebrew and the study of the English Bible to their original places in the course, but this movement is only in part successful. I have never seen any answer to the question, What has become of the endowments that have been given in olden times for the teaching of Hebrew and other portions of biblical and theological work?”—C. A. Briggs, in *Presbyterian Review*, January, '89, p. 113.

<sup>2</sup> Charles Hodge, *Church Polity*, pp. 449, 450.

missioned of God to discharge, is this very work of teaching and training the moral and religious nature.

But how is this work to be done? Certainly in the mode which is the most practically effective and successful. Universal experience would seem to show that the most effective method of teaching and training, in fact without which teaching is practically impossible, is through the use of that instrumentality we call the school. The effort to teach the languages, or science, or philosophy in any other way would be just as successful as is the effort to teach the Bible without the school. Teaching is a technical process which requires the school with its organization, discipline, classes, methods of administration, peculiar influences and distinct life; and to expect that Latin, Greek, Hebrew, chemistry, or zoölogy will be learned without these, is just as reasonable as to suppose that the Bible will be taught without them. Dr. Hodge truly says: "This is the only method in which a religious education has hitherto ever been given to the mass of the people of any country." The attempt to teach any system of truth to a large class of minds without employing the methods and influences peculiar to the school is certainly foredoomed to failure. And so the methods of teaching which God has indicated as proper through the experience of the church in the effort to perform her mission would seem, as we might expect, to coincide with the method which God has indicated in the word itself. Upon this point the writer will avail himself of the results of the research and learning of one whose protracted study, extending over many years, of all that pertains to the educational function of the church entitles him to a respectful and an attentive hearing.<sup>1</sup> After describing minutely the sys-

---

<sup>1</sup> The reference is to the Rev. Dr. Henry Clay Trumbull, editor of *Sunday-school Times*, author of *Kadesh-Barnea*, *Blood Covenant*, *Teaching and Teachers*, etc. In the Yale Lectures, on Lyman Beecher Foundation, for 1888, by Dr. Trumbull, will be found a scholarly and thorough discussion of the teaching function of the church. The work is done primarily with reference to the Sunday-school, but is compelled to take a wider range. If one does not come from the study of this book with the conviction that the church has an educational function to perform, yet he will certainly find so much of helpful suggestion and digested learning and stimulating influence that he will feel amply repaid for the effort necessary to master the book.

tem of education in Palestine in the time of Christ, and fortifying his positions by an array of testimony from Talmud and Targum, Josephus and Philo, and all the extant literature of the period, he summarizes results as follows:

“And this was the Bible school system of the Jews in Palestine at the time that Jesus of Nazareth was born into that land to be brought up there as a Jew. Bible teaching was to begin at home. At from five to seven years of age, at the latest, the child was to find his place in the church Bible school. He was there to memorize the words of Scripture, and he was at the same time to come to an understanding of its meaning through the process of familiar questioning and reasoning. Later he was to be a member of the synagogue Bible school, to share the benefits of that interlocutory teaching which was the only process which the Jews deemed worthy the name of teaching.”<sup>1</sup>

“Obviously it is in the light of well-known Jewish customs, rather than only in the light of classic Greek or of modern English, that we are to interpret the terms ‘teach’ and ‘teaching’ in the narrative of our Saviour’s life course. It is in the same light also that we must read the great commission as it stands in its one undisputed, authentic form at the close of the gospel of the kingdom: ‘Go ye, therefore, and make disciples [scholars] of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.’ As the Jews would have understood that charge, and as we have every reason to suppose that our Lord meant it, the direction therein is to organize Bible schools everywhere, as the very basis, the initial form, of the Christian church. Grouping scholars, the child and the childlike, in classes, under skilled teachers, for the study of the word of God by means of an interlocutory co-work between teachers and scholars, that is the starting-point of Christ’s church as he founded it. Whatever else is added, these features must not be lacking. And it would seem that this was the way in which the great commission was understood by the apostles and their immediate successors.”<sup>2</sup>

“Thus it is clear that the early Christian church was not unfaithful to its trust, nor unmindful of the duty imposed upon it by the great commission. It organized Bible-schools far and near, as a means of instructing its converts and of training its membership. And so it continued to do so long as it wisely followed the injunctions of its divine founder. But as it grew in worldly prominence and lost in spiritual life, changes came in the methods of its training work. Its ritual services were expanded and its teaching exercises were diminished. Says De Pressensé: ‘Teaching gained in proportion as ritualism lost, and conversely teaching lost as ritualism gained.’ . . . In the recently issued valuable work of Mr. Henry C. Lea, on the History of the Inquisition, it is shown conclusively by that impartial historian of the religious history of the middle ages that the decline of the spiritual life of the church was attributable to the neglect by the church of its educational function. It is also shown by Mr. Lea, as it has been shown by so many historians before, that the gleams of a pure life, and the struggles toward a better state of

<sup>1</sup> *Yale Lectures* for 1888, by H. C. Trumbull, pp. 28, 29.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 36, 37.

things, meantime, were among and on the part of those who studied and taught the Bible, and who sought to secure Bible instruction for the people generally. It stands out most clearly in the ecclesiastical history of the middle ages, that where the Christian life was purest, in those times of general decline, was where the Bible-school idea was adhered to most closely as a means of religious instruction and training. Peculiarly was this the case with the Waldenses, the Albigenses, the Lollards or Wiclifites, the Bohemian Brethren or Hussites, and the Brethren of the Common Life. Not the pure liturgy, nor yet the faithful pulpit, but the divinely appointed Bible-school in its more primitive elements, was the distinctive means of their preservation from the well-nigh universal defection."<sup>1</sup>

As indicated alike, therefore, by experience and by God's word, the church is the agent charged by God with the duty of giving this religious education through the instrumentality of the school; and the church cannot surrender her rights in education without at the same time evading her plain duty. We must note, however, that religious education, while essential to a true education, cannot be properly the entire discipline of the school which aims at a complete and harmonious development of the whole man. The religious nature, while infinitely the most important part of man's being, is yet not the whole of it, and the other and lower departments of our being require training and development also, if we would make the most of ourselves of which we are capable. We must remember, too, that as man is a unit, in order that his spiritual powers may be at their best his other powers must be drawn out and trained, or else they cannot serve as the effective instruments of the higher governing powers. As a spiritual being one is better equipped for religious service with a sound body, a strong and sagacious understanding, an affluent fancy and a trustworthy memory; and a system of complete education must provide room in its discipline for the training of all the faculties of the entire man. Especially has the experience of the past selected a curriculum of study which, within certain limits, is capable of definite specification, which is the most effective instrument for sharpening and quickening the purely mental faculties, and which must not be ignored or neglected at the same time that the claims of religious education are emphasized and provided for.<sup>2</sup> There must be,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Yale Lectures* for 1888, H. C. Trumbull, pp. 63-65.

<sup>2</sup> See Painter's *History of Education*, pp. 154-247, for suggestive thoughts on "Abstract Theological Education," and the reaction against an exclusively religious training which necessarily follows.

then, an indissoluble marriage in the school between the religious and secular education, because the object of the school is to give the complete education which develops alike the religious, mental, social, and physical powers. But in order that religion may be in the school, it must pervade the entire school life, the secular studies being pursued in a religious spirit and exhibited in their relations to biblical truth; for as truth is an organism, every part is related to every other part, and is necessary for its complete explanation. If religion be excluded from the school and the education be entirely secular, the tendency of such education must be distinctly anti-religious. The words of Christ apply here, "He that is not with me is against me." The same school, in the unity of its discipline, must give the complete education, both religious and secular.

"Religion cannot possibly be separated from the mass of human knowledge without rendering it positively irreligious. The one cannot be taught in one school while the other, entirely purged of it, is taught in another school, because they necessarily interpenetrate one another, just as God and nature, providence and natural law, penetrate each other in every event."<sup>1</sup>

"In order to make popular education truly good and socially useful, it must be fundamentally religious. It is necessary that national education should be given and received in the midst of a religious atmosphere, and that religious impressions and religious observances should penetrate into all its parts. Religion is not a study or an exercise, to be restricted to a certain place or a certain hour. It is a faith and a law which ought to be felt everywhere, and which, after this manner alone, can exert all its beneficial influence upon our mind and our life."<sup>2</sup>

There cannot be a divorce, then, between secular and religious education without fatal injury to both the causes of religion and education, and the school, therefore, must include both.

We inquire next, then, for the agent or agents who shall control the school in giving this complete education. For present purposes we will leave out of consideration private enterprise, for while it may, and in fact has, accomplished much for which we are thankful, it is manifestly unable to grapple with the great problem of the education of an entire people, and we are left, then, to consider the claims, in some cases the contesting claims, of

---

<sup>1</sup> *The State and Religion*, Christian Statesman Tracts, No. 14, by Dr. A. A. Hodge, p. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Guizot, quoted by Cardinal Gibbons before National Educational Association.

church and state. There are several modes in which this question may be adjusted. If there were a union of church and state, as in England, Germany, and other continental countries, the religious education of the school might be given by the church, and the secular education in the same school might rest in the hands of the state. In popular discussions of this theme, examples are often adduced from England and Germany, entirely overlooking the union of church and state in those countries—a union opposed alike to our Constitution and the genius of our institutions. Again, an alliance without formal union might be made between church and state, by means of which a co-partnership in educational work might be formed, resulting in a harmonious settlement of the place which religious education under church control, and secular education under state control, should be assigned in the common schools supported by both alike. But on account of the division of the church in our country into numerous conflicting sects, as well as on account of the American theory of the relation of church and state, such an alliance is an impracticability, and, indeed, where adopted has not worked satisfactorily.<sup>1</sup> Neither a union nor an alliance between church and state is at present possible in the United States.

The question, then, before us is, Whether education shall be conducted by the church exclusively, or by the state exclusively, or shall both engage in this work, each independently of the other. If the church leaves education entirely in the hands of the state, will the religious part of a complete education receive the attention it requires? Can the state introduce religion into its schools? For religion must be a part of the schools, whether conducted by church, or state, or private enterprise.

“Religion must be a part of education, and if it cannot be made so without committing education to the church, why then the church must take charge of it. The state has advantages, in some respects, which the church does not possess; but if the distinctive principles of Christianity are to be excluded from the schools of the state, these schools must be abandoned. The great problem to be solved in this country is the introduction of religion—THE WHOLE RELIGION OF THE BIBLE—

---

<sup>1</sup> See numerous articles on school question in Canada, where this is substantially the plan adopted.

into public institutions of learning. That problem *must* be solved, or the church will be driven to establish institutions of her own."<sup>1</sup>

But has the state a religion which it can introduce? If so, what is the religion of the state? Is it a bare and naked theism, or is it the religion of the Bible? If the religion of the state be the religion of the Bible, then where is the commission of the state to teach it? There are difficulties and perplexities here which the wit of man has never yet satisfactorily solved. The present writer has no sympathy with those who call the state godless or atheistic; but he has never been able to find a satisfactory reply to the questions proposed above. To quote again from Dr. Thornwell—

“Supposing, however, that schools have a higher object, the formation of character, as well as the discipline and cultivation of mind, religion must enter as an element. But by what authority does the state introduce it? Is not the state institution founded essentially upon the relations of justice betwixt man and man? No doubt, if it has a right to introduce religion at all, it is bound to introduce the true religion; but the opinions of the magistrate are a poor security for the permanent introduction of an evangelical faith. My mind, however, labors on the question of right. Religion may be introduced as a matter of *science*, a thing that ought to be *known*; but as a living power, a system of divine grace, what has the state as such to do with it?”<sup>2</sup>

The theory upon this subject most widely prevalent now is that which Dr. A. A. Hodge has called the Secularist theory, which claims that the state is a purely secular and naturalistic institution, without religion of any kind, and upon such a theory, of course, religion cannot be introduced into public institutions of learning.<sup>3</sup> Under the influence of this theory, as President Porter says, “the tide is now strongly setting towards the complete secularization of our public educational system,” and under such circumstances the church must engage in educational work.<sup>4</sup> If she resigns the whole of education into the hands of the state, she will fail to fulfil her mission, which requires her to undertake the religious education of the people, and she will give her work into the hands of

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Thornwell's *Collected Writings*, Vol. IV., pp. 497, 498.

<sup>2</sup> Thornwell's *Life and Letters*, by Dr. B. M. Palmer, p. 329; extract from letter to Dr. R. J. Breckenridge.

<sup>3</sup> See Spears' *Religion and the State*, pp. 51-53.

<sup>4</sup> See an admirable article upon “Secularized Education,” by Dr. R. L. Dabney, in *Princeton Review*, September, 1879; also Porter's *American Colleges*, p. 394.



an agent who, as things now are, will certainly fail in doing this work which the church ought to do. If the church suffers the education of the people to be destitute of a religious element, she fails in one of the most solemn duties which God requires of her; and if the circumstances of our day and country are such that no union or alliance between church and state is possible in this work, and if the prevailing "Secularist Theory" prevents the state from attempting to give anything save a purely secular education, then it becomes the bounden duty of the church to see that education is not thus disastrously secularized; and in order to this end the church has the right, yea, is under the duty, of entering and cultivating the whole field of education. To one who carefully examines the *status* of affairs in the educational sphere in our country, there can seem but little doubt that the alternative which stares the church in the face is the complete secularization of education, or education by the church, which gives religious instruction and training its proper place in the educational system.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> As Dr. Thornwell has been twice quoted in this discussion, a brief foot-note on his views may not be out of place. No one is altogether superior to his environment, and Dr. Thornwell's long connection with a state institution as student, professor and president must have influenced his views; and yet we find that he was in grave doubt upon this subject for years (see extracts quoted above), and even after his celebrated letter to Governor Manning, in which he commits himself unreservedly for state and against church education, we find him connected with an institution for education under church control, the Columbia Seminary, and at our first Assembly he was a supporter of Dr. Jas. A. Lyon's scheme of a Southern Presbyterian university, supported by the whole church, though, as Dr. Palmer tells us, he was opposed to such university having any organic connection with our ecclesiastical courts. In his letter to Governor Manning (see pp. 29-31) his positions are: 1, Religion must be a part of education; 2, The state has a religion which it can introduce; 3, The methods by which this is to be done are three-fold; (1), Through the religious and Christian character of the teachers; (2), By the obligatory observance of the Lord's day with its duty of public worship; (3), By teaching the evidences of Christianity.

Upon these views we remark: 1. They are not those generally held by the advocates of state education, who usually assign no such prominence to religion in the school. 2. While good so far as they go, they make no provision for the study or teaching of the Bible, a conspicuous and fatal lack. 3. They take a far wider view of the functions of the state than the current opinions allow. The question, Shall the state teach religion? answered in the affirmative by Thornwell, would receive an almost universal negative from educators in our day. 4. The methods indicated for the introduction of religion can be effectively employed only by the

The testimony of history constitutes a powerful argument for the truth of the view now presented. Education in all lands is dominated by the national religion, and rests largely in the hands of religious teachers.<sup>1</sup> The church in every age has found it necessary to use the school as an indispensable instrument in accomplishing its mission.<sup>2</sup> Especially has Presbyterianism in all of its branches been foremost in the practical recognition of the mission of the church in education by the establishment of institutions dedicated to this end.<sup>3</sup> If any one desires to investigate the relation of American Presbyterianism to education, let him consult Baird's, Moore's, or Alexander's *Digest* for the long chain of testimony on that point, extending from the earliest organic existence of Presbyterianism in our country until the present day, and he will see that the historic doctrine of the Presbyterian Church is that she cannot fulfil her mission in the world without the recognition of her educational function and its discharge through the instrumentality of institutions of learning. It is conceivable, perhaps, that there might be a state of things in which there would be no necessity of complete education under church control, but such a state of things does not now exist, nor, as a matter of fact, has ever existed in the past.

The advantages which the church has derived from its work in the educational sphere indicates the right of the church to engage in it, for which we are contending. If you subtract from the

---

church, (see Porter's *American Colleges*, chapter on Religious Character of Colleges). 5. As a matter of fact, with few exceptions, state institutions are not religious in the sense indicated by Dr. Thornwell. If they could be, or if they were, the same urgent necessity for complete education under church control would not exist.

<sup>1</sup> Examine on this point the view of Dr. William T. Harris, United States Commissioner of Education, in Introduction to Painter's *History of Education*, pp. 7, 8; also Dr. McPherson's Centennial Address on Presbyterianism and Education, in volume of *Centennial Addresses*, delivered at Philadelphia, p. 66.

<sup>2</sup> As space forbids the quoting, let me refer the reader to an address on Christian Education by Dr. J. N. Waddel, in *Quarto-Centennial Addresses*, delivered at Augusta, pp. 36, 37, and also to a discourse by the late Dr. Thomas Smyth, of Charleston, on Denominational Education, of which Dr. Thomas Chalmers, who heard him deliver it, afterwards remarked "that he could never cease talking about it." (Dr. Brackett's *Memorial Sermon*, p. 31.)

<sup>3</sup> PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, July 1889, pp. 332, 333—"Presbyterianism and Education," by Rev. Dr. Joseph R. Wilson.

church's equipment of power the forces which have issued from her various institutions of learning, you withdraw the mightiest of the natural forces which have made the church the most influential factor in the world's history. The words which have been used of our own country are capable, *mutatis mutandis*, of far wider application: "Were the religious influences that proceed from the colleges of this country to be withdrawn or sensibly diminished, it would seem that the gospel itself might almost cease to be acknowledged, so manifold are the relations of each generation of college students to the faith and life of the whole Christian church." Not only is religion a debtor to church education, but the cause of sound learning and of true education rests under an incalculable indebtedness to the church for the work she has done in this sphere. The glowing tribute which, in the opening chapter of his monumental history, Macaulay pays to the work of the church in preserving the seeds of learning and civilization is none the less true because of the splendid rhetoric in which it is enshrined. Not the least of the benefits of education administered by the church has been the healthy influence which has reacted on those institutions conducted by the state or by private enterprise. The whole tone of institutions sustaining no direct connection with the church has been in this way elevated, and public education is in some respects different from what it would have been had it not been brought into competition with, and thus been influenced by, those institutions of Christian education under church control. Further, the supply and preparation of an educated ministry has been almost entirely dependent upon church institutions.

"The church has never depended, except to a very limited extent, upon secular institutions for the supply of its ministry. Her experience has taught her that she cannot do it. In proof of this, let me give some unpublished statistics which have been kindly furnished me by Dr. Bunting, of Clarksville, Tenn.: 'The University of Alabama, up to 1879, graduated 659, and, so far as known, only 30 were clergymen. The University of Georgia, at Athens, in eighty years, has sent out 2,003 graduates; only 137 entered the ministry. Of all the graduates of the University of Michigan in thirty-six years, from 1844 to 1879, only 157 were ministers. Cornell's graduates number 814. She can put her finger positively on 19 who have become ministers.' Now, these are the facts on one side. What are the facts with reference to the denominational colleges? Suwanee, the Episcopal University of the South, has sent 11 of her 80 graduates into the ministry, while 53 of her

students are now candidates. Emory College, Georgia, of her 791 graduates, has sent 156 into the ministry, also a large number who did not graduate. Mercer University (the Baptist institution of Georgia) has sent out 591 graduates, and 101 of them are ministers. Of the 54 graduates which Roanoke, Va., has sent out in the past five years, 24 have studied theology. The alumni of Washington and Jefferson College number 3,274, and 1,458 have entered the ministry. Your own Davidson has graduated 537, and 162 have entered the ministry. These figures prove the correctness of a recent statement made by Dr. Dabney, that 'each church must look chiefly for the rearing of candidates to its own colleges. Whether we can explain it or not,' he adds, 'the stubborn facts prove this.'"<sup>1</sup>

We remark, in passing, that the general admission that the church is justified in engaging in the work of education to the extent necessary to prepare her ministers for their work would by parity of reasoning constitute sufficient ground for broadening her work in education to prepare for Christian service the other officers of the church and the private members as well, including that most influential of all classes, the mothers, in whose hands the future of both church and state so largely rests.

It is true that objections to education under church control are numerous, for criticism is ever the easiest and cheapest of all things. Many are loud in the objection that the church has no commission to teach science or philosophy or the languages. Of course, the church has no right to teach any of these things for their own sake, but if teaching any branch of secular learning becomes necessary in order to the most effective discharge of "making disciples of all nations" in the "all things" which Christ has commanded, then the right becomes plain, and the duty becomes imperative to so teach. But we must observe that such secular learning is taught, not in the authoritative way in which scriptural truth is delivered, but in the subordinate and secondary manner in which the church, in the theological seminary, through her accomplished professors, teaches Hebrew or Chaldee or Greek.<sup>2</sup> It may be objected that the end of education is culture, and that if the church engages in this work culture will be sacrificed for the sake of religion. We do not believe with Matthew Arnold, in his *Culture*

<sup>1</sup> An able address on "Denominational Colleges," by Dr. W. M. Grier, delivered at Davidson College, and published in semi-centennial volume of that institution, pp. 86-88, and also in *THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY*, October, 1887.

<sup>2</sup> See an admirably clear statement of this point in a speech delivered before Synod of South Carolina by Dr. Jas. Woodrow, pp. 15-17.

and *Anarchy*, that there is any necessary antagonism between the claims of culture and those of the biblical religion; and an examination of the history and work of those institutions of learning which are entirely under church control, and which are most distinctly religious in their influence and common life, will satisfy one that there is no necessity that they should be on this account the less severe in their mental discipline or more lax in enforcing an elevated curriculum of study.

The claim is sometimes made that the education of the church is sectarian, and therefore separative and divisive in its tendencies, and that as enlightened and patriotic citizens all should combine in the hearty support of that public system of education which tends to unify all the dissimilar and conflicting elements of our heterogeneous national life. But church education is not necessarily sectarian, nor, as a fact, is it actually so in the majority of church institutions, nor is there any need of teaching the Bible in a sectarian sense.<sup>1</sup> The discipline of biblical theology is the greatest theological achievement of our century, and the arena where it is destined to do its best work is in the curriculum of study of our institutions of Christian learning. Sectarian theology need not be taught emphasizing points of difference and heightening existing antagonisms, but a distinctively biblical theology will be irenical in its influence on creed or sectarian differences; for just as the Bible contains in its unity all the manifoldness of temperament and diversity of type which characterize human nature, so the influence of the religion of the Bible upon individuals and peoples is the great unifying factor in creating a homogeneous and harmonious people. Religion is the great bond which unites man to man as well as to God, and the way to unite our people is by exerting upon all of them the unique influence which comes from the Bible and its religion.

There are some who fear that if the church engages in education there is danger of overpassing the limits which properly bound the activity of the "spiritual kingdom." No doubt, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Shearer deserves the thanks of the church for his work in showing how the Bible is to be taught in our higher institutions of learning. See his *Syllabus of a Course of Bible Study* (three volumes), also two articles in *PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY*, January and July, 1888.

doctrine of the spirituality of the church needs the emphasis which our church has placed upon it through the teaching of representative theologians and the action of our ecclesiastical courts; but the spirituality of the church does not mean that the church is a ghost without a body and visible, physical functions to discharge. There is a tendency in some quarters to minimize by extreme "spiritualization" the power and the functions of the church until, instead of being a mighty spirit, with a strong and healthy body as its effective instrument, it is reduced to the ghostlier shadow of a ghostly shade, whose influence in the world will be almost imperceptible. Here, as at many points elsewhere *in medio tutissimus ibis*; we need to resist the tendency which would strip the church of its proper prerogatives just as we must also resist any tendency towards that extreme churchliness which, as in the popish system, clothes the church with unwarranted powers. But there can be no danger to the spirituality of the church in the employment of the agencies which are necessary to accomplish its mission, especially if that agency is proven to be necessary by universal experience, and is indicated as well by divine prescription.

There are some opposed to education by the church who apprehend that the control of the necessary institutions will be troublesome, involving ecclesiastical courts in delicate and embarrassing details of administration, and leading to heated and injurious discussion and controversy. Those were wise words addressed by the President of Wofford College to the Methodists of South Carolina:

"No church can expect to enjoy at once the ease of those who, for any reason, decline great enterprises, and the success and enlargement of those who wisely attempt great enterprises. There is an infinite range and depth in the divine, sleepless law, 'Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.' It applies to churches as well as to individuals. Surely we do not intend to say to sister churches in the State and to sister conferences beyond our State lines, 'Go on with all your educational efforts. We can do as much for the public good without these helps as you can with them. We shall pour into the next generation as full a current of moral and intellectual influence as you can, with all your outlay of interest, money and men.'"<sup>1</sup>

Observe also that it is a serious and unjust indictment against our church polity and the wisdom of our courts to pronounce them incapable of the wise and successful management of such institu-

---

<sup>1</sup> *An Appeal to the Methodists of South Carolina*, by Jas. H. Carlisle, LL. D., p. 3.

tions. A sufficient answer is an appeal to history, showing the successful conduct by the church of every grade of educational enterprise from the academy to the university. Through its system of committees our church successfully grapples with all of the numerous and complex details involved in the control of its enterprises of Home and Foreign Missions, Education and Publication; and practically the same system is employed in the appointment of the trustees and directors who are charged by our courts with the duty of administering the affairs of the schools and colleges of the church, and who are responsible for the manner of discharging this trust to the ecclesiastical bodies which appointed them. Perplexing details requiring delicate tact, much experience, and a sagacious knowledge of affairs, may be safely left to the directory of such institutions, just as in similar cases such questions are left to the committees of Education, Publication, Home or Foreign Missions. The church need only assume sufficient control to secure the following ends: 1. That the Bible be taught by competent teachers; 2, That nothing inconsistent with the Scriptures as interpreted in the symbols of the church be taught in any department of the school; 3, That the moral and religious influence of the institution be strong and decided; 4, That the curriculum of study and the intellectual culture be of the highest grade. As long as the directors, by their administration of the school, college or seminary, secure these ends, the details of administration should be left in their hands, and the control of the church would thus be exercised mediately and indirectly. When, however, there is failure to secure these ends, which the church must regard as paramount, the delinquent directors may be easily substituted by others who will be true to the policy of the church in her educational work, and thus in either case the church maintains a general control and supervision while unembarrassed with perplexing matters of administration. This is substantially the plan adopted in most cases by the church in the government of her institutions of learning, and which experience has shown to be safe and practicable.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Those interested in the question of the management of institutions of learning will find suggestive thoughts in these works amongst others: Mark Pattison's

This article will conclude with some practical suggestions—

1. Let the doctrine of the duty of the church in education be recognized and practically applied whenever possible. The doctrine of our church on this point is contained in the circular letter issued in 1871:

“(1.) The promotion of the great work of education in all its departments is now, as in all our past history it has been, not only the true policy, but the indispensable duty and an absolute necessity, of our beloved Zion.

“(2.) This necessity, in the opinion of this Assembly, exists not only with reference to the preparation of our young men for the ministry, but with equal certainty as it bears upon the training of the entire body of our youth for their future career in every sphere of human effort, and that its obligation extends to both sexes alike.

“(3.) While there may exist an honest difference of opinion as to the precise form of control which should be maintained over this great interest, there is a happy unanimity in the sentiment that it is one too dear, too vital to us as a church, to be remitted to the state, to other communions, or to any irresponsible body of educators; that, in a word, the education of our children can be safely surrendered to no other than a Presbyterian influence.”<sup>1</sup>

Let our officers and people be trained to accept this historic doctrine of Presbyterianism, and our church courts be fixed in the habit of fostering institutions of Christian education in all legitimate ways.

2. The primary and secondary education which our country offers its children needs re-organization in the interest of religious instruction and training.

The fathers of the common-school system in our country did not anticipate the exclusion from the public school of religious instruction derived from Bible study.<sup>2</sup> If the “secularization” of

---

*Academical Organization; Letters on Collegiate Government*, by late President F. A. P. Barnard; *Thoughts on College System in United States*, by Francis Wayland. There were at one time in the Theological Seminary library, at Columbia, interesting and valuable notes in manuscript by Dr. George Howe, on this subject, prepared when he was chairman of the Assembly's Committee on the Revision of the Seminary Constitution. The changes he advocated, and they seem to have been adopted, were in the direction of throwing all matters of administration upon the board and leaving control only to the courts of the church; for this position Dr. Howe argued from the example of other seminaries, the experience of the college world, and the nature of the case.

<sup>1</sup> Alexander's *Digest*, p. 212.

<sup>2</sup> See Horace Mann's *Reports*, pp. 710-715.



the public schools now in progress is to continue, the Christian church in this country, in all of its branches, will be compelled by the duty of self-preservation to withdraw support from such a system.

“One thing is absolutely certain: Christianity is ever increasing in power, and, in the long run, will never tolerate the absurd and aggressive claims of modern infidelity. The system of public schools must be held, in its sphere, true to the claims of Christianity, or they must go with all the other enemies of Christ, to the wall.”<sup>1</sup>

In some quarters of our country the utterance of such views is construed as lack of public spirit, but patriotism as well as religion demands that some method must be devised by which the Bible and religion may be a part of the discipline of the common-school system, as was designed by its founders, or the system is doomed to failure and final extinction. The church is awaking to the peril which is involved in a “secularized” and godless education. President Seelye, of Amherst, tells us that “it is a grave question whether by our popular education we are not lighting the torch of the incendiary rather than that of the guide,” and there are many who share the apprehension of this eminent publicist and scholar. In this reference Dr. Roberts, ex-Moderator of the Northern General Assembly and President of Lake Forest University, argues that—

“It should be made the duty of the presbyteries to see that each of them, if the members of the churches and the population of the district should demand it, has an academy or an intermediate school to prepare their youth for business and for entrance into college. These academies should be well endowed, thoroughly equipped with scientific appliances, and permeated with the spirit of religion. A large number of these is now needed, and a still larger number will be needed in the near future.”<sup>2</sup>

3. Female education ought to receive far greater attention than has been the case in the past.

While our church has some excellent institutions of a high grade for female education, thoroughly Christian in their influence, and enforcing, to some extent at least, Bible study as a part of their curriculum, yet the supply of such institutions is far too limited, and the support they receive and the honor accorded them in the

<sup>1</sup> *New Princeton Review*, Vol. III., p. 47, Dr. A. A. Hodge.

<sup>2</sup> *Presbyterian Review*, April, 1888, p. 219; see also Dr. Roberts' opening sermon at the last Assembly at Saratoga.

public estimation of the church is not that which they are entitled to receive on account of the value and dignity of the work they are doing. It is far too common to regard the position of president or instructor in a female seminary as a *dernier resort* for some superannuated, invalid, or "broken-down" brother, who has failed at preaching or at teaching boys, and who, therefore, *must* be fitted for this work. There are few "prevailing views" that are more grossly "heretical" than the place which public opinion assigns female education, and the relative position of conspicuous inferiority to which the instructor in the female institution is relegated when contrasted with the higher esteem and nobler station with which the professor in the male college is honored. The whole tone of public opinion on this point ought to be revolutionized; the transcendent importance of Christian education for the girls should be recognized, and the unsurpassed field of usefulness occupied by those engaged in female education should attract the best talent of the church, and secure for the work the distinguished respect which it deserves.<sup>1</sup>

4. Our church is plentifully supplied with institutions for the higher education of males, and does not need to multiply them.

The opinion may be entertained that we have too many male colleges, but a careful examination would show that all of them have their own peculiar fields, to occupy which, with the growth and development of our South-land, it will require their best efforts to worthily fill.<sup>2</sup>

"If we are wise and successful in managing our public affairs, we may soon have a population which will need all the Southern colleges now in existence. Each institution sheds light in a region which but for it might be unenlightened. The small colleges have performed, and seem destined still to perform, an important part in the social, literary, and religious growth of our country."

---

<sup>1</sup> Without instituting invidious comparisons, what an incalculable gain to the whole church, if each Synod had located within its bounds an institution like Bellewood Seminary, at Anchorage, Ky., distinctly religious, and making the Bible an indispensable part of the curriculum of study!

<sup>2</sup> For a suggestive and vigorous discussion of the tendency, especially in the South, to multiply the number of colleges, see a pamphlet entitled *The College Question*, by President Julius D. Dreher, of Roanoke College, Va.

Without exception, all of the colleges connected with our church offer a curriculum of study which represents at least respectable attainments, and the existence of each is justified by the work it is accomplishing. If the alternative which confronted the church were a choice between the policy of increase or that of concentration, the wiser choice would seem to be to concentrate resources upon fewer institutions, perhaps to combine some of them, so as to have strong, ably manned and amply endowed institutions, which, by their superior excellence and recognized merits, would command a wide patronage both without and within the bounds of our church. But no such choice as this is required of the church, and her wisest policy would seem to be, while not increasing the number of existing institutions, and while not questioning the right of any to exist, to give a more generous and hearty support to those already in existence, elevating the standard of scholarship, raising ampler endowments, so that larger and abler faculties may be employed, above all, strengthening the distinctively religious influence of the college, and making the Bible a central part of the curriculum of study, ranking with the severe studies in science, language or philosophy, and pursued by the same rigorous scientific methods.

The only point where divergence of view may arise is in South Carolina, where the Presbyterian College of South Carolina, located at Clinton, is asking to be received under synodical control, and where also a movement is on foot looking to the establishment of a South Atlantic University, under the control of the four Synods of North and South Carolina, Georgia, South Georgia and Florida. If both of these movements are successful, the number of colleges will not be necessarily increased; perhaps they may be decreased. Nor does there seem to be any necessary antagonism between them. The Presbyterian College of South Carolina, though young, has yet done a good work for its years, and gives promise of better with future growth. It deserves well of the Presbyterians of South Carolina, and the request which it now makes of the Synod, while carefully canvassed, and all possible contingencies weighed, should not be lightly disregarded. The Synod of South Carolina, with its 16,000 members, would seem to be as

able to support an institution as Kentucky with 15,500, Missouri with 9,700, Texas with 10,000, or Arkansas with 4,500.<sup>1</sup> It may be thought, however, that if the movement for the establishment of the university is successful, as it ought and *must* be, that it would injuriously divide the strength of the Synod to sustain organic relations to the two institutions. But Arkansas is one of the Synods sustaining the Southwestern University, while at the same time Arkansas College, within its bounds, is doing a good and necessary work, which otherwise would not be done, to the serious loss of Presbyterianism in that and other States. The Synod of Nashville sustains similar relations to Southwestern University, while King College, located within its bounds, is discharging its mission in that rapidly developing part of Tennessee which so greatly needs the influence and work of just such an institution. Presbyterianism would be much the poorer in the two States of Arkansas and Tennessee were the two colleges at Batesville and Bristol blotted out of existence; nor is the loss a serious one, if indeed there be any loss at all, to the Southwestern Presbyterian University, because in the bounds of two of the Synods supporting that noble institution there are located two colleges doing a work for Christian education which else would go undone. The university proposed for establishment by the four Synods would not suffer if the college at Clinton were brought into closer relations to the Synod of South Carolina; nor, on the other hand, would this college be injured by the successful consummation of the movement to enrich the cause of Presbyterianism and Christian education by the establishment of a university worthy of the support and the patronage of the four Synods. Presbyterianism would gain incalculably in moral influence and in efficiency in preparing its ministers and members for Christian work, were there established in this part of the church an institution for both collegiate and professional training of the very highest grade, with an able faculty amply supported. Dr. Jas. A. Lyon said twenty years ago:

“We must not disguise from ourselves the unpleasant fact that our honorable *prestige* is gradually but surely passing away from us; not that we have lowered

---

<sup>1</sup> This article cannot omit recognizing also the great debt which the church owes to that venerable and noble institution, the Hampden-Sidney College, and its younger sisters, Davidson and Westminster Colleges and the Central University.

our standard, but that we have stood still, content with past honors. One is never in greater danger than when he is lulled into indifference by fancied security."<sup>1</sup>

The time has come for a forward movement in order to maintain the honorable eminence in education which distinguishes us, and to strengthen our church in these four Synods to grapple with the supreme duties which the immediate future of this rapidly developing section will present.

5. Our institutions for theological education ought to do more work in preparing our future ministers to use and to teach the English Bible.<sup>2</sup> The Southwestern Presbyterian University, in its theological as well as in its academical department, is already doing much good work in this reference, and some of our other seminaries are moving in this direction, as, in fact, are most of the theological seminaries of a high grade amongst all the churches.

"The church ought to do more for the expounding of the English Bible, and to train its ministers more efficiently for this work. The ministry must know the originals, and draw their inspiration from the originals, but they have to teach their people through the medium of the *English Bible*; and, therefore, it is necessary that they should understand this medium, and that they should have facility in its use. . . . But the knowledge of the originals will be of little service to them as public teachers, unless they can use the English Bible as the medium by which they are to instruct the people. They need thorough training in the use of the English Bible as well as in the original Scriptures, and only in this way does their knowledge of the originals attain its practical importance and bestow its blessings through the ministry on the church. In my opinion, the institutions of learning have been neglecting the English Bible, and it is high time that its study should take a prominent place in the curriculum of every theological seminary.

"The study of the English Bible in the theological seminary has, therefore, this as its aim: (1), To set the English Bible in the light of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek originals; (2), To impregnate the English Bible with the spirit and life of the originals; (3), To train the student to expound the English Bible in that light, and spirit, and life; (4), To give him 'a comprehensive view of the whole Bible, showing him the principles of its structure, the variety and unity of its organism; (5), To set the whole Scripture in the light shining from the throne of

<sup>1</sup> *Southern Presbyterian Review*, April, 1869, p. 153.

<sup>2</sup> The writer wishes that this review could secure for its readers an admirable address on this subject of the Bible in schools, colleges, and theological seminaries, delivered at the opening of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, in 1889, by that great preacher and scholar, Dr. John A. Broadus, whose course in New Testament English shows, by successful example, the importance and value of the study of the English Bible in the theological seminary. If personal testimony were in place, the writer would testify to the inspiration and stimulus, whose influence is abiding and permanent, which he derived from attendance for some time upon the class in the English Bible of this distinguished teacher.

God. Such a study of the English Bible in the curriculum of a theological seminary should not interfere with any existing courses of study."<sup>1</sup>

6. Our church should return to the conception of the teacher or doctor as one of the permanent officers of the church, and this not simply as teacher in academies, colleges or seminaries under church control, but also in the particular congregation where there is the greatest need of religious instruction and training. The local churches need teachers as well as preachers. Congregations of a large and prosperous membership, able to sustain and needing the ministrations of both the preacher and the teacher, ought to be encouraged to secure, in addition to the preacher in the pulpit, the services of men gifted in the function of teaching, who, by their skill in the Sabbath-school, the Bible-class, the teacher's meeting, and other assemblies for associated study of God's word which could easily be established, might build up God's people in Christian knowledge and guide them in methods of successful Bible study. There are men admirably fitted for this work, who are not adapted to proclaim with inspiring effect the truth from the pulpit; and this is an illustration of that "diversity of gifts" which Christ bestows upon his disciples, and which, if the church is wise, she will utilize by providing each particular variety of endowment with that kind of work which it is prepared most efficiently to discharge. The church needs teachers, the gift of teaching is bestowed by Christ upon some of his disciples, the office of teacher is recognized in God's word; the true policy of the church is, therefore, to faithfully employ, wherever possible, this officer in the discharge of his proper function of teaching God's truth to God's people, and thus supply one of the great needs now pressing upon us, which is not so much more and better preaching as more and better teaching.<sup>2</sup> And we need have little fear that the church will unduly emphasize its teaching-office and the educational function which by its very charter it is commissioned to discharge.

THORNTON C. WHALING.

<sup>1</sup> *Presbyterian Review*, April, 1889, p. 297, C. A. Briggs. The vagaries of *Whither* will not prevent one from recognizing the sound and sober sense of this excerpt from the author of that brilliant but erratic book.

<sup>2</sup> Upon the teacher's or doctor's office, see Mitchell's *Lectures on Westminster Assembly*, pp. 184-186; Briggs's *Whither*, pp. 38-43; Stuart Robinson, *Church of God*, Appendix, pp. 23, 28, and 71, and Minutes of Westminster Assembly, *passim*.

## IV. REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN THE CHURCH.<sup>1</sup>

I. Complaint has been made against the affirmative answer of Lexington Presbytery to the question, "Is the authority of the session exclusive of all other authority in the matter of calling a congregational meeting to consider its temporal affairs?"

This answer is based upon the three following grounds: *First*, that the government of the church is exclusively in the hands of presbyters appointed to rule; *second*, that this government is a government by the people through their chosen representatives; and *third*, that the organized assembly of the body of the church is expressly limited to two purposes—the election of their representatives and the dissolution of their relation to one class of these, the pastors of the church.

1. The proof of the first of these grounds is found in the general statement that "the officers of the church, by whom all its powers are administered, are, according to the Scriptures, minis-

---

<sup>1</sup> At a recent meeting of Lexington Presbytery a paper was presented, asking the following questions, to which the Presbytery gave the annexed answers:

"1. Is the authority of the session exclusive of all other authority in the matter of calling a congregational meeting to consider its temporal affairs?—*Answer*: It is.

"2. Has the board of deacons a right to call or have called such a meeting when, in its judgment, it is expedient to consult the body of the people about their temporal affairs?—*Answer*: No; the answer to the first question settles this.

"3. Has the session authority to decide where and what if any change shall be made in the house of worship, or the method of seating the congregation?—*Answer*: The session has the abstract authority; but it would not be expedient to use this power without consulting the congregation, except in extraordinary cases."

To these answers the following explanatory resolution was added:

"4. *Resolved*, That, in returning the answers above given, the Presbytery expresses, as the ground of its decisions, that the session is the only governing body in the church, except in those cases where the constitution expressly authorizes the congregation to exercise that authority."

Against this deliverance of the Presbytery, a complaint was brought up to the Synod, and two members of the body complained against were appointed to defend its action. In the discharge of this duty they presented the paper here published in explanation and defence of the interpretations of law adopted by Presbytery.

ters of the word, ruling elders, and deacons." (*Form of Government*, Chap. I., Par. 4.)

This general statement answers, in its designation of the officers, who are to use the offices, to the general distribution of the whole polity or frame of the church as given in another place. "The whole polity of the church consists in doctrine, government and distribution." (*Form of Government*, Chap. IV., Sec. I., Par. 2.)

The government of the church, as thus distinguished from doctrine and distribution, is specifically lodged in ruling elders, exercising their power generally in joint assemblies, occasionally severally, as in visiting the people. Deacons are absolutely excluded from governmental functions. Ministers of the word are associated in the government, but not in their several capacity as teachers; their part in government is due to their being ruling as well as teaching elders. As ruling elders, their authority is equal, no greater, no less, than that of all other ruling elders. "Ruling elders" are defined as those "whose office is to wait on government." (*Form of Government*, Chap. IV., Sec. I., Par. 2.) The same definition is made in broader terms in *Form of Government*, Chap. IV., Sec. III., Par. 1.

This is the distinctive character of Presbyterian church government, as distinguished from the papal, the prelatical and the congregational. The papal is governed by the pope, as the alleged successor of Peter, construed as the head of the apostles. The prelatical is by diocesan bishops, construed as successors of the twelve. The congregational is wholly in the hands of the brotherhood. (Hodge's *Presbyterian Law*, pp. 9, 10.) The Presbyterian is government by ruling elders, chosen as representatives by the people. (*Form of Government*, Chap. VI., Sec. I., Par. 2; Chap. II., Sec. III., Par. 1.) From these authorities it is clear that, under the Presbyterian system as regulated by the standards of the Southern Presbyterian Church, the government of the church is exclusively in the hands of the ruling elders chosen by the body of the people to exercise the ordinary functions of government.

2. The second ground of this answer of the Presbytery is, that the government of the church in the hands of ruling elders



chosen by the people is a representative government, and as such, is in the truest sense a government by the people. All representative governments are popular governments; they are governments over the people, by the people, through their representative agents. The representative government organized for action is the government of *the people organized for action*. It is the only way in which the will of the people can be legally and constitutionally organized for action under this species of government. Under a pure democracy the will of the people may be organized for action in a different way—by calling the whole body together and organizing it. But the power of the people under a representative system, organized to give legal effect to their will, can only be expressed through the regular government of their representatives, except in those cases where the constitution itself or some law passed by the representative body shall authorize primary assemblies of the people. The authority of the people under the law of our church is only to be expressed by the election of their representative rulers. It is expressly said:

“The power which Christ has committed to his church vests in the whole body, the rulers and the ruled constituting it a spiritual commonwealth. This power, as exercised by the people, extends to the choice of those officers whom he has appointed in his church.”—*Form of Government*, Chap. II., Sec. III., Par. 1.

The power of the people is the original fountain of power in all representative governments; but it is never exercised directly by the people except in the special cases in which it is reserved to them by the arrangements of law decreed by themselves. They limit their own direct power as well as confer and limit the power they confer on the different classes of officers they appoint. When these powers are conferred they hold good as long as the law remains unchanged, against the people themselves, and each office as against every other office. What is assigned to one office cannot be discharged by another office nor by the people themselves. An office of legislation cannot do the duties of an executive office. A judicial office cannot do the duties of an executive office. The law properly made by the representative makers of law prescribes to the people the time, place, and mode in which they shall elect their officers. The people have no right to elect in any other

way. If they assemble at another place or another time, and elect, the election is contrary to law and void. The limitations placed on themselves are binding. The offices they create are binding on the lawfully-elected officer in positive prescriptions, and bind against all intrusion by others by the prohibitory implications of the law. That this is the true law of all representative governments is thus asserted by the celebrated Daniel Webster in his argument on the case of the Rhode Island government before the Supreme Court of the United States. The facts were briefly these: The people of Rhode Island, by a majority asserted to embrace a very large proportion of the population, resolved to change their State government. No authorization was granted by the existing government; no law was passed requiring the election to be held, or regulating time or place of election; no specifications were made of what officers were to be appointed. Irresponsible meetings of the people, held without authority of law, called a convention, adopted a constitution, and elected Thomas W. Dorr governor. A legislature was called together, went through the forms of electing a supreme court, remained in session one day, and adjourned never to meet again. The whole procedure was universally condemned as revolutionary and unlawful. The case came up in course of time before the Supreme Court, and Mr. Webster's speech contains the clearest exposition of the great principles of representative government and the established system of American liberty anywhere to be found. The following extracts are made from more than one part of his address, in order to bring his expositions into a brief and connected compass suitable to the issue before this body.<sup>1</sup> He says:

"Now, without going into historical details at length, let me state what I understand the American principles to be on which this system rests:

"First and chief, no man makes a question that the people are the source of all political power. Government is instituted for their good, and its members are their agents and servants. He who would argue against this must argue without an adversary."

"The aggregate community is sovereign, but that is not *the* sovereignty which acts in the daily exercise of sovereign power. The people cannot act daily as the people. They must establish a government, and invest it with so much of the sovereign power as the case requires; and this sovereign power being delegated and

---

<sup>1</sup> *Webster's Works*, Vol. VI., p. 221.

placed in the hands of the government, that government becomes what is popularly called the State. I like the old-fashioned way of stating things as they are; and this is the true idea of a State. It is an organized government, representing the collected will of the people, as far as they see fit to invest that government with power."<sup>1</sup>

"The next principle is, that as the exercise of legislative power and the other powers of government immediately by the people themselves is impracticable, they must be exercised by representatives of the people."

"Representation has always been of this character [that is, the representatives are charged with the protection of the rights of the people]. The power is with the people, but they cannot exercise it in masses or *per capita*; they can only exercise it by their representatives. The whole system with us has been popular from the beginning. Now, the basis of this representation is suffrage. The right to choose representatives is every man's part in the exercise of sovereign power."

"This being so, there follow two other great principles of the American system:

"1. The first is, that the right of suffrage shall be guarded, protected, and secured against force and against fraud; and

"2. The second is, that its exercise shall be prescribed by previous law; its qualifications shall be prescribed by previous law; the time and place of its exercise shall be prescribed by previous law; the manner of its exercise, under whose supervision (always sworn officers of the law), is to be prescribed. And then, again, the results are to be certified to the central power by some certain rule, by some known public officers, in some clear and definite form, to the end that two things may be done: first, that every man entitled to vote may vote; second, that his vote may be sent forward and counted, and so he may exercise his part of sovereignty in common with his fellow-citizens. . . . In the exercise of political power through representatives we know nothing, we never have known anything, but such an exercise as should take place through the prescribed forms of law."<sup>2</sup>

"I have said that it is one principle of the American system that the people limit their governments, National and State. They do so, but it is another principle equally true and certain, and, according to my judgment of things, equally important, that the people often limit themselves. They set bounds to their own power. They limit themselves by all their constitutions in two important respects; that is to say, in regard to the qualifications of *electors*, and in regard to the qualifications of the *elected*. They have said, we will elect no man who has not such and such qualifications. We will not vote ourselves unless we have such and such qualifications. They have also limited themselves to certain prescribed forms for the conduct of elections. They must vote at a particular place, at a particular time, and under particular conditions, or not at all."<sup>3</sup>

"Is it not obvious enough that men cannot get together and count themselves, and say they are so many hundred and so many thousand, and judge of their own qualifications, and call themselves the people, and set up a government? Why, another set of men, forty miles off, on the same day, with the same pro-

<sup>1</sup> *Webster's Works*, Vol. VI., p. 222.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 224.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 224, 225.

priety, with as good qualifications, and in as large numbers, may meet and set up another government! What is this but anarchy?"

"Another American principle growing out of this, and just as important and well-settled as is the truth that the people are the source of power, is that, when in the course of events, it becomes necessary to ascertain the will of the people on a new exigency, or a new state of things or of opinion, *the legislative power provides for that ascertainment by an ordinary act of legislation.*"<sup>1</sup>

The principles of all representative government are substantially the same. The law of the Presbyterian Church as a representative popular government is substantially the same. It prescribes the qualifications of electors and the elected. It prescribes the steps preliminary to an election, and what power is to take them. It defines and limits the power of the people. It prescribes the powers of the teaching elder. It prescribes the powers of the ruling elder. It prescribes the exercise of function in ruling officers when several and when joint. It prescribes the powers of the deacons. It prescribes the powers and the mutual relations of the lower and higher courts. It is truly, fully a representative government over the people and by the people through their representatives. A presbytery, whether the presbytery of a single parish called a session, or of a larger territory called a Presbytery, or of a still larger territory called a Synod, *is the government of the people organized for action according to law.*

The vindication of the answer of the Presbytery is effected by these principles. The answer is to the question, "Is the authority of the session exclusive of all other authority in the matter of calling a congregational meeting to consider its temporal affairs?" The answer is, "It is." If it is true that a representative government is the will of the people legally organized for action, and if it is also true that under representative government all exercise of power, whether by the people or by any officer of the government, "should take place through the prescribed forms of law," then manifestly a previous prescription of law should precede any action by either officers or people in order to make it legal; that previous prescription of law must be made either by the constitution or by an act of the existing government. Admitting hypothetically what we do not admit in fact, that the people, under our

---

<sup>1</sup> *Webster's Works*, Vol. VI., pp. 226, 227.

constitution, are legally entitled to control their temporal affairs directly in their own hands, still the principles of representative government require that the assembly of the people for this purpose should be prescribed by law in the ordinary seat of current government. This is expressly required when officers are to be elected. The people may assemble to build a church or alter its arrangements, or elect officers, or raise money, or appoint days of thanksgiving or fasting in the exercise of their own will, but it would not be a lawful proceeding. It would be contrary to the law and defiance of the very government established by themselves as the organized and legal instrument for the expression of their will. For anything to be done by the people in a lawful way, it must be done according to law. As a legislature or a constitutional convention, in order to be lawful, must assemble under the prescriptions of a law previously made by the lawful representatives of the people, the authority of the session, whenever the constitutional law of the church fails to order it, must precede the assembly of the people in order to make it lawful. Their authority is the only authority which can give legal effect to the assemblies of the people under an established and settled constitution. This exclusive authority of the session is not intended to impeach the right of a higher court to order a congregational assembly. The question raised before the Presbytery of Lexington had exclusive reference to the issue tendered by the memorial between the people and the deacons on one side, and the parish Presbytery on the other. The answer asserting the exclusive jurisdiction of the session had sole reference to that issue.

3. The third ground on which the answer of the Presbytery is based is that the constitution of the Presbyterian Church limits the direct action of the people in the frame of the government to two specified purposes—first the election of officers, pastors, elders, and deacons, and second, to the dissolution of the pastoral relation. (*Form of Government*, Chap. VI., Sec. III., Par. 1; Chap. VI., Sec. V., Par. 13.)

This is a limit fixed on themselves by the people in the original framing of their government. The limitation excludes their direct legal control over the administration of their temporal affairs. Their

relation to them is the same sort of relation as that held by the people of a representative State over the finances of the State: a relation which gives sufficient power to the people over their finances, taxation, and expenditure, while it leaves the actual legislation and administration over their financial interests in the hands of the officers of the law. The will of the people in every representative government over the finances of the State is all-powerful by their influence over their representatives, although the actual making and administration of the laws is, and must be, in their officers. To call such a government a tyranny is absurd.

Several objections have been made to this view of representative government in the church. We will notice them in order.

1. It is asserted to be essentially incompatible with the fundamental idea of the spiritual or non-secular character of the church, for the parish presbytery to assert a legislative control over the temporal affairs of the kingdom of the Lord Jesus. The spirituality of the church has been asserted in the most extreme terms. The whole church is disabled from the ownership or control of secular property in any form, from the use or management of anything secular whatever. The session is disabled; the deacons are disabled; the people are disabled. To meet the necessity which always emerges in the progress of the church for money and property in various forms, a new body is created outside of the church for the purpose of "owning and managing property" for ecclesiastical uses.<sup>1</sup> The functions of the whole ecclesiastical body are so "wholly spiritual" as to render it a violation of her charter to meddle with anything secular, no matter how completely incident it may be to her spiritual ends, and essential to the discharge of them. This is the theory of the spirituality of the church gone to seed.

(1.) This extraordinary view is refuted first by the express words of the standards, in which it is "acknowledged" that there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God and the government of the church common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and "Christian prudence."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Irving in the *Central Presbyterian*, May 8, 1889.

<sup>2</sup> *Confession of Faith*, Chap. I., Sec. VI.

Certain secular things stand in such a relation to spiritual things as to be indispensable to the use of them. The use of houses for worship, the rules of business in ecclesiastical courts, bread and wine in the sacrament of the supper, are specimen instances in which the secular is incident and so necessary to spiritual uses as to condition the use of them to any useful purpose, and in some cases absolutely. There has always been a far greater tendency to overstretch these incidental relations of secular to spiritual things rather than to the extreme ostracism of them now attempted. The principle of *incidency* to spiritual uses furnishes a safe logical barrier to abuses, and, at the same time, repels all impossible attempts to abandon secular matters altogether. In these things there are common rights of usage pertaining both to the secular and the spiritual spheres, and therefore there is no compromise of essential character in either to use them.

(2.) It is refuted, secondly, by the principle of law, which is a dictum of common sense, that every system of granted powers carries with it a system of incidental powers, such as are necessary to carry them out. To confer the grant, and to withhold what is incident and necessary to discharge it, is to disable the original power altogether; it is to give and take back in a breath; it is to require bricks without straw. To require reading without letters, or ploughing without a plough; to require a bank to be operated without records, or a railway without wood and iron, would be considered a renewal on a grand scale of the wisdom which determined to swim without water. To suppose the Lord Christ organized a visible institute to conquer the world, and disabled it from using any modification of matter or secular things, is absurdity gone up into a craze.

(3.) It is refuted by the usage of the church in every age. Undoubtedly the use of secular powers has been often frightfully abused; but abuse is no argument against rightful use. Paul used ships to carry him to his work; he used parchment to write his immortal testimonies; and in neither did he sin. Houses, books, coined money, food, clothing, and secular things, too many to list, were from the beginning, and always, employed as incident and essential to the discharge of spiritual ends. The rightful

gain, use and management of these things for such ends is altogether becoming in an institute purely spiritual. Practical, not less than legal and logical, necessity settles many things. When it is said there is no revealed law which requires the management of property by the church, it is evident the *κοινωνία* of the saints, the collection of money to be laid by in store on the first day of the week, about which Paul was so solicitous, is forgotten. It is forgotten that when any duty is required all that is necessary to its best discharge is also conveyed by the same authority.

(4.) It is refuted by the absurd alternative of a body altogether outside of the church necessary to manage the property and income on which the very existence and work of the church are dependent. In order to keep the legislative control of church property out of the hand of the constitutional government of the church, the entire capacity of the whole church is successively disabled in teachers, elders, deacons and people. The whole organism is struck with the weakness of organic paralysis. Then, to hold its needful elements of support, and feed the helpless thing, another body, outside of it, carefully distinguished from it, is created, and this alone is accepted as lawfully empowered either to own or manage the necessary support. To say nothing of the utter shame thrown by this ridiculous organic weakness on the church of Christ, it is refuted by the complete silence of our Form of Government upon the existence of such a body. It is admitted not to be there in form; it is asserted to exist by implication.<sup>1</sup> We deny it; that old and dangerous conception, which is not the only disastrous inheritance which the Presbyterian Church has received from its former unlawful commerce with Congregationalism, has disappeared from our standards. The congregation, as distinguished from the church, with its bought franchises in the sacred house, has gone. It was none too soon. It was the logical solecism of a body outside the kingdom, controlling it in many and disastrous forms. No other organized body would have borne it so long or borne it at all, and the recent attempt to restore it will come to grief. To assert the necessity for it is to charge the legislation of Christ with having created an institute absurdly in-

---

<sup>1</sup> Irving's Arguments, *Central Presbyterian*, May 8, 1889.



competent for its purposes. It is also obviously implied that the body of the church, under the name and power of this outside body, can be called into assembly to order the affairs of the church by any one who chooses. The regular representative government of the church is set aside as incompetent to call an assembly to order affairs in which the highest spiritual interests under their care are deeply involved, and set aside by an avowedly different body from the church, called and managed by any irresponsible party. For if the temporal matters of the church are wholly under the control of a body called the congregation, it is obvious that *without positive restrictions* in the constitution of this "congregation," any member or members of it may call it into assembly at will. There is no other organized body on earth which would submit to be stripped of its functions in such a way and by an irresponsible outside association; not one would consent to live gripped about the throat by the thin talons of a ghost thrust out of a mist. No Masonic body, laying aside its Masonic character, can assemble on the basis of mere citizenship and natural rights, and assume to control the affairs of the Masonic order. The interference of such an outside body would be instantly repudiated. Masons can only act as such when organized for action as a Masonic body under Masonic law. No reading or debating club, no society of any sort, male or female, would allow an outside and irresponsible body to control their affairs. Yet the church of God is supposed to be so weak as to be compelled to submit to this species of impertinent tyranny. This may suffice for the objection to representative government in the church drawn from the spirituality of the kingdom.

2. A second objection is that temporal affairs are not subject to church government. A distinction between polity and government is drawn for the purpose of taking the control of temporal affairs out of the hands of the government. There is a distinction between polity and government; the Book recognizes it. It is said: "The whole polity of the church consists in doctrine, government, and distribution."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Form of Government*, Chap. IV., Sec. I., Par. 2.

The distinction is that between a general term, and a particular term under it; one is the *genus*, the other is the *species*; one is a logical whole, the other one of its exhaustive divisions. But, admitting the distinction, it will not avail for the purpose in view. Unless the extreme ground just refuted is taken and the management of temporal affairs is removed altogether out of the church, and from the hands of every one of its constituent elements, it is useless to appeal to such a distinction between polity and government in the church. Polity must dispose of the temporal affairs somewhere within its territory. If government cannot have them, they must pass to either doctrine or distribution. Are the teaching elders to manage them? Hardly would that be conceded! Are the officers of distribution to manage them? Certainly, as administrative and executive officers of finance; but we are discussing, not the administrative, but the legislative and directive control of them. The State of Virginia cheerfully allows the auditor and treasurer of the commonwealth to administer her finances, but reserves the right to her Legislature to make the laws by which those administrative officers are to move the funds, and to prescribe the objects for which they are to move them. If, then, polity fails to provide for the temporal affairs in the hands of doctrine or distribution, it must place the legislative ordering of them in the hands of government. In doing this it would simply follow the dictates of common sense, and the example of every other sensible polity in the world. The finances of every State are under the direction of the State government. The finances of every college are under the management of the lawful government of the college. The finances of a bank are under the directors of the institution. The precedent is universal; and we see no reason to believe the finances of the church are under some other control than that of its own lawful and free representative government.

3. It is objected again that the powers of government are expressly defined and limited in the standards, and that the control of temporal affairs is nowhere given to any of the courts or defined as belonging to the office of the ruling elder, under any of its authorized combinations for exercise. It is said that all the

functions given to any court, from the highest to the lowest, are specified, and that what is not given is withheld. The powers given are "wholly spiritual," and no grant over temporal matters can be read into the prescriptions of the law. We only refer to what we have said, that a power so wholly spiritual as to admit of nothing temporal to execute it is an absurdity. The granted power carries the necessary incidents. But we meet this allegation with a frank denial. The grants to every court do not exhaust on their verbal face the powers conveyed to the courts. The session is expressly empowered "to order collections for pious uses." They are expressly commanded by the fundamental law to officially order a thing so completely secular as the raising of money for "pious uses," but these uses broadly classified as "pious" may be and are very various; yet none of them are specified in the grant. To say that a church court can do nothing whatever unless it is expressed in so many words in the Book is to hamper it to the sacrifice of a vast measure of its usefulness. In the specifications of the Book *comprehensive expressions are used, under which a variety of things are embraced without articulated and specific designation.* For instance, a session is empowered "to concert the best measures for promoting the spiritual interests of the church and congregation,"<sup>1</sup> and a presbytery "to concert measures for the enlargement of the church within its bounds."<sup>2</sup> Under this grant, both courts may do a number of things which are not specified in the grant. They may order a chapel to be built, as was done by the presbytery of Lexington last spring. To deny such a power to these courts would often be to prevent the best and even an essential measure for "the spiritual interests of a congregation," and for "the enlargement of the church within the bounds of a presbytery." Under this clause these courts are empowered to send delegates to local conventions in some public interest, or to appoint local days of fasting and prayer or of thanksgiving, or to inaugurate a congregational library yet none of these things are specified as among the grants of the public law to sessions or presbyteries. Some of these grants are necessarily

---

<sup>1</sup> *Form of Government*, Chap. V., Sec. III., Par. 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Chap. V., Sec. IV., Par. 6.

non-specific of all they embrace, and therefore it is overpressing a principle of interpretation, generally wise and effective in its application, to say that the grants of the constitution are so exactly defined that they exclude all that they do not specifically express. The primary sense of the word "concert" is to "set or act together," to "consult and plan," "to agree," "to adjust." To "concert measures" indicates investigation and contrivance, the handling of a variety of expedients, which, however various, divergent, and even opposite, they may be, are yet, with equal propriety considered; and yet none are specified: all come under the general designation used in the grant. It is admitted that the location, the size and quality of the accommodations of a house of worship will bear, remotely, it is said, on the spiritual interests of the church. Although forewarned that it would be preposterous to do so, we must nevertheless dare the expression of the opinion that such things bear materially and directly on the spiritual interests of the church and congregation, and are on that very account properly drawn under the control of the officers appointed to seek the best measures for promoting them. But in the instance of this lower court, the answer of the Presbytery of Lexington suggests that in all ordinary cases the representative government should take counsel with their represented body; in extraordinary cases they may act without this consultation. This answer has been severely dealt with, as "an abandonment of the right," "as showing a sense of danger in the assertion." It is often inexpedient to use an undoubted power at a given time or under certain circumstances. It may sometimes be inexpedient for a commander to order his army into a certain position; yet his right to command it to go there is unquestionable. A banker may deem it a little inexpedient to make a certain loan, yet his power to do it is undoubted. All power is under bond to discreet use, and may be withheld at the dictate of expediency without abandoning the power. Prudence is no natural enemy to power. The Legislature of Virginia might think it desirable to build a new State-house; their power to do it is unsusceptible of dispute; yet they might very well think it best to consult their constituents before doing it. Such a course would not involve an abandon-

ment of their right, or the abnegation of their power, or at all imply they thought such power, as vested in the Legislature, was a dangerous power. The answer of the Presbytery was wise, and does not deserve the censure cast upon it. A session has a perfect right to call a meeting of the congregation and lay any business before it on which it may desire the views of the people,<sup>1</sup> whenever it may deem it advisable. They can act otherwise if they please, and their action may be wise or unwise. The Presbytery warrants their independent action "in extraordinary cases," but advises consultation with the body they represent in ordinary cases. The counsel was judicious, but it was not designed to abandon the power or to tax it as dangerous. It may also be said generally, in all cases where the action of the representative government is not sustained by the body represented, there is abundant redress. There are previous safeguards as well as subsequent remedies. To discontent the people is sometimes to peril the spiritual interests with which the session is charged. It has grave and beloved interests to protect, over which it may be presumed to preside with a real solicitude. The court is under authority, as well as invested with it. Each court is required to act with prudence in the use of its powers, and is answerable for its course. The necessity for united action in the church, for peace and harmony of feeling, the interests of the church and the souls of men, their own honor, conscience, Christian principle, desire of approval from the Head of the church, and of support from the courts above them, are powerful preliminary safeguards against abuse of power in the lower representative court. Any grant of power in the hands of erring men is liable to misuse or abuse; but when proper safeguards are established beforehand, and proper subsequent remedies are provided, it is to repudiate government altogether to denounce power as wrongful because it may possibly be abused. If all preventives fail, the whole series of the appellate courts is open for the redress of grievances for the people or the vindication of the court below.

4. It is objected again to the control of the representative courts over the temporalities of the church, that it is inconsistent

---

<sup>1</sup> Hodge's *Presbyterian Law*, p. 165.

with the laws of the state. The state has refused an incorporation to religious bodies, and very properly. But it has never refused to allow them to own property properly related to the state. It allows and incorporates trustees to hold property for different ecclesiastical bodies, and is as prompt to protect that property as any other. Trustees, when authorized simply to hold, are not authorized to do anything else with the property, and the state is absolutely indifferent how the property is managed within the ecclesiastical body itself. It may be managed in complete accord with the laws of the church so long as it stands properly related to the state in the hands of the trustees appointed by the state for the purpose. The property of the Presbyterian Church may be managed by its own internal representative government, to any extent, without giving the least umbrage to the State of Virginia. This form of empowering trustees simply to hold, but not manage or control property for the church, is amply sufficient to secure the property, and, at the same time, to preserve the liberties of the church free from all possible intrusion by the political power of the state. Property is the only thing which creates a necessary connection between the church and the state, and this form of the link is the only one by which the necessary connection can be fully met without any intrusion of either of the spheres within the bounds of the other. For the state to create a corporation of trustees, authorized not merely to hold, but to control and manage the property, necessarily involves a gross invasion of the kingdom of Christ, and the transfer of powers conveyed by him to officers of his own. It invades the legislative control over the property vested in the elders, and the administrative control vested in the deacons. The state creates a corporate body, thrusts it into the church, and transfers to it the official functions conferred by the Lord of the kingdom. It is a gross wrong; it dishonors the authority of the King; it robs his servants; it degrades the church under secular control. This wrong can be avoided before it is done, and redressed where it has been already permitted, by simply seeking such a modification of the law of the state as will make *trustees* simply competent to *hold*, but not to manage, property of the church. Where existing values are held under this

odious intrusion into the sphere of the church, the correction ought to be cautiously but resolutely sought, or else the name of Christ will remain in disgrace. It is no salvo at all to make the elders or deacons the trustees to control, for their power to control, as given by their Lord, is deliberately evacuated, and the power to control actually exercised by them is the power conferred by the state. The dishonor to the Master, and the insult to the kingdom, is, if anything, increased rather than diminished by compelling his servants to divest themselves of functions conferred by their Lord, and to accept the same powers at the hands of the state. All the purposes of the state can be fully served by trustees to *hold*, but *not to manage*, and it will honor the rights of a true religious liberty, by leaving the internal jurisdiction of the church to discharge its divinely-appointed work without any state interference.

5. It is objected again, that this claim of legislative control over the temporal affairs of the church is inconsistent with the attitude of the Southern Presbyterian Church towards the Walnut Street Church case. The doctrine of that celebrated decision makes the definition of theological opinion by the General Assembly decisive of title to property. If no difference of opinion is involved, the principle of the Walnut Street decision will not apply. If both parties are agreed in doctrine, and a dispute about the title of property is raised, the civil courts will have to decide it on a different principle from that of the Walnut Street case; they will decide it as a mere question of priority of claim. Under the laws of Virginia the title to church property is held in trust by trustees for the benefit of the church, and not by the internal government of the church; and the trustees would have to defend the title and trust which they hold, and not the ruling presbyters. The Walnut Street case regulates a single class of litigated cases, with reference to title. The claim for the legislative control and management of temporal affairs in the church is a claim for internal jurisdiction altogether, and has no reference to matters of title which are vested by law in hands of parties appointed by the state to hold property in trust. What a decision affecting title, as the Walnut Street case does, has to do with the settlement of a

power in which title is not at all concerned, passes our wit to discover. Our claim for the session is to manage, not to hold, the title to the property.

6. It is objected, once more, that it is an assumption of power impossible to use except to the destruction of the church. A regular and constitutional representative government, chosen by the people, regulated by law, and amenable to a whole series of appellate courts is delineated as a gross and dangerous usurpation, an oligarchy whose powers will be resisted by the constituent body at all hazards to the peace and prosperity of the church. It is supposed to order churches to be built, altered, or pulled down, with more than imperial authority. Such decrees will be resisted, and ruin will be the result. For the explosion of this unpleasant vision one or two brief explanations may suffice. In the first place, the laws made by a real and lawful representative government are not the same as the imperious edicts of an autocratic power. It is the government of the people themselves. It is the power of the people organized for action. The laws made are the laws of the people, made by the lawful organ of their will. If the people are dissatisfied with the manner in which their will has been interpreted and embodied in a law, the remedy is in their hands. Representative governments have often mistaken and gone counter to the will of their constituencies, and constituencies have often corrected the mistakes of their representatives. But neither have discounted the power used in making the mistaken laws, or denounced it as tyranny or unlawful power. The power employed is not imperial, but representative power; it is not usurpation, but a grant under law; and the use of it is positively required by the law. The power is not discounted or dishonored, though a particular use of it may be disapproved and reversed. The power is not construed as dangerous or impossible to be used in consistency with the public interest, though the special employment of it may be repudiated as not wise or suitable. To represent the control of the temporal affairs of the church by its own representative government as essentially involving a tyranny and a usurpation, is absurd. When to the intrinsic representative character of the power employed is added its responsibility to the



courts above, the imputation of usurped and dangerous oligarchical power is absurdity raised into its most exquisite degrees.

In the second place, the vision of imperious decrees on the part of the session, and fierce rebellion on the part of the people, is dissolved by another consideration. The jurisdiction of church courts is "ministerial and declarative."<sup>1</sup> That is, they simply declare what the law is; they do not make it; they are servants of the law themselves, and simply set it forth as the law requires them to do. Teaching elders set it forth in words, by argument, and by citation of authorities from the sacred law. Church courts set it forth by presenting the law in form to be obeyed. But neither set it forth as their own, or in any way except as the ministers of a Higher Power, declaring his will. In one great sense, the government of the church is not a government by presbyters, prelates, or people; all these are alike under law, all are bound to obey the King. The compulsory right to legislate is his, and his only. Law, as formulated by man in his kingdom, is only the declaration of law by a commissioned minister. These declarations of law are enforced by no process or penalty whatever. Whenever a church court gives direction for a chapel to be built, or a church altered, it is simply setting forth, in the form of a rule of action which determines obedience, that which seems to be the will of the King and the duty of his people. This they are empowered to do under the order of the constitution "to order collections" and to "concert measures for promoting the spiritual interests" of the church and its attending congregation of unconverted men. But when this is done, their full part is done. The part of the people then comes to the front. The law has been set forth, and each one must determine for himself, and under his own responsibility to his own master, how and to what extent he shall obey it. It has been proposed as an objection, or, at least, as a difficulty, that such a legal order or declaration of law in reference to matters which have to be carried into effect by the money of the people, was of doubtful propriety at least, as savoring somewhat of a compulsory demand for it. This is absolutely mistaken. In reference to all grants of money, or any other

---

<sup>1</sup> *Form of Government*, Chap. V., Sec. II., Par. 2.

property whatever, the law of the kingdom leaves every man at liberty to determine his own proportion, whether much, little, or none at all, on his own convictions of personal duty, and on his own responsibility to the King. *No greater freedom is possible under any law at all.* The right of one is the right of all, and the right pertains to everything in which money or property is concerned. It has been supposed that neither the session nor any church court has any right to propose matters involving the raising of money. This is positively contradicted by the express words of the standards. They are positively commanded "to order collections for pious uses,"<sup>1</sup> and the session which fails to do it is delinquent in duty. But when these collections are ordered their duty is done, and the people are left to deal with them on their own convictions of their duty. Whatever the people may do, the order of the collections by the session was absolutely right, and to construe their act as an impertinent use of an unlawful power is absurd. These collections afford the parallel of all other grants of money under the orders of the representative government of the church. All proceed on the same principle, are ordered under the same power, and are subjected to the same free subjection to the conscience of the individual. Whether the session should declare and set forth to be dealt with as the law of the King, as determined by the interests of his kingdom, that a chapel or a new church should be built, or an old one altered, the power employed is a perfectly legitimate power in the government of the church. The people have it in their power to defeat it by withholding the means. They may consider the use of the power under the circumstances as unwise, but they have no right to impeach the power itself, or the church court, as passing one whit beyond its legitimate authority in employing it. To say that the legitimate control of the temporal affairs of the church is a usurpation over the pecuniary rights and interests of the people, is wholly without a foundation.

7. It is objected again, that this relation of the government of the church involves "gross injustice." To whom? Of all men under heaven, to every member of that unrecognized "congrega-

---

<sup>1</sup> *Form of Government*, Chap. V., Sec. III., Par. 5.

tion," still carefully distinguished from the church, who contributes to the building and maintenance of a house of worship. Such a person is construed as a stockholder in the house, and has a voice in its management, a right secured by the practice of simony; and the doctrine complained against is supposed to warrant the lower court to usurp his right and defraud him out of it. It will be at once perceived that this extraordinary conception of injustice proceeds on the supposition that the old simoniacal notion of a congregation, with coördinate, and, in fact, superior rights to the church, is still recognized in our law, and still standing in its old ruinous and dishonoring relation to the kingdom of Christ. But this is absolutely untrue, to the best of our knowledge and belief. The word "congregation" is still used occasionally as distinguished from the "church," but it is now used to represent the unconverted portion of the people who attend worship with the church, and not a vague but powerful body outside of the church, with the franchise of the kingdom bought for money in its hand, and supreme control over the property and income of the church. This sort of "congregation" is defunct in our law, and will never be raised to life in it again. To speak of gross injustice done to such a body, or any individual unit of it, by reserving the temporal affairs of the church in the hands of its own government, is amazing. Test it by a parallel case. A man contributes to build a Masonic hall, and on the strength of his monied contribution claims he has a purchased right to take part in the regular management of that purely Masonic interest. A man contributes to a public library under the management of a definite, perhaps an incorporated company, because he thinks it a public benefit, and then, instead of being satisfied with the privilege of using the books, claims that he is entitled to be associated in the management. If a man, to secure a public benefit, contributes of his means, no law of essential justice entitles him to more than his ratable share of the benefit. To say it entitles him to intrude himself into the management or supreme control of the interest is incredible. To call the determination to repel such a claim a positive injustice and an actual fraud is intolerable.

So much for the vindication of the first answer of Lexington Presbytery, both on its positive and negative side, the statement of the reasons for it, the refutation of the objections against it. If the control of the finance of every institution is in its own government, it is equally so in the church. If all the lawful movements of all the members of a representative system are regulated by previous law, the call of the people into assembly by the exclusive authority of the government in the church is as lawful as the call of the people of a state by the exclusive authority of its own legislature.

II. Complaint is again made against the answer given to the second question of the memorial. (See foot-note, p. 561.)

The vindication of the Presbytery from this part of the complaint can be now made without any difficulty. The deacon's office is a peculiarly noble one. According to its New Testament idea, transferred to our standards, *it is the arm by which the church of Christ confronts the temporal evils of human life*. They are Christ's officers to take care of his poor, his sick, his widows and his orphans. In view of this function we can understand the peculiar sanctifying power attributed to the good use of the office.<sup>1</sup> No such effect can be ascribed to the most efficient conduct of financial matters. Our standards recognize this as the main purpose and function of the deacon's office. It has never yet been developed; and the day when it is will be a glorious era in the history of the Presbyterian Church. These officers are now regarded almost exclusively as officers of finance. The language of the Book defining this character is somewhat peculiar; it is far from being the most appropriate which could have been used, and is liable to serious misconstruction. It is said, "To the deacons, also, may be properly committed the management of the temporal affairs of the church."<sup>2</sup> This language has been construed to mean that it is really a mere matter of choice to commit the administrative management of the temporalities of the church to the deacons, which might nevertheless be committed to other parties with equal propriety. The language of the Book will certainly bear

---

<sup>1</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 13.

<sup>2</sup> *Form of Government*, Chap. IV., Sec. IV., Par. 2.

this construction, and that too without straining it. The words "may be" can be easily interpreted as implying an alternative in the grant. But they are also capable of another construction which has the controlling advantage of absolute consistency with the clear constitutional determination of the functions of the diaconate and with the unimpeachable powers of an office appointed by the Holy Ghost. If the deacon's office is divinely ordained to "serve tables," nothing embraced under those terms can be lawfully transferred to any other functionary; and if the language of the Book appears to warrant such a transfer, it is clear that the construction of that language must be brought into consistency with functions conferred by divine authority. The church is empowered in its government to appoint sexton's, clerk's, and similar offices, as essentially incident to some clearly granted power and necessary to carry it out; but such incidental appointments are limited by the grant in the most absolute form. But no such incidental power can possibly warrant the transfer of any function attached to an office by the authority of God. The question now to be settled is whether the deacon is the divinely appointed *financial officer* of the kingdom; and if so, on what ground and with what propriety the words "may be" are used in the standards with reference to his financial functions. To the first member of this two-fold question we now call attention. The language of the Book defining the deacon's office is as follows:<sup>1</sup>

"The duties of this office especially relate to the care of the poor, and to the collection and distribution of the offerings of the people for pious uses under the direction of the session. To the deacons also may be properly committed the management of the temporal affairs of the church."

In interpreting these words in their bearing on the general financial functions of the deacon, let these considerations be deliberately weighed:

1. In the first place, every kingdom that has ever appeared in the world has had its revenue laws and its revenue officers. Milton somewhere speaks of "war moving by its two main sinews, iron and gold." The main strength of every kingdom is its revenue; the chief sinew of its strength is its gold, without which the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Form of Government*, Chap. IV., Sec. IV., Par. 2.

sinew of iron could not move. The most important of the secondary instruments of its success in the kingdom of Christ is this same revenue. Can it be supposed that this kingdom alone has neither revenue laws nor revenue officers; that it has made no regular provision for the chief instrument of its success? The presumption in the case amounts to proof.

2. In the second place, this presumption is amply supported by the facts in the case. The standards of the church just quoted unequivocally assert the appointment of a financial officer in the New Testament legislation; two parts of his financial work are defined as of clear divine authority—"the care of the poor, and the collection and distribution of offerings for pious uses." A distinction is taken in the standards between funds for "pious uses" and "the temporal affairs of the church," the essential propriety of which is seriously open to question, for the following reasons: *First*, the distinction is not taken in the New Testament Scriptures; *second*, the distinction is repelled by the very nature of the case, for so far as "temporal affairs" mean money and other property consecrated to religious purposes, they are identical with "funds" or "offerings for pious uses," and a distinction taken between them is inept. The money given for a church or a parsonage at home is identical in its spiritual significance with money given to build a church or a school in the foreign field. The money given for the support of a minister at home is identical in its religious character with the money given to send a missionary to the heathen. To say the deacon has a divine commission to collect and distribute the one, and nothing but an appointment by the church to handle the other, is absurd. The inference, therefore, is thoroughly warranted, that the financial officer avowedly under divine appointment for a part of the financial service of the kingdom was also appointed for the whole. To divest the deacon of a part of the financial work of the church on the authority of an arbitrary distinction not taken in the Scriptures is inadmissible.

3. In the third place, the mode in which grants of function and power are made in the New Testament legislation is all-controlling in this question. In human governments, where the funda-

mental constitution of the state is formally drawn up in words, the powers conveyed are definitely specified, the general scope of its offices, with the grants and limitations of each, is expressly defined. The appointments of the Christian system were differently made. There were no formal grants specifying all the positive powers and marking the limitations upon them. A grant was made of one function of an office, under which all the functions of the office were carried. Thus the teaching elder was empowered directly to preach the gospel, but he received no direct commission to teach the law; yet that was carried under the general commission to teach conveyed under the specific command to teach the gospel. This is proved by the positive order to preach the word, which embraced law, gospel, and the historical illustrations and poetical developments of both. The ministry received no positive commission in so many words to administer the sacraments, but, as these are instruments of teaching by symbol, the commission to teach carried this exclusive function to the great teaching office. Ruling elders are appointed to rule by a broad term of rule, under a broad specification of "overseeing" the flock; but while the one function is specified, the function of rule covers all the business of a ruler. In like manner the deacon specifically endowed in the sacred record with the one express financial function of taking "care of the poor" is rightly construed by the standards as equally empowered to "collect and distribute the offerings for pious uses." But this last function is not expressly ordered, although properly construed as carried by the express grant. Why the "temporal affairs" of the church were not assigned to them with equal decision and on the same ground, does not appear. It is possible—and this is the explanation we offer—that the hesitating terms, "may be committed," were applied to the "temporal affairs" of the church because there was no positive investment of the deacon's office with a general financial function in so many words, and it was felt to be best not to decide where the Scriptures had not spoken. But the scriptural mode of granting power by one specification, logically involving all the rest, sets aside this hesitating construction. Perhaps, also, the fact that the "temporal affairs of the church" include some

things indirectly involving the use of church property—such as cleaning, warming and keeping in order—may have contributed to the use of these words, “may be committed.” However this explanation may be accepted, we think it is beyond all reasonable question that in the use of these words the church did not intend to convey the idea that it was optional with the church to commit the care of its temporal affairs to any party it might choose to select. The Book does actually refer the temporal affairs, as well as the collection of offerings, to the deacons; and while the mode in which it is done is not free from exception as inconsistent with the scriptural method of granting power, it is sufficient to discount the idea that the deacons may be properly divested of the function at will.

4. This leads directly to the fourth argument bearing on the issue. If the construction that the temporal affairs of the church can be committed to any party at will is sound, it certainly warrants the multiplication of *classes* of financial offices. The appointment of deacons with an admitted partial financial function by the Head of the church warrants the inference that the appointment of other financial officers in his kingdom by another authority might be considered an offensive usurpation of the appointing power. The great fundamental principle of the Presbyterian Church, the Headship of Christ, would evidently be set aside by such a procedure. The church will run no such presumptuous risk as this. The deacon is the recognized financial administrative officer in the kingdom of Christ, so recognized in our standards as determined by the word of God.

5. In the fifth and last place, the general authoritative financial character of the deacon's office is established beyond all doubt by the terms employed to denote the business on account of which the office was appointed. The sixth chapter of Acts tells us that the apostles who had undertaken the management of the arrangements for the relief of the wants of the poor of the gathering church were finally so oppressed by it they resolved to lay it down. They announced the purpose in these words, “It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables,” and then ordered the election and ordination of the seven first



deacons of the Christian church. The work of these officers was defined in two forms: *first*, by the broad term "serving tables," and *second*, by one particular specification of that service, the daily ministrations to the wants of the widows and poor saints of the Christian body. That the specification of this work did not cover all that was embraced in the general term "serving tables," is manifest from the meaning of those terms. The word "table" had two senses: it was used to express the household implement on which the food of the family was spread, just as it is with us. It was also used to express "the table of a money-changer, a broker's bench or counter, at which he sat in the market or public place, as in the outer court of the temple." Hence it came to signify "a broker's office, or bank where money is deposited or loaned out."<sup>1</sup> From this grew the established significance of the phrase "to serve tables," "to take care of monetary affairs." The sense of the broad term used in defining the business which the deacons were appointed to manage renders it impossible to confine its meaning to the special use which was prominent at the time of the appointment. According to the New Testament method of granting power, the specification would have been sufficient to carry the coordinate functions; but this is confirmed and rendered irresistible by the broad terms also employed in defining the work. Beyond all doubt, the deacon is not merely the guardian of Christ's widows and poor, the office through which his church confronts the temporal evils of human life: this is the chief function and glory of the office—the source of the extraordinary sanctifying power that is said to be in it.<sup>1</sup> But in addition to this great capacity, he is the divinely-appointed officer of the Christian kingdom to administer all its financial and business affairs. It is truly a most noble function in both of its branches—the peculiar glory of the Presbyterian system.

This merely administrative character of the deacon's office vindicates the answer of Lexington Presbytery touching their right independent of the session to call a meeting of the people to consider their financial affairs. The deacons may well report

<sup>1</sup> Robinson's N. T. Greek Lex. Bloomfield, *in loco*.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 13.

the condition of affairs in their hands officially to the session, informally to the people, and advise a legal assembly of the people by the lawful authority. But this is all. The auditor and treasurer of Virginia may well acquaint the Governor with difficulties in the condition of the finances, but they would not be warranted in calling of their own will an extra session of the Legislature or the assembly of the people at the polls. The law puts that out of their power and into the hands of others. The answer of Presbytery to the second question is fully vindicated.

III. The answer to the third question is equally right. (See foot-note, p. 561.)

This answer is in accord with the necessary effects of a representative government. Under such an institution the people limit themselves; they refuse to make themselves a coördinate element of current government, except in the two instances expressly reserved. They put all the powers of ordinary administration into the hands of their representatives. Those representatives, then, hold the abstract and practical legal power to order all the incidents of legal government. But it does not follow that they are never to consult the views of their constituents. In extraordinary cases they must act often under peril of the public interests, without consulting them. In all ordinary cases which really require it, the very law of their representative character requires them to confer with the people. The answer of the Presbytery was based on these principles, and is obviously proper. If the people of a church want to take any steps looking to such changes as those prominent in this affair, their action can be *legalized* only by the regular administration of their own representative government. Acting otherwise they might carry their point, but not in accordance with law. If they consider themselves aggrieved by the dissenting views of their trusted and chosen rulers, the way of redress through the higher courts is always wide open. But reverence for law, and obedience to all who are in authority, is a noble characteristic of people bred under Presbyterian influences. They know that both rulers and people are under subjection to the King in Zion, and wish to act in obedience to him.

IV. The explanatory resolution adopted by the Presbytery

merely reveals the broad foundation on which their interpretation of the law of the church was based. It asserts that the only government in the individual church is the parish presbytery, or session. To admit the people as a coördinate element in the current and ordinary administration of the church is to make the system partly Presbyterian and partly Congregational. It would be as gross an anomaly in itself, and as radical a departure from the principles of a representative government in the church, as for the Constitution of Virginia to put its ordinary legislation partly in the hands of a legislature and partly in the primary assemblies of the people. Both would involve a radical departure from the principles of representative institutions. To make government, and especially a free and popular representative government, synonymous with tyranny, and call it "an oligarchy," because it is a real government and not a sham, and asserts its own distinctive principles, is to abuse the invaluable human privilege of talking nonsense. A true and faithful government in church, or state, or family, or in any place where associated men are bound up together, is the noblest of God's gifts for the welfare of mankind in a world like this. It is the most glorious image of the divine justice and benignity in their manifestations within the earthly sphere of human existence.

C. R. VAUGHAN.

## V. M O B L A W.

WE use a common form of words in the title we have set at the head of this paper, but in truth what is called mob law is the very opposite of law. It is the will of a mob set up in the place of law, and executed instead of law. It is capricious and irregular in its working, governed by no principles, and conformed to no rule. A man is accused of crime. Perhaps he is guilty, perhaps not. He is put under the arrest of law and committed to prison. A band of men break into the jail and take him out and hang him without a trial. By an association of words which sounds like an intentional self-contradiction, this lawlessness is called mob law. It is well known in this country, and in every part of it. Usually it appears in the action of one or the other of two distinct classes of mobs. In one form it has gained a specific name, and is now widely known as Lynch law. The other form has been sometimes called Striker's law, and though the name is not so widely known as the other, it so plainly indicates what is meant, that we shall use it here for that form of mob law which is given by mobs of "striking" laborers. Lynch law is mob law applied to crime. Striker's law is mob law applied to rights of laborers and employers. It is concerned with questions of wages; of employment of laborers other than those engaged in the strike; of the number of hours that shall constitute a day of labor and for which a day's wages shall be paid. These two stand together in their preëminence, and it may be said, too, that they stand alone; for they have divided the country between them. In the South, from Texas to Kentucky and Virginia, striker's mobs are unknown except by report, while mobs of lynchers are not uncommon. In the older portions of the North, from Pennsylvania to Maine, lynching is so rare that it is almost unknown. In the same section striker's law seems to be stronger at times than the law of the state; and those times come whenever a large body of workingmen consider themselves sufficiently aggrieved to go on a strike. Lynch law seems to be unsuited even to lawless men in

the North. Strikers' law seems to be unsuited to the South. These mobs, in both kinds and in both sections, are growing in strength, in frequency of appearance, and in the arrogance of spirit which they display. What is there in this law-breaking which commends it to the use of a practical people such as ours? or what is there in our laws which makes so many of our people impatient and dissatisfied with them after trial and the experience of generations? or what is it in our people, in their character or their opinions, which inclines them to lawless ways? Perhaps we may find a part of the explanation of the rise and increase of the mob spirit among us, in the answer to these questions. A practical people are not of necessity a far-sighted people, nor a wise one; and various passages in our history have convinced us that our people are neither far-sighted nor wise. The law gives relief with slow and cautious movement, and will insist on looking at the other side. Our people are not patient of delay. Some, at least, among them are not such lovers of justice that they wish to see the whole case, and when they are interested in it they are slow and unwilling to believe that there is in truth any side to it but theirs. Mobs meet the impatient with prompt action, and to those who wish to hear one side and then close the case, there never was a neater device. Whether the action is wise and just as well as prompt, and whether mobs have any right at all to act as they do, are other questions.

To one who has examined the ordinary course of education given to our people in the school-room, and after school years have ended, from books, and newspapers and public speech, it does not seem to be at all a strange thing that they are fast forgetting their reverence for law. Not many generations ago the doctrine of the divine authority of government was perverted into that of the divine right of kings. Against this folly there has been an extreme reaction. There is no divine right in government; it is from the people and by the people, as well as for the people. The government, not the administration, gets its power from the people, and from them only. The powers that be are ordained of the people, and not of God. We have put the negative proposition far more distinctly than it is usually given, but we have not changed the

meaning of the false and foolish flatteries with which our people have been taught that the authority of government has no higher origin than their own will. Now if that teaching were true, why should they renounce that authority? They made the law, and gave to it an authority which was inherent in them, and which belongs to the law, not because it is law, but because it is the will of the people. And so, when it ceases to represent that will, its authority ceases; the life is gone out of it, and it deserves no reverence.

To all this fulsome flattery it is a fatal objection that if it is true, then, if the people say so, they may live without a government and without law, and however foolish it may be, there will be nothing wrong in it. Nay, since the majority must rule, they may, if they will, abolish government and law together, and the unprotected minority "have no rights which a majority is bound to respect." Practically this seems to be the doctrine now held. The loss of reverence for authority is an unfailing condition of lawlessness, and the popular political doctrine of the country has made sure of that loss.

When grievances, fancied or real, come to people who entertain such opinion of the law, what is to be expected? They want speedy relief; they always do. Why wait for the law? They are the people—at least, they are that portion of them who are interested in the grievance. Why not take the law into their own hands since from them the law gets its authority? This is one outcome of the false adulation which for a century has been poured into the ears of the American people.

Another question of interest comes up for consideration before we turn our attention to the present condition of affairs in connection with this subject. Are mobs and mob law ever to be defended as right? It is very clear that they are often in the wrong. Are they always so? To those who hold that authority is from God, it is a very simple piece of reasoning which says, He never gave to any one but the government the powers exercised by mobs, and hence the mobs have no right to those powers; no right to take away life; no right to destroy the property or regulate the business relations of others; and all assuming to do either of

these things is a usurpation and a crime. This is conclusive in ordinary cases. But there are some rights given which men may defend, and which they are not bound to defend separately and apart from each other. In cases in which it would be right for one man to do that which mobs combine to do, it may be right for the mob. When the strength of the multitude is called out for the necessary defence of the community, then, though the defenders may be a mob, we cannot pronounce them wrong. Such cases are rare; but they have occurred.

In the early history of California there was a gathering of adventurers from every part of the world; of criminals who had fled from pursuit of law, and criminals who had cheated law and justice in California; a gathering of gamblers, pick-pockets, burglars, and cut-throats, and of those who were ready to become as criminal as they. Soon it became evident that the law had lost its hold upon the people. Violent crime was common; murder was committed without provocation and without excuse, and was followed by no inconvenience to the murderer, and of course by no danger from any intrusion of the law. It became dangerous to criticise the doings of these desperadoes. A look of disapproval might be answered with a bullet or a knife-thrust. A word of disapproval was almost sure to be so met. The courts were overawed and debauched. A reign of terror was in progress. At last a murder of unusual boldness was committed, and the murderer set free by the court. In one of the city papers appeared a grave review of the case and of the general condition of affairs. It is said to have been most moderately written. Soon after it appeared the murderer, who had just been turned loose, came into the office, and shot the editor at his desk. Then came the next act in this exciting drama. A call was issued for a public meeting of citizens to consider the state of affairs, and this call was signed by many of the best men of San Francisco. Knowing the desperate character of those with whom they had to do, the signers of the call and their friends went to the meeting expecting an outbreak. But from the beginning the spirit of the assembly was such that opposition was overborne and put to silence. A strong Vigilance Committee were chosen and requested to take vigorous measures to protect the

lives of quiet citizens, and to make it safe for honest men to speak when evil deeds were done; and those present pledged support and protection to each other and to the committee. The committee met and acted at once. They sent out and arrested the man who had committed the last atrocious murders, and along with him they arrested others who had also been guilty of crime. The arrested men were given an immediate trial, were found guilty and hung. The work went on and spread through the State. The Vigilance Committee held their place and did their work till the combination of lawless men had been broken, and law-keeping citizens could take control of the courts and other machinery of the law, and then they laid aside the power they had wielded and went back to private life.

Doubtless there was much that was wrong in the action of these men, but if so, it seems to us that it is to be found in specific cases and not in principles, nor in the general plan which they followed. What they did was done in the defence of the public liberty and in the repression of crimes which other and legal means had failed to repress. And they succeeded. They put the law of the State back into its true place of supremacy and honor; they made bad men submit to its authority and keep its commandments or suffer its penalties; and they brought safety to law-keeping people throughout the State. They did this, though themselves exercising an authority unknown to law.

Some have denied that this was a case of mob law, and have rested their denial upon the quietness and order and the good intent of the proceedings of the committee, and upon the fact that when this great work was done the organization was dissolved by its own action and retired from the scene with the applause of all good men. We have no doubt the applause was deserved, but the truth is that here were private men taking upon them authority which the law denies to any but its own officers, and even larger authority than is granted to them. They were not chosen to their position by any legal election, and they set aside the courts and hung men whom the courts had set free. Now, let us suppose that the state of things had been reversed; that the courts of law had been doing their duty; that criminals had been punished with vig-



orous justice, and that the streets of San Francisco had been as safe for quiet men before the committee began their work as they made it afterwards, would there, in that case, be a word to be said in justification of the committee? And if the work which the committee did had been done against the peace and good order of society, and in behalf of the criminals whom they so vigorously pursued and punished, then would any of us hesitate to call this a case of mob-law? The argument in defence of the Vigilance Committee really means that the case was so bad as to justify a mob of good men in coming to the relief of the people. We may as well face the truth and admit that if a case has been made out for the committee, then it has been shown that hard necessity may justify a mob. But in showing this we have also called out the proposition that nothing less than necessity will do so, and we now lay emphasis upon that assertion. We assert that in the case which has been called before us, if there had been legal relief, then that relief ought to have been sought, as indeed it had been sought and found wanting. And we declare that the common judgment is a true one, that neither indignation against crime, nor impatience with the slow procedure of the law, nor the wrong verdict now and then of a jury acquitting one who ought to be punished, none of these, nor all of them, will justify a mob. None of them would now, after nearly a half century has passed, and prejudices and passions are asleep, justify the Vigilance Committee of California.

We trust that we are now better prepared to consider the common forms of mob law, and to take to ourselves the lessons they teach and the warnings they bring. To us of the South the lessons and the dangers that come from lynching mobs are more directly before us.

It has already been said that lynch law is mob law applied to crime. It might be expected that its forms of proceeding would be very simple. They are so in fact. By some means an accusation of crime is made against some man, and private men, in ways that are satisfactory to themselves, investigate the charge, or they simply accept it as true. At any rate, and in some way, they become satisfied that it is true, and they act upon that conviction. Murmurs of condemnation are heard. A proposal is

made in secret and in secret discussed, if any discussion is had, that a band of men shall be formed, who shall seize the accused man and lynch him, and then the band is formed. By this time the mutual support of the conspirators has, perhaps, made them bolder than they were, and hints and rumors of what is coming begin to float upon the air; but this is vague and unsupported. The persons who intend to do the deed remain unknown. Indeed, it is not sure that it will be done. But the band is gathered, and, under the cover of darkness usually, they break open the jail, or seize the sheriff and take the keys away. They get the prisoner into their hands, and then the next thing is to hang him. Sometimes the raid is organized against a man who is not under arrest of law. The difference in procedure is very small. The first purpose is to get the accused man into their hands; the next is to put him to death. There is a third purpose which some recent events have made tolerably clear—to do these things without risk to themselves. We have spoken of the purpose of death to their prisoner as if this were the only penalty known to the criminal code of mobs; and in effect this is about the truth. At first scourging held a prominent place among the punishments inflicted by them, but in later years it has been almost entirely discarded, and death, usually by hanging, is practically the only punishment. Perhaps it is natural that it should be so. Perhaps it is in the common order of things that extreme men should get control of such an expedition and lead it to the utmost extreme of their own reckless disposition. The work is usually without even a shadow of risk to them. Almost invariably the jail is found undefended, and the prisoner is shut up, unarmed and defenceless. There is danger only to the man they have come to kill, and he is in deadly peril. The hope of mercy and the hope of escape are alike distant. Now, it is needless to say that not one of the men so gathered has a right to pass sentence of death. It is equally needless to say that the increase of numbers does not give the right; that the whole mob has no more right to kill than one man has, and it is as needless to say that in all ordinary cases such killing is murder. It is perhaps even more needless to say that at such a time and in such a state of things no sufficient care can be taken

to prevent mistakes, and that innocent men may be killed and guilty men may escape, and may even be found among the lynchers, and that the danger is not diminished by the general indignation against the crime that has been committed. All this is easy to see. We note for illustration a case or two:

Some years ago a murder was committed in York county, S. C. It was so atrocious that even now the memory of it awakens a feeling of horror. An active investigation resulted in the arrest of several persons, all charged with participation in the crime. One of them, it is said, made a confession, and offered to become a witness for the State. Rumors touching the effect of his confession began to fly about the county. The arrested men were all confined in the county jail. The court met, and a day was set for the trial. On the night before that day the jail was forced by a band of lynchers, and the prisoners, *including the witness*, were taken out and hung. Men have not been slow to say that in this case there was no need of a mob to avenge the murder. They have asked, Why not wait till after the trial? Why was not that witness allowed to tell his story in court? Was there, perhaps, some man to whom it was important that that story should never be told? It is whispered that the confession had pointed to some man hitherto unsuspected, and had implicated him with those already accused. It is also whispered that perhaps this man was among the lynchers. There is suspicion that in this case the motive was not a desire to punish crime; and in either case, whether these rumors and suspicions be true or false, the case itself demonstrates the truth of the statement that mob law offers a way of escape to the guilty, and gives opportunity to prevent the investigation of crime. We offer another case: Eight men were in jail at Barnwell Courthouse, in South Carolina. Some of them were under no accusation of crime. They were witnesses, who were held to appear and testify before court in a trial to be had soon. A mob took all of these prisoners out of jail and slew them, *the innocent with the guilty*. We submit that this is proof that innocent men may suffer; and the two cases together prove that there is no instrument which bad men can more easily use to further their bad designs, and none which they can

so securely use, until the State, impatient of this arrogant lawlessness, shall put out her hand and bring to justice those who go with a multitude to take life without law.

It seems that in each of these cases the jail was undefended, and they who went into these mobs did so with the knowledge that to them there was no danger, none whatever at the time, and almost none from after pursuit of law. A case has occurred which illustrates the difference where the element of safety to the mob is left out of the motive to form it:

A man involved in a personal difficulty with his neighbor fled from him and was pursued into his own house. He there turned and shot the pursuer within the inclosure of his bed chamber. The man who thus lost his life was a leader among his companions, and they bitterly resented his death. In a day or two one of the neighbors was invited to join a party who should seize the slayer at night and put him to death. The invitation was refused, and an appeal made to give up the purpose. This in turn was refused, and then the warning was given that it could not be executed except at the risk of life to those who made the attack. It was said: "Some of us think it was not the fault of this man that the other lost his life. He was not to blame in the quarrel, and he was defending himself in the killing. We think, too, that there has been more than enough of lynching. We suspected this, and we are ready. There will be a battle around that man's house when you come to kill him. We intend to make a deadly defence."

Nothing more was heard of that lynching party. Can any man doubt that, if there had been a similar readiness to resist in Barnwell, the shameful slaughter of the innocent there would have been prevented? We put emphasis on the point we are now making. We have given one argument that wins when an appeal is made to these raiders to give up their purpose. Can any man give another? Did ever a plea for mercy prevail? Does any one know of a case in which one of these mobs, after assuming the authority of a court of justice, then paused in its bloody work to ascertain what would be just in the matter before it? Doubtless substantial justice is often done. The present complaint is

that it often fails, and when done is done by those who have no right to administer justice, and whose unmerciful temper makes them unfit for the work and the responsibility they have taken upon themselves.

It is said in excuse for these lynching mobs that they are usually called into being by great provocation. Let us grant that it is so. It is not uncommon now, as it has never been uncommon, for men guilty of crime to be brought before court and escape scot-free. Bribery of witnesses or of jurymen is no more impossible now than it was in the past. Ingenuity of counsel is perhaps as great, and misplaced compassion for those who are unfortunate because they are criminal operates as effectively, perhaps, as ever. And in those cases where mob law is the surest we incline to the opinion that the law of the State makes the provocation far greater than it need be, and greater than it would be if our law was what it might be made. There is one crime which, throughout this country, is held in peculiar abhorrence. The right of a woman to the undefiled chastity of her person is held by all as sacred as the right to life, and even more precious. Now let it be said, as it may in simple truth be said, that in the South the victims of the crime against the persons of females are almost without exception white women of good character, and the criminals are almost without exception negro men. It is but natural that the indignation which, over all the land, flames up against those who are guilty of this revolting crime should blaze with peculiar heat when it is perpetrated under conditions which make it doubly revolting. And, so far as we know, there is no provision of law which secures a speedy reckoning with the villain who has committed the crime. There is no indication that the State will in any way take unusual care to avenge this terrible wrong, or to make overawing examples of those who are guilty. On the other hand, it may be said that, when the criminal has been caught and put to trial, there begins anew to the victim of his crime the torturing shame of her great wrong. In most cases she is the only witness, the only possible one. She must tell in public how her person has been defiled. She must speak before an audience of men of that outrage, and tell the details of the crime. The whole

brutal scene of shame and terror must be renewed to her mind and published by her own tongue. Now, our complaint against the law in this case is a two-fold one. We complain, first, that no way is provided by law for the speedy and final trial of those who are charged with atrocious crime, such as that of which we are now speaking. We are satisfied that it can be done, and the interests of justice promoted thereby. We complain, again, at the publicity which attends the testifying of the unfortunate woman, who has already more of shame than she knows how to bear. We do not ask that her evidence be secretly given; but when the court, with its officers and jury, the witness and the accused, and the opposing counsel are present, and no injunction of secrecy is given, it seems to us that all the safeguards of public trial are retained; and, with the mass of bystanders excluded, much of the torture of the trial would be avoided in behalf of one who needs every alleviation of her lot that can be given. Let special courts be organized as indicated above for the speedy and final hearing of cases such as these, and the excuse of "great provocation" will be taken away from the mob.

Let us now turn and look at the other form of mob law which prevails so largely in our country. It at once impresses us with the fact that it keeps out of the Southern States, as lynch law for the most part keeps out of the Northern. It impresses us also with the boldness of its operations. Its mobs work by daylight, and seem to prefer that the sun shall look upon their lawlessness. They wear no disguises. They break the law without an effort to hide their law-breaking. At first sight there is something attractive in the openness and candor with which they present themselves on the case which they have made. But, as we look longer, this candor puts on an arrogant and overbearing appearance. It seems to us to be a sign of danger now coming too near to be unrecognized. We are impressed also, as has already been intimated, with the difference in the provocation which, whether fancied or real, gives rise to the outbreak. The mob of strikers does not pretend to deal with crime. Business matters need regulating, and they gather to do that. If allowed to have their own way, they are good-natured enough; but if resisted, they are like other

mobs, and become exceedingly dangerous to those who are not strong enough to be dangerous to them. Their methods differ widely from those of the lynchers. In most cases, if not in all, there is a compact and permanent organization of workingmen behind the mob of strikers. The strike is ordered by officers chosen in part for this purpose. And the mob comes upon the scene with full knowledge that they have the sympathy, the influence, and the power of the association, ready to move in their behalf. Their movements are made with the steadiness of drilled men, with the definite aim of those who move at the word of command.

A contest arises between employer and laborers on some question of wages, or of hours of employment, or of fellows in labor, and the workingmen throw down their tools and quit. One might suppose that this is an end of the matter. The men have a right to refuse the terms offered. They have exercised the right, and have left the work. On the other hand, it is said, the employers also are free, and have exercised their freedom. The issue has been joined, and they claim the right to say what terms they will give and what they will accept. The laborers are not owners, nor part owners, of the works in which they have been employed. They are free to go out and find work elsewhere; they are free to go out and do nothing, if they choose. They have gone out, and their connection with their late employer, and with his works, has come to an end. Their places are vacant, and the employer is free to hire other workingmen if he can. There is no doubt that the wage-workers are free to find new work and to make a new contract. But if the wage-payer takes it into his head that what sets the one party free must free the other also, if he acts on the theory that rights are equal in this country—for practically it seems to be only a theory—if he puts his liberty to the test, and opens the gates of his mill with other operatives at work there, then a new and very serious phase of the case begins. A band of the striking men, strong in numbers and in physical force, comes on the scene, and demands that the work which they have thrown out of their hands shall not be given to anyone else, and that the new hands shall be discharged, though they and their employer are satisfied with work and pay. In a word the demand is, that

the capital of the employer shall lie idle till he is ready to come to the terms offered by the strikers. If he still thinks that he is free, and acts on that opinion, then the mob of strikers take up the case. They break his machinery, they assault his laborers and drive them from their work, they refuse to let business go on and wages be earned by industry, they forbid the hungry to work for bread, and require that the enterprises of the rich shall cease, and the needs of the poor shall continue, till the demands of the strikers are satisfied. And on this they insist with violence and shedding of blood. This is "strikers' law," of which it seems to be a maxim that freedom is for the laborer, but not for the employer, and, indeed, is for the laborer of the one part, but not for the laborer of the other part; that it is for those who can call for their rights from a thousand throats, and enforce the call with a thousand uplifted right hands, but for the very reason that it is for them, it is not for him who stands alone and ungirded but by the State, and its laws, and its people.

These statements illustrate the differences between these two classes of mobs; and at the same time they bring prominently forward the fact that there is no difference in the bloody and usurping spirit by which they are animated. Strikers' mobs are made up of unemployed men who have lost their income with the loss of employment, and are naturally impatient. They are not unacquainted with hunger, and if not pressed by it to-day, they fear its coming to-morrow. This fact ought to go far in excuse for them, but that it is also true that if they suffer, it is by their own improvident habits. Wages are high in the United States; they are lower in the South than in the North, yet the North is the chosen field of these mobs. Yet more, if these men suffer, it is very commonly by their own immediate act. They have refused and are still refusing work. It is claimed that the offered pay is insufficient. But it is not claimed that it is not enough to give food and raiment and shelter to those who will use it with care. Indeed, it is said that the laborers of other countries would be thankful to the bountiful providence which would give to them the pay which the laborer of this country pronounces insufficient. And we know that the reported average of the wages



received by those who go on these strikes in the North is beyond that of those who do not go on strikes in the South. Now, we are not objecting to higher wages. We are answering the attempt to justify strikers' mobs and strikers' law on the ground that their wages are low, so low as to bring suffering and justify the mob. The lot of the railroad hands and of the miners has been pointed at and declared to be a peculiarly hard one. Perhaps it may be, but railroad men and miners are not the only men who have gone on strikes and been found in strikers' mobs. And they are not tied to these forms of labor. The roads run through fertile lands, where labor is wanted for the farms. The mines are dug in the midst of such land. To reply that the wages of farm-laborers is too low would be to set up the claim that the strikers ought to receive more than other laborers can get, and more than the market offers to any. It is a claim to be made favorites of fortune in comparison with others. It is a surrender of the argument.

Yet again it is said that combinations of capitalists are easy and are often made. They drive competition from the field, and control the market, and fix the price of labor so low that working men are driven to desperation. This argument is the same with that already considered. The simplest answer is the one already given. It is a denial that this is the real reason of the suffering in those cases where suffering is found. Yet, for later use in this article, we are disposed to put emphasis upon what is said of the easy and frequent combinations of those who control large capital; and, if possible, we would lay still greater emphasis upon the complaint against the use they make of the capital so combined. For the present we are dealing with the excuses which are offered for these mobs.

It is said that the strikers have a moral claim upon those for whom they have been working. Let us admit it. Now, for whom have they been working? As matters stand in business, is it ever seen that laboring men seek the interest of the employer and discard their own? A new mill is set up in any town, and is able to offer employment and increase of wages to every laborer in the place, while the old mill is not able to offer more than was

paid before. Then comes to the working people the question whether they shall stay or go. Shall they remain in the old place at the old rate, or go to the new and make more for self and wife and children? Is there any doubt of what they would do? There is no suggestion of blame here. We are only seeking an answer to the question, "For whom are the laborers working?" And the case we have put gives the answer. Laboring people work, as other people do, for the support of themselves and their families, and for the improvement of their condition. And in truth, a mill-owner who has been giving employment and paying wages has as valid a claim upon his employees as they have upon him. But let him set up such a claim against the offer of better pay. Let him set it up, and then wait to be instructed as to their opinion of the tie which binds the wage-worker and the wage-payer together. Let him listen to the jeers with which his claim will be received, and he will learn whether his employees are seeking his interest or their own. He will be a very slow-minded man if he needs more than one lesson.

It ought not to be forgotten here that there is a claim upon all men in behalf of every one who is unfortunate. But this is the claim of mercy rather than of justice. It is the claim of the Lord, who has the right to make it, and who has required of us that we "love mercy" as well as that we "do justly and walk humbly with him." It ought not to be forgotten that this requirement touches all the relations of life, and lays its constraint upon the ways of business; and that business rules and principles can no more put it away than they can put away the ten commandments. But it must be borne in mind that this claim is the Lord's, and that he has not set it among human rights nor put it into our hands so that any of us having received justice may then demand mercy and complain of wrong done to us in that we have failed to receive it at the hands of our fellow-men. No man has a right to demand mercy from his fellow. He may be entitled to kind treatment, but if so, unkindness would be injustice, and his demand would be for justice. Whether your hired laborer be starving or prospering, he may demand that you pay him his due, and the courts will enforce the demand. The court that refuses

to do so will earn for itself the reprobation of all honest men. But if the man has not been hired and there be no debt, then his call will be for alms and not for payment. He can only entreat; he has no right to demand, even though he may be starving. What, then? Has the man who showed him no mercy done no wrong? Yes he has, but it is a wrong which God will deal with, and for punishing which he has given no rights to man. We can only ask mercy of each other. We cannot demand it. There are valid reasons in human nature why it ought to be so. The application of this principle to the matter in hand is seen when we remember that the excuses offered keep before us the unhappy condition of those who compose the mob. To make a valid argument from this it must be shown that they have a claim to justice which would include kindness, and that this has been denied. Let this be shown, and there ought to be such an uprising of public sentiment that there would be no need of a mob for swift and thorough righting of the wrong. So let us put these claims in their true place. We find that rich men have managed their capital for their own benefit, and that laboring men have followed the same policy with their strength and skill, and the working men have suffered. Sometimes the capitalist suffers also. Contracts cannot be kept, enterprises fail, credit breaks down and bankruptcy comes. But, in the main, the heaviest suffering falls on the poor. And then, in large numbers, men see their families in want, and see the prospect of sharper need in the near future. And though the suffering comes from a policy which they have chosen, they are not likely to be reasonable or just. They become impatient of the restraints of conscience, as well as unruly toward the restraints of law; they put the blame for their distress where it ought not to rest; they make demands which go beyond the limits of reason and justice; and they do deeds which no law, human or divine, will fail to condemn.

A few years ago there was a strike of the working men of a railroad in Pennsylvania. The history of events preceding the strike is about the same with that of other such movements. There were demand for negotiation, refusal of offered terms, and finally the withdrawal of the men from the service of the road. Then the

managers employed other men in the place of those who had left. The strikers assembled and denounced the employment of the others. They declared that they would not submit to it. Then came rioting, incendiary fires, destruction of tracks, and other injury to the property of the road. They assaulted the new hands and drove them from their work; they arrested the movement of trains; they refused to allow commerce to go unhindered. And these things were done not in swift and sudden heat of blood. The strikers had become an angry mob, and the violence of that time lasted long. The damage to property amounted to many thousands of dollars, and the loss by the obstruction of trade was vaster still. The city of Pittsburgh has had a heavy burden to carry in the taxation made necessary by that expensive lawlessness. An effort was made to enforce the law and protect property and vindicate the rights of those who wished to earn their living. But at first the effort was a failure. The State troops were called out in sufficient numbers to have put down the rioters, but their sympathy was with the mob. And though the mob was acting in public defiance of authority, and in destructive opposition to personal rights and to public welfare, it was not found possible to prevail on the troops to enforce the law or to protect the property or the rights thus assailed. And on the State and people of Pennsylvania lies till now unremoved the shame of that disgrace that not their love of freedom for all men, nor their love of justice, nor their indignation against crime, nor their reverence for law, nor their will to protect those who keep the law—not one of these motives, nor all of them together, could keep her soldiers true to discipline, nor her citizens free from sympathy with a mob whose whole history is stained with robbery and bloodshed. These statements need no proof to those who remember the general history of our own times. It may be confidently said that they need no proof to those who pay taxes in Pittsburgh. They have not forgotten.

The mob of which these things have been written is a specimen of what strikers' mobs are in spirit; and of what they may at any time be led to become in action, its history is at once an illustration and a warning. The attitude of these mobs towards the law

is that of public defiance; towards personal rights and rights of property, it is that of overbearing disregard. The spirit displayed is insurgent, destructive and murderous. They pursue their own ends, even in opposition to the public interests and to the needs of the great multitudes whose living depends on the steady flow of trade. They lift their voices against the oppressions of the rich, and they do deeds which make life harder for the poor, and hardest of all for the poorest of all. Their outcry against oppression is followed by deeds of oppression such as perhaps none but a mob would, in this land, venture to commit.

Let us bring together here, for emphasis, some of the more obvious objections to mob law, in both of its forms, as they have here appeared. It gives advantage to vicious men for working out their malice against others, or for hiding their own evil doing from the law, under shelter of the wider and more clamorous lawlessness of the mob.

It is a standing menace to the property where laboring men are hired. Pittsburgh is not the only place which has seen property broken and burned by mobs who were enraged, as the Pittsburgh mob was, against those who owned and controlled the property. All men know that the mob is not dead, and that it may come together again, and there is not a railroad in the United States that holds its property as securely as it would if there were no mobs. And along with the threat is the standing injury to the market value of the property. If mobs of striking laborers had never injured mills, or mines, or roads, the expenses would have been less, dividends would have been larger, and values would have gone higher with the dividends.

The damage done by mobs falls first and hardest on the poor. It is complained that before the courts the poor may be in danger, but the rich are not, and this is made an excuse for lynching-mobs, which never hang any but poor men. It is claimed that the poor operatives are oppressed by the rich capitalists, and this is made the excuse for strikers' mobs, by which poor men are beaten, and wounded, and slain, or driven from the work on which they and their families depend for daily bread. These statements sound even absurdly improbable. They are true.

Mob law adds crime to crime, in the case of the lynchers, even in the best of their ordinary administration of mob law; and in the case of the strikers, it brings in crime without the excuse of preceding and provoking crime; and last of all, it fails, whether as lynch law or strikers' law, to redress evils, to repress crime, or to deliver the poor from the hardship of their lot. In the one case and in the other, bad matters are made worse, evils are left unremoved, and worse evils are brought in.

Yet it is our wish, for a purpose already intimated, to give all possible weight to the one excuse which, in various forms, is urged in behalf of these mobs. We are ready to admit, and want to urge, that in many cases the provocation is extreme. We cannot forget, nor do we wish to forget, that when men feel that life and female honor are exposed and not protected by law, they grow impatient; and when men who know what it is to go hungry, and being without hope of better things for themselves, look forward for their children and can find no prospect of better fortune for them, then, if to hopelessness for the future be added the sting of present trouble, they are apt to feel that they are hardly treated, apt also to lay the blame of all their trouble on some one else, and not upon themselves, apt also, above all, to grow desperate and reckless and savage. Thus mobs are born. Thus are born dangers to individuals, to corporations, to the commonwealth—disorders which grow to be dangers, and are of such character that they threaten all interests.

And seeing that these things are so, and seeing also that employers are not without responsibility for the strained relations existing between capital and labor, we would urge upon them the obvious truth that it is an unprofitable gain which lays up wealth at the expense of the goodwill of those through whose labor it is won; a bad prosperity which stores up the hatred of men as fast as it stores up the profits of trade. Security is worth much; and in order to security the goodwill of the humblest of these people is also worth much. At the risk of the ridicule of those to whom we would speak, we would point to the changes that are even now in progress, and call attention to the undertone of attendant muttering that tells of discontent growing more intense. At the risk

of scoffing, we would speak of the increasing unfriendliness of laborers towards those whose pay they receive; of the rapidly-enlarging extent and boldness of the laborer's demands, and of the violence, becoming constantly more prompt and deadly, with which these demands are pressed. And we would count it time well spent if by spending time we could win thought to these dangers; but experience does not encourage such a hope. When once the love of riches comes in sight of the prize, we know with what imperiousness it takes control of the life, and we do not need now to be told that under its control men become blind to danger as well as to duty, and deaf to warnings of conscience and warnings of prudence alike. We have seen this insensibility go on until it was broken by the noise of mobs and the loss of life and possessions. So we fear it will be again. And beyond these dangers, indicated, perhaps, and heralded by them, lie others larger and more portentous, of which we can only say now that they are real dangers, and not the fancies of an affrighted brain. While the laborers are growing more impatient and determined, the holders of capital are in their turn losing patience, and are not losing the determination that their capital shall be theirs, and its uses and profits shall be theirs, and the control of it shall be in their hands. The issue is made, and is visible to the world. And now what are the strikes and lockouts that we see but skirmishes preliminary to the great struggle? And if the conflict should be fairly joined, would either side allow the day to go against them and a final decision to be had without the appeal to bullets and bayonets?

We have heard these fears derided, and we expect to hear the derision again. In the same way, before 1861, we heard derision of warning then given of what might be expected from the advancing alienation and bitterness of the times. Since then we have not given undue reverence to the opinions of those who can see no danger in a strife that does not lose its heat from one generation to another, that gains in extent, and is growing fiercer as time goes on. If this progress continues as we have seen it, we would like to ask, how long can it be before there will be armed collision between the forces of capital and labor? It is asserted

with much confidence that such a collision would be brief and disastrous to those who came out against the forces of the laboring men. Such confidence does not grow out of the history of these struggles. The strength of the parties is too nearly balanced for boasting to be in place. But we may say that the victor will probably come out of the fight torn and bleeding, exhausted, and ready to perish. Let the work people who are disposed to laugh at the numbers of those on the side of capital remember that money can hire defenders, and those of the capitalists who scorn the scanty resources of the laboring men not forget that skill and enthusiasm can create resources. If the controversy between labor and capital ever comes to the issue of actual war, we believe the fight will be long and deadly.

The danger from the lynching mobs of the South is more limited and more remote, except, indeed, the danger to those individuals who fall into their hands. It can be put away, and effectually, whenever we will. And there are indications that the day is at hand when law-keeping men will insist that the State shall follow and punish with strong hand those who thus defy and insult her authority, and that in no case must such contempt be borne with as if that were a matter of course. There has been one case in which the mob was resisted by the sheriff with a band of armed men guarding the jail in which the prisoner was kept. We wish that this brave and manly policy had been adopted from the beginning in every State. We wish that the cowardly policy of fleeing with the prisoner from a mob had never been adopted, but that, on the other hand, the State, standing upon her right and in her power, had from the first bidden all men beware how they put contempt upon her majesty; and then, if men would force the issue, let the State meet it, if need be, with all its power, and suppress the mob. Our people can be brought back to their former reverence for law, and it must be done, or in time this irreverent spirit will bring danger to our dearest interests. Let it be done now while it is not hard to do. We need to settle it in our minds and in our public policy, that lawlessness is not a remedy for crime, and that antecedent crime shall not be taken as an excuse for lawlessness. Let us see to it that those who commit the



crimes which now provoke the vengeance of the mob shall be overtaken by the swift retribution of the law, and let us bring home to all men the conviction that the State is the surest avenger of crime, and that in her hands the innocent are safe; and in order to this, let us make it so in fact.

A proof of the faultiness of our present methods may be found in a case which has too many like it among us. A few years ago a criminal was acquitted and set free in one of the counties of North Carolina, and that too after such proof of guilt that those who heard the trial were amazed at the acquittal. Not long after that another murder of singular atrocity was committed by the same man. He was arrested and sent to jail. A mob of lynchers took him out of the jail and hung him. And when an appeal was made to them to leave him to the law, their answer was, that they had once done that very thing, and the law had turned him loose though guilty. And then it was added, "This man shall commit no more murders." It is said that a single man on the jury had prevented a conviction in the first case, and it is believed that he was corrupt. It is held in that community till now, that the second murder would not have been committed if the law had not been too tender with criminals. We think they are right.

The problem presented by mob law in the South seems to us a simple one. It needs only the vigorous enforcement of law to quiet and put down this insurgent spirit, and to put it away from among us. The problem is a simple one now. But there are two races here, and as plain as daylight is the tendency of these mobs and their mob law to create hostility between the races, and then to intensify it continually. After a few years the situation may present difficulties and dangers which will make it worthy to take its place by the side of that now lifting its head in the North. The problem presented in the North is an exceedingly difficult one, and is growing more threatening and more urgent. There is presented there a double antagonism: between the laborer and the employer, and between the law and the mob. Human history will be examined in vain to find an instance in which the last two have been able to abide and prosper together. An instance in which a mob has rescued the law from bad men may be found, as has been

already seen. But no case is known in which law and mob have lived and flourished together. The association is fatal to one or the other. The double antagonism thus presented is between forces each too strong to be at once and easily set aside; and while we might refuse to acknowledge that there is danger if other causes were withdrawn and the mob stood alone, yet we cannot forget that there are other grounds of apprehension, and every note of warning which comes to us from them is reënforced and made more impressive when borne to our ears on the menacing cry of a mob.

If the question be asked, why not put down the mob of strikers, as it has been said the lynchers ought to be put down, the answer is two-fold: there is a widely prevalent sympathy for the mob. Right or wrong, large numbers of those not engaged in strike or strikers' mob feel that there is reason in the demands of the strikers and justification for what they do; and sympathy is given to their indignation against wrong. It is given without stopping to inquire where lies the wrong or who brought it upon them. There is danger of spreading that sympathy wider; of making it more active; of provoking those who feel it till they are ready to join the mob. The other answer is, that already matters have come to that point that State troops have refused to quell the mob, and policemen have been unable to do so when it was out in force. The troops of the United States are the only other force that can be called in at such a time. The too frequent use of this power for police duty is so suggestive of standing armies and military governments that the very thought seems to be laden with danger to the republic.

An analysis of these answers presents this proposition, that already the mob has grown so strong that it will be hard and perhaps dangerous to suppress it. What, then? Shall this visible danger be let alone and the country drift into revolution? Surely the resources of statesmanship are not lost, nor those of philanthropy, which ought to be but another name for brotherly love. And the religion of Jesus Christ still abides in its power to control the passions of men. It is to this last and to the overruling providence of God that our thought turns with the largest

measure of hope. Indeed, we are sure that the action which seeks to meet these evils without the Christian religion will fail as surely as human passion is stronger than human law. We must exalt the law of God before our own consciences and the consciences of others. We must learn the truth and hold it, and teach it to others, that God's law is not set aside by temptation, whether the temptation come to one or to many; and that, tempted and weak and overborne by the multitude, as we may be, we are held by the authority of that law, and are bound by it, even though all others refuse to obey. Nay, our understanding and keeping of the law must require of us a closer obedience than this. We must obey, though in so doing we not only stand against the world, but also stand against our own hearts; though provocation and injury shall stir us to the depths, and resentment struggle within to answer the call, and though the world tempt us to set aside the divine law, we must realize that we are not free to do so; we are not excused from our obedience, and we are to teach ourselves and others so. And then, when truth and duty both are clear, there will be need of more than human power to control and lead us. In its best work the law is not a saviour. By the law is the knowledge of sin, and even here in this perplexity also the law is our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. In him lies our hope. Unless his hand shall lead us we see no hope of return from our wandering out of the path of safety; unless his power shall save us, we see no hope of escape from dangers that are in sight.

The greatest need of the country, to meet this danger and to meet others, is the revival of a spirit of reverence for God and for his law. And this means a genuine revival of religion that shall spread over the land. And as we remember what part has been played by revivals and what impression made upon the history of this people, and especially as we think of the great revival of the early part of the century now running fast to its close, and remember its reforming and conservative power, our hearts move with prayer for the coming of one like it. It is not too much to say that the country has been saved from danger by one revival. Is it more than faith may ask or hope expect that another may be given when we are in similar need?

D. E. JORDAN.

## V I. N O T E S.

---

### THE PRESBYTERIES AND THE TITHE.

#### AN ANALYSIS OF THE ANSWERS TO THE ASSEMBLY'S OVERTURE.

THE problem of revenues is always a difficult one, both in church and state. The state claims the right to supplement her present resources derived from taxation by a free use of her credit, whether wisely or unwisely. The church dares not violate the injunction, "Owe no man anything." Nor has she any God-given power of taxation by which she may compel the filling of her treasury; nor does she hold the power of the keys in any such sense as to compel an otherwise unwilling people to supply her financial needs. Her only legitimate resource is an appeal to a sense of duty and to love for the Master's cause. Her only assessment law is the word of God, sustained by the conscience of the individual believer, and enforced by the same law of love, and not by pains and penalties, either civil or ecclesiastical. There is no wonder, then, that the ever-enlarging schemes of Christian enterprise should call for serious and perplexing discussions about ways and means. And when we consider that since the fourth century the church has depended mainly for her revenues upon tithes, rates, Peter's pence, etc., assessed and enforced by civil and ecclesiastical sanctions, we need not be surprised that the disenthralled church should grope slowly towards the full measure of the divine standard; and we may well expect Protestant Christianity to be keenly alert to denounce any appearance of ecclesiastical domination.

In feeling after some divine indication of duty in giving to the Lord, the tithe has been slowly entering a claim to recognition for many years; and many of the leaders in Christian giving, on both sides of the Atlantic, beginning with the tithe as the minimum, have mounted up to such measure as to show that they believe that "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof;" and multitudes of others have been led by their example to a larger measure of duty, though they have never even considered whether there be such a thing as a divine indication of a minimum rule.

So prominent did the question of tithing become, that the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, in 1889, sent down an overture to the Presbyteries asking them to discuss and report on the "Law of the tithe" as a "means of revenue." The whole subject of tithe and "tithe law" was discussed from many points of view, in the press and in the Presbyteries, and answers to the Assembly's overture were sent up in May from nearly all the Presbyteries, a thing in itself quite significant.

These answers were referred to a special committee, who made the following report, which was adopted unanimously enough, except that a large minority wished to have the subject lie over a year for further general discussion, so that if possible a properly guarded deliverance might be made by the next Assembly, more carefully defining the scriptural rule of duty and liberty, and defining also the limitations of ecclesiastical courts in legislating, or even in making authoritative deliverances, on the subject, or, in other words, in defining the relations of the spiritual to the secular:

"In response to the overture of the last Assembly, sixty-eight of the seventy-one Presbyteries on the roll have sent up papers on the law of the tithe as a means of raising the funds of the church. All the shades of opinion expressed could not be presented without giving the papers in full, some of which are quite voluminous. The following summary, however, is substantially correct:

"Of the sixty-eight reporting, fifty-one express the opinion that the law of the tithe is not binding under the New Testament dispensation; ten regard it as still binding, either upon the church or the individual, or both; one is not clear enough to be put on either side; six decline to express an opinion. Of the fifty-one that do not regard the law as binding under the present dispensation, sixteen refer to it as suggestive in the matter of systematic giving, or useful to guide the Christian in determining his duty. Of the ten that believe the law to be binding, three advise against formal enactment, or measures to enforce the law.

"A large number of the Presbyteries enjoin greater consecration to the Lord, and liberal and systematic giving according to one's ability, and quote, as setting forth the Scripture principles that should guide in the discharge of this duty, such passages as these: 'Let every one lay by him in store according as the Lord hath prospered him;' 'The Lord loveth a cheerful giver;' 'As a man purposeth in his heart, so let him give.'

"The committee recommend that these facts be spread upon the minutes, and that no further action be taken upon the subject by the General Assembly."

This report is entered here, not for criticism, but as a part of the history defining the present ecclesiastical status of the question. From the standpoint of an Assembly's committee, with its recognized functions, this report is perhaps adequate. From another standpoint,

however, the reports of the Presbyteries on the tithe are a curious and interesting study, when they are carefully analyzed and studied on the comparative method.

The first thing which strikes one is the many points of view from which the discussions proceed, and the varying definitions on which the reports are based. If a categorical proposition had been sent down for discussion, the range would have been much narrower. Instead of this, a subject was proposed; but there was given no such definition of terms as to secure unanimity of view in considering it. A wide range of answers was, therefore, to be expected, and opinions apparently divergent, if not contradictory, may possibly be unified by a more accurate definition and a wider generalization. The very form of the answers given in most cases reveals the supposed intent of the Assembly's overture, while it often equally reveals the various and diverse views of the nature and workings of the tithe, when it was confessedly a rule of action, and, which is more important, of the relations of that "tithe law" to the voluntary and cheerful liberality of God's people.

Many of the Presbyteries, and probably the majority, understood the overture as raising the question, whether the Assembly should enact a "tithe law" to be enforced upon God's people by ecclesiastical sanctions, in order to secure, by authority and by suitable measures, a satisfactory revenue to the church; in other words, whether the Assembly should establish a compulsory revenue system. If the Assembly of 1889 meant to raise any such question, it were easy to anticipate the cleancut and emphatic "no!" which came back from so many quarters; and some Presbyteries, which did not so understand the overture, took the pains (out of abundant caution) to negative any such suggestion. The reports are all unanimous on this point, either in what they say or in what they do not feel it necessary to say. Presbyterians in this country are too intensely imbued with the law of liberty to forge such fetters for themselves. And, what is remarkable, not a single Presbytery seems to desire the Assembly to make any deliverance on the subject which should carry with it even the moral weight of so august a body. A few Presbyteries would like the Assembly to commend the tithe as a minimum rule of duty to the consciences of God's people.

It is further evident that many of the Presbyteries, in discussing the binding force of the "tithe law" in all dispensations, start with this assumption, that the Old Testament tithe was a revenue system imposed on God's people, and enforced by civil as well as ecclesiastical

power, and so put on the mere level of taxes ; and some of the Presbyteries actually pronounce it unequal, unjust and cruel, forgetting that no God-given institution can be so characterized. The wonder is that such a suggestion did not lead to the inquiry whether any such tithe system is found in the Scriptures. At least one Presbytery does find such a tithe system to be anti-Mosaic, anti-Christian and unscriptural, and there drops the subject. It is no wonder, then, that, with such a definition of the Old Testament tithe, so many should find it not binding on the Christian church, and so declare themselves.

Some Presbyteries, again, reject the tithe because it embraced, as they suppose, the civil taxes for the support of the state.

Others again reject the tithe because we are not "under law, but under grace," as if this fact were inconsistent with law as a rule of life.

Others again reject the tithe because "all is the Lord's," as if this were any more true to the Christian than when David said, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein."

A large number of Presbyteries emphasize very properly such passages as these: "The Lord loveth a cheerful giver;" "As a man purposeth in his heart, so let him give;" "Let every one lay by him in store as God hath prospered him." Now, it would seem sufficient to say, that these principles are quoted for substance from the Old Testament Scriptures, where they have full prominence. Compare Ex. xxv. 2 ; xxxv. 21-29 ; 1 Chron. xxix. 6-9 ; Prov. xi. 25, etc. A divine rule of duty is in no wise inconsistent with a "voluntary," "cheerful" and joyous obedience.

Only ten Presbyteries declare the Old Testament "law of the tithe" of permanent binding authority, and it is evident they proceed from a more liberal definition of said law and a juster view of its working. According to them, the tenth of the increase is the Lord's in all ages and dispensations ; and in their view the "tithe law" is only the divine indication of a minimum rule of duty, sustained and enforced only by providential sanctions, and calling only for a voluntary and cheerful obedience from willing hearts ; a rule which neither priest nor magistrate could enforce, or did enforce in any form ; only a rule of minimum duty from which the cheerful giver might rise to such higher standard or proportion as God's providence might indicate, or the exigencies of his cause demand. Now, whatever may be thought of the strength of the scriptural argument for such a tithe, there cer-

tainly are no objections to such a tithe in itself which do not lie equally against the Sabbath or any other positive institution of holy living.

The six Presbyteries that decline to give an opinion do so either expressly or impliedly because they are "undecided" on this "vexed question," and are not able to reach a conclusion. These Presbyteries evidently present a hopeful field to the advocate of a scriptural tithe.

Twenty-two Presbyteries reject the tithe outright, as in no sense binding on the Christian as a rule of action, using in the discussion such terms as these: "Solely Jewish," "repealed," "exaction," "not equitable," "ecclesiastical tithe law," "deliverance mischievous," "violates liberty," "enforcement," "exact," "compel," etc., etc.; all of which shows the prominence of a definition of "tithe law" already noted. A few of these argue, "under grace," and "all is the Lord's," as already noted. Only two of the twenty-two say "not binding," without adding some form of argument as indicated above.

The remaining thirty Presbyteries present views which are curious, interesting and hopeful. Many of them reject the present binding authority of the "tithe law" for the same reasons substantially as the twenty-two cited above; several of them reject in negative and modest phrase: "Do not see," "Are not convinced," "Are not prepared to adopt," "Unwise at present stage," etc. But all reject for reasons, expressed or implied, largely drawn from such a view of the "tithe law" as ought to condemn it in all ages and dispensations. Still, these thirty Presbyteries all express sentiments favorable to the tithe as a starting point for Christian liberality, while the full measure of duty is much larger. This is easily shown by phrases like the following (quoted literally or for substance and in brief): "Tithe binding on all men as token of God's ownership;" "Jewish obligation enhanced to the Christian;" "Christianity calls for more;" "An expression of God's will;" "A guide;" "Valuable in practice;" "Larger consecration and larger proportion needed in Christianity;" "More liberal;" "Might be usefully recommended and adopted;" "Assembly may advise;" "Valuable indication and guide;" "The principle continues;" "Not less:" "Christianity calls for more;" "New Testament measure not below the Old;" "Proportion not diminished, but enlarged;" "A scriptural precedent;" "Good minimum starting point;" "Obligatory in spirit for enlarging;" "Superior graces and larger field of a superior dispensation do not suggest less;" "No Christian should do less;" "Urges tithing as a question of personal duty;" "One-tenth the ordinary minimum;" "Forcibly suggestive," etc., etc.



Now, it is evident that we have no right to count any of these thirty Presbyteries with the ten that formally endorsed the tithe as of permanent binding authority; still, it is evident that the two classes are not working on the same definition of the scriptural tithe, and, if they had been, it would still be hard to say how much nearer they would have come to each other in their conclusions. The first class of ten, however, would certainly endorse all that the thirty feel free to say in favor of the tithe as a voluntary minimum in ordinary cases in the Christian dispensation. So, then, by throwing these two classes together, we find that forty of the sixty-two Presbyteries who are able to express an opinion about the tithe as a means of revenue for the church are found endorsing and commending it in some form. It would perhaps be difficult to formulate this commendation into a single paper which all would accept; still the concurrent trend of opinion is marvellous. The most ardent advocate of a properly defined scriptural tithe may well be surprised at its evident good standing in our church. Some will think also that the arguments adduced for this favorable status of the tithe are not only true, as they undoubtedly are, but scriptural as well. The consequences of this proposition we will not press.

The work which the writer proposed to himself is completed by making this analysis from a little different point of view, and for a different purpose from that of the Assembly's committee. The writer has refrained in these notes from discussing his own views of the tithe, except in an incidental and parenthetical way.

It may not be amiss, however, to construct a brief and coherent paper on the tithe out of materials the most of which is gleaned from the reports of the Presbyteries, which shall at the same time express the writer's views: such a paper as any church court might adopt without usurpation of authority or infringement of Christian liberty; such a paper as a large minority in the last Assembly hoped to see passed, in whole or in part, by the Assembly of 1891, in case the subject had been postponed till that time, to-wit :

1. The scriptural tithe was one-tenth of the proper product of capital, labor, spoil, or any other form of increase, estimated in gross, and was consecrated to the support of the institutions of religion, and was the divine indication of a minimum to be given for this purpose. Circumstances and the exigencies of the case often called for a much larger proportion in the form of free-will offerings.

2. This tithe is seen in practice before the ratification of the Abrahamic covenant, is recognized by Jacob as the law of his life consecra-

tion, and was formally engrafted on the Mosaic system at Mount Sinai. It must not be confounded with the sanctuary tithe and the poor tithe, which presumably originated with that system and passed away with it. Having none of the features of a type or mere ceremonial, it would seem to be of divine authority as long as there are institutions of religion to support.

3. This tithe was purely a voluntary offering, self-assessed, and collected by no civil or ecclesiastical authority, and enforced only by providential rewards and punishments. The enacted and enforced tithes of so many other religious systems have been a usurpation of a divine prerogative and a galling despotism.

4. Nor was this tithe an inexorable law, to be self-enforced in the face of all conditions. All positive institutions which indicate a certain measure of service would sometimes become irksome and cruel if there were no principle limiting their application in actual practice. Phariseism says, "Enforce at all hazards." Christ says, "Go ye and learn what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice," thus quoting and setting up the Old Testament and universal principle of "necessity and mercy," as limiting such positive measures of service. Such plea of "necessity and mercy" in the tither's case is between him and his God, and he must needs be careful that he is not moved by covetousness on the one hand, or by weakness of faith on the other.

5. It is left to "prophet" and "teacher" to expound and enforce this duty of tithing as far as he may see his way clear to do so from God's word, and only so far; and it is also left to the conscience of the individual Christian to determine how far he shall accept and act upon this minimum rule of honoring God with the substance; but both the teacher and the taught must give account to the same Judge, and to him only. All other question or inquisition about it would be an impertinence and a usurpation.

6. It follows, therefore, clearly that the church courts can pronounce nothing on this subject which shall bind the conscience or the conduct of God's people, even by its moral weight. Besides, such deliverance would be of the nature of promulgating a new article of faith not now embraced in the standards of the church. Such a new article of faith might perhaps be added to the *Confession of Faith* in a constitutional way, but in that case the constitutional duty of enforcement would rest upon the church, and then liberty perishes under ecclesiastical domination.

7. The obligation to support the institutions of religion seems to

have been unquestioned in New Testament times by the heresies of the day; we, therefore, find but two references to it, one by Christ—"The laborer is worthy of his hire"—and one by Paul, Heb. ix. 13, 14; and both references are drawn from Old Testament usage and authority. Numerous and urgent arguments and exhortations are, however, given to secure generous gifts to the poor, and they were no doubt timely. These exhortations contain principles of wider application to Old Testament tithes, and free-will offerings as well.

8. Many who may not concede the permanent binding authority of the tithe as a minimum for all ages and dispensations will perhaps concede the following proposition: If the tithe was the minimum proportion in a confessedly inferior dispensation, the larger graces, wider field and abounding prosperity of a better dispensation do not suggest a smaller proportion when we essay to "honor the Lord with our substance."

J. B. SHEARER.

*Davidson College, N. C.*

---

## THE DODS-BRUCE DECISIONS.

THE General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, which met last spring in Edinburgh, was the largest that has been held in twenty years, the number of commissioners in attendance being seven hundred and sixty. On the 27th of May the great Assembly Hall on High street, which holds about two thousand people, was packed as never before perhaps in its history. As early as eight o'clock in the morning people began to gather, and by ten, when the Assembly was called to order, not a vacant seat could be seen, though only holders of tickets were admitted. Even after benches had been placed in the aisles a great block of people was left standing at each door. This extraordinary manifestation of interest on the part of both ministers and people was due to the expectation of a debate and a decision concerning the alleged heresies of Prof. Marcus Dods, of Edinburgh, and Prof. Alexander Balmain Bruce, of Glasgow. The former had exposed several joints in his harness by certain expressions he had used in regard to the divinity of Christ, the atonement and the resurrection, as well as by sundry unguarded statements concerning the "errors" and "immoralities" in the Old Testament. The latter had rendered himself obnoxious to the heresy hunters by loose statements also on the subject of inspiration, particularly in regard to the free reports of the words of our Lord in the synoptical Gospels.

The matter came up in the form of a report by the College Committee on the case of Dr. Dods, stating that his writings did not furnish grounds for instituting a process against him as teaching what is at variance with the standards of the church. On this five motions were introduced, three by the Professor's opponents, one by his friends, and one by those who put personal and party considerations aside and decided the question more purely on its merits. Happily the last prevailed. Of the three adverse motions, one proposed that the Professor should be "libelled," another that his case should be sent to a committee, while the third condemned his views, but declared that a formal prosecution was not "advisable." These were all voted down by large majorities. The motion introduced by his supporters adopted the conclusion of the College Committee, that there were no grounds for a libel process, reaffirmed the Assembly's belief in the great verities of the faith, and suggested to Dr. Dods to—

"Bear in mind in his statements, not only what he thought requisite in the interest of truth, but what his brethren deemed due to it, and exhorted their faithful ministers and office-bearers to observe all due care in speech and action, lest utterances from her accredited teachers be misapprehended in the church."

The final vote was taken between this and the following resolution, introduced by Dr. Adam and supported by Principal Rainy and others :

"The Assembly approve of the report of the College Committee in respect of the conclusions arrived at, that the writings of Dr. Dods do not afford ground for instituting a process against him as teaching what is at variance with the standards of the church.

"But having regard to questions which have been raised in connection with certain passages in Dr. Dods' writings, the Assembly find it necessary to declare as follows:

"(1). This church holds immovably the cardinal doctrine of our Lord's divinity, and highly disapproves of all representations, by whatever motive dictated, which tend to lower the sense of its vital importance in the minds of many hearers of the gospel.

"(2). This church steadfastly adheres to the fundamental doctrine of the atonement as laid down in her standards, and cannot consent to sanction its being set forth as a mere theory, or as only one among many phases or aspects of the Saviour's death.

"(3). This church firmly believes that the resurrection of our Lord is not only an incontestably proved fact, but one which lies at the very foundation of the Christian system, and it looks with high disapproval on any apparent countenance being given to speculations fitted to bring the reality of it into question.

"(4). With regard to the Holy Scriptures, this church continues to hold, as she has ever done, that they are 'all given by inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and life,' and that of their infallible and divine authority we are assured by the inward work of the Holy Spirit. She views the use of the term 'mistakes and

immoralities' to describe recognized difficulties in the Scriptures as utterly unwarranted, and fitted to give grave offence.

"Finally, the Assembly, while thankfully acknowledging Dr. Dods' strong declaration of adherence to the doctrine of the church as laid down in her standards, and desiring to do justice to his high character and services, find it necessary in present circumstances to remind him, and the church's professors generally, that the primary duty which devolves on them in the responsible offices they have been called to occupy, is to teach and defend the church's faith as embodied in her Confession, and it earnestly exhorts them, even when engaged in laudable efforts to convince gainsayers and to help the doubting, to be on their guard against all lines of argument and forms of expression which may have a tendency to endanger the faith of others, and to wound the hearts of those who tremble at the divine word."

This was carried by a majority of eighty-five.

Two days later the case of Dr. Bruce came up in the same way. Both he and the Edinburgh professor were greeted with enthusiastic applause when they entered the house. Only two motions were submitted. The one from the opposition ran as follows :

"The Assembly receive the special report of the College Committee and of its sub-committee in the case of Dr. Bruce, and thank them for their diligence. The Assembly find, as regards the case, that in the volume of Dr. Bruce, entitled "*The Kingdom of God*," and other of his writings, there are many statements which are seriously objectionable, and appear to be irreconcilable with the standards of the church and the position and responsibilities of a professor of theology. The Assembly remit this decision, along with the special report of the College Committee and its sub-committee, to the Presbytery of Glasgow, to deal therewith as seems to them fit."

The motion which became the finding of the house was introduced by the Rev. R. G. Balfour, and reads thus :

"The General Assembly approve of the report of the committee as regards its conclusion, finding no ground for a process against Dr. Bruce as teaching doctrine opposed to the standards of the church. But the Assembly also declare as follows :

"(1.) With regard to the inspiration of the gospels and the reliable character of their reports as to the life and ministry of our blessed Lord, the Assembly find that, by want of due care in his modes of statement, and by his manner of handling debated questions as to the motives and methods of the evangelists, Dr. Bruce has given some ground for the misunderstandings and for the painful impressions which have existed.

"(2.) With respect to Dr. Bruce's doctrinal positions and his statements about the system of the Christian faith, the Assembly find ground for reminding Dr. Bruce that, in endeavoring to state afresh the bearing of our Lord's teaching, and in setting forth aspirations after fresh light upon the matter of the teaching received among us, he was bound to express himself, not only with essential loyalty to the church's faith, professed by him along with all his brethren, but also so as to make that continued loyalty evident to the world. With reference to both de-

partments of this finding, the Assembly call Dr. Bruce's special attention to the responsibilities attaching to his position.

"Finally, the Assembly cordially recognize the good gifts which Dr. Bruce has brought to the service of the church in the line of the theological literature and otherwise, as well as those which distinguished Dr. Dods, whose case was before the Assembly at a former diet. They assure those brethren of the Assembly's earnest desire for their acceptance and success in the important work which the church has entrusted to them."

The majority for this was one hundred and fifty-five, and the decision was received with loud cheers, as in the former case.

It is easy to sneer at this action as a compromise. It will not satisfy those hyper-orthodox people whom Dr. Stuart Robinson used to speak of as men of "high pints." Nor will it satisfy those who are in full sympathy with the accused professors. But a careful study of the whole case convinces us that the action was wise. It was not a compromise, but a decision based upon the evidence. There may be facts which would justify judicial process against Messrs. Dods and Bruce, but they were not adduced in this discussion. Even Principal Rainy declared that the first clause of the motion, which stated that there was no ground for censure, was most important and fundamental, and that he would vote for no motion from which that was absent. The most obnoxious statements of Dr. Dods seem to have been made, not as expressing his own views, but as premises in an *ad hominem* argument, for purposes of apologetics. That he has made other unsound statements which cannot be explained in this way, we have no doubt, but they were not in evidence. The truth is, his opponents had not studied his writings, and relying apparently upon passion and prejudice rather than facts, they made but a feeble attack when they might have made a strong one. The prosecution was conducted by weak and imprudent men. Their lack of force was accentuated by contrast with the strength of the two professors, whose abilities are beyond question, whatever may be said of their orthodoxy. The speeches of the opposition were intemperate and abusive. The three leaders of this minority were Mr. Howie, who "came to grief in an attempt to introduce the name of Dr. Dods' father in connection with an argument against the professor"; Mr. Macaskill, who threatened his brethren from the Highlands with excommunication if they should venture to vote contrary to his views; and a Major McLeod, the most picturesque of them all, who "sporting a very pronounced true-blue necktie" and "delivered a very perfervid speech (of ten minutes), in the course of which he was twice called to order."

These men were all more orthodox than the Confession of Faith, and, of course, the decision of the Assembly counts for nothing with them, notwithstanding the tremendous majority against them. These are the men who compose "the purest church on earth," who denounce those that do not agree with them and distrust those that do, like the extremely orthodox Scotchman who had carried secession so far that when asked about the membership of his church said, "There's only Sandy and me, and I hae my doots o' Sandy." "While dispensing the sacrament in Fearn, on a recent Sunday, the Rev. D. Matheson, during the fencing of the table, debarred all who believed in the opinions of Professors Dods and Bruce from taking their places at the table of the Lord." These Mucklewraths and Macbriars will probably cause a defection which will sadly cripple the real friends of the truth in coming contests. Shortly after the adjournment of the Assembly, a secret conclave of the malcontents was held in Glasgow. Though declining to make their proceedings public, there is little doubt that they took steps looking to the further agitation of the matter in the church courts. Accordingly we read of another and later meeting, at which an elaborate manifesto was adopted, setting forth reasons for dissatisfaction with the decisions of the Assembly. This they have a right to do, of course, and there is little doubt that the matter will soon come before the Assembly again in some shape. But we hope that, when it does, the cause of orthodoxy may fall into the hands of abler and wiser men.

In pleasing contrast with the hysterical and bitter speeches of the minority were the dignified and conciliatory expressions of the two professors. If they *have* taught some of the doctrines attributed to them, we have as little sympathy with them as with the extremists just described, but we are bound to admit that they showed throughout an admirable Christian spirit. While the decision was an exceedingly unpalatable one to Dr. Dods, he has bowed to it loyally, and in token of his readiness to submit to his church's ruling he immediately changed the subject on which he was expected to speak at Oxford. As for Dr. Bruce, he achieved an extraordinary triumph. The statement that his much-abused book was included by the Princeton professors in their list of the best hundred books for a minister's library, was received with cheers. His speech of half an hour was listened to with the closest attention, the unusual stillness which reigned throughout the hall being broken only by an occasional storm of applause. The tone of it took all the heart out of the attack upon him. He ac-

knowledged his imperfections, reiterated his hearty acceptance of the great doctrines of our faith, defended his book in a modest and manly way, and yet accepted the admonitions of the Assembly in a spirit of humility. He has, moreover, recently issued a new edition of his book, in which certain passages to which objection was taken have been modified.

We have not seen the end of this matter. Neither the unwise enemies nor the unwise friends of the two professors are satisfied with the Assembly's decision. But we shall look forward to the further agitation of it without apprehension. The Free Church is sound. The papers above cited ring true on every one of the great doctrines involved. And the overwhelming majorities by which they were adopted relieve all fears as to the issue of future controversies. W. W. MOORE.

*Hampden-Sidney, Va.*

---

#### THE SARATOGA ASSEMBLY AND THE PUBLICATION BOARD.

SUMMIT, N. J., *August 21, 1890.*

EDITORS PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY: My special attention has been called to an article in your July number, in which Rev. Thomas A. Hoyt, D. D., has attacked severely the report of a special committee of the General Assembly of the Northern Church, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

Assuming that your spirit of fairness will allow your readers to hear both sides, I ask your indulgence while I give you some of the facts in the case, so that they may be able to judge of the matter in question.

Let me say that Dr. Hoyt himself is a member of the Board of Publication that is under investigation, and that he seems to have availed himself of the advice of a distinguished lawyer to a young student, "When you have a bad case abuse the witnesses on the other side."

The special committee, who are spoken of as "supposed to be experts," as "obscure and incompetent persons," etc., were appointed by the moderator on account of their acquaintance with the matters under investigation. Of the number two are book publishers, one the publisher and owner of a paper with an issue of 350,000 copies monthly, another is a general printer, another was for fifteen years the Business Agent of the American Tract Society, in charge of manufac-



turing and selling, while the last one was a business man of wide and varied experience.

After a most careful and thorough investigation by this committee of the matters committed to them by the Assembly, including a full conference with the business committee of three days, this committee made a report, which is characterized by the defendant as "malicious charges," "slanders," "infamous report," "libels," etc. This report, with the facts on which it was based, was fully and in detail made known to the business committee, as is shown by the stenographic report of the conference, covering nearly three hundred and fifty pages of manuscript, and the recommendations of the report were in the hands of that business committee for fourteen days without our receiving even the courtesy of an acknowledgment, until five days before the meeting of the Assembly, when they were withdrawn.

This report was upon business methods, and showed a most grievous lack of common business sagacity, and instanced repeated cases where the Board was paying more than double for its work what it was offered to be done for by reputable houses.

In stating the facts, the committee expressly and fully disclaimed charging anything like dishonesty on the part of any one, and any statement to the contrary is a mistake.

Now, the whole question turns upon the truth of the statements made by the committee, and the Assembly, after hearing the representative of the business committee at great length, referred the matter to a new committee.

After this reference, the Assembly then, with but a single dissenting voice, passed resolutions continuing the special committee another year, and extending to them "a vote of thanks for their faithful services during the past year."

I respectfully submit that this is a somewhat strange way to treat a committee who had made an "infamous report," after "every charge was effectually disposed of and the Board vindicated, while the authors of the libel were covered with confusion!"

As to the insinuation that the committee published "libels for which their authors are in danger of prosecution before the civil courts," let me say that is only the way the doctor expresses the fact that *he* does not like statements of the committee which were wholly collected from official reports and statements of the Board.

I do not think there is any danger of the "civil" or uncivil courts being called upon to suppress a report of a special committee to the

General Assembly because it does not please the Board that is investigated.

In conclusion, allow me to say that the special committee, fully understanding their responsibility to the Head of the church, are prepared now, or at any other time, before any committee, session, Presbytery or Assembly, to furnish absolute and indisputable proof of every statement in their report, only asking that the official reports of the Board shall be taken as telling the truth; and we are willing to rest our reputations as honest, truth-telling men and officers of the church upon the verdict.

Pardon the length of my communication, and believe me, I remain,  
 Most fraternally,                    H. E. SIMMONS, *Chairman, etc.*

#### DR. HOYT'S REPLY.

In reply to the above, I am a member of the Board, but not of its business committee, whose matters are at issue.

The special committee was not continued, except that it might appear as a body before the new committee and answer for its report.

There was no such conference between the two committees as was intended by the General Assembly. The three hundred and fifty pages of stenography contained the report of a debate between the two committees.

The General Assembly required a joint report. There was no joint report, but merely an *ex parte* statement by the special committee.

The special committee did not lay before the business committee the facts, but only their inferences; that is, they gave estimates, but not the specifications on which they were based.

The nameless bidders at lower prices may have been men of straw and the bids hypothetical. The special committee failed to show that responsible parties offered better terms.

Dr. Agnew demonstrated to the Assembly, by a comparison of its books with those of several large publishers, that those of the Board were better and cheaper.

The special committee made an active, partisan propaganda among the members of the Assembly, by button-holing them, circulating their report, and insinuating charges. No more flagrant attempt was ever made to influence the members of a court in advance of the public hearing.

T. A. HOYT.

## VII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

---

GIRARDEAU'S "CALVINISM AND EVANGELICAL ARMINIANISM."

CALVINISM AND EVANGELICAL ARMINIANISM: Compared as to Election, Reprobation, Justification, and Related Doctrines. *By John L. Girardeau, Professor of Systematic Theology in Columbia Theological Seminary, South Carolina.* Columbia, S. C.: W. J. Duffie; New York: The Baker & Taylor Co. 1890. Pp. 574.

The author gives the following account of the origin of his treatise in the preface:

"During the temporary occupation of the pulpit of the First Presbyterian Church in Columbia, a few years ago, some of the young members of that church requested me to instruct a Bible class on Sabbath nights, in the distinctive doctrines of the Calvinistic faith. A large number was enrolled, and the understanding was, that the members of the class would be entitled to a free interrogation of the instructor. Unexpectedly, from the very first, a large promiscuous congregation attended, and the liberty to ask questions was used by outsiders, the design appearing to be to start difficulties rather than to seek light, and to convert the exercises into a debate. To avoid this result, and to treat objections in a more logical and orderly manner than was possible in extemporized replies to the scattering fire of miscellaneous inquiries, resort was had ere long to written lectures. Notwithstanding this change, the attendance and the interest suffered no abatement, but rather increased—a fact which seemed to militate against the common opinion that doctrinal discussions would prove dry and unacceptable to a popular audience. The lectures, which were prepared not without pains-taking labor, suggested the production of a formal treatise on the subjects which had occupied all the available time,—namely, Election and Reprobation, with special reference to the evangelical Arminian theology. This was done, and a discussion of the doctrine of justification was added."

These facts are instructive. People who hear the gospel, if they think at all, *will* revolve the great problems it suggests. They will have a theology of some sort and of some extent, and he who has the ability and the opportunity to aid them in forming a sound theology, and in correcting their errors; who shall point out a true method, and shall succeed in persuading them to follow it; who shall make them see that the difficulties which stagger them most press upon all systems alike, and that even atheism gives no relief from them, while it is burdened with greater difficulties of its own—he who shall do these things, will render an inestimable service. Let our younger ministers take the hint. They cannot all be Girardeaus; but all who are fit for the office of a minister and defender of the gospel can teach the people how to think on these great subjects, how to put to silence the unlearned ignorance of foolish men, and how to obtain the contentment of learned ignorance for themselves. The people can be taught how to stop the mouths of cavillers, and to recognize in themselves the necessary limitations of the knowledge of God and of his ways.

“Evangelical Arminianism” is a term used since the time of Wesley, to denote a type of theology which, while it was the same as the Arminianism of the Remonstrants of Holland upon the capital point of Election and Reprobation, modified that theology in the departments of anthropology and soteriology, so as to bring it into nearer conformity with the teaching of the Scriptures and with Christian experience. This is the theology which was taught by Wesley, so far as he can be said to have had any scientific theology at all; which was expounded and defended by Richard Watson in his *Institutes*, and which is taught in a popular form in the pulpit of the Methodist Church in Great Britain and the United States. The piety of such men as Wesley and Watson has so far commended it even to Calvinists, that it has sometimes been spoken of in terms not at all warranted by its scientific character. Thus, Dr. A. A. Hodge (*Outlines*, p. 106) speaks of it as very much like “the Calvinism of Baxter, and of the French School of the seventeenth century,” a statement the correctness of which we should not hesitate to challenge, and, if this were the place for it, to disprove. The real meaning of Dr. Hodge is brought out more clearly in a passage in his *Popular Lectures*, p. 160 (Lec. VII., which is one of those that were printed from his own MS.). We quote the passage the more willingly, as we have seen a part of it quoted very recently by one of the revisionists in the Northern church, with the effect of making a different impression from what was intended by the author. He had said in the preceding paragraph, that “all thinkers who understand themselves know that they run along one or other of these lines” (in reference to the government of the universe), the theory of mechanism, or that of personal intelligence and will. He then goes on—

“Here, as everywhere else, there is essential truth on both sides of every controversy, and the real truth is the whole truth, its entire catholic body. Arminianism in the abstract as an historical scheme is a heresy, holding half the truth. Calvinism is an historical scheme which, in its best representatives, comprehends the whole truth with considerable completeness. But the case is essentially different when we come to consider the great coexisting bodies of Christian people calling themselves respectively Calvinists and Arminians. Each of these parties holds all essential truth, and therefore they hold actually very much the same truth. The Arminians think and speak very much like Calvinists when they come to talk with God in either the confession of sin or the supplication for grace. They both alike in that attitude recognize the sovereignty of God and the guilt and helplessness of men. Indeed, how could it be otherwise? What room is there for anything other than Calvinism on one’s knees? On the other hand, the Calvinist thinks and speaks like the better class of Arminians when he addresses the consciences of men, and pleads with them as free, responsible agents, to repent and believe in Christ. The difference between the best of either class is one of emphasis rather than of essential principle. Each is the complement of the other.”

It appears, then, that the comparison of Dr. Hodge is not of Calvinism and Arminianism as theologies, but of “the bodies of Christian people calling themselves Calvinists and Arminians respectively.” When he compares the *theologies*, he calls Arminianism “a heresy holding half the truth,” and asserts, not that “Calvinism, in its best representatives,” holds the other half, but that it comprehends “the whole truth with considerable completeness.” A very different idea, truly, from that which would be naturally suggested by the writer in the *New York Evangelist* (of the issue of the 7th of August). In other words, Dr. Hodge held what Dr. Girardeau holds, what we all hold, that in the average preaching of the

Methodist pulpit, and in the experience of God's people in that denomination, there is a sufficient leaven of "the doctrines of grace," that is, of the gospel, to save the soul. We should be sorely distressed if we were compelled to think otherwise.

Notwithstanding this concession, we think Dr. Girardeau is right in subjecting the theology of this same *evangelical* Arminianism to a thorough examination, and this for several reasons :

1. Because we are commanded to "contend for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints," and this contending implies a refutation of error, as well as a setting forth of the truth. What we believe to be the truth of God is caricatured and denounced. How can the truth fail to suffer if the polemics be all on one side ?

2. Whatever piety may have been produced under the preaching of evangelical Arminianism, it is certain that that piety will gradually decay and assume a more unscriptural type in proportion as the elements of truth in the theology drop out in the teaching of the schools and in the preaching of the ministers who are trained in them. True doctrine is the mould of life (Rom. vi. 17), the seed of regeneration (James i. 18; 1 Pet. i. 23), the means and condition of sanctification (John xvii. 17, 18; 2 Thess. ii. 13). Christian experience answers to the doctrine as the impression upon the wax does to the device and inscription upon the seal. Mar the seal, and the impression will be marred.

3. In point of fact, evangelical Arminianism as a theology is undergoing a change for the worse, a change in the direction of Pelagianism, or at least, of semi-Pelagianism. Dr. Girardeau shows this clearly by quotations from the English theologian, Pope, and the American theologians, Whedon and Raymond. Wesley and Watson would stand aghast at the positions taken in the name of evangelical Arminianism by Whedon and Raymond. These last-named are of the Methodist Church North. Ralston, of the Methodist Church South, is a writer of less ability, but is less unsound. We cannot do better than quote here a passage of some length from our author to show how the Arminian theology of to-day has receded from that of Wesley and Watson :

"Wesley and Watson held that the race suffers penally in consequence of Adam's sin. Raymond denounces 'the abhorrent doctrine of inherited obligation to punishment.' By Wesley and Watson the doctrine of total depravity was more strongly and unqualifiedly asserted than it is now. Wesley allowed the imputation of Christ's righteousness. The denial of it was begun by Watson, and it is now emphatically rejected. But it is in regard to the supreme question in hand, of the entire dependence of the poor, guilty, miserable, undone sinner upon the grace of God for conversion, that this downward tendency becomes as conspicuous as it is lamentable to every lover of gospel truth. The venerable John Wesley failed not to affirm this dependence in strong and unmistakable terms. Where will you find an assertion by him of the supremacy of the sinner's will in the great concern of personal salvation ? But now we hear it boldly and roundly declared by learned theologians 'that man determines the question of his salvation.' These ominous words peal on the ear like the notes of a fire-bell at the dead of night. They mean a sure descent to a lower level of doctrine than that of the early evangelical Arminians. Those men were prevented by their deep experience of grace from using this language. But alas! they sowed the seed which have sprung up and are now bearing the fruits of semi-Pelagianism. Well, it may be asked, what is there so bad in that ? What if the logical tendencies of the system are in the direction of semi-Pelagianism ? To that question this must be replied: James Arminius did not,

as Limborch afterwards did, advocate that theology; John Wesley would have gone to the stake before he would have confessed his approval of it; it is one for which Jesuits have contended, and against which pious Romanists have struggled; it is, in some respects, less orthodox than that of Trent; such men as Prosper, Hilary and Fulgentius treated it as essentially Pelagian, and the Magdeburg Centuriators afterwards did the same; in short, it denies the supremacy of the grace of God, and reduces it into subordination to the human will, and is, therefore, a subversion of the gospel scheme. I have sung and prayed and preached with evangelical Arminians, and have been with them in precious seasons of reviving grace; some of them are among my most cherished friends, and some I have seen cross the Jordan of death whose shoes I would have carried; but could I get the ear of my evangelical Arminian brethren, I would ask their attention to those ill-boding and alarming words issuing from high places: '*Man determines the question of his salvation!*' Do they express the logical result of their theological principles? If they do, is it not time to subject those principles to a fresh examination?" (Pages 158-160.)

In this examination Dr. Girardeau does thorough work, ferreting out the adversary from all his hiding-places and stripping him of all his disguises. Indeed, he seems to us often too thorough. He not only kills his man, but tears his body limb from limb; or, to change the figure a little, he is not satisfied till he leaves his adversary's argument "twice dead, plucked up by the roots." His favorite logical weapon is the *dilemma*, a two-edged sword dangerous to handle, but one which he has handled without, so far as we remember, ever in a single instance cutting himself or giving the adversary an opening to smite him with it. His arguments are, of course, not new; how could they be on such subjects? But he has his own way of putting some of them, which imparts to them an air of freshness, if not of novelty. We will give a specimen or two by way of whetting the appetite of the reader for the book itself. The first is in regard to the Arminian position, that the design and effect of Christ's death is only to put all men into a condition of *possible* salvation, not to procure an actual and certain salvation for any man. (See pp. 303 ff.)

"A possible salvation would be to a sinner an impossible salvation. Mere salvability would be to him inevitable destruction. It will be admitted without argument, that a possible is not in itself an actual salvation. That which may be is not that which is. Before a possible can become an actual salvation something needs to be done—a condition must be performed upon which is suspended its passage from possibility to actuality. The question is, What is the thing which needs to be done; what is this condition which must be fulfilled before salvation can become a fact to the sinner? The Arminian answer is: Repentance and faith on the sinner's part. He must consent to turn from his iniquities and accept Christ as his Saviour. The further question presses, By what agency does the sinner perform this condition; by what power does he repent, believe, and so accept salvation? The answer given to this question, whatever it may be, must indicate the agency, the power, which *determines* the sinner's repenting, believing, and so accepting salvation. It is not enough to point out an agency, a power which, however potent, is merely auxiliary to the determining cause. It is the determining cause itself that must be given as the answer to the question. It must be a factor which renders, by virtue of its own energy, the final decision,—an efficient cause, which by its own inherent causality makes a possible salvation an actual and experimental fact. What is this causal agent which is the sovereign arbiter of human destiny? The Arminian's answer is: The sinner's will."

The author then goes on to show that this will of the sinner which discharges so momentous an office as determining the question of salvation is his *natural* will. It cannot be a gracious will, that is, a will renewed by grace; for this would suppose the sinner already saved. But the very question is, Will he consent *to be*

*saved?* It is the will, then, of an unsaved man which is to determine whether a possible salvation shall become an actual, and this will must be sovereignly exercised; nothing must determine it, not even the blessed Spirit of God. That glorious Agent may argue and persuade; but he cannot touch and transform the will, because this would be an invasion of the will's sovereignty. The author's conclusion, therefore, is that no sinner could be saved, because there is an invincible repugnance to salvation in the sinner's natural will. Again, as the evangelical Arminian holds that no sinner can save himself, hence, if Christ procured only a possible salvation, no sinner can be saved. According, then, to the Arminians themselves, a possible is an impossible salvation.

The next specimen shall be taken from pp. 328 ff. Dr. Girardeau is answering the objection to the doctrine of election as made by Watson, that it is inconsistent with the *wisdom* of God. "The bringing into being," says Watson, "of a vast number of intelligent creatures under a necessity of sinning and of being eternally lost, teaches no moral lesson to the world; and contradicts all those notions of wisdom in the ends and processes of government which we are taught to look for, not only from natural reason, but from the Scriptures." The author, after correcting the misrepresentation of the Calvinistic doctrine in this passage, goes on to answer the objection, 1, By showing that the Calvinistic doctrine is *not* inconsistent with the wisdom of God; and 2, By showing that the Arminian doctrine *is*. He does both by setting forth the nature of wisdom as consisting in the selection of worthy ends and the use of the fittest and most effectual means to secure them. The ends of God are the glorification of his grace in the salvation of some of our race, and the glorification of his justice in the punishment of others. The evangelical Arminian does not deny that some are saved and that some are lost, and that God's grace is glorified in the saved and his justice in the lost. The question, then, is about the fitness of the means. Which view of the means, the Calvinistic or the Arminian, is most worthy of the wisdom of God? The question hardly admits of doubt. According to the Calvinist the means are effectual and the result is certain, so far as the end of saving the elect is concerned; according to the Arminian the means may fail in every case, and not a single sinner be saved.

The same conclusion is reached by considering what Watson calls "the ends and processes of government." Our author shows that from this point of view Calvinism sets forth the wisdom of God far more clearly and impressively than Arminianism does or can. We wish we had the space to quote his argument; but we must refer the reader to the book itself.

No one can read the discussions of this book without feeling that the fundamental question between the Calvinist and the Arminian is whether God or man is the sovereign in the matter of salvation; and the Calvinist may well be pardoned if he sometimes uses language which is not respectful to sovereign man. Courtesy to your adversary is something which must always be maintained, even when he is blaspheming God and endeavoring to subvert the very foundation of your hope of eternal life. Dr. Girardeau never forgets in these discussions that he is arguing with *Christian* Arminians: with men who do not *mean* to be blasphemers, who of course do not *intend* to destroy the only hope of a sinner, whether ours or their own. He gives no quarter to their arguments, while he judges charitably of their state and character. The temperature of the book is admirable; warm, as it behooves to be when handling such vital themes, but at the same time gentle and

tender to the persons of God's people who, in opposing the truth, "know not what they do." We heartily wish they could be persuaded to read it. It could not fail to do them good, if it did not convince them of their error. It would be a great thing if they should be induced to retrace their steps, to abandon such writers as Raymond and Whedon, and to get back on the ground of Wesley and Watson.

As authors are not perfect, and as it is supposed to be the office of a critic to find fault as well as to praise, we shall answer to this expectation by expressing our surprise that our author's eulogy of Dr. Dabney (in the note on p. 160) should have ended with the Horatian *serus in coelum redent*. His meaning, of course, is, may his stay on earth be prolonged, and his departure to heaven be delayed; but the meaning of the poet and of his words (as they stand in the original, *Carm. l., 2, 45*), is "Mayest thou be late in *returning* to heaven." Horace was ascribing divine honors to his master, Augustus, identifying him with Mercury, "the messenger of the gods." No man can *return* to heaven who did not come from heaven (John iii. 13). We should not have thought it worth while to notice the matter if this had not been the third time, to our knowledge, that this pagan phrase has been used to or of a Presbyterian minister. Words are things. A few days ago a notice of Dr. Pryor's death in a Presbyterian newspaper had the heading "Requiescat in pace," the form which appears generally in papal obituary notices. Did the writer mean to offer a prayer for "the repose of the soul" of the departed patriarch? Of course not. Nevertheless, he would have been so understood by any Romanist who happened to see that notice.

T. E. PECK.

#### GILBERT'S "POETRY OF JOB."

THE POETRY OF JOB. *By George H. Gilbert, Ph. D., Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in the Chicago Theological Seminary (Congregational).* Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. 1889. Pp. xiv., 224. \$1.

Nowhere does the superiority of the Revised Version to that of 1611 appear more clearly than in the poetical books of the Old Testament, and in none of these are the changes more numerous and important than in Job and the Song of Songs. In the case of the latter the new version, by removing the preposterous chapter headings, separating the discourses of the different *dramatis personae*, and correcting the false renderings, has swept away a great mass of the allegorical cobwebs which had for ages obscured this most beautiful of all pastoral poems. In the case of the former all such picturesque absurdities as the anachronism about *printing*, in chap. xix. 23, the reference to the formation of "dead things from under the waters," in chap. xxvi. 5, and Job's wish that his adversary had written a book (xxxi. 35), have been dispensed with; all such baffling ambiguities as that of chap. xxvi. 10, have been clarified; all such contradictory entanglements as that of chap. iv. 6, have been solved, and scores of other changes made which affect the complexion and scope of the poem; so that we now have a fairly faithful and intelligible translation of "this greatest product of the Hebrew mind." Not the least of the merits of the revision is its preservation of the Hebrew parallelism. But the peculiar rhythm of the original, that is, its movement by tones, was not preserved by the revisers, and indeed we had never seen it reproduced anywhere until this little volume of Prof. Gilbert's appeared. It is well known to readers of the Hebrew text that most of the lines in Job have three tones, the only important ex-



ceptions being the two-toned and the four-toned lines, about fifty-nine of the former and eighty-five of the latter. The first part of the book before us is a rhythmical translation of Job, in which the Hebrew lines are in each case rendered into English lines with a corresponding number of tones. The following are examples of the three-toned lines:

- “ The wicked have ceased there from troubling,  
And there are the weary at rest.”—Chap. iii. 17.
- “ Of a truth, now, ye are the people,  
And wisdom will perish with you.”—Chap. xii. 2.
- “ Behold, in his pure ones he trusts not,  
And the heavens are not clean in his eyes.”—Chap. xv. 15.
- “ I gave them a smile when despondent,  
And they made not my cheerful face sad.”—Chap. xxix. 24.
- “ Like a stone are the waters congealed,  
And the face of the deep groweth firm.”—Chap. xxxviii. 30.

The following are examples of the two-toned and the four-toned lines:

- “ My spirit is broken,  
My days are extinct,  
The graveyard is mine.”—Chap. xvii. 1.
- “ The wicked man is in pain all his days,  
And the sum of the years reserved for the tyrant.”—Chap. xv. 20.

Dr. Gilbert is felicitous in alliteration, but rarely resorts to it:

- “ Nay, man unto trouble is born,  
As the children of flame fly aloft.”—Chap. v. 7.
- “ If I saw the light when it shone,  
And the moon in majesty moving.”—Chap. xxxi. 26.

This translation does not claim to be metrical, but rhythmical, and unquestionably it does better represent the original, both in sound and sense, than either of the current English versions. It has been well said of the Revised Version, that the text represents in the main tradition, while the scholarship is found in the margin. It therefore speaks well for Professor Gilbert, that he nearly always agrees with the margin and the American committee where these differ from the English revisers. A notable case of this is his translation of the famous passage in Chapter xix. 25-27:

- “ But I know my Redeemer doth live,  
And later shall rise o'er the dust,  
Then after my skin, thus beat off,  
And free from my flesh, I'll see God;  
Whom I for myself shall see,  
And mine eyes behold, and no stranger.”

On the other hand, some of his renderings are not so good as those of the Revised Version, *e. g.*, Chapter xvi. 18:

- “ O earth, do not cover my blood,  
And be there no place for my cry.”

This is more literal than the Revised Version, but does not so well express the meaning, which is this: let there be no place where my cry shall rest, or cease; let it be heard everywhere until justice be done me. The obscure passage in Chapter xix. 17, is finely rendered in point of rhythm:

- “ My breath to my wife is offensive,  
And my sigh to the sons of my flesh.”

But does not the last expression involve the poet in a contradiction? Job's sons were dead, according to the prologue.

In Chapter iv. 17, he would have done well to follow the margin, since the idea expressed in the text is an irrelevant and enfeebling exaggeration. There was no question with Eliphaz as to whether a man could be *more* pure than God. His point was, that the holiness of God was such that no creature could be pure before him.

Such cases, however, are extremely rare, and, on the whole, as already remarked, Dr. Gilbert's version is by far the best in the language.

The second part of this little volume is an interpretation of the poem, and here we have five truly charming chapters, the first being an analysis of Job, and the remaining four being devoted to a study of the poetical conceptions of the book. Its references to inanimate nature, animal life, and human life, and its conceptions of God, are compared by means of copious quotations with those of Homer, Dante, Shakspere, and Milton. Let us hasten to assure the reader, that there is here none of that learned lumber which overloads so many discussions of this character. Comparative criticism is the pedant's paradise. But our author's selections are all to the point, and the treatment is conspicuously salient and brief. The whole book can be read in three or four hours, and read with undiminished interest to the end.

Two specimens of the graphic style of his interpretations must suffice. The first is his exposition of the beautiful verses in chapter xxxviii. 12-14:

“Hast thou ever commanded a morning?  
Hast shown to a dawning its place,  
To lay hold of the corners of earth,  
That thence may be shaken the wicked?  
It [the earth] changes as signet-clay,  
So that things appear as a garment.”

“Night spreads a blanket over the earth. Morn comes, and, seizing the corners of this vast blanket, lifts it, and shakes the wicked out of its thick folds. Earth, smitten by the dawn, is transfigured. What but a moment ago was formless clay shows now a clear and divine impress. The mountains and hills and valleys stand forth with sharply-cut outlines—the beauteous garment of the earth.”

The second is an illustration of the reverent and simple way in which the Hebrew poet regards nature.

“Yea, knows one the unfoldings of clouds,  
The great crash of his tent?”

“The dark thunder-cloud which Elishu sees approaching is a ‘tent’ of the Almighty. A childlike yet sublime conception. Yonder comes the threatening cloud, impenetrable to human vision, majestic in its mountainous proportions and in its steady onward sweep. There is a mysterious power within it which ever and anon lights up its caverns and towering summits with a marvellous light, and straightway its depths are shaken by a voice that reaches to the distant hills, and is sent back by them in long, heavy reverberations. Now its dark folds are thrown around the summit of yon high hill, as once the cloud enwrapped the rocky crest of Sinai; and now, descending along the valley, its lowest drapery, like streaming pennons that have been shredded by rude blasts, almost touches the earth. Out of its dark depths comes ‘the great rain of his might.’ As the cloud passes by, and recedes further and further from us, we see that its upper parts are glistening white. This is the tent of the Lord!

“It is our loss that we have magnified natural law, to the exclusion, as it were, of the Creator. In pondering one truth we have lost sight of the other. The He-

brew conception of nature is as true to-day as it ever was. A storm-cloud is still a tent of the Almighty; the wind his breath. But our feeling does not keep pace with our understanding. It may not be as easy to see God's hand in the objects and phenomena of nature now that forces and laws are better understood; but it is none the less true that his hand is there, because we have learned a little about laws and forces. These only show how he is present."

The author complains that "this Hebrew poem is relatively unknown as a literary production. When it is studied it is studied only for its teaching." His little book, however, like *The Lily Among Thorns*, by Dr. Wm. Eliot Griffis, is a restatement for general readers of some of the assured results of that severer scholarship of the day which, while laying most stress upon the truth itself, is not indifferent to the literary setting of the truth. He would emphasize the human as well as the divine elements of the Bible. "For it not only contains a revelation of divine truth and grace which infinitely transcends the best dreams of the classic world, but it is also the treasure-house of poetry, whose literary excellence ought to share the highest honors with Homer, with Sophocles and Sappho, and the bards of later ages. This treatise, while aiming, especially in the translation, to make the spiritual lessons of Job plainer and more effectual, would call attention to the surprising beauty of the human elements in this portion of the Bible. There is little danger that, by so doing, the divine teaching would receive less honor and become less dear; on the contrary, such attention would in the main lead to a more appreciative estimate of the heavenly message. It does not detract from the beauty of the rainbow to know that it did not come down out of the skies perfect and complete, but that only the wonderful light came down, and found in our earthly atmosphere the lenses which could make its hidden riches visible to our mortal eyes. It is still God's bow, and though it should be arched through human tears." Whatever differences of opinion there may be in regard to questions like this, it will be conceded by all that Prof. Gilbert has made a valuable contribution to the understanding of the world's greatest poem. W. W. MOORE.

*Union Theological Seminary, Hampden-Sidney, Va.*

#### THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE.

JUDGES AND RUTH *By the Rev. Robert A. Watson, M. A., author of "Gospels of Yesterday."* Crown 8vo. Pp. 424.

THE PROPHECIES OF JEREMIAH. With a Sketch of his Life and Times. *By the Rev. C. J. Ball, M. A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn; contributor to Bishop Ellicott's "Commentary," "The Speaker's Commentary," etc.* Pp. 424.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW. *By John Muuro Gibson, M. A., D. D., London, author of "The Ages Before Moses," "The Mosaic Era," etc.* Pp. 450.

THE BOOK OF EXODUS. *By the Very Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D. D., Dean of Armagh, author of "Christ Bearing Witness to Himself," "The Gospel of St. Mark," etc.* Pp. xx., 442.

Each volume, cloth, \$1.50, or six volumes per annum to advance subscribers for \$6. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1890.

The "Expositor's Bible," to which series the above volumes belong, has been fully described, as to its general methods and scope, in previous notices. It is sufficient now to say that each succeeding volume is a worthy contribution to a work

the great excellence of which has been everywhere commented upon. The authors of the several expositions are men widely known for their ability both to instruct and to attract. The plan adopted is not to give a running comment or exposition upon the book under treatment, but to take up its salient features and present the book in its entirety rather than in its details, and in doing this to give the results rather than the methods of learning. In this way the work is admirably adapted to the general reader as well as to the student. It has been our experience that we never open one of these volumes without becoming so fascinated that we unconsciously linger over it hour after hour.

In *JUDGES AND RUTH* the author had a portion of Scripture which it is difficult for many to understand. He has, however, with rare discrimination and spiritual power, drawn from the dark passages of the first, and the tender pastoral of the second, lessons of wisdom and truth. The conquest of Canaan, the decadence of Israel from the faith, the rudeness of the times, the apparent heartlessness of the chosen people and their leaders, are fully discussed and explained. God's chastisement of his people is particularly set forth and its lessons impressed. Mr. Watson is careful, however, to avoid undue spiritualizing and apologies. He does not regard Samson's taking his own life, for instance, as a type of Christ dying for his people. He does not attempt to veil the cruel act of Jael under a cover of special inspiration, or in the suggestion that she was a Kenite, and not responsible as an Israelite would have been, but represents her as simply a type of the unscrupulous helpers of a good cause. Of Jephthah's fulfilment of his rash vow he takes the literal view.

In the volume on *JEREMIAH* the author gives very little critical interpretation of the text, but after a preliminary sketch of the prophet's life and times, presents a series of lectures on the general features of the prophecy, the character of the prophet, and the practical, every-day lessons intended for our use. With the difficulties connected with text-criticism in this book the author does not concern himself. He scarcely touches the question of the relation of this prophecy to Deuteronomy, and the objections to the Mosaic character of the latter sprung by the higher critics. His suggestion that "in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah the martyrdom of Jeremiah becomes the living image of that other martyrdom which, in the fulness of time, was to redeem the world," and his characterization of verbal inspiration as "an exploded and pernicious belief of sectarian theology," as well as other statements here and there, are defects in an otherwise useful work.

*THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW*, by Dr. Gibson, is simply a series of lectures on such subjects as the Coming of Christ, His Reception, His Herald, His Baptism, His Temptation, Beginning of his Galilean Ministry, The Gospel Kingdom, The Signs of the Kingdom, The Shadow of the Cross, The Parable of the Kingdom, To Jerusalem, etc. The author discusses none of the critical questions connected with this Gospel, and only hints at its essentially Jewish character, without mentioning the question, so much mooted, as to the language in which it was originally written, in the general statement that "to the Jew first" was the natural order in which the plan of redemption should be presented, and "we have, accordingly, in this Gospel a setting forth of Christ as he presented himself to the mind and heart of a devout Jew, . . . rejoicing to find in him one who fulfilled ancient prophecy and promise." etc. The style is fresh and attractive, and the writer full of that earnestness and unction which have given such success to his ministry and public work in America and England.

Dean Chadwick's *EXODUS* begins with the statement that, however much doubts many obtain as to the Book of Exodus, one thing cannot be doubted or denied, viz., that Jesus Christ did certainly treat this book, taking it as he found it, as possessed of spiritual authority, a sacred scripture, and so taught his disciples to regard it. He then intimates that he will not shrink from what appears proper, because the utterance would be unwelcome to the latest critical theory. From this we may conclude what is the author's general view of the date and origin of Exodus. He maintains that there is a genuine connection between the Old and the New Testaments; that it is the task of the expositor to discover the permanent in the evanescent, and the spiritual in the form and type which it inhabited and illuminated; that the Book of Exodus yields solid results to a sober devotional exposition in this age, and that it is not an idle fancy that its teaching harmonizes with the principles and theology of the New Testament; yea, that it demands the New Testament as its true commentary. This is firm ground upon which to build. He introduces the book as taking up the history of God's people at that point where they really pass from the family to the nation, and then shows how God was in their wonderful history, in the oppression of Israel, in the career of Moses, in the deliverance of the people from bondage, in the passover, in the giving of the law, in the establishment of the institutions of religion and civil government. All this is to foreshadow and set forth that deliverance and care of his people in all ages which God will secure, through the redemption purchased for them through Christ, the paschal Lamb. Here and there we find objectionable expressions, as, for instance, when the author travesties our faith and God's word by alluding to what he denominates "the tyrannous deity of Calvin." These are few, however, and the author's general soundness will incline the reader to forget the errors, or excuse them on the ground of the infirmities of the human mind.

JOHNSTON'S "A CENTURY OF CHRISTIAN PROGRESS."

A CENTURY OF CHRISTIAN PROGRESS, showing also the Increase of Protestantism and the Decline of Popery. *By Rev. James Johnston, F. S. S.* Second edition. 108 pp. 7½ x 5 inches. Cloth, 50 cts. F. H. Revell, New York. 1890.

The world is moving ahead. Moreover, it is getting better every day. Progress in Christian civilization and science is ever followed by a steady improvement in religion and ethics. In spite of the gloomy croakings of pessimistic writers, there is an improvement all along the lines. The hand of our God is in history continually guiding the church into higher and better things, while ethics and civics advance in like measure. The leaven will leaven the whole lump in spite of the Church of Rome and her friend, the devil.

The book before us was written to prove progress. A well-known author needs no commendation from an unknown critic. Suffice to say, few have such a knowledge of just these facts like the distinguished author. The English compiler of *The Missionary Year Book*, editor of *Missionary Conference Reports*, a contributor to *The Missionary Review of the World*, gifted with diverse talents, he has a complete grasp of all facts bearing upon Christian progress; and, moreover, he presents his facts and deductions with clearness and accuracy. Well-arranged tabular statements of statistics prove all his propositions. A full index—that *desideratum* in such books—offers convenience of reference to all the facts.

What is the result of an hundred years' progress (from 1786 to 1886)? The

Protestant denominations, holding a strict system of morals and binding the conscience under higher laws, has suffered less than Roman Catholics from the disastrous effects of the social evil upon birth-rate. Protestants have had a comparatively high birth-rate, while Papal population has been "unproductive and unprogressive." In one hundred years Protestants have increased *fourfold*, while Papists increased *twofold*. At the same seemingly permanent rate of increase, another hundred years will find Protestants standing to Papists in the proportion of five to three. The Greek Church has also increased *twofold*; and the Slav is beginning to be a rival to the Anglo-Saxon. The Greek Church, however, is not missionary and emigrative.

Nations also show the effect of religion upon progress and population. Rome, with its opposition to knowledge and sanitary engineering, offers barriers to progress not known among Protestant nations. The Roman Catholic powers of Europe double their population in one hundred and thirty-eight years; Protestant powers in sixty, while the Greek States, which are mainly Russian, double in fifty-two. That fact accounts for the retirement of Roman-Catholic France from an equality with Protestant Germany and England. Intellectual darkness and superstition leave an indelible mark. Light and knowledge go hand-in-hand with an increased birth-rate.

The question of wealth and financial progress finds no lengthy discussion here. Roman Catholics "accumulate by *saving* small sums; Protestants by *producing* wealth," by steam and commerce. Of course it is not hard to see where most progress is made.

Is Christianity prevailing upon the earth? Facts prove it. Fetichism is steadily declining. Having no restraint to put upon morals, it offers splendid inducements to decreased birth-rate and internecine destruction. Civilization hastens this destruction, as is clearly shown by the American Indian. "Polytheism is no longer the religion of any independent, self-ruling power in any country." Buddhism, by discrediting marriage, lowers the birth-rate, and so works out its own destruction. Brahminism exists only by sufferance. Neither of these religions are spreading. Two monotheistic religions of almost gigantic proportions yet bar the road to world-wide Christianity. Of these, Islam is on the decline. "Turkey, Persia and Afghanistan have all lost both territory and population." Islam is only spreading in Africa, but force never will gain the day. The morals of Islam are repugnant even to fetich-worshippers. "We shall therefore set down the population of the Islamic powers as stationary or retrograde." Confucianism is slowly increasing in China; but by its peculiar system of ritualistic service has proven itself a failure as a popular religion. It holds its ground by virtue of being the Chinese established religion. Confucianist powers double their population in about one hundred and sixty years, the slowest of all rates.

So it seems, from a careful survey of all the facts, that Protestantism is gaining ground upon everything else. Since Ethiopia has already begun to "stretch out her hands unto God" (Ps. lxxviii. 31), we may begin to expect that glad time when the "kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Jehovah is with his church.

The book is crowded with facts which encourage to greater zeal in the Master's service. It furnishes material for many a thought, calculation or illustration. Buy it, read it, study it, use it.

R. B. WOODWORTH.

*Union Theological Seminary.*

## VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

---

**THE PULPIT COMMENTARY.** *Edited by the Rev. Canon H. D. M. Spence, M. A., and by the Rev. Joseph S. Exell.* FIRST CORINTHIANS; SECOND CORINTHIANS; LUKE, 2 vols. FIRST SAMUEL; SECOND SAMUEL; HOSEA AND JOEL; PETER, JOHN, JUDE. From 360 to 564 pp. each. 8vo. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1890.

The rapid republication in America of this great work is placing on our shelves an imposing array of books. For exposition one will consult other commentaries more satisfactorily. The large attention paid to homiletic work in this obscures its expository department. The aim of the editors, however, was to prepare the volumes for popular use, and as a thesaurus of homiletic suggestions for ministers and laymen. The expositions, so far as we have followed them, are sound and conservative. Being the product of many writers, though most of them the ablest living authors, there is a certain lack of unity in the volumes. This, to our mind, is more than compensated for by the special ability and adaptation of each writer to deal with the book before him; as Canon Rawlinson, Canon Farrar, Principal Tulloch, Dr. Plummer, and others. *The Pulpit Commentary* is unquestionably the best commentary of its kind now published, and for the purpose for which it is prepared deserves the large measure of success which it is meeting. The work is published by the Messrs. Randolph, in substantial form, and on terms to subscribers or purchasers which will be found exceedingly favorable.

**THE BIBLICAL ILLUSTRATOR;** or, Anecdotes, Similes, Emblems, Illustrations, Expository, Scientific, Geographical, Historical and Homiletic, gathered from a wide range of Home and Foreign Literature, on the verses of the Bible. *By Rev. Joseph S. Exell, M. A.* GALATIANS, pp. xviii, 557; LUKE, Vol. II., pp. 798; LUKE, Vol. III., pp. 684. Each volume, cloth, net \$2. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1890.

The scope of the work, three volumes of which are named above, has already been described. The work will embrace all the books of the Bible. Two or three volumes are issued each year. Eight of these have now appeared. Each volume is complete in itself, and is sold separately. However much opinions may differ as to the matter of too much ready-made material for sermons, and as to the effect upon the mind of the student, few will deny that to the right-minded, conscientious preacher there is a proper use for such material. With the proper checks upon himself, and with the purpose to use others' work only so far as it will quicken his own mind and be suggestive, he may safely consult such works. *The Biblical Illustrator* is an encyclopedia of illustration and other homiletic matter. The editor has gathered from every available source the best thoughts of the best men to aid in setting forth clearly and in popular style the meaning of each text of the in-

spired writer, and for enforcing its truth. Literature, history, science, art—every department has been ransacked for similes, illustrations and suggestions. Original exposition is seldom attempted, but the views of the ablest expounders of both hemispheres are freely given. To each volume there is also an introduction to the book treated, in which the compiler gathers the opinions mainly of such men as Westcott, Lightfoot, Plumptre, Wordsworth, Eadie, Sanday, and others. By the use throughout of fine type and the largest octavo page, combined with careful condensation, an immense amount of material is packed in each volume.

THE SEVEN CHURCHES OF ASIA; OR, Worldliness in the Church. *By Howard Crosby, Pastor of the Fourth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York.* 16mo., pp. 168. 75 cts. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1890.

Dr. Crosby's idea in this series of sermons is to show that, while the letters to the seven churches partake somewhat of the symbolic character of the rest of the Revelation, and have prophetic developments, there is yet under the surface a practical significancy, and to aid the reader to trace the great moral and religious principles which are involved and which are applicable to the Christian heart and understanding at all times. He therefore lets alone the prophetic and symbolic features of the letters, and with singular force and incisiveness portrays the excellences and defects of the seven churches, and proves that worldliness is the ever-present and all-destroying sin. This he shows by the history of the church in subsequent days, when, as the result of letting the world into the church, joining the church to the state, forming alliances and friendships with the world, compromising and letting down the standard of holiness and separation between Christ and Belial, her spiritual ruin has been accomplished.

FAMOUS WOMEN OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. A series of popular lectures delivered in the First Baptist Church, Montgomery, Alabama. *By Morton Bryan Wharton, D. D., Pastor.* Illustrated. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 340. Price, \$1.50. E. B. Treat, Publisher, 5 Cooper Union, New York. 1890.

This book is a companion volume, as the title-page announces, to *The Famous Women of the Old Testament*, by the same author. Dr. Wharton has thoroughly studied each personage, the environments of each, all that conduced to the formation of each character, the native and acquired characteristics of each, and the lessons taught by each to the women of all succeeding ages. His analytical power is keen and just; his ability in describing picturesque scenes is of high order, and his shrewd demonstration of how old wicked devices are reproduced in modern fashionable sins, shows that he is not only a close observer of human nature, but a plain, faithful preacher of the truth, and a rebuker of iniquity wherever and by whomsoever displayed.

THE FALLACY OF "CHRISTIAN SCIENCE." *By Edward P. Terhune, D. D.* New York: Albert B. King. 1890.

This short treatise is one of the best that we have seen. The author finds the usual difficulty in treating seriously many of the claims of the so-called Christian scientists; but the wit and sarcasm that he uses are ever refined and pungent. He first gives a history of the notion, then considers the question of what it is, here



carefully showing the distinction of it from mind-cure, and faith-cure, and giving the grounds, the slight admixture of misunderstood truths with an overwhelming mass of errors or unjustified generalizations, upon which the advocates of the notion rest their belief. He next shows the inconsistency of the Christian scientists and their practical disbelief in their own theory. He properly emphasizes the facts that there is such looseness about the conception of Christian science that one finds difficulty in grasping the idea; that most of its priests are *priestesses*, with the usual airy irresponsibility and contempt of logic of the feminine mind; that its advocates have no common ground; that their fundamental principle, if they have one, is pantheism, and that miracles are not supernatural; that the idea has failed practically; and above all, that Mrs. Mary Baker Glover Eddy, as she styles herself, "the Glover and Eddy being the annotation for the two husbands whom this apostle of the immaterialists has taken to herself to convince her that matter is a delusion," holds herself to be not a seeker after truth, but herself "the truth."

THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY. *By H. M. Gwatkin, M. A., Lecturer and late Fellow in St. John's College, Cambridge.*

THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE MIDDLE AGES. *By William Hunt.*

Each volume 8vo.; pp. 176 and 224; price, 80 cents. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1890.

These volumes are contributions to the publishers' "Epochs of Church History" series, under the editorship of Prof. Mandell Creighton. The first-named is both an able summary of the literature of the subject, and also a faithful and fair narrative of the leading events in that remarkable period of the church's history in which the Arian controversy raged. With justice to whatever was praiseworthy in Arius and those who believed with him, the author shows no mercy to their principles. The volume is a valuable one.

The second-named volume covers the period from the coming of Augustine to England, in 597. to the public appearance of Wyclif, of which usually but little is known. The aim of the author is perhaps a little too sharply in the direction of Anglicanism and the maintenance of the theory that the Church of England has from the first been a national church, in its inherent life and independent attitude, as well as its intimate and peculiar relations with the state.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF PREACHING. *By A. J. F. Behrends, D. D., Pastor of the Central Congregational Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.* 12mo.; pp. 234. \$1. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1890.

Eight lectures, on the Lyman Beecher foundation, before Yale Divinity School, the subjects being, The Philosophy of Preaching, The Personal Element in Preaching, The Ethical Element in Preaching, The Biblical Element in Preaching, The Spiritual Element in Preaching, and the Practical Element in Preaching. As will be seen from these subjects, the lecturer's aim is to expound the spirit rather than the mechanism of pulpit discourse. He deals with the fundamental inquiry of the end of preaching, and emphasizes the universal elements of effective address. It is an admirable and stimulating book for all preachers, but especially the younger ones. The author's heart and soul are in his words, and he speaks from large and happy experience. He places preaching upon the highest plane. He magnifies his office.

JONATHAN EDWARDS. *By Alexander V. G. Allen, D. D., Professor in the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Mass.* 12mo.; pp. xii., 401. Gilt top. Cloth, \$1.25. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1889.

The publishers have appropriately made this the first volume in a series entitled "American Religious Leaders," designed to "not only depict in a clear and memorable way several great figures in American religious history, but to indicate the leading characteristics of that history, the progress and process of religious philosophy in America, the various types of theology which have shaped or been shaped by the various churches, and the relation of these to the life and thought of the nation." No figure was more prominent in the early thought of America than Jonathan Edwards, and no one by his personality and philosophy has ever made a deeper impression upon his countrymen. The biography of Dr. Allen is well written, and intensely interesting, and is, in some respects, a good analysis of his subject's character and worth. The popularity of it is affected, we think, by its being a critical work, attempting all along to solve the problem of what Edwards thought and how he came to think as he did. The faithfulness of this effort, too, we must think is affected seriously by the author's being out of harmony with the subject which he sketches. He is disqualified for a thoroughly correct estimate of Edwards, not only by a want of sympathy with him, but actual antagonism towards the philosophical and theological views of the subject of his biography. He is impressed with the imposing figure of Edwards on literary and historic grounds alone. But in these respects, as compared with the place he filled in religious and philosophical thought, Edwards was a mere pigmy. Dr. Allen's estimate and analysis of Edwards as a preacher, and especially in the "Great Awakening," is, we think, sadly deficient, in not taking due account of the marvellous spiritual power of the man. The spirit of the biographer, as to Edwards' theological position, may be seen in the words in which he sums up his examination of this greatest and best of all the characters of the early history of our country: "The great wrong which Edwards did, which haunts us as an evil dream throughout his writings, was to assert God at the expense of humanity. Where man should be, there is only a fearful void. The protests which he has evoked have proclaimed the divineness of human nature, the actuality of the redemption in Christ for all the world. Only in the intense light which he threw could the necessity for these protests have been so clearly perceived." That is, the world in general, and New England in particular, is indebted to this hero of the faith as the escaping family is indebted to the incendiary who kindled the fires that light them out!

THE BUSY PASTOR'S WORK REGISTER. Arranged by Rev. W. C. Campbell, D. D. Pp. 193; 60 cts. Roanoke, Va.: The Bell Printing and Manufacturing Co. 1890.

A practical pastor's arrangement for the record of regular work. This neat blank book is bound in morocco, is of "handy" size and shape, and contains pages, properly ruled, for (1), the members of the church; (2), visits; (3), new members received; (4), new persons met; (5), baptisms solemnized; (6), marriages celebrated; (7), funerals attended. It will greatly facilitate the busy pastor in keeping the record of his work and keeping up with the new work opening before him. The arrangement is such as will suit any pastor. It is undenominational.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE in Physical, Psychical, Moral, and Social Relations; according to the Law Natural and Revealed. *By B. Franklin, D. D.* 12mo., pp. xii., 208. New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co. 1889.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE IN THE UNITED STATES, as they are and as they ought to be. *By Dr. Converse.* 12mo. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1890.

These volumes will be most useful in furnishing one with the principles and the facts that underlie the important matter with which they deal. Dr. Franklin's study is a thoroughly philosophical one, and well bears out the title to his book. It especially emphasizes the psychical relations of the subject and rightly traces the evils of the present day to a disregard of this aspect of marriage. Advancing to higher ground, he argues for such moral considerations of the subject as will place it upon the highest possible plane. He apparently lays too much stress upon canon law on the matter of marriage and divorce; yet his citation of historic canon law and the opinions of Christian fathers is useful as testimony. The work of Converse does not deserve the same praise, earnest and faithful as it is in supporting the soundest positions. The author has laboriously gathered and tabulated a multitude of facts and laws, and from these reached conclusions to which exception must sometimes be taken. He calls special attention to the fact, as he believes, that divorce is much oftener sought by women than by men, and that women can do much to check the abuse to which their own frequent applications for relief from domestic hardships or jealousies have given rise.

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION. *By Justin McCarthy, M. P., author of "An Outline of Irish History," "England under Gladstone," etc.* In two volumes. Vol. I., 8vo., pp. 668. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1890.

We almost regret that we have read this volume, because we must wait for the second. As he has shown in his previous works, few writers combine such rare powers as Mr. McCarthy for describing the events of any period of history. His language is always striking, his pictures glow with warmth, his style is full of fascination. We drew a long breath when we sat down to read, expecting to find the French Revolution too abstruse a subject as to its beginnings for even this author to lend interest to the theme. We find it has all the interest of a romance, from the first paragraph. Incident, person and philosophy are so blended in the story as to give it a charm which is irresistible. When completed, the work will receive, as it deserves, a full and comprehensive notice.

ALDEN'S MANIFOLD CYCLOPEDIA OF KNOWLEDGE AND LANGUAGE. With Illustrations. Vols. XX.-XXIII. "Infant—Memorian." New York: Garretson, Cox & Co. 1890.

Since our last notice, we have received four volumes of this admirable work. Each volume contains about six hundred pages, filled with useful and interesting matter, well illustrated, and is bound in handsome style. The popular character of the work and its thorough adaptation to its end are well maintained. It is designed to be an encyclopedia and dictionary combined, and published at a price, phenomenally low, which will place it within reach of the masses. It both merits and is meeting with large success.

**RUDIMENTARY PSYCHOLOGY** for Schools and Colleges. *By G. M. Steele, LL. D., Principal of Wesleyan Academy, Wilbraham, Mass.* 12mo., pp. xxiv., 264. New York: Leach, Shewell & Sanborn. 1889.

The author modestly disclaims any attempt at original discussion or speculation. His effort is to present the main facts of psychology, omitting as far as possible without circumlocution unnecessary technical and difficult terms, and the more abstruse parts of the study. This involved the apparent dislocation of many psychological facts from their logical relations, in which it must be remembered, however, that, by the youthful mind, usually a clearer understanding can be had of many phenomena by considering them in the order in which they present themselves to the mind than in their logical relation. To carry out the author's purpose, concrete illustrations have been largely used and abstract reasoning left to a maturer age and deeper study. The work is well adapted to its end, and will stimulate and encourage the study of this most interesting and important department of science.

**THE GREAT ENGLISH WRITERS**, from Chaucer to George Eliot, with selections illustrating their works; a Text-book of English Literature for the use of Schools. *By Truman J. Backus, LL. D., and Helen Dawes Brown.* 12mo., pp. 410. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1889.

The authors have successfully attempted to adapt the method and style of their work to those who are taking their first survey of the history of English literature. Only the very prominent authors are discussed, and the more striking works considered; while the selections, accompanied by concise editorial comments directing the student's attention to those literary characteristics of each author which are worthy of special note, are well adapted to display these special traits and to equip the student with a fair knowledge of the best work of the best writers.

**FATHERS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.** A brief examination of the "Falling away" of the Church in the first three centuries. *By E. J. Waggoner.* 12mo., pp. 392. San Francisco and New York: Pacific Press Publishing Co. 1889.

The author, with some show of learning, but more of prejudice in favor of the doctrine of immersion and of seventh-day-ism, examines the early fathers, especially Clement, Irenæus, Origen and Justin Martyr, without much prepossession in favor of any of them. The latter third of his book is to apply what he has brought out to set forth "the great apostasy." One cannot read the book without feeling that the author rather regards the denial of the principles of the Seventh-day Baptists as "the sin of sins."

**AMONG THE CANNIBALS OF NEW GUINEA.** Being the story of the New Guinea Mission of the London Missionary Society. *By the Rev. S. McFarlane, LL. D.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 75 cents. 1889.

This work was originally published by the London Missionary Society. It contains so much of intense interest to all friends of missions that, with the consent of the London Society, it is now republished as a valuable contribution to missionary literature. The book is illustrated with a series of original drawings by an artist who has visited the island.

DR. MUHLENBERG. *By William Wilberforce Newton, D. D.* 12mo., pp. 272. \$1.25. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1890.

It is largely in the words and acts of Dr. Muhlenberg that in this volume the biographer has told his story. The three grand features of the life of a man whom all respected and loved were his relation to the development of the school idea in American church life, his struggle for the abolition of ecclesiastical conventionalities, which he regarded as the great barrier to Christian unity, and his practical advocacy, resulting in the erection of the first church hospital, of what the biographer terms "Institutionalism." It is the account of a noble life, told in the most admirable manner by one who loved and appreciated him, and who believes that the man lived before his day and announced and advocated principles which will yet prevail.

THE PROPHET OF PALMYRA. *Mormonism Reviewed and Examined in the Life, Character and Career of its Founder, etc., etc. By Thomas Gregg.* 12mo.; cloth, \$1. New York: John B. Alden. 1890.

The Prophet of Palmyra, or Mormonism Reviewed and Examined in the Life, Character and Career of its Founder, from Cumorah Hill to Carthage Jail and the desert, together with a complete history of the Mormon era in Illinois and an exhaustive investigation of the "Spalding Manuscript" theory of the origin of the Book of Mormon, is written by one who was intimately conversant with the early development of Mormonism at Nauvoo, and who appears to have been a close observer and student of all that has occurred or has been written concerning the subject. The volume is a useful collection of facts connected with the development of this frightful evil, and will strengthen the hands of those who righteously wish to pull down the iniquitous fabric.

GENESIS OF POWER and the Media through which it Acts. 12mo.; pp. 288. \$1. New York: John B. Alden. 1890.

One would not know from the title that the book is a plea for Christian union. Its main point is the essential power of union, on which the author says some excellent things. The application of his principles, however, to denominationalism, to the abuse of creeds, confessions and discipline, indicates that he is one of that class whose minds are so filled with one idea that all else has been thrust out, or all else is necessarily erroneous.

THE BIBLE AND LAND. *By James B. Converse.* Morristown, Tenn.: Rev. James B. Converse, publisher. Pp. 251. 1889.

This little treatise on the most perplexing problem in all the range of political science is very suggestive and full of interest. The author takes a theistic view of his subject, and seeks to turn the electric light of the Bible upon his dark problem. The results have handsomely repaid him. If the statesmen of to-day could be induced to pursue the same course, they would see that God knows more about "the land question" than they, that the Bible contains the guiding principles of all true science. "The four truths," says the author, "that this book asserts are: First, that God is the original and ultimate proprietor of all land; Secondly, that he gives

land to men; Thirdly, that his grants are conditional; and, Fourthly, that civil government is the ordinance of God, and is, therefore, in its own sphere bound to see to it, so far as it is able to do so, that the conditions of God's land grants are complied with." This is a new, but true and glorious, conception of the function of civil government. That nation which hopes to survive the impending crash will hurry to a settlement of "the land question." W.

THE PATIENCE OF HOPE AND OTHER SERMONS. *By the late Rev. Joseph H. Wright.*

With a brief Sketch of his Life. Edited by Oliver J. Thatcher, Professor in the United Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Pa. 12mo., pp. 224. Cloth, \$1.25. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1889.

The author of these sermons was a graduate of Union College, Schenectady, and of the U. P. Theological Seminary, Newburgh, N. Y. He had only three pastorates—Davenport, N. Y., Philadelphia, Pa., and Xenia, O. We learn from the Sketch that he was considered far beyond the average, both in pastoral efficiency and pulpit ability. The sermons selected are on the following topics: The Patience of Hope; the Gospel; Call; Finished; Prisoners of Hope; John the Great; the Smitten Sheep; the Only Salvation; God's Word like Rain; God's Building; Our God; our Sun and Shield; Danger, Duty, Comfort; Call to the Ministry; Truth; Convincing the World of Righteousness; and are lucid, pathetic, inspiring, well-illustrated, beautiful in diction, practical in application, and can hardly help making the candid reader wiser and better.

JESUS OF NAZARETH. Three Lectures before the Y. M. C. A., of Johns Hopkins University, in Levering Hall. *By John A. Broadus, D. D., LL. D., President of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.* 12mo., pp. 105. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1890.

These lectures are on Christ's Personal Character; Christ's Ethical Teachings, and Christ's Supernatural Works. They are designed to be suggestive, convincing, conclusive to inquiring and thinking minds, rather than a fervid appeal to believers. They are characterized by the gifted author's usual simplicity and directness of style, and are thoroughly adapted to the class to whom they were addressed,—thoughtful young men engaged largely in scientific and philosophical study. The Personal Character that could influence and inspire the life of humanity, the Teachings that could attract the respect and admiration and loving response of his followers, and the reasonableness as well as power of faith, are here so presented as to give the most satisfactory apologetic to thinking men.