





THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

---

JULY, 1843.

---

No. III.

---

ART. I.—*Report of the General Committee of Public Instruction of the Presidency of Fort William in Bengal.* Calcutta: G. H. Huttman, Bengal Military Orphan Press. 1841. pp. 266.

WE regard this as a very interesting document on a very important subject. We are grieved, and almost out of patience, at the apathy with which the social and moral destiny of India is regarded, by the great mass of our intelligent and public-spirited people. Why should we feel so little interest in a country which contains a population equal to that of England, France, Spain, Portugal, Prussia, Italy, Switzerland and Germany together; a population of remarkably interesting character, and just in the act of undergoing the most important changes, political, social, moral and religious? We await with anxiety the arrival of our steamers, to tell us the price of cotton in Liverpool, and the rate of interest and exchange in London; and the variation of a cent a pound in the former, and a half per cent. per annum in the latter, creates a sensation from one end of the country to the other; but who knows what progress Christian civilization is making in Asia, and who cares to hear of the difficulties and successes of education, and of social and moral improvement, among the hundred and twenty millions of British India? If we thought we could

inspire a tenth part of the interest we feel, it would give us pleasure to lay before our readers, from documents we have at command, a complete view of the history and present posture of India, in relation to these great subjects. But, in despair of this, we only propose, at present, to make an abstract of what we deem most important, in the single volume quoted at the head of our remarks.

British India is divided into three Presidencies—Bengal, Madras, and Bombay. This report relates to Bengal alone: and, of course, describes only the education schemes of the Government. We shall, therefore, say nothing about the important labours of Missionaries, private individuals, and societies, in the work of Christian education.

Whatever may be said of the motives and policy of Great Britain in seizing upon India, and however open to censure her measures may have been, in establishing and extending her jurisdiction there, no one can doubt that it has been an incalculable blessing to the native population, to be brought under British influence. The present policy of the government is in many respects highly enlightened and liberal, and while it is not, in a religious point of view, by any means what we could wish it to be, we have no question that the regeneration of India has been begun, and will be consummated under its auspices. Among the numerous plans adopted by government for elevating the character and ameliorating the condition of her Indian subjects, those of education have early and always been prominent. The chief efforts of those who had charge of this department, were for a long period directed to the communication of instruction through the medium of the Sanscrit and Arabic languages, at colleges established in different parts of the country. The object was to gain over the influential and learned classes, in order to secure their influence upon the rest of their countrymen. The importance of becoming acquainted with the language of their rulers, however, soon gave rise to English classes in connexion with some of the native institutions, and distinct English seminaries were formed at the seats of others. In the progress of events, there arose at last a struggle between the two modes of education, which involved the friends of the vernacular languages in a war of great bitterness, against the friends of the English, as a medium of instruction. The facts and arguments on either side of the controversy we pass over; although they involve questions of the grandest

moment. It was finally settled by a resolution of government in 1835, which declared the intention not to abolish any school or college for native learning, "while the native population shall appear to be inclined to avail themselves of the advantages which it affords;" but at the same time laid it down as a principle, "that all the funds appropriated for the purposes of education would be best employed on *English* education alone." It also required the entire abolition of the practice of supporting the students at the public expense, during the period of their education. The government, henceforward, relinquished the hope of using the learned classes of natives as the chief agents in the progress of improvement, and undertook to act on the population directly, by diffusing widely European knowledge through the means of the English language.

In the appendix to the report before us, we have a long and elaborate minute by Lord Auckland, late Governor General of India, accompanied by a note of like description by J. R. Colvin, Esq., Private Secretary, in which all these questions are fully and ably argued, and extracts are made from despatches, showing the views of the Honourable Court of Directors upon the several points.

It is with extreme reluctance that we forbear to cite, and, according to our ability, to signalize the protracted and expensive experiments, and the profound and ingenious views and reasonings, of the government and its agents in this work, by which they have reached their conclusions. And even yet, there appears to us to be some confusion among the leading authorities; Lord Auckland and the authorities in Bengal (of which Presidency, let it be remembered, we are speaking) have decided to use the English language as the medium of communication, not only in their colleges, but also in their zillah, or preparatory schools: as it is impossible, however, to substitute the English for the vernacular languages, among the mass of the people, all their plans look to the ultimate engrafting of the principles of European education, into the tongues, habits and institutions of the native population. In the Bombay provinces the common provincial education is imparted through the vernacular languages, and the higher branches and more promising students, alone, are carried into institutions, where English is the medium of instruction. It may, however, be regarded as a settled principle in the policy of the government, "that the higher tone and better spirit of European lit-



*erature, can produce their full effect, only on those who become familiar with them in the original languages."* This sentiment, contained in a despatch from the Court of Directors, is quoted with high approbation by Lord Auckland, and concurred in by Mr. Colvin and the general committee at Calcutta.

"I would then make it my principal aim," adds Lord Auckland, "to communicate through the means of the English language, a complete education in European literature, philosophy and science, to the greatest number of students who may be found ready to accept it at our hands, and for whose instruction our funds will admit of our providing."

The object of this complete European education, we may gather from the despatches of the Court of Directors, and the views expressed by the high functionaries in India.

"There is no point of view," we quote from a despatch of the honourable court, "in which we look with greater interest at the exertions you are now making for the instruction of the natives, than as being calculated to raise up a class of persons, qualified, by their intelligence and morality, for high employments in the civil administration of India. As the means of bringing about this most desirable object, we rely chiefly on their becoming, through a familiarity with European literature and science, imbued with the ideas and feelings of civilized Europe, on the general cultivation of their understandings, and specifically on their instruction in the principles of morals and general jurisprudence. We wish you to consider this as our deliberate view of the scope and end to which all your endeavours with respect to the education of the natives should refer." To the same purport Mr. Elphinstone of Bombay, (than whom we could quote no better authority,) says: "In the mean time the dangers to which we are exposed from the sensitive character of the religion of the natives, and the slippery foundation of our government, owing to the total separation between us and our subjects, require the adoption of some measures to counteract them; and the only one is to remove their prejudices, and to communicate our own principles and opinions, by the diffusion of a rational education."

Again, as regards the ultimate means for diffusing among the mass of the people the principles of European morals and education, the Court of Directors hold the following

language : “ While we agree with the committee that the higher branches of science may be more advantageously studied in the languages of Europe, than in translations in the oriental tongues ; it is also to be considered that the fittest persons for translating English scientific books, or for putting their substance into a shape adapted to Asiatic students, are natives who have studied profoundly in the original works.” . . . . “ And intelligent natives who have been thus thoroughly educated (in English) may, as teachers in colleges and schools, or as writers or translators of useful books, contribute in an eminent degree, to the more general extension among their countrymen, of a portion of the acquirements they may have themselves gained ; and may communicate in some degree to the native literature, and to the minds of the native community, that improved spirit, which it is to be hoped they will themselves have imbibed from the influence of European ideas and sentiments. You should cause it to be generally known, that every qualified native who will zealously devote himself to this task, will be held in high honour by you ; and that every assistance and encouragement, pecuniary or otherwise, which the case may require, will be liberally afforded ; and that no service which it is in the power of a native to render to the British government, will be more highly acceptable.”

The scope of the views and policy of the government in the business of education, may be summed up in a few words. The permanence and prosperity of British institutions in India, render it necessary to diffuse the principles and opinions of the rulers, among their native subjects. This can only be done by bringing the native mind under the full power of those political and moral influences, which are embodied in the literature, science and jurisprudence of Europe. To accomplish this object, it is proposed to put as large a class of minds as possible in contact with those influences, by making them masters of the language in which they are treasured up. Trained up in this manner, so as to become thoroughly imbued with the ideas and feelings of civilized Europe, with cultivated understandings, and thoroughly instructed in the principles of morals and general jurisprudence, this class of natives will become qualified for high employments in the civil administration of India. They will furnish teachers for native colleges and schools, to be conducted after the model, and in the

spirit of English institutions. Thoroughly versed in the science and literature of Europe, they will be competent to transfer them, by the translation or preparation of suitable books, into the vernacular languages of the east. Thus, in the course of time, the learning, morals and jurisprudence of England, her domestic and social institutions, her civil and religious liberty, and her awakened intellectual energy, would be transplanted and naturalized in the soil of poor, enslaved, down-trodden India.

Such are the views and ends which the government proposes to attain under the powerful patronage which they wield in India, by the system of education which they have adopted, and the resources which they have appropriated to the object. What that system and those resources are, we now proceed to state in brief.

The chief agent of the government in the work of education in Bengal, is *The General Committee of Public Instruction*, consisting, we believe, of some seventeen members, European and native gentlemen of education and influence, resident in Calcutta. They have charge of the entire presidency, subject only to the instructions of the government. The colleges and schools at a distance from Calcutta are superintended by local committees, subject to the control of the general committee. These local committees are composed of European and native residents, who are appointed by the government, at the recommendation of the general committee. Each local committee appoints a secretary from its own number; but where there is a collegiate institution, the principal is secretary *ex-officio*. The funds of each institution are placed in the hands of the secretary, subject to the general supervision of the local committee. These consist of donations, subscriptions, and pay for the tuition of the youths. The accounts are made up every month, in the most exact manner, and the balance is drawn from, or remitted to, the general committee. The local committees meet monthly or oftener if necessary. Their duties are to carry into effect the orders of the general committee: to regulate and control the principals and masters: to suggest improvements and correct abuses; to encourage local subscriptions and donations; to visit the college or school during the month, to insert in a book kept for the purpose, a memorandum of the classes examined at each visit, and their opinion of the state of the institution, and of any changes they may consider necessary, (which



book is sent annually to Calcutta for the information of the general committee,) to admit and expel pupils, to superintend and assist at all examinations and report minutely to the general committee.

The colleges are placed under the general charge of a principal, who is *ex-officio*, secretary of the local committee, and is prohibited "from any concern in any trade, traffic or business, that he may give his whole time and attention to his duties in the college." He is made most strictly responsible for the prosperity and progress of the institution committed to his care.

Under the immediate control of the principal are the head masters of the departments, who in their turn are held responsible for the conduct and success of the masters. The strictest responsibility is maintained by a regular gradation from the lowest to the highest. Daily registers are kept, in a form which is exactly prescribed, so that the general committee at Calcutta can put their finger upon the slightest defect in the organization, or negligence in the conduct of any of their institutions however remote. We have never seen a system of accountability more perfectly exact and effective. The same remarks hold good of the schools and branch schools, under the care of the committee. Precise regulations are adopted to govern the local committees in the admission of pupils, prescribing the ages, attainments, &c., necessary to enter at any given stage, and no boy is admitted whose age exceeds sixteen, whatever his attainments, nor any scholar once expelled, without the express sanction of the general committee.

The college or school is open every day except Sundays and authorized holidays, for six hours; one of which is devoted to recreation: and there is one half-holiday in each week.

Registers of daily attendance are kept by the masters of each class in a specified form, which are submitted daily to the principal, or head master, and monthly to the local committee; who may expel any scholar whose irregularity or misconduct may deserve it. Masters are strictly enjoined to attend to the personal cleanliness of the scholars, and to check any practices inconsistent with propriety, such as the use of improper language. Corporeal punishment is not permitted.

Nor is this all merely beautiful theory. The body of the document before us is the annual report of the general com-

mittee to the government, showing, most minutely, the application of these principles, and the results attending them, in the institutions under their charge; comprising EIGHT COLLEGES, THIRTY-SIX PREPARATORY SCHOOLS, and *six probational schools*. The number of students at the close of the year, was *six thousand five hundred and fifty*; of whom 198 were Christians, 1400 Mahommedans, and 4952 Hindoos.

That our readers may have more definite ideas of the subject, we will give a condensed abstract of the report of one of these institutions. The first on the list is the Hindoo college at Calcutta. This institution was originally founded, if we mistake not, by native gentlemen; and is now in its twenty-seventh year.

The number of students reported, is 533; of whom the school society pay for 30; the free boys are 59, donation scholars 24, and the remaining 420 pay for their education at the rate of five rupees a month. This number would be increased, if more ample accommodation were provided. The students are divided into two departments, Junior and Senior. In the former were 372 scholars, subdivided in nine classes. The course of study in the Junior department comprises four years; two-thirds of the school time to be devoted to the English, and one-third to the vernacular studies. The first object, of course, is the acquisition of the English language, including grammar, which the Junior students are to master, so far as to read, explain and parse both prose and poetry. The other studies of this department are biography; arithmetic, as far as fractions, vulgar and decimal, proportion, involution and evolution; geography by reference to globes and maps, and preparation of maps: lessons on objects: writing from dictation: translation from vernacular into English.

“After a careful examination,” say the committee, “we have pleasure in stating that these classes were all in a favourable condition at the close of the year.”

The Senior department consists of 161 students divided in five classes. The Senior course also occupies regularly four years, and only one hour each day is devoted to vernacular studies. The following is a condensed view of the studies pursued.

In the fourth or lowest class, (besides attention to reading, grammar and literature,) history of Greece: algebra, to simple equations: use of the terrestrial globe: physical

geography : drawing : translation from the vernacular into English : English composition.

For the third class, history of Rome and England : algebra : first four books of Euclid : physical geography : elements of natural philosophy, including mechanics, hydrostatics, hydraulics and pneumatics : projection of maps : drawing : translations and English composition.

For the second class, in addition to several of the foregoing continued ; history of India and modern Europe : algebra : geometry : plane trigonometry and conic sections : natural philosophy : drawing : perspective : mechanical and architectural drawing : practical surveying : translation and composition.

For the first class, history of England, modern Europe and India completed : Smith's Moral Sentiments : algebra : integral and differential calculus : spherical trigonometry : astronomy : mechanics, hydrostatics, hydraulics, pneumatics, optics : drawing : perspective : mechanical and architectural drawing : practical surveying : translation and composition.

The foregoing is the course of study prescribed by the general committee, and pursued in all their institutions. We have not space for an account of the annual examination of the several classes in the Hindoo college, on their respective studies. The following extracts must suffice. "The first pupils solve questions in pure or mixed mathematics, the differential and integral calculus included. As a circumstance of some interest, it will be observed that whilst so many of the natives around us, have been bewildered and terrified by the recent eclipses, we have before us the diagrams and calculations of the youths of the Hindoo college explaining the causes of these phenomena, and showing the exactitude with which the times of their occurrence, their duration, extent, and every remarkable circumstance connected with them, may be ascertained previously to the event.

From the historical examination, (which, like the others, was conducted in writing, the students being cut off from access to books, and to each other, without the least previous knowledge of what the questions would be, and required to write their answers instanter,) we are tempted to quote one or two answers as specimens, as well of their knowledge and command of English, as of history. We ought to premise that the historical questions put to the stu-

dents were twenty-two in number, covering the whole field of Grecian, Roman and English history, and also the history of philosophy and literature, and that they were prepared by a gentleman in no way connected with the institution.

“*Question.* Give a short account of the Athenian expeditions to Sicily in the Peloponnesian war; mentioning the names of the leaders, and the death of such of them as perished in Sicily, and the effect which the behaviour of the Athenian people to Alcibiades, had upon the success of the expedition.

“*Answer.* The Athenians committed the charge of the expedition against the Syracusans to Nicias, Alcibiades and Lamachus. At first all their attempts were attended with success, and the Syracusans, besieged in the capital, were reduced to the utmost extremity through want of provisions. But the arrival of Gyllipus, the Spartan general, soon changed the face of affairs. And the subsequent defeats of the Athenians, both by sea and land, rendered their situation quite desperate. But the timely arrival of Demosthenes' fleet revived their hopes, and would have ensured them success had it been properly used. But Demosthenes rashly determining to storm the heights of Epipolac, in which he failed and made their situation worse. After twice failing to escape by sea, the two commanders, Nicias and Demosthenes, determined to lead their army by land. The superstition of Nicias in delaying the march of his troops on account of an eclipse of the moon, and his easy credulity in believing the friendly suggestions of Hermocrates, the crafty Sicilian General, proved the utter ruin of his army. The Sicilians being in possession of all the important passes of the country, the Athenians were continually harassed in their retreat, and the two divisions of the army being separated in a dark night, were obliged to surrender as prisoners of war. Nicias and Demosthenes were soon after executed. One of the principal causes of the defeat of the Athenians was their recalling Alcibiades to answer the charges preferred against him by his enemies at home. The other generals, namely, Lamachus, Alexander and Euremedon were killed in battle.”

“*Question.* Are the two translations of the Iliad of Homer, and the Eneid of Virgil, written in the same measure?

“*Answer.* Both these translations are written in the heroic measure. But Pope who made Dryden his model, has excelled his master in some of the beauties of style, he has added precision and correctness to the loose but vigorous style of Dryden.

To any one who can enter with us into the amazing obstacles which have been surmounted in the education of these youth, (obstacles of which we have no adequate illustration in this country,) these extracts will furnish the most pleasing evidence of the progress of education in India.

The medical department of education possesses peculiar interest. The only institution of this sort under the care of the general committee is the medical college at Calcutta, which has now been in existence, we believe, about eight years, and has succeeded remarkably well. In 1839 a class was formed, consisting of some sixty of the most promising students, not instructed in English, for the purpose of educating native doctors for employment in the army and at civil stations, where a knowledge of English



was not indispensable. The pupils are all taught anatomy, pharmacy, medicine and surgery practically, by the aid of the dissecting room, laboratory and hospital. A large female hospital intended to embrace the advantages of a lying-in-hospital, with instruction in midwifery, was commenced in 1839; and as a proof of the public confidence in the scheme, fourteen thousand rupees were collected forthwith in Calcutta, to complete handsome buildings and accommodations, for upwards of a hundred patients. The male hospital was opened about the same time, and contains generally about seventy cases; many of them, especially in the surgical department, very important. It appears that natives of every caste, with increasing eagerness, avail themselves of these noble institutions. Besides these there is a dispensary, under the immediate charge of a native doctor, in which 200 to 300 patients are treated daily.

The influence of this medical institution is very great, and is daily increasing. The effect will be to wake up the dormant intellect of the natives, to mix up the different castes in the common pursuit of a blessing which all appreciate, and to bring the whole people into broad contact with the superior knowledge and skill of Europe.

How extensively this process is already begun will appear from the facts which we gather from the dispensary returns, made to the government by the medical board for the half-year ending January 31st, 1841. There were then twelve stations, where dispensaries were established in charge of these native doctors, with the title of *sub-assistant surgeons*. During six months, there were admitted to these dispensaries 32,166 patients; and the reports were not all complete. Of these 19,598 were completely cured, 1905 were relieved, 7923, chiefly "out-patients," ceased to attend, and the result was therefore unknown; but most of the cases were probably either cured or relieved.

Lest it should be thought that the cases committed to these native practitioners, are only of the simple kind, we quote the following list of surgical operations, performed by Shumachurn Dutt at Allahabad, during the half-year of his report: viz., 1 of amputation below the knee: 1 of the penis: 6 for cataract: 3 for fistula in ano: 1 for fistula in perinaco: 8 Paracentesis abdominis: 8 for ectropion and 2 for removal of encysted tumours. All these operations were completely successful, except two of the cases of cataract.

Besides those who have engaged in the service of the



government, a number of the graduates of the medical college are reported as settled with a large and lucrative practice, and others as conducting flourishing apothecary's establishments. This whole medical department is a school of recent growth, from the great and spreading roots of the tree of European education, planted and fostered by the British government in the soil of India, and destined to spread like her own Banian, till it shall furnish shelter to millions of her poor afflicted population.

Our limits forbid any farther details from the report of the general committee. Some of their institutions, however, were in a state so unsatisfactory, that, at the instance of the Governor-General, they have given in the appendix an elaborate document, showing exactly what ought, in their opinion, to be done to place the whole department of education on the most efficient footing. They recommend the appointment of additional professors, and teachers, and the employment of a higher grade of talent in several posts, on larger salaries. The additional expense of these improvements, they estimate at *two hundred and forty thousand four hundred and seventy-one rupees a year*. The results of these measures, which were promptly concurred in by the government, without reference to the increased expense, must be highly satisfactory.

One grand difficulty in the education of the natives of India, is to retain them under instruction long enough to secure a complete development of their intellect, and furnish them adequately for the stations of usefulness to which they are destined. A great body of the students are from the poorer classes of the people, and neither they nor their friends appreciating fully the advantages of the higher grades of education, they are liable to be withdrawn from their studies at an early stage, partly to escape the expense of a protracted course, and partly to turn their attainments to account in the support of themselves and family.

To surmount these difficulties, at the instance of the Governor-General, with the concurrence of the Honourable Court of Directors, the following plan has been adopted: viz., to connect the zillah schools with the central colleges, so as to give to the best scholars of those schools an impulse, which shall carry them beyond the ordinary range of instruction, which is reached by the mass of the pupils. And in order to accomplish this, it is proposed to

form pecuniary scholarships, for the most meritorious students. The value of the Junior scholarships, in the English Institutions, was fixed at eight rupees a month; and they were to be so arranged, that one scholarship should be assigned to be competed for by the pupils of each district school, besides six to the students of each central college. This scholarship to be held for four years, or in some cases longer.

The incumbents of these Junior scholarships are to compete with other students, for the Senior scholarships, which are valued at thirty rupees a month, for the two first, and forty rupees for the four last years, during which they can be held. These higher rates are deemed indispensable to retain the students, after their attainments have become valuable in a pecuniary point of view. In the oriental institutions, the scholarships are valued at eight, fifteen and twenty rupees a month respectively, as there is less difficulty in retaining the pupils.

The aggregate expense of all the scholarships, as authorized by the government, in all the institutions under the care of the committee, is *fifty-two thousand, four hundred and sixty-four* rupees yearly.

The competitions for these scholarships, take place annually before the heads of the institutions, the local committees and other competent persons. The questions are sent from the office of the general committee in Calcutta, to be answered in writing, on the spot, and without any assistance, even from books,—sealed in the presence of the local committee, and returned with the names of the candidates. The awards are then made by the general committee in the most cool and impartial manner.

As a proof of the grade of scholarship attained by the native pupils of these Indian colleges, we should be glad to quote some of the questions proposed at the examination for scholarships found in the appendix to the report before us, covering the following branches: viz., literature, history, mathematics, (including Euclid, conic sections, algebra and trigonometry,) natural philosophy, mental and moral philosophy, political economy, and translations from English to the vernacular. We have no hesitation in saying, that while these examinations were not for graduation, but only for scholarships, to be held in some cases, for six years of further study, we should tremble for the reputation of some American colleges, if it depended upon the ability of

many of their graduates to answer the questions proposed. Lest this should seem extravagant, while our limits forbid extended quotations, we give the following specimens, just as they stand, under the head of conic sections.

“ Prove that the equation to the section of a cone by a plane is of the second degree, being  $Ax^2 + Bxy + Cy^2 + Dx + Ey + F = 0$  in its general form.”

“ Show that the curve is an ellipse, a parabola, or an hyperbola according as  $B^2 - 4AC$  is less than, equal to, or greater than zero.”

“ Trace the curves, of which the equations are

$$3x^2 + 27y^2 + 6x - 108y + 123 = 0 ;$$

$$x^2 + y^2 = 0 ; x^2 - y^2 = 0 ;$$

$$x^2 - 12xy + 36y^2 + 2x - 12y - 3 = 0.”$$

The following, from the algebraic questions, may perhaps puzzle some of our more juvenile readers.

“ A bag contains red and white balls, of which 11 are red, and the number of white is unknown. Find the number of white, having given the condition, that if four balls be drawn out together, the chance of their being all red, equals the chance of 2 being red and 2 being white.”

To render their institutions more attractive, as well as facilitate the education of the pupils, cabinets, for the illustration of the natural sciences, and valuable libraries are provided for the use of the pupils. It was farther proposed, and the suggestion was at once adopted by the government, to award to the most deserving student, who has made the greatest advancement in general knowledge during the year, from the use of the library books, a gold medal to each college, and a silver medal to each preparatory school, at the annual examination; the cost of the whole to be one thousand rupees a year.

Perhaps nothing that we have said will give a higher impression of the extended and munificent scale on which these operations are conducted, than the simple fact, that the balance-sheet of the general committee for the year ending April, 1840, shows receipts and expenditures to the amount of TWO MILLIONS SIX HUNDRED AND THIRTY-ONE THOUSAND, SIX HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINE RUPEES; more than *one million, three hundred thousand dollars*.

We have now filled up the limits we had allotted for this brief and very imperfect sketch of the plans and doings of the government, in the work of education, in one of the

three presidencies, which constitute the British Empire in India. There are several other topics which we should be glad to discuss, and many additional facts which we should like to bring to notice. Among these are the efforts made to supply text books in the native languages, and the progress and prospects of the work of education, through the medium of those languages. It would also be interesting to us, to trace the results of this great system upon the social and political state of India, so far as they appear in the actual history of the past: to show how far it has succeeded in its objects, and how far and why it has failed. But we desist. We shall rest satisfied for the present, if we have succeeded in making known to those who were before unacquainted with it, the existence of this powerful and efficient agency in the heart of India, for educating and elevating her native tribes, and in awakening some degree of interest in its efforts and successes.

There is one topic, however, which we cannot consent to dismiss, without a single word: the bearing of these measures upon the spread of the gospel in India. We ought not to disguise the fact, however much we regret it, that in her education schemes, as well as every other department of her public policy, the government of India rigidly abstains from the introduction of every religious influence, obnoxious to the prejudices of her native subjects. The Bible and Christianity are, therefore, scrupulously excluded from all the institutions under her control. And it so happens, that the science of India is so blended with her religion, both being drawn from the same sacred books, that when the former is overthrown, by the mere demonstrations of true science, independently of Christianity, it carries with it, and buries in the same ruin, the errors and absurdities of her religious creeds. It is next to impossible that a young man should pass through the course of education prescribed by the government, without being taught to laugh at the faith of his fathers, and despise the authority and craft of his native priesthood. Unless an accomplished scholar can believe that the earth is a flat surface, reaching immeasurably beyond the orbit of the remotest planet, and made up of seven successive concentric continents, with intervening oceans of salt, and sweet water, sugar-cane juice, melted butter, spirits, milk and curds, it is impossible that the educated native youth of India, can admit the truth of their religion, and the power of its ministry, because their shastras teach all these absurdities, and innumerable others.



The consequence of this state of things deserves to be carefully and solemnly weighed by the church. We have here an extended and efficient system of education, forming the character of a vast assemblage of nations, not only destitute of religious influence, but the whole tendency of which is to undermine and destroy the sanctions of all religion. For in the absence of all evidence in favour of Christianity, the natural influence, in minds situated as are those of the pupils of the government institutions in India, is, that every other religion is as ill-founded as their own, and every other ministry as worthless and despicable an imposture, as their own priesthood. The unavoidable result, is the introduction of religious scepticism of the wildest and most reckless form. And how disastrous this must be in the end, in the case of young men like those in question, and in a country like India, it is almost impossible to conceive, without personal knowledge of the facts.

While we say these things in sober grief, we have not the slightest disposition to make common cause with those who denounce the government of India, and the English Christian public, who concur in the wisdom of that policy, which excludes the Bible from the system of public education. We wish it were otherwise, and we hope one day to see a change. But notwithstanding all we have said, it is our deliberate judgment, that a great and good work is in progress; and that it will be found in the end, if the church is true to her duty and responsibilities, to have contributed most materially to the regeneration of the benighted and enslaved millions of India. It may be wisely ordered in the providence of God, that that work is to be done, without the direct interference of Christianity. The result will be to wake up the native mind from the sleep of ages, and free it from the oppressive shackles of superstition—to sweep away the clouds of mysticism and prejudice which dimmed and hindered its vision, and enable it to appreciate the force of evidence, and feel the power of truth. We concur most fully in the sentiments urged with such eloquence and conclusiveness by the Rev. Dr. Duff, in his speech to the General Assembly of Scotland in 1835, that this very class of educated youth, furnish the most interesting and hopeful subjects for intelligent and well directed Christian efforts by the church and her missionaries, provided those efforts be not delayed too long. And there is no sort of labour which we conceive to be more fraught with promise to India, than that which is di-



rected to the training of a suitable ministry from among her own gifted sons to establish and perpetuate the institutions of the gospel among her people. The American Mission Seminary at Batticotta, and the Scotch College at Calcutta, (the latter containing at present no less than 800 students) are among the most interesting projects of usefulness to which the active and intelligent piety of the Church has given birth, since the commencement of modern missions.

We conceive that the responsibility of the church, in view of the present state of things in India, and especially in view of the progress of unsanctified education, is peculiar and immense. She must take those millions of untrammelled minds, and lead them into captivity to the obedience of Christ. On the ruins of superstition and idolatry, which British education is contributing to produce, she must prevent the devil and his allies from rearing the hateful structure of infidelity and libertinism, and erect in its place the pure and glorious temple to the only living and true God. This is a work which none other can do. It ought to be known throughout all our churches, that India cannot long remain pagan, under British influence; and that whether she is to be desolated and cursed with infidelity and impiety, or blessed with the gospel of Christ, depends, under God, upon the influence which the church shall exert upon the generation now coming on the stage. The subject, however, is one which we have, at present, no space to discuss.

*Geo. W. Andrews*

- ART. II.—1. *Travels in North India, containing notices of the Hindus; journals of a voyage on the Ganges, and a tour to Lahore; notes on the Himalaya mountains and the Hill tribes. Including a sketch of Missionary Undertakings.* By the Rev. John Lowrie, Assistant Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church.
2. *An Address delivered in the Duane Street Presbyterian Church, N. Y., on the evening of Oct. 3, 1842. The day of Humiliation appointed by the General Assembly.* By the Rev. George Potts, D. D.

It is plain that the great mass of Christians in America take no real interest in Foreign Missions. The charge is

proved true, even of our own church, by figures which cannot lie, in the annual returns to the general Assembly. The sums actually contributed, and from which the entire support of our missionary establishments is derived, are in a great measure from a narrow strip of country, from not many congregations, and indeed, as it regards a very considerable portion, from a few individuals. The monthly seasons for united prayer in behalf of missions are not marked with that frequency of attendance, which betokens a lively widespread zeal. The purchase of missionary periodicals and other publications is not made with any such increased avidity as denotes a predominant interest. No great retrenchments for the sake of this cause have come to our knowledge. Wealth and fashion display themselves in the church, as out of it, in houses, furniture, table and equipage; and the external superfluities of decoration, in churches and Christian houses, are certainly not less than they were twenty years ago, when there was less complaint of hard times, and when the claims of missions were less regarded. And all this, when, as a church, we are pledged to this work, as one to which we are solemnly called of God.

It is not to be denied that there has been a great increase of effort, in the aggregate: our lamentation is, that it is not diffused. Here and there, in every part of our territory, there are individuals and clusters of pious people, from whose zeal we might all be willing to light our torch. But the rank and file of our army have by no means come up to the point of even looking in the direction to which they are summoned to go. The work of Foreign Missions, whenever mentioned, is treated as a good work, but too much as a work of supererogation. There is a feeling that we can do without it; whereas a truly scriptural view of the subject would show us that it is of all others the prime and essential work of the church, to which it is bound by the command of Jesus Christ, and in neglect of which it can scarcely continue to be a church at all. For, when the gracious Redeemer left us, he commanded us not to grow great, or rich, or strong, or learned, but to disciple all nations, to preach the glad tidings to every creature. And although it may be made a question how far the message must penetrate in any country before the preachers should be justified in leaving it for another, there can be no question whatever as to those amazing tracts of infidelity

and heathenism, in which millions have never heard of Christ. It should seem as if the Master had made it at the very beginning the grand characteristic tendency of his religion to swell, and spread, and propagate; intimating this by the figures of light and leaven; a tendency which strikingly manifested itself in the first age, when every minister was a missionary, and when every church was like the seed-vessel of an autumnal plant, bursting with reproductive power, and scattering the germs far and wide; a tendency promotive in the highest degree of piety and happiness in the subjects of it, and marking, when strong, the healthiest ecclesiastical condition, but at the same time so opposed by circumjacent pressure of bad influences, as in every age and country to spend itself and die away, as in perpetual need of immediate quickening from on high. Such quickening touches the church has felt again and again, with an electric shock of influence, as if from the finger of God extended from heaven, and then the graces of believers have been mightily strengthened and the church has pushed forward its conquests. It was thus that every country in Europe, and many in Asia, first received the gospel, and this missionary operation was spread through a longer series of years than is generally considered. And then, when all was dead again, the Lord looked out from the pillar of cloud, and gave the word of reformation, and great was the company of them that published it. And in later revivals, such as those of the Calvinists of Britain, the Pietists in Germany, the early Methodists, the United Brethren, and the founders of our American churches, God has been pleased to renew his direct approach, and teach us in the most gracious manner, that his are the power and glory, and that ours is the work of diffusing the gospel. It is the great business of the church, for which it was founded, and of which nothing can lawfully take precedence.

Is there not a secret scepticism among thousands of professing Christians, as to the real danger of the heathen? Can they believe them to be in a perishing condition, and yet care nothing about sending them the gospel? It is not to argue this point, that we now bring it to view, but to direct to it the notice of pastors and other preachers and instructors. A latent but prevailing error here, is enough to account for wide-spread apathy, and must paralyze, and at length kill, the whole enterprise. We may preach with the eloquence of Paul on the claims of hundreds of mil-

lions of immortal souls, but if we leave the hearer with the comfortable presumption that, after all, these poor creatures will deserve a lenient treatment at the hand of God, and are in no danger of everlasting perdition, we disconnect his heart from the only motive which will be powerfully affecting. Every cause will prosper in proportion as its grand principles, rather than subsidiary ones, are pressed. It is when the Christian heart yearns with unutterable anguish over souls in peril of everlasting ruin, that it breaks forth with the true missionary spirit. The collateral advantages, of light, civilization and comfort, which Christianity proffers to the heathen, are trifles compared with this. It is salvation, in all the awful import of that sacred term, which we are asking for them. Inasmuch as scarcely any man, and certainly no good man, can be found, who on being besought to pity the heathen would say, let them eternally perish; there is great reason to think that multitudes who, when thus besought, refuse their aid, pillow their inaction upon the falsehood that the heathen are in no danger. And if ministers shrink from the painful subject, and dread to harrow up their sensibilities by prospects so tormenting, error must grow upon error, and the church must spend other ages in neglect. But if the true state of the case be presented; if it be shewn, that precisely this motive brought the incarnate Son of God to the cross; that precisely this view of the heathen condition winged the zeal of apostles and early Christians when they hastened over land and sea to publish Christ; if the tremendous, soul-moving danger of thousands of thousands on the brink of perdition be fairly presented, and made to command belief, it is inconceivable that even avarice, so far as existing in renewed hearts, should not give way.

From what has been said, it may be easily gathered, what are our views with regard to ministerial responsibility. We have no belief that the zeal of the church will outstrip the zeal of her ministers. Those whose very function it is to be constantly intimate with the subject in all its bearings, and whose situation gives them most complete information of the acts and wants of missionary bodies, may naturally be expected soonest to catch and most readily to propagate any good influences which may be abroad in society. So we have generally observed the fact to be. Notwithstanding some striking exceptions, the pastor has usually been the agent in bringing up his people to the work.



Those churches which have done nothing have usually been those in which the pastor has cared nothing; and those which have largely bestowed (we of course mean in proportion to means) have been those in which the pastor has been a very missionary himself, all alive, and talking in every house on the all absorbing topic. If pastors, from any obscure regard to policy, for fear of losing, or for fear of offending, keep this subject from their flocks, resist all awakening approaches from without, and make common cause with the avarice of their people instead of assaulting it with the sword of the Spirit; not to speak of the reaction upon their own temporal discomfort, by the results of selfishness thus engendered, the consequences will undoubtedly be the congealing of the mass in unproductive, hopeless parsimony, and the eventual decay of vital religion. As ministers of Christ, we must act out our principles. We must proceed on the belief, that he that watereth shall be watered, that such giving is lending unto the Lord, and that we and our people shall be abundantly richer and happier for all that we bestow on the perishing heathen. And we have the testimony of some who have the best right to speak on such a subject, that they and theirs have never so prospered as since they began to act on these principles. It is our pastors—we must repeat it, and earnestly and most respectfully ask attention to the remark—it is our pastors, with whom the work of missions must rise or fall. Under God, it is they, who must bid it live or die. Let a thousand ministers arise to their feet, and join shoulder to shoulder in this work, and no man doubts, that the whole land would be moved, and more than our brightest dreams realized. No man doubts, that in the hand of Divine Providence and grace, the ministry is the lever which moves the whole church to every great combination of effort. And what we have already seen of renewed endeavour in the last generation, has been owing chiefly to the animating words and example of a few men. Even a hundred, having the mind of Carey or of Mills, would be like the host of Gideon. The cause of Foreign Missions claims such animation of our ministry. It is too late in the day to regard the work as suitably done by a small deputation, sent abroad to distant lands. It is the whole church, and eminently the whole ministry, who are bound for the evangelizing of mankind. Considering the proportion of unevangelized millions, the *prima facie* call on every minister is to go



himself. The question is not, Why should I go, but Why should I stay? And many of us, when casting about for excuses for parsimony, or sloth, or indisposition to vex our people with so unwelcome a topic, ought rather to be bewailing, before God, our sin in leaving other brethren to go and bear the burden and heat of the day, while we have stood all the day idle. In a word, if Christianity is what it purports to be, if the danger of blinded heathenism is such as the New Testament declares, and if Christ's dying command has such a latitude and force as has been affirmed, then is it the plain, imperative, immediate duty of all among us who bear the ministerial name, to lay ourselves out in carrying forward this very work of Foreign Missions.

In writing a few plain words in behalf of Missions, we mean distinctly the missions of our own church. Not that we undervalue others; nay, we esteem and love them, and bid them God speed, but our own duty lies in our own field. The instrumentality which Providence has laid within our reach is that which is afforded by our own organization, and for this we are accountable. And we solemnly protest against being regarded as hostile to other societies or modes of conducting missions, because we prefer our own. More than this, inasmuch as this precise mode of sending the gospel to the heathen is one for which we have conscientiously contended, we must be permitted to assert its precedence, as a method for our own people, above any and every mode unauthorized by the church; and this without justly incurring the charge of malice or even coldness. Especially do we wish it to be understood, that towards the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, we entertain no sentiment incompatible with Christian respect and good will.

Our Foreign Board does not awaken as great an interest as the American Board. Its resources are smaller, its missions consequently fewer, and from these the intelligence cannot yet be as awakening. It is not to be concealed, moreover, that we have to make our call on a population who have come later into the great work, and who in general are less acquainted with the demands of the unevangelized world, and less used to give money.

There are difficulties but there are encouragements. At the outset there seemed nothing but difficulties. If delicacy towards individual modesty did not forbid, we could tell how heavy were the rebuffs which drove back the zeal-

ous advances of those who were foremost in a scheme then considered a chimera. Those difficulties have been wonderfully removed, and our success has been such as we could not have dared to hope. Nor do we see why we may not expect, in a holy emulation, to outstrip the noble society, which gave us our example and impulse. If the great Presbyterian bodies were united in visibility as they are in doctrine and government and worship, what a front would they present, in this as in every good work ! Against the so-called Catholic churches, they now show scattered detachments, instead of an army. The opposing ranks are solid and compact. The prelatical squadrons are every day consolidating, and exchanging signals with the half-dead churches of the East, some of whom they have for ages been denouncing as schismatics or heretics ; a phenomenon due to the progress of missions in Asia. It is time that Presbyterian forces were more concentrated, at least in action ; time to give over our lesser controversies among ourselves, and to unite to push the conquests of truth into the heart of an unconverted world ; time to take up the work of reformation, where the plough was left in the furrow of the sixteenth century ; and especially time to press onward together in the enterprise of missions,

Taking as a basis the Reports made to the General Assembly of 1842, these being the latest to which we have access, it must be acknowledged that we find too firm a ground for our opening remarks. For example : although our communicants, numbering 140,433 contributed \$46,541, yet of this the sum of \$20,355 was contributed by seven presbyteries out of ninety-eight ; and, omitting thirteen presbyteries who gave nothing, there are eleven, including more than six thousand communicants, of whose donations the sum is \$319. There are more than eight hundred congregations, to no one of which a single cent is credited in the column. Yet we are more encouraged by the grand result, than disheartened by these particular failures ; and the increased liberality of a few churches serves to show what has been done in certain places, and what might be expected if the zeal of these should, as we hope, extend itself through the whole body. Our meaning will appear when it is considered, that five churches gave the sum of \$13,529, being more than one third of the whole amount from one thousand nine hundred and four churches. By the renewed and indefatigable labours of the ministry,

and by no other means so certainly we may hope to see the sacred flame of missionary benevolence catching and diffusing itself over our whole territory. For as in another and more obvious sense, the salvation of mankind is entrusted to ministers of the gospel, so it is to them beyond all the rest of the church that the conversion of the heathen world is consigned; for it is by their personal exertions that the public interest must be maintained, and the enthusiasm of our pastors will always be a just exponent of the missionary spirit of the body at large.

It is worthy of consideration, that even where something is done in behalf of Foreign Missions, there is a tendency to regard it as an extraordinary effort, lying beyond the sphere of ordinary, daily duty. Till this error be corrected, we cannot expect the stream of contribution to be full and regular; it must be subject to fitful ebbs and floods, and to the reaction and collapses which inevitably follow sudden excitements and over-strained exertions. To prevent this, our congregations must be put upon a system of missionary education, which shall bring them gradually but surely to the point of acknowledging that the duty of sending the gospel is a never-ceasing obligation, on every member of Christ's church, and to be held constantly before the mind as much as the duty of prayer or of supporting the means of grace at home. The proper place for beginning this revolution of feeling, is with the rising race, who will thus grow up free from the misconceptions under which the present generation have lain supine, and for this work we have an invaluable aid in the excellent little paper issued by the committee, under the title of "*The Foreign Missionary.*" In addition to this, some of the most successful friends of the enterprise have seen cause to recommend systematic collections such as to bring out the whole strength of the people, at stated times, and at very short intervals, application being made to every church member. Some churches have regularly organized themselves as missionary societies, and have framed lists of all who should contribute, with the weekly sum appended to the name of each individual. This has the advantage of conforming exactly to the apostolic suggestion: "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." There is perhaps no one who will not be agreeably surprised, at the result of this simple method, finding how the burden is lightened by minute

division, and how much larger the annual gift becomes, when made up of frequent small sums, instead of what one is too ready to consider a single large one. Let it not be thought an insignificant matter, when we observe, that if every communicant were to lay aside three cents each Lord's day, the resulting sum would be more than two hundred thousand dollars annually.

Next to the faithful presentation of the duty of Christians to send the gospel to the perishing heathen, must be placed the diffusion of missionary intelligence, as a means of awakening and supporting public sympathy in the cause. For this the monthly meetings for prayer may be profitably employed, and the invention and diligence of pastors should be tasked to render their communications animating and instructive, by the most valuable tidings from abroad, with the aid of maps and other illustrations. We have never joined in the fear of some, that the communication of intelligence at the Monthly Concert would forestall the sale of the Missionary periodicals: on the contrary, the little which may be made public once a month cannot but whet the appetite of the people for the fuller details of the journal. The circulation, among all our families, of the Missionary Chronicle, we need scarcely add, is what no church-session can at this juncture neglect, without loss.

In the midst of all our lamentations, we think we see cause to believe, that a silent and gradual, but perceptible increase is manifest in the interest of our people in these great Christian operations abroad. It is carried forward by the renewed zeal of many ministers, in every part of the land, who are giving more time to the exposition of our common duty in this regard; preaching, not merely on special occasions, but often in their weekly ministrations, on the spread of the gospel; it is furthered by the increased circulation of missionary books and papers; by the obvious signs among the nations, of God's purpose to break down the barriers which for ages have hindered the access of Christianity; by the voice of entreaty which comes to us from our brethren in foreign parts; and by the frequent departure from our own family-circles or neighbourhoods, of beloved brethren consecrated to this work. In consequence of this, it is encouraging to observe that the missionary character is treated with more signal respect. Perhaps the public designation of an evangelist, or the sailing of a missionary ship, may not quicken the feverish

pulses of public enthusiasm quite so much as twenty years ago; the departure of a Christian family for the east may not seem so much like a sacrifice, a burying alive, or an eternal expatriation. These events have come to be ranked among the more stated, if not the ordinary, fruits of religion, and so it should be. But at the same time, there is a higher value set upon the labours of the missionary. If the day ever was, when it was thought fit to lay aside inferior gifts and talents for the foreign service, that day is past. On this subject, there has been a great advance in our theological institutions, from which some of the brightest ornaments have yielded themselves to the work of missions. We speak from knowledge, when we add, that among the missionaries of our Board, are not a few, certainly a fair proportion, of men, who for genius, learning, finished education, aptness to teach, and acceptable gifts, would shine in any station in the home-service. This is sufficiently proved by the communications received from them, and by the course of their enterprising action in trying circumstances. As the number of these increases, as their repeated communications thicken upon us, as new neighbourhoods are successively brought into tender connexion with foreign stations through the sons and daughters whom they have sent thither, and as the greatness of rising churches and presbyteries, in lands only lately known to us shall be revealed, the intelligent zeal of our community will render this the prominent and attractive object, and the theme of daily conversation and daily prayer.

The plan of conducting our church-missions through the intervention of a board, has met with opposition. It is not our purpose to vindicate it now; as well because this opposition has had no extensive influence, and has not in any degree unsettled the policy of the church, as because we are not aware that the duty of church-missions, in this mode, has been anywhere more fully discussed than in our pages.\* We owe hearty thanks to Providence, that so momentous a trust has fallen into such hands, where our highest expectations, in regard to zeal, enterprise, patient labour and judicious counsels, have been more than realized. We are even surprised, that in the conduct of operations so va-

\* Besides other instances, see vol. viii. pp. 413—440., vol. ix. pp. 101—150., vol. x. pp. 535—542.



ried, onerous and delicate, where there is so much room for difference of opinion, we should have found nothing to which we can object. Few know the toils, the anxieties, and the perplexities of these brethren; none in this world will know how much they deserve of us as a church. They should have the sympathy, respect and prayers of their brethren: for while it is our work, and not their own, in which they are wearing out their lives, it is certain that whatever repugnance to the enterprise may exist in any portion of our congregations is made to fall on them as its objects. If there is delinquency, however, we take delight in saying that we do not believe it lies with them, but with some of us who are too ready to shift the accountability to our agents; nor can we read without at once assenting and confessing judgment, the remarks of Dr. Potts:

“Where then lies the fault? *Does it lie at the door of the brethren appointed for the management of the work?* They have with great solicitude asked themselves the question. What more can they do than they have attempted to do: what appeal could they have made, which has not been made, what service rendered, which they have not rendered? Let the church point out any reasonable claim upon them, and they will cheerfully comply, although if it were the will of God, they would gladly be released from the heavy responsibility of working almost without means. They are very sad at this moment, dear brethren, for they are overwhelmed in spirit with calls for help, and discussions, perplexities, despondencies, which cannot be spread upon the printed page. But tell them what more they can do, and they will do it.

“Where lies the fault? *Is it to be found at the door of our ministry?* I must speak out my convictions—I dare not conceal what I conceive to be the truth. The largest, by far the largest share of accountability for the meagerness of our condition, is to be borne by them. Let me then speak to them, who myself often feel my need of the rebukes of the truth.

“My brethren did you fire up with zeal for the glory of Christ, the results would be speedily manifest. Did you give palpable demonstration that this duty in your eyes is one of paramount interest, did you in season, out of season, —in prayer to God at your own firesides, in the social circle, in the sacred desk —in exhortations and faithful admonitions in private—did you in your Sessions, Presbyteries and Synods, in your pulpit discussions of any subject which would warrant an introduction of it even remotely—did you, when standing at that high vantage ground, and during that holy time of covenant-sealing, the supper of our Lord the great missionary—did you in all these ways show that the conversion of the world to Him to whose service you are pledged and whose blessings lie thick around you, was, not merely an item in your creed, but a reality interwoven with all your Christian experience—oh, think you, you would be long without a greater enlargement of *the spirit* of missions among your people, leading to an enlargement in missions themselves? Take a case: say that one of our churches is very poor: a public collection is annually taken up for Foreign Missions amounting to *ten* dollars: (I do not suppose an imaginary case :) I ask now, is it not certain that a little personal exertion of the minister of the flock, would double that sum? And may not the possibility of an increase be supposed universally, except perhaps in the cases of a very few large contributors? I speak as a pastor, who knows the sinking of heart

which follows after an unsuccessful public appeal : but I admit my own fault : I feel that I have not been sufficiently urgent, and especially that I have not been sufficiently watchful for fair opportunities, in private, which if improved are the best opportunities for pressing home any truth or duty. While I remember this, I am humbled, and fear even to seem to cast a stone at the most faulty. But let the truth be spoken, let it be received in humility, by those who feel their need of it.

“ I say then, that there is reason to fear that our ministry is in danger of neglecting this duty in their avowed zeal for another. Have they not in their defence of the truth forgotten its propagation ? Have they not been content that their share of obligation to the truth shall consist in standing guard over the precious deposit to see that it be not rifled ? But might it not almost as well be rifled as hid away out of sight of the world for which it was intended ? What avails it if we have orthodoxy in profession, if the orthodoxy of action be wanting ? or that Christ should be preached so that not a single flaw can be discovered in the theological accuracy of the teaching, if Christ be not so preached as that every believer shall be inspired to pray, and give, and labour to have his salvation made known, not in their own Jerusalem only, nor in their own Judea only, nay nor even to the dispersed of their own people merely, but to the *Gentiles* ? Is that the true trumpet of the gospel which does not summon the church to this war ? Oh my brethren may the appointment of this day arouse first of all the *ministers of Christ*, and make us humble and bow us down for our lagging zeal, and rouse the smouldering embers of our love for the world, until it shall flame so high and so steadily as that none can mistake that we are men of one calling and purpose—the conversion of the world to God. Then only shall we have no cause left to fear that our other ministrings are selfish, and our other offerings at the altar like those of Nadab and Abihu. Oh what a fear is that ! Can we conceive of a more terrible condemnation than that which must await the professed leader of God’s people, who, instead of grasping the interests of the world, has been absorbed in taking care of his own ; instead of going forward has held back ; instead of firing the zeal of others for Christ’s glory, has shed around them an atmosphere of death. Our pulpits may glitter with the beauties of learning and eloquence and orthodoxy, but if learning, eloquence and orthodoxy be not warmed with love, universal love, their glitter will prove like the brilliancy of that region where all is chill and dead. In any degree to do this, is to abuse the truth, and forfeit the final welcome, Well done good and faithful : ye have done it unto these—ye have done it unto me.

“ Then, oh my brethren in the ministry, let us see it for ourselves. Let no weariness overcome us, let no opposition of the inimical, no indifference of the lukewarm, let no danger of being stigmatized as beggars, let no disheartening contrast between the grandeur of the cause and the smallness of our success in gathering means to carry it forward, let no poverty which is not absolute, prevent us from giving ourselves, and labouring to induce others to give. The poorest church is rich compared to the destitution of the perishing. I admit that my own faith sometimes almost faints when I contrast the wealth, which sits in many of our places of worship, with the fact that out of our abundance we give to the poor, poor Lazarus who lies at the gate, only the crumbs which fall from our table ! I could hide my head when I behold the energy of the church when the world’s purposes are to be secured, how mountains are cut through, and rivers crossed, and a vast mechanism constructed by the people of a single city, for the purpose of securing pure water for the body : and still more how unnumbered thousands are spent by those who profess the truth, for baubles or luxuries. We would not recall the days of ascetic monkery : we ask not that a race of barefoot friars should be raised up to preach the gospel—

but we do ask, and you, dear brethren, must *demand* from the church, (and let those who refuse to hear do it at their peril,) that a fair portion of its superfluity, and if there be no superfluity, then some fruit of personal self-denial, shall be given to carry the Bible and the missionary *into all the world.*"

A volume might be written upon the collateral and secular advantages resulting from foreign missions, as well to the countries from which they proceed as to those on which they terminate, in regard to science, literature, commerce and the arts. Already have we received, from the writings of missionaries, more information respecting remote, and once unknown regions, than from all the volumes of professed travellers. In addition to the stated journals transmitted and published, the literature of the age has been enriched by a large number of able and instructive works, which rise above the degree of ephemeral productions, and become authorities in regard to the subjects of which they treat. The intimate acquaintance which the missionary obtains of the languages, manners, opinions and localities of distant heathen tracts, renders his testimony far more exact, full and authentic, than that of the mere voyager or tourist, even when the latter is a man of science. But for this, we should be possessed with the same crude and fabulous reports respecting the Eastern world, which deform the books of the last century. And if we are ever admitted to the recesses of China, with its wonderful and anomalous semi-civilization, it will be by means of missionaries, already preparing to enter the breach made by the victorious arm of power. Among these contributions, we give a place to the modest but valuable work of Mr. Lowrie. It is now about nine years since this gentleman, who had been the pioneer in the mission to Northern India, was constrained by the entire failure of his health, to return to his native land, where he has ever since been rendering active service to the same cause. The little volume before us contains the results of his observation. It affords, in an unpretending but interesting manner, such an account of the Hindus, as is well suited to awaken a special concern in every reflecting mind, for the work of the gospel, in which our church is engaged on their behalf. The nature of the narrative, which is rapid, various, and comprehensive, absolutely forbids abridgment or analysis; and in the attempt to make extracts, we almost fear that we shall do injustice by severing valuable matter from its connexion. Yet there are some portions, of which the interest is such, that we believe we shall sub-

serve the cause we plead, by giving them insertion, in the belief that some of our readers will be attracted to the volume itself. The whole account of the Hindu character is full of information. We would ask attention to what follows, in regard to one of the most stupendous barriers to the introduction of Christianity, we mean the institution of caste.

“This peculiar system was and continues to be primarily a religious institution, but it has become interwoven with the social and civil institutions of the country, and indeed with the entire life of the Hindus. It completely perpetuates the state of things with which it has become connected. Any general change would be fatal to its power. Originally there were but four castes. The Brahman, formed from the mouth of the Creator to expound his laws, stands at the highest point of human elevation; the gods themselves are hardly his superiors; all rulers who are not of his own order, are far below his rank, and for the most atrocious crimes his life, under the native law, cannot be taken from him. Then follows the Kshatriya, formed from the arms of the Creator, to protect the Brahmans in their spiritual duties. The noble looking Raj-puts of the western provinces are generally Kshatriyas, and are in great numbers found in the native regiments of the East India Company, where they make capital soldiers. Below them are the Vaisnyas, created from the belly of their deity, and much inferior to the two higher classes. They are the ryots or farmers, a simple minded, regular, peaceful body of people, as farmers are every where, enjoying the proud distinction of minding chiefly their own business, sharing more largely in the quiet satisfaction of human life, and less in its turmoils, than any other class of people. Still lower are the Indras, formed to be servants to the Brahmans from the feet of their god. Thus does this system exalt the Brahman tribe, and degrade all the other classes of the people. It was probably introduced to promote and perpetuate the power of the priestly class, as the various monastic institutions, with their regulations, are made subsidiary to the power and elevation of the Roman ecclesiastics above the common people.

“It would seem that the original features of this institution have, in the progress of many centuries, become greatly changed. It would now be a difficult task to determine a Hindu's employment, or even his relative standing among his countrymen, by his relations to these general divisions of the system. Numerous sub-divisions of caste have occurred, and many mixed castes exist, though new sects, I believe, are no longer formed. Perhaps few subjects are more embarrassing than the formation and rules of these mixed classes; I shall not attempt to describe them. It will be sufficient to note that while the original classification still exists as the basis of all the existing varieties, and in a great measure determines their rank, still these smaller divisions have landmarks of their own, and their usages are tenaciously adhered to by their respective members. At the present day every occupation is allotted to a distinct sect. A person of one caste never eats with one of a different caste, nor are marriage connexions formed between them. The system is hereditary, and so is commonly the occupation; the son of a farmer being commonly a farmer, the son of a shop-keeper a shop-keeper; and the usages of the system, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, are unchangeable. There can be no change but by falling, no rising to a higher class, nor transition from one to another; and the transgression of the smallest ceremonial would precipitate even a Brahman to the bottom of society. Provision is made, however, for restoring those who have fallen, to their former standing. Liberal presents and bounteous feasts to the



Brahmans have great efficacy in expiating the offence incurred by a departure from the usages of this system, if the penitent transgressor will but walk more strictly for the future.

“ It would be a departure from the usages of caste to adopt any improvement in any kind of employment, and the violation of these usages would be instantly visited with the severest punishment, the loss of property, of reputation, of employment, even all hope of obtaining from the nearest relation the cold charity bestowed on common beggars by the hand of strangers. Here is one great difficulty preventing the conversion of this people to Christianity. To receive the memorials of the Lord’s Supper in company with other communicants, would be a violation of caste, unless the officiating minister and all the communicants were of the same caste; and the same difficulty is apparent as to other Christian duties. Nor is it less a hinderance to all improvement in the temporal affairs of the people. It is a heavy weight crushing down the spirit of enterprise, even though enterprise in that land is goaded on by necessity, and quickened by the keenest appetite of covetousness. It raises a wall around the Hindu, which he never dreams of climbing over or throwing down. He concludes that such is his fate, ‘*Hamara dastur hai,*’ ‘it is our custom.’ is his resigned, passive reply to every proposal of a change. Shall this dreadful system always bind down the minds of the people of India? No, surely. Its very weight and bondage will conduce the sooner to its being thrown off, when the people begin to see its many direful evils. And other considerations, which cannot here be introduced, serve to show that the day is drawing nigh when this master-piece of the great spiritual adversary’s invention to enslave the minds of men, shall be broken and dashed into a thousand fragments, and when it shall be known only on the pages of history as one of the almost incredible things of former ages.”

Of the religion of the Hindus, it is in the highest degree important that we should have some adequate notion, as it is the very antagonist with which so great a part of our missionary array is brought into conflict. We shall avail ourselves of Mr. Lowrie’s information and sometimes of his words, even when we do not mark the quoted passages. It is a godless system, conveying no knowledge of the true Creator. It provides no atonement for sin, nor any motives to holiness, nor any idea of holiness itself. It imposes no restraint on wickedness; it gives no consolation in affliction, it reveals no hope beyond the grave. It authorizes crime, even remorseless murder in certain cases. Its deities are patterns of bloody and loathsome iniquities. Impurity, such as cannot be named, is consecrated in its worship. Abandoned women form the retinue of its temples. Such is the prevalence of polygamy, that a priest has been known to have sixty wives. The consequence is a total degradation of the female sex. Truth and honesty are scarcely recognised as connected with religion.

The choice of the North Western provinces, as a missionary field, is vindicated on grounds which ought to be widely known to our churches, in order that they may act



intelligently in their prayers and contributions. They contain a large and hardy population, in a better climate than the rest of India, with access to the cooler ranges of the Himalaya mountains. They are unoccupied by Christian teachers, as are the great countries to which they open. At the time of commencing this work, an effort was in progress towards the diffusion of the English language in several great cities. And the enterprise was looked upon with marked favour, by intelligent English Christians. The city of Lodiāna, since made familiar to the lovers of missionary record, was selected, and at length reached by Mr. Lowrie. It is the most remote of the English stations on the north-west, and has a population not much less than twenty-five thousand. It has an active trade with the countries to the west. A hundred persons use the English language, twenty-five hundred of its residents are from Cashmere, and about a thousand are Affghans, who speak Persian, as do all the higher classes throughout India. The Sikhs speak and write the Gurmukhi or Panjabi dialect, allied to the Hindui.

We could easily gain the attention of our readers by dwelling on the tour to Lahor, and the very striking account of Ranjit Singh, whose name has now become part of history in connexion with the recent advances of British power; but we choose rather to give some notices of the mission in which so many of our beloved brethren, and some of our own cherished friends, are spending their energies. A good map must supply those geographical points, which it is not our province to elucidate.

The stations which have been occupied in Northern India, are Lodiāna, Sabathu, Saharunpur, Futtehghurh, and Allahabad. At Lodiāna, Messrs. Wilson and Newton took charge of an English school, two or three common schools, a weekly service in English, and a printing press. They spent a portion of their time, after acquiring the language, in preaching tours among the neighbouring natives. Two dwelling-houses, a school-house, and a printing-office were erected. On the arrival of a third company of missionaries, Mr. Porter was associated with Mr. Newton at Lodiāna, and Mr. Wilson accompanied Mr. Rogers to a new station. Since 1838, Mr. Rogers has superintended a boarding school at this place, and Mr. Morris conducts the printing, with an additional press. At Lodiāna, has been erected, for native services, the first Presbyterian and the first Mis-

sion church, in that part of India. In 1837, a church was organized, which had an accession of several native converts.

Sabathu was first occupied by Messrs. Wilson and Rogers, in 1837. They were succeeded by Mr. Jamieson. Besides the schools, the missionaries have made frequent tours among the Hill Tribes, and into the plains, and Mr. Jamieson has given attention to the language of the Thibetian people who find their way in numbers across the snowy mountains.

Saharunpur was occupied in 1837, by Messrs. Campbell and Jamieson. In 1839, the former was joined by Mr. Caldwell, and Mr. Craig, a teacher. They conduct schools for orphans, and have a church, which in 1841 numbered twelve members. Their labours are abundant and their prospects highly favourable. This place contains about 40,000 inhabitants, is surrounded by a populous country, and is within forty miles of Hardwar, where the Ganges issues from the mountains, a place of great resort for pilgrims, so that the missionaries preach to multitudes. The number of these pilgrims is seldom less than two hundred thousand, and every fourteenth year the multitudes are greatly increased.

Allahabad, at the junction of the Ganges and the Jumna, was first occupied in 1836, by Mr. McEwen, who established schools and founded a church, but was compelled by disease to abandon the work; he was followed by Mr. Wilson and Mr. Morrison, and more recently by Messrs. Freeman and Warren. Printing operations are here maintained, and the school for orphans contains fifty pupils. A number of natives have been admitted to the church. An edifice has been erected for native services, through the liberality of R. Montgomery, Esq., of the Civil Service. and other English gentlemen, and a valuable property on the Jumna, has been purchased, for missionary purposes. Mr. Owen and Mr. Wray are also labouring at Allahabad. This city is probably the most important station in Upper India, as the seat of various courts, and the residence of civil officers. It is only less sacred than Hardwar and Benares, and is frequented by multitudes of pilgrims.

Futtehgurh, on the Ganges, is about six miles from the great city of Furrukhabad, and was first occupied in 1838, by Mr. Wilson. The station has enjoyed manifest proofs of the Divine favour, of which not the least was the obtaining

a well educated and pious native, Gopinath Nundi, as an assistant missionary. The number of orphan children has risen to more than a hundred. Many of these are learning the carpet-making business, and it is proposed to settle them in a village by themselves, under Christian regulations. In 1840, the Government generously placed a valuable tract of land at the disposal of the mission. In 1839, Mr. Scott arrived, and opened a school for teaching Persian and English, which is now attended by about seventy pupils. In 1841, Messrs. Rankin and McAuley reached Futtehghurh. A church is probably organized by this time.

“These stations are classed in three Missions, called after the names of prominent cities, the Lodiana Mission, embracing Lodiana, Saharunpur, and Sabathu; the Furrukhabad Mission, having as yet but the station of Futtehghurh; and the Allahabad Mission, with but one station yet formed, that of Allahabad. Each of these Missions is distinct from the others, and they report directly to the Board, whose seat of operations is in New York.

“The missionaries at Lodiana were formed into a Presbytery in 1836, which was recognised by the General Assembly in 1841, and is called the Presbytery of Lodiana, embracing the ministers at Lodiana and Sabathu. The same General Assembly constituted the ministers connected with the Furrukhabad and Allahabad Missions into Presbyteries, known by those names respectively; and these three Presbyteries are connected together as the Synod of North India. The Presbytery of Lodiana, at their first meeting, received two natives under their care as candidates for the holy ministry, and the Presbytery of Furrukhabad have also taken under their care a native convert of much promise for the same sacred office. The missionaries at Saharunpur are of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and have also been organized into a Presbytery by the Synod of their Church.

“There are now three missions, five stations, seventeen ordained ministers of the gospel, one printer, one teacher, nearly all of whom are married men; several valuable assistants; three schools, containing nearly two hundred orphan children, who are supported and brought up by the missionaries as if they were the children of Christian parents; three English schools, with about one hundred and fifty scholars; two printing establishments, with book-

binderies ; and four churches, whose members comprise the families of the missionaries, and a number of native converts, besides the orphan children, who have all received the ordinance of baptism."

Let no one turn away from these details, as dry and uninteresting. They concern an enterprise in which much of the substance and we trust many of the prayers of the church are invested, and which tends towards the immortal welfare of thousands, perhaps millions, in ages to come. We have written the names, which have just been given, with no common emotions, remembering most of these missionaries and their wives, as beloved fellow-christians, with whom we have enjoyed a tender association for years. Knowing the talent, faithfulness and piety, which are included in this mission, we cannot but indulge the hope, that incalculable blessings will result from their labours ; and we would affectionately commend them and their cause to the prayers of God's people. If any thing further is needed, to show the importance of this particular effort, it will be found in the subjoined remarks of Mr. Lowrie :

"It certainly deserves our devout thanksgiving, that so large a mission establishment is now planted and exerting an effective influence where, a few years ago, there was but a solitary pioneer, or rather where but a year or two before, the wants or even the names of those provinces, and their millions of people, were little known to our churches. A beginning has been made, a number of faithful labourers are engaged in the Lord's work, schools have been formed, the Sacred Scriptures printed and circulated widely, churches and Presbyteries constituted, and the work of converting grace displayed, and still in progress : this is surely the Lord's work, and it is marvellous in our eyes. We cannot but regard the past history of those missions as presenting a strong inducement to enlarged efforts, and as holding out good encouragement of final success.

"That success should be devoutly prayed for in these endeavours, no one can doubt, who considers how lamentable is the condition of men not enjoying the light of Revelation, and how far above all price are the benefits conferred on those who sincerely embrace the gospel of Jesus Christ. Every motive that induces Christians to set a high estimate on their religion, should persuade them to use all proper means to extend its blessings to those who are destitute of them. Nor is this duty left to their choice. Its performance is made binding by the command of Christ. The generous promptings, however, of their benign faith, not less than the beautiful example of their blessed Lord, should constrain them to offer a free and ready service on behalf of those who are represented in Sacred Scripture, with touching simplicity, as 'sitting in darkness and the shadow of death.'

"The entire north-western part of India, above a line drawn between Benares and Allahabad, may be regarded as specially open to our missionaries. There are many important places below that line where they might be well employed, indeed where the services of missionaries are most urgently required ; and they would be made welcome by the missionaries of other branches of the Church of Christ, now employed in the lower provinces, their numbers



and resources being altogether inadequate to the work in which they are engaged. But in those north and north-western parts of India, there are no other missionaries from the American Church, and but few from the English Societies. The entire number of European missionaries is probably under a dozen, nor is there a prospect of this number being much increased. There is ample room, therefore, for the employment of many more missionaries from this country. Those upper parts of India, from Allahabad to the Indus, and from the mountains so far west as to include the Raj-put tribes, comprising the provinces of Allahabad, Agra, and Delhi, part of Malwa, and the whole of Rajputana, the kingdom of Oude, the Protected Hill and Sikh States, and the entire kingdom of the Panjab, including Cashmere, containing in all a population of perhaps thirty millions. And besides these, the provinces of Scinde, on the lower waters of the Indus, the countries of Beloochistan and Affghanistan, west of the Indus, and Thibet, on the north-east, can all be reached from this part of India, perhaps better than from any other quarter. In all these countries there is no mission establishment whatever.

"Now although we grant the position already adverted to incidentally, that one great object of missions is to prepare the natives for becoming themselves preachers of righteousness to their countrymen, yet we cannot doubt the extreme importance of all labours that look to the conversion of adult heathens. And these must be made by foreign missionaries, if our benevolence shall reach the generation now on the stage of life. In a few years more, they will go down to the land of silence, and time will not have been afforded for the work of training up native youths, and sending them forth on this high work of mercy, to their fathers and older countrymen. It may justly be said, that the Christians now living must put themselves in communication with the heathens now living, and that chiefly by their direct efforts, if the latter are made to know the true God, and eternal life, which is through his son Jesus Christ our Lord. And beyond all question, the followers of Christ are responsible, and will be held to a strict account in the great day, for the fulfilment of this duty, according to the measure of their means and opportunities.

"If to any it should appear a hopeless work to preach Christ, and him crucified, to adult heathens, confirmed in evil habits, and surrounded with temporal interests, altogether adverse to their believing on the Son of God, let it be remembered that there is the same encouragement now as in the first ages of the Church. A minister of the gospel has the same reasons to expect the Divine blessing on his ministrations among the Hindus, that encouraged the apostle Paul to preach in the city of Ephesus. In both cases, it is by the foolishness of preaching that God is pleased to save them that believe. In both cases, it is the power of God that must overcome the otherwise insuperable difficulties that would hinder and utterly prevent the conversion of any pagan, either in ancient or modern times. And that power shall not be withheld, when the followers of Christ sincerely seek its aid, and employ the appointed means through which that aid is given. On this principle rest the whole foundation and superstructure of Christian Missions. And it is a principle of perfectly established firmness."

We have been led by the interesting volume before us, to confine our remarks in a great degree to a single missionary field; but the field is the world, and we could point to a ripening harvest on every continent. China, alone, if there were no other claims, might absorb all the available energy of our church, and at the present crisis, when this strange, populous and forsaken country is for the first time



opening a crevice for protestant religion, it is cheering to find it attracting the special notice of our General Assembly, as will appear to be the fact from their late resolution. "Whereas the great empire of China is in the providence of God open to the Christian missionary, and the widespread moral desolations of that ancient people present strong and pressing claims for the bread of life; and whereas qualified men are prepared to go on this errand of love and mercy, and are only waiting till the necessary means be afforded.

"Resolved, That the claims of China be and they are hereby presented to the prayers and the liberal support of the churches; and without deciding in favour of a special effort, the General Assembly do hereby authorize the Board to receive donations from individuals and from churches, in aid of this mission; but they would remind the churches that the wants of China, great and pressing as they are, ought not to be supplied at the expense of existing missions, and that these can only be sustained, and at the same time, this mission to China carried forward, by a support increased and enlarged above that of previous years."

If these desultory hints and statements shall awaken to renewed attention but a few of our readers, we shall think them successfully offered. Believing the work of Missions to be our great work, we know of no topic, which could more properly occupy our pages; and so urgent, in our view, are its claims on the affections of the Church, that we have been unwilling to defer it to another number, though by so doing we might have availed ourselves of the documents presented to the General Assembly.

*Rev. W. Doxander*

ART. III.—*Classical Studies: Essays on Ancient Literature and Art, with the Biography and Correspondence of eminent Philologists.* By Barnas Sears, President of Newton Theological Institution; B. B. Edwards, Professor in Andover Theological Seminary. C. C. Felton, Professor in Harvard University.—Boston: Gould, Kendall and Lincoln, 59 Washington street, 1843. 12mo. pp. 413.

THE remarkable beauty of the volume, the reputation of the compilers, and the fascination of the title, give this

work a claim upon our notice. It is a somewhat irregular miscellany, of which however, almost every article is interesting and instructive. If, instead of three names upon the title page, there had been but one, we think the book would probably have possessed more completeness and unity, and would have had less of the magazine character: but it would be hypercritical to demand system in what is avowedly a collection of tracts. Considered as a publication for the young, intended not so much to inculcate the details of literature, as to awaken classical enthusiasm, by presenting the excitement of great foreign examples, it is truly welcome, and we should not be sorry to find it in the hands of every undergraduate in our colleges.

After a well written Introduction, we find the contents to be as follows: Essays on the Schools of German Philology, containing Sketches of Heyne, Winckelmann, Wolf, Bekker, Böckh, and Hermann. A tract on the study of Greek Literature, by the great Swedish poet Tegnér. An Inaugural Discourse, by Frederick Jacobs, of Gotha, on the study of Classical Antiquity. A Discourse by the same author, on the Wealth of the Greeks, in Works of Plastic Art. Next follows a series of letters, on philological topics, chiefly by Ruhnken, Heyne, Wyttenbach, Voss, Böttiger, Hermann, Jacobs and Passow. An Essay on the Dutch School of Philology, containing lives of Hemsterhuys, Valckenaer, Ruhnken, Wyttenbach, Van Heusde and others. A third Discourse by Jacobs, on the superiority of the Greek Language in the Use of its Dialects. A History of the Latin Language, abridged from the German of Hand; and finally, another Discourse by Jacobs, on the Education of the Moral Sentiment, among the Ancient Greeks. The notes at the end are liberally provided with biographical and bibliographical notices of the scholars named in the course of the work.

From this statement, it will appear that the nexus between the several parts is exceedingly slight. a characteristic rendered more prominent by what we consider the want of arrangement. In our esteem the value of the manual would be greatly increased, if the didactic and æsthetical pieces were placed in front, if the historical sketches were so placed as to bring Holland before Germany, and both before the Philological Correspondence, and especially, if the valuable but fragmentary matter of the notes were interwoven into the body of the work; since there is no reason

why it should not take equal rank with the first and sixth articles. But it is a pleasant book, prepared throughout in a scholar-like manner, and which no one who has the slightest taste for classical studies will lay down without satisfaction and profit. Especially welcome are the facts respecting the progress of philology and criticism on the continent of Europe, which will be new to many students and some teachers, and which cannot fail to draw forth any latent enthusiasm which exists in aspiring youth.

There is a prominence given to the writings of Jacobs by the editors, and for this we find abundant reason in the essays themselves, which are marked by originality, warmth and that graceful philosophizing on matters of taste which prevails in the modern German school. At the same time, we more than doubt the expediency of suggesting to inexperienced youth such opinions as those contained in the discourse on the morals of the Greeks. These are errors which need not be engrafted on the stock of Christian America. They go far to break down the barrier between true and false morals, between hideous idolatry and the worship of the true God, and to cherish the notion, already more prevalent than it once was, that religion is a vague elevation of sentiment, in but a slight degree dependent on positive doctrines, or even the particular object of worship; and to engender a vicious thirst for a religion of mere poetry and taste. Nor is it enough to say, as is done in the corrective note, that Jacobs's defence of the Greeks, in regard to certain flagitious crimes, is inconclusive; for, not to say that the poison will influence hundreds who will pay little attention to the antidote, no such defence should have been entertained, no such hint breathed into the ear of youth, and no allowance given for an instant to a perversion so enormous. Far purer, and more true, is the view taken by Tholuck, to which allusion is made in the note. Indeed, such is the loathsomeness of many classical remains, from the pens of Catullus, Martial, Petronius, even Ansonius, that it is our sober judgment that their very republication in our day is little less than a crime. Nor can we successfully vindicate the study of the classics, unless with the understanding that the student shall be guarded at every step against the seductions of vice presenting itself in the blaudishments of consummate taste, and this by means of a teaching which shall take the scriptural ground, and present in the boldest manner the irreconcilable opposition be-

tween heathenism and Christianity. On this point, we doubt not, the author of the note in question thinks as we do: our regret is that he should have opened the subject in such a connexion. We should have been pleased also, if his caveat had been accompanied by something more clear and decisive, on the necessity of revelation and the glory of the evangelical system.

No reader of this volume can fail to be struck with its continental, we might indeed say, its German aspect. Not only are most of the essays from the German, but there is a marked and almost a studied silence with regard to the philology of England. It is true, some great British scholars are incidentally named, but never with any detail, and only as accessory to the main design. If this occurs in consequence of a supposition that our youth are sufficiently familiar with the English school of philology, we consider the supposition unfounded: but if it proceeds from a disparagement of its merits, we must respectfully enter our protest. To say truth, it is from Great Britain rather than from Germany that the scholarship of our country needs reinforcement, just at this time. The tendency among us is to rapid, superficial study. Our young men hasten into college, after a most insufficient and desultory preparation. It is for this reason, that with all our admiration for New England accomplishments, in certain kinds, we have never been willing to look in that direction for our guidance in the matter of classical training. And when, in this state of inadequate preparation, the student is caught and dazzled by the *prestige* of German scholarship, the effect is often injurious. He begins to know much of the bibliography and philosophy of the classics, before he has mastered the intricacies of the language. It is the fault of one who decorates with Gothic buttresses and pinnacles a structure of pasteboard. We do not mean that the Germans are superficial. In their own native soil, the German works do not produce this evil, because they are read by students whose preparatory course is vastly different from anything known in our country, and who come to the University from the long years of drilling in the school and the gymnasium, where they have read a number of authors with searching care, familiarized themselves with Latin and Greek composition, and laid a solid foundation on which to erect the more airy parts of education.

Many years of observation authorize us to say, that the



old-fashioned plan of studying language, borrowed from British schools, which once prevailed throughout this part of the country, has been gradually falling into disuse; and we mean no harm, when we say that it has been in proportion as we have conformed to the methods of our more enterprising brethren of the north and east. How seldom, at a school examination, as in former days, do we hear compositions in the ancient tongues; how rare is a specimen of original versification; and when, as in the school of our ancient friend James Ross, does Latin form the medium of discourse! The long, laborious, minute investigations of the German and especially of the English schools, prevent that sciolism which is manifested by many a collegian, who can rehearse the names of all the critics, while he could not construe extempore a passage of Homer or of Tacitus. We are persuaded that there are few students in our best colleges, who would not be horror-stricken at the course of preparation which is demanded in a candidate for University honours in England. Let us take as a specimen the characteristic, and occasionally comic letter of famous Dr. Parr, to his young friend and godson, Charles Burney.

“Your father is indisputably right in desiring you to read all the plays of Euripides in continuity, and I add, that you will do well to proceed immediately to Sophocles, to Aeschylus, to Aristophanes, to Menander, to Philemon, and the fragments, such as they are, both of the tragic and comic writers. This you must do diligently, and without aberration in the first year, and you will do it again in the fourth, with some additions which I shall mention in due order, but I must state to you, generally and seriously, that I wish your morning to be invariably employed upon Greek. In the second year read Isocrates, Lysias, Isæus, the twelve Orations of Demosthenes, published by Allen, his speeches and those of Aeschines, *de falsâ legatione* and *de coronâ* twice, the *Memorabilia*, *Cyropædia*, and *Anabasis* of Xenophon. Do not read any more of Xenophon, except one book, till you have taken your degree, and remember that I am writing to you as an academic, that I am laying foundations only, but that I mean to make them broad, deep, and solid. In the third year, and not till then, read Herodotus, Thucydides, and the *Hellenics* of Xenophon, go on again with the *Anabasis*, *Cyropædia*, and *Memorabilia*: then take up the dialogues of Plato, by Etwall, Forster and Rotth. Then, my boy, when you are so robust,



grapple with Aristotle, and read his *Ethics*, his *Poetics*, and his *Rhetoric*. I say, read them in this order, and observe, that this is your morning course of reading, for I have provided another place in which both the *Poetics* and the *Rhetoric* are to be read, and you will be improved by the double and distinct reading. Charles, close your third year by a second and most attentive perusal of Herodotus and Thucydides, and when you have finished Thucydides, the second time, read the speeches, and the speeches only, a third time, and read them as they are collected by Bauer, separately from the history. Begin the fourth year with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; don't despise the common Homeric *Clavis*, and indeed upon all occasions beware of despising the received practice of scholars, for by doing well what they are accustomed to do, you will be eventually enabled to do more with immediate and permanent effect. When you are engaged in Homer you will certainly be a strong scholar, and therefore holding Clarke in your hand, and reading his notes, you will avail yourself of Heyne and Wolfius. Read Wolfius twice, and fail not to read every line that has been written by Heyne. Charles, from Homer go to Pindar, and take the aid of Heyne and Jacobs, and read Pindar twice, and then go a second time through Euripides, Sophocles, Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Menander, and Philemon.—Charles, I wish your evenings laid out in the following manner. We must have Latin sometimes by itself, and sometimes intermixed with Greek, but with different Greek from that which I have mentioned, with two exceptions at which I have already hinted. Read first the common Delphin edition of Cicero's *Orations*, and be content with these for the present, for you are not to die when you cease to be an under-graduate, and living, you are not to cease to read. Well, after this you may in the first year go on to Tacitus and to Sallust, and to Cornelius Nepos, and to the select orations from Livy, for you have not time to read his history through, but you must get some vague general notion of his style; but I must again and again urge you to read Caesar. After this you may read Terence through, and four plays of Plautus, but no more; and unwilling as I am to let your mind be seduced into philology for the present, I must advise you to read not only the *Prolegomena* to Terence in the common edition, not a word of which you must miss, but the prefaces of Bentley and Hare, every word of which must be

impressed deeply upon your memory. Get books which you may mark with your pencil, and insert in your common-place book all peculiarities of diction in all Latin writers, and some elegancies, as they are called, but not all. In your second year we must look to ancient rhetoric; and here Charles, begin with Cicero de Inventione, go on to the work de Oratore, the Brutus and Orator, then go to Quintilian. Charles, I love Quintilian; read him in Rollin's abridgment, but have Caperonnier open before you; then proceed to Aristotle's Rhetoric, and then to the critical parts of Dionysius Halicarnassus, published by Holwell; to his work de structurâ, and to Demetrius Phalereus. This is the right order, and you will find it so. Consider, that your mornings are all this time employed upon the Greek Orators, and excuse me for having forgotten to except Dionysius and Demetrius; they are for your evenings, and for those evenings, Charles, when you are setting about Plato, give them to the philosophical writings of Cicero, and read them as edited by Davis, whose notes are inestimable for the matter. Read the Tusculan Questions, the work De Finibus, De Natura Deorum, De Legibus, De Officiis—I pause a little about the Academics: perhaps this book, with the work De Divinatione, may be deferred till you have taken your degree. I say the same of Hermogenes de Ideis, in your rhetorical reading, but at some distant time, you must work at Hermogenes. Now, Charles, in your third year you may choose for yourself among the rhetorical writers whom you have read before, always, however, remembering that Quintilian, Cicero de Oratore, his Brutus, his Orator, and Aristotle's Rhetoric must be perused, and even studied a second time.—While you are reading Homer in the morning, take up Virgil in the evening, and depend upon it that your time will be well employed in reading Virgil twice or thrice.—Remember that in your nooks, and especially when you are reading in the rhetorical works of Cicero, &c., you must reserve a nook for Heineccius de fundamentis styli Latini, and for Scheller's praecepta styli bene Latini. My friend, great will be the use to your taste of these books, and let me add, even to your learning and your compositions. If any nooks be open, fill them with Gesner's Isagoge: it is a most useful book to readers of every age, and scholars of every size.—Charles, there is one book which hardly for one day ought to be out of your hands while you are busy

with the prose writers of Greece. It is almost the only indulgence I grant to philology, but it is a necessary one, and I even impose it upon you as a duty. Whensoever you have a spare half-hour, read Vigerus, with the notes of Hoogeveen, Zeunius and Hermann. First read him through in regular series, do so a second time in some of the nooks, and consult him again and again, and read him a third time while you are in statu pupillari. Have the book almost by heart. I almost say the same of Mattaire de Dialectis, especially when you are busy with Pindar or Homer."

Truly this is a curiosity. On taking breath after the perusal, the reader will not fail to observe the justice done in these advices to the great German scholars; and if he be disposed to ask how it is possible for an under-graduate to compass such a course of reading, in any but the most superficial manner, let him remember the previous years of grammar-school instruction upon which this superstructure is reared; years in which a few books have been pondered and repeated, by small portions, and with the daily application of rules, committing originals to memory, and composition in the ancient languages. It is the latter discipline, which we need in our academies, and with this, such delightful volumes as that before us will be invaluable stimulants to our youth. Nor do we suspect the learned editors of wishing to further such an abuse of their important contributions, as we have been deprecating. But the *labor improbus* of early, assiduous, unremitted studies is indispensably prerequisite to any thing like an intelligent and faithful reading of the classics in a cursory manner. Plodding examination of small portions, often repeated, closely sifted, searchingly analyzed, with minute and endless oral explanation, comparison of synonymes, of idioms, and elucidation of allusions, and cross-examination, must occupy the first years, nor can it be rejoined that such a method will obtund the faculties, cause an exclusive attention to minutiae, or unfit the scholar for enjoying with great zest, the higher beauties of literature. The triumphant answer to this is found in the whole history of English scholarship. Not even Germany has exhibited such fruits of refined taste and exquisite composition as may be produced in scores from the statesmen as well as the professors and authors of Great Britain. Indeed we have been constantly struck with this difference between the German and English results. Among the continental

scholars there is on the one hand a herculean application to the minutest delicacies of text and diction, and on the other, an ever-varying invention of hypotheses and broaching of philosophical schemes, but less, far less, than we think we perceive in England, of unfeigned interest in the beauties of classical learning. And we wish that we could receive, from hands as able as those now employed, similar accounts of the progress of these studies in Great Britain. Her scholars deserve it from us, and claim to be mentioned in more than a passing sentence.

No error is more fatal to sound scholarship among us, than that statesmanship and political eloquence, are matters of so practical a kind, as to require no preliminary culture. Our young men hurry into college, into professions, and into congress, with trifling attainments; careless or ignorant of the fact, that the greatest statesmen and lawyers of Britain, her Chathams, Burkes, Cannings, Mansfields, Stowells and Windhams, were all matured by the discipline of the ancients. And this we wish to see brought out in works like the one under our hands. Because Mr. Pitt blazed forth on the world, as a parliamentary meteor, when scarcely past his majority, it is fancied that he had overleaped the drudgery of academical labours. But hear his biographer and tutor, Bishop Tomline; he is speaking of Pitt's Cambridge studies: "In Latin authors he met with no difficulty, and it was no uncommon thing for him to read into English six or seven pages of Thucydides, which he had not previously seen, without more than two or three mistakes, and sometimes without even one. He became deeply versed in the niceties of construction and idiom, both in the Latin and Greek languages. While Mr. Pitt was an undergraduate, he never omitted attending chapel morning and evening, or dining in the public hall, except when prevented by indisposition. Nor did he ever pass a single evening out of the college walls. I never knew him spend an idle day. There was scarcely a Latin or Greek writer of eminence, the whole of whose works Mr. Pitt and I did not read together. It may, I believe, be said with the greatest truth, that no one ever read the Greek language, even after devoting his whole life to the study of it, with greater facility than Mr. Pitt did at the age of twenty-two." Nor is this a rare instance among the great men of England. For, as Sir Robert Peel inquires, in a discourse before the University of Glasgow, in 1837, "What are the chief names (I am speak-



ing of public life,) which have floated down, and are likely to remain buoyant on the stream of time? Of the whole number, how large is the proportion of men eminent for classical acquirements, and classical tastes! In the judicial station there are Lord Mansfield, Lord Stowell, Lord Ellenborough, Lord Tenterden. In public life, Lord North, Mr. Pitt, Mr. Fox, Mr. Burke, Lord Grenville, Mr. Windham, Mr. Canning—all eminent for classical attainments. This at least is demonstrated, that the time devoted to classical studies had not obstructed their elevation. But surely there is a very strong presumption, from the proportion which they bear to the total number of distinguished men, that classical learning, and the accomplishments derived from the study of it must have given them great advantages in all competition for distinction. Follow them into the retirement of private life, witness the refined taste with which classical studies have inspired them, and learn to estimate the compensation they have offered, for the loss of power, or the interruption of active employment. Take as examples the men most prominent in recent political history, the great rivals Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox. In the case of each, you have the most unexceptionable evidence, as to the pursuits and studies in which they found relaxation and amusement, whenever the contentions of public life were suspended. Lord Holland thus speaks of Mr. Fox in the Preface to the History of the Reign of James II. ‘During his retirement, the love of literature, and the fondness for poetry, which neither business nor pleasure had ever extinguished, revived with an ardour, such as few in the eagerness of youth, or in pursuit of fame or advantage, are capable of feeling. His letters are filled with complaints of such interruptions as arose from politics, while he speaks with delight and complacency of whole days devoted to Euripides and Virgil.’” Similar is the testimony of the late Marquis of Wellesley, himself an eminent classic, and no mean Latin poet: “Mr. Pitt was perfectly accomplished in classical literature, both Greek and Latin. The accuracy and strength of his memory surpassed every example which I have observed, but the intrinsic vigour of his understanding carried him far beyond the mere recollection of the great models of antiquity in oratory, poetry, history and philosophy. Those studies were his constant delight and resort. At Holwood, in Kent, and at Walmer Castle, his apartments were strewed with Latin and Greek classics; and



his conversation with those friends who delighted in similar studies, frequently turned on that most attractive branch of learning. In these pursuits his constant and congenial companion was Lord Grenville, who has often declared to me that Mr. Pitt was the best Greek scholar he ever conversed with."

Let those who consider their classical studies as necessarily ended when they enter on a profession, attend to these testimonies, and ponder such remarks as those of Mathias: "When I consider that every subject in philosophy, in history, in oratory, and in poetry—whatever can dignify or embellish human society in its most cultivated state, has there found the highest authors—that the principles of composition are better taught and more fully exemplified than in any other language; that the Greek writers are the universal legislators, in taste, criticism, and just composition, from whom there is no appeal, and who will be found unerring directors, I would with peculiar emphasis and earnestness request young men of fortune, ability, and polished education, not to cast off the study of the Greek writers, when they leave school, or the university. A few hours devoted to the study in every week, will preserve and improve their knowledge. It will animate the whole mass of their learning, will give colour to their thoughts and precision to their expressions. There is no necessity either to speak or to quote Greek, but the constant perusal of the historians, orators, philosophers and poets, will be felt and perceived." Even amidst the toils of black-letter research, the young lawyer may recollect the words of Sir William Jones, who is not quoted as a jurist, only on account of his surpassing claims as a philologist: "You will see my shelves filled with reports and abridgments. Tully and Demosthenes alone have preserved their places. These I devour—these I get by heart—these I repeat—these I shall never cease admiring and imitating to the end of my life." He elsewhere says that he made it a rule to peruse the works of Cicero once every year. The grand hindrance to the pursuit of such studies by our public men, is to be found in the deficiency of their early training, and the defect of that accurate preparation which we so earnestly desire to restore. And even when a late conviction of this impels to study, the method attempted is too often that of cursory and uncritical reading, instead of a resort to foundations. Better far would it be, if the repentant scholar

should follow the example of Wyttenbach, in the reparation of his juvenile losses. We add the history with the greater pleasure, from the remembrance of the animating effect with which we read it more than twenty years ago.

“‘When I was in my eighteenth year, I had learned about as much Greek, as you have generally acquired after being with me four months. I had attended the lectures of the professors, both in literature and in the severer sciences, with no great advantage. I appeared to others to have made progress, but not to myself. I was weary of the toil. I wanted space to soar higher. I returned to my studies, and began to review them privately. Though I had advanced somewhat further than I had gone when attending the lectures of the professors, yet it was in a manner which did not at all correspond to my expectations, and I gave it up in disgust. I proceeded from one study to another in the course, yet all were wearisome and repulsive; and yet, like one whose appetite is disordered, I was continually seeking for some intellectual food. I remembered the pleasure which I had enjoyed, when a boy, in the study of Greek. I searched for the books which I had formerly read. I took out of a corner Plutarch’s treatise on the Education of Boys, and read it once and again, with much effort, but little pleasure. Then I went over with Herodian, which afforded me a little more enjoyment, but was far from satisfying my mind. I accidentally found, elsewhere, Xenophon’s *Memorabilia*, Ernesti’s edition, which I had before known only by name. I was captivated with the indescribable sweetness of that author. The grounds of it I better understood afterwards. In studying this treatise, I made it a point never to begin a section without re-perusing the preceding; nor a chapter or book, without studying the preceding chapter and book a second time. Having, at length, completed the work in this manner, I again read the whole in course. It occupied me almost three months; but such unceasing repetition was most serviceable to me.’

“By the help of Ernesti’s notes, Wyttenbach acquired some skill in criticism, as well as bibliographical knowledge. He then determined to read the Greek authors in chronological order, and thus lay a foundation for the superstructure which he was intending to build by means of other branches of learning.

“I began upon Homer. When a boy, I had studied about a hundred lines of the first book of the *Iliad*. This book I finished in two months, reviewing it in the same manner that I had the *Memorabilia*. I continued the study of Homer more as a task than as a pleasure. I did not yet recognise that divine genius. Many other youths, as I happen to know, have had the same experience. In consequence, I read Xenophon in connection with Homer, devoting the greater part of my time to his works. They were so easy to be understood, that I, as it were, devoured them. I was rarely compelled to use a lexicon, for nearly every thing was intelligible from the context. I made use of a Latin version, which was advantageous to one of my age, but is never so in schools. All the works of Xenophon, the *Memorabilia* excepted, I read four times in four months. I now thought that I could read any author with equal ease. I took up Demosthenes. I had a copy without a Latin translation, but accompanied by the Greek notes of Jerome Wolf. Darkness itself! But I had learned not to be frightened in setting out. I went on. I found greater difficulties than I had ever had before, both in words, and in the length of the sentences. At last with much ado, I reached the end of the first *Olynthiac*. I then read it a second and a third time. Every thing now appeared plain and clear. Still, I did not yet perceive the fire of eloquence for which he is distinguished. I hesitated whether to proceed to the second oration, or again read the first.

I resolved to do the latter. How salutary are the effects of such a review! As I read, an altogether new and unknown feeling took possession of me. In perusing other authors, my pleasure had arisen from a perception of the thoughts and words, or from a consciousness of my own progress. Now, an extraordinary feeling pervaded my mind, and increased with every fresh perusal. I saw the orator on fire, in anguish, impetuously borne forward. I was inflamed also, and carried on upon the same tide. I was conscious of a new elevation of soul, and was no longer the same individual. I seemed myself to be Demosthenes, standing on the bema, pouring forth this oration, and urging the Athenians to emulate the bravery and glory of their ancestors. Neither did I read silently as I had begun, but with a loud voice, to which I was secretly impelled by the force and fervour of the sentiments, as well as by the power of oratorical rhythm. In this manner, I read, in the course of three months, most of the orations of Demosthenes. My ability to understand an author being thus increased, I took more delight in Homer, whom I soon finished. Afterwards, I studied other great authors, with far more profit.”

“Having completed the study of Demosthenes, Wytttenbach next repaired to Plato, not only reading the dialogues, but writing annotations upon them, as if he were intending to lecture upon the subject. As he strolled along the shady walks of Marburg, he was accustomed to carry, in his pocket, leaves of Plato’s works, as his father, when he wandered in his youth, among the Alps, had taken scraps of Xenophon. From his friend, Hassencamp, he procured Ruhnken’s *Timæus*. ‘Then I began to know,’ he writes, ‘that the study of Plato is not only useful in itself, through the influence which it exerts on the manners, the intellect, the moral character, the style of writing,—also, by its promoting an elegant delivery, and a thorough acquaintance with Greek literature and philosophy,—but that it is far more useful, from the fact, that it enables all scholars, who have lived subsequently, to understand the Greek and Roman authors correctly, the effects of the study of Plato being diffused through them all, and even through the whole circle of ancient knowledge.’”

“Having completed the study of Plato, Wytttenbach commenced reading, in chronological order, the other principal Greek authors, both in prose and verse. He made it, however, his main object, to obtain a favourable introduction to Ruhnken, who was now constantly in his thoughts. Accordingly, he commenced the study of Julian, Plutarch, and other philosophers and rhetoricians of that age, with the design of amending them, by the aid of earlier writers, particularly of Plato, after the example of Ruhnken in annotations on *Timæus*.”

Even at the hazard of harping on the old string, we must declare our hope that English scholarship will not be overlooked. Germany can show no Latinity superior to that of Bishop Lowth, Dr. Philip Barton, Dr. Lawrence, Sir George Baker, Sir William Jones, Dr. Parr, Vincent Bourne and Tweddell. And although the *ars diplomatice* has not been pursued with the undeviating devotion, or the voluminous results which have immortalized the names of Ernesti, Heyne and other Germans, yet criticism can never neglect the genius or the works of Bentley, Dawes, Markland, Taylor, Toup, Burney, Tyrwhitt and Porson; nor should justice be withheld from Elmsley, Musgrave, Monk, Burges, Butler, Stanley, Gaisford and Blomfield. With Dr.

Parr, there are associated in our imagination his Spital sermon, his pipe, and his huge "amorphous wig;" yet Hermann names him as "virum, quem omnes in litteris antiquis primarium esse fatentur." Of Porson, it were superfluous to speak more than what is contained in the words of Parr: "a giant in literature, a prodigy in intellect, a critic, whose mighty achievements leave imitation panting at a distance behind it, and whose stupendous powers strike down all the restless and aspiring suggestions of rivalry into silent admiration and passive awe."

The insertion by the editors of so large a selection from the correspondence of eminent philologists, we regard as a happy expedient. Believing as we do, that a volume like this might be furnished every year, to the great delight and advantage of classical scholars, we hope still larger draughts will be made upon the same fountains. Nor shall we be displeased, if a place be given to the letters of English scholars. Nothing in this kind could be more awakening, than such as might be culled from the remains of Sir William Jones, Burney, Porson, Parr, Tyrwhitt, Twining, Tweddell, and the correspondence of Fox and Wakefield. In these would be brought to view a treasure of facts in regard to the progress of classical research, and this is what we need. Of the present volume, no part is more attractive than that which is historical, especially the articles on the schools of Holland and Germany. The following extract, though long, will not, we are sure, be unwelcome:

"If the founder of a particular school of criticism is to be estimated by the character of his disciples, few will come off with more honour than Wolf. Heyne's influence was felt throughout all Germany and all Europe. He interested different classes of minds in ancient learning. Wolf's influence, on the contrary, was greatest upon the few who were thoroughly disciplined under his care. The first distinguished scholar, formed under Wolf, was Heindorf, so justly celebrated for his edition of Plato. The second, was the ablest and most prolific editor of the age, Immanuel Bekker, of Berlin. The third, was that prodigy of Greek and antiquarian learning, Augustus Böckh. These young men were, indeed, finally alienated, to some extent, from their teacher, in consequence of his growing arrogance; but they were always true to his principles of criticism. They were certainly excusable for being restive under the galling yoke which was unceremoniously put upon them, after they were full-grown, by this ill-natured and freakish veteran of learning. The truth is, the whole period, from 1807, when he was called to Berlin, and employed in laying the foundations of the University, up to his death in 1824, was one which increased neither his literary reputation nor the number of his friends. The rupture which broke out between him and Buttman, Schleiermacher, Niebuhr, Böckh, J. G. Schneider, and Savigny, has no importance, except to illustrate the literary feuds of those times.

"Heindorf, then in Berlin, as were most of the early disciples of Wolf, was



the very opposite of his teacher. He was uncommonly mild and amiable. His health was very feeble, and he was subject to melancholy. One cannot read his history without feelings of sadness. All our sympathies are awakened in favour of a modest and worthy young man, eager for improvement, and yet depressed in spirit; first encouraged and highly honoured by his teacher, and then an object of jealousy; struggling with ill health, and working enthusiastically upon his Plato, partly as an antidote to despondency; seeking to merit an important station, and rapidly rising in fame; and then thrown upon a bed of illness, at the idea of his responsibilities, when appointed professor at Breslau, and finally dying a few years after.

“Immanuel Bekker, now fifty-eight years of age, betrays in his iron features the determined and unyielding perseverance of his character. No living critic has such a knowledge of Greek manuscripts. The libraries of Paris and Romo have been his laboratories. He was, at first, educated under Spalding and Heindorf, in a gymnasium of Berlin, his native city; then he went to Halle, and studied under Wolf, who pronounced him the best qualified, of all his disciples, to carry out his views of criticism. Since then, he has been professor in the university of Berlin, though he has spent much time abroad, in various foreign libraries. The extent of his critical labours is truly astonishing. The most searching investigation of the texts and manuscripts of such voluminous authors as Plato, and Aristophanes, and Aristotle, is only a small part of his labours.

“Augustus Böckh, also fifty-eight years of age, is a native of Carlsruhe. He studied under Wolf in Halle, and was then, for a time, in Berlin. At the age of twenty-two, he was made professor in Heidelberg, and since 1811, he has been professor in Berlin. At the present time his reputation is higher than that of any classical scholar in Germany. In mere language, Hermann is undoubtedly his superior; in the single department of manuscript learning, called, in Germany, diplomatic criticism, Bekker takes precedence. In the archæology of art, Müller excelled him, as do many others. But in a knowledge of what the Greeks and Romans were practically—in the power of reproducing Grecian and Roman life, in all its thousand forms—no one can pretend to be his equal. No one else could have written the *Public Economy of the Athenians*, published when he was but thirty-two years of age. In this kind of research, Charles Ottfried Müller, his own disciple came nearest to him. It is the union of the better portions of the methods of Wolf and of Niebuhr, that constitutes the excellence of Böckh and his followers. Bernhardt, Gerhard, and Meyer are now among his most distinguished disciples; and it is very evident, that the Berlin method of philology is gaining upon that of Leipsic, and is more closely united with all the intellectual movements of the present day. In the lecture-room of Böckh, when he is upon some important subject, it is no uncommon thing to meet with such men as von Humboldt and others, who are, themselves, among the profoundest scholars of the age. The ascendancy of this school may be owing, in part, to the spirit of the times, which is more intent upon great discoveries in the world of facts, than upon the niceties of language. The best Latin writers of the present day, and the best expositors of words and phrases, are trained under Hermann, to whom we now turn our attention.

“If one were to go into the lecture-room of the professor of Poetry and Eloquence at Leipsic, a few moments before the hour, he would see a crowd of the maturest scholars of the university, and of philologists who had been educated elsewhere, finding their seats, and preparing their papers, for taking notes. The hum of numerous whispering voices fills the room. An aged, but spirited man, of moderate stature, with fire in his eye, and fury in every movement, darts in at the door. The well-known signal, given by those nearest

him, instantly silences a hundred tongues. By this time, you hear his clinking spurs, and, as he mounts the stairs to the desk, your eye falls upon his blue coat, with metal buttons and badge of knighthood, his deer-skin breeches, and long riding boots. His whip and gloves, and hat and chair are all flying to their places, and a stream of extemporaneous Latin is already pouring forth. Before you are aware of it, the ship is under full sail. The whole energy of the lecturer's mind is directed to his object; the point of difficulty in the Greek text, or in the interpretation, is placed directly before you in all its bearings; the principles involved, are clearly stated, and discussed in animated and flowing Latin; the difference between his views and those of Böckh, Müller, or Dissen, are alluded to freely but kindly, occasionally with keen satire, but more frequently with the playfulness of harmless wit; and thus the hour is passed, and the most difficult and abstruse subjects luminously exhibited and disposed of, before the hearer stops to take a long breath. When the lecture is over, one's mind is so exhilarated, and so possessed of the spirit of the Greek author, as to be ready to plunge directly into a protracted perusal of the text; but, after a moment, a feeling of exhaustion suggests the query, whether it would not be better to go to the dinner-table.

"Such is Godfrey Hermann, in his lecture-room. Visit him in his museum, as he calls his study in the city, and he will entertain you with free and lively conversation; and if you have any reasonable claim upon his attention, he will show you a chair, and draw you into protracted conversation, as if you were an old friend. In his family, that resides a little out of the city, he appears as a plain, but lively old man. Simplicity and sterling sense characterize his domestic circle.

"Hermann has no airs of professional dignity. He seems to act with reference to himself, simply as a man, not as the titled individual whom kings love to honour; and, in this respect, he is the very opposite of Schlegel, of Bonn. Once, he promised the writer some of his occasional works, but would not set a time when they might be called for. A few days after, he was seen walking from one side of the city to the other, to the writer's lodgings, with the pamphlets under his arm. The Germans generally pour out their curses liberally upon Napoleon, as the enslaver of their nation; but Hermann, in the true spirit of an old Greek, said, it was a good thing, once in a while, to have the slumbering spirit of a whole continent stirred up by such a man as Napoleon. In regard to the proverbially intricate statutes of Leipsic university, he once observed, that, for his part, he followed his own sense of propriety, in the affairs of the university; for no man could safely calculate on a life long enough to trace the laws through all their alterations and amendments, so as to be able to follow them.

"Hermann has been a spirited controversialist, and always victorious, till Böckh and Müller entered the lists. Neither of these men could be completely vanquished by any opponent. Probably no German scholar understands the Greek language, its grammar, lexicography, and general usage, and Greek metre, better than Hermann, or has read the Greek authors more than he. Certainly, no one excels Böckh in his way. I know not how to characterize the lamented Müller's greatness. Perhaps it may be represented as consisting in comprehensive and magnificent views of antiquity as a whole, a true survey of it in all its aspects, a harmonious construction of the materials of Winckelmann, Hermann, and Böckh, into one grand and beautiful system.

"Hermann and Böckh are to be regarded as the heads of the two great schools of philology that divide Germany: the former, making language the end, and all historical and antiquarian research subservient to that end; the latter, making a complete knowledge of antiquity the end, and language only the means: the one aiming chiefly at intellectual discipline, the other at useful

knowledge. Among the more distinguished disciples of Hermann, may be mentioned the names of Lobeck, Thiersch, Passow, Rost, Poppo, Eichstädt, Hand, Fritzsche, and Klotz."

In all that is said in the Introduction, concerning the neglect of the classics by our professional men, every educated reader must concur. The utilitarianism which would banish them is false to its own principles: for they are not useless. True they do not visibly drive machinery, or coin money, or manure land: but like a flowing river, they pass over the tracts of mind, to fertilize and purify; and by these effects alone their course is indicated. The degenerating process indicated by the editors as going on in our vernacular tongue is undeniable.\* It is the study of language and the habit of recourse to models which must counteract this; and this advantage alone would repay us for the toil, and vindicate its utility. But over and above all such ponderable and calculable results, we hesitate not to say that the innocent solace and healthful refreshment derived from classical pursuits, are themselves a good, and worthy of consideration. Since the intervals of repose will be filled up with reading of some kind, and in point of fact are filled up with that which is vapid and contemptible, all who like the editors of this work strive to promote a taste for more enduring and satisfying beauties, deserve well of their country. For, after all, these are the works which have survived the convulsions of time, which have been found in the hands, not only of the ancient gentiles, but of the fathers, the reformers, and the great patriots and statesmen of later generations, and which will continue to be the daily entertainment of the ripest minds at home and abroad,

Ante focum, si frigus erit, si messis, in umbrâ.

\* We know of no English authority, for making Ruhnken, himself an English scholar, say, in his first letter—"I will now give you a brief sketch of what has *transpired*." True, the old-fashioned Pomeranian had not the advantage of an American dictionary.

ART. IV.—*An Inquiry into the Organization and Government of the Apostolic Church: particularly with reference to the Claims of Episcopacy.* By Albert Barnes. Philadelphia: Perkins and Purves. 1843. pp. 251.

IN a recent charge to the clergy of his diocese, Bishop Onderdonk of Philadelphia went into a laboured and minute defence of liturgical worship, not, as he said, for the purpose of disturbing the convictions or changing the practice of those who use another method, but to satisfy the minds of such Episcopalians as are shaken or annoyed by the objections continually urged against the use of written forms. The reason thus assigned by Bishop Onderdonk, for undertaking the defence of liturgies, appears to us entirely legitimate. There can be no doubt that in all communions there are some, who, though entirely persuaded of the doctrines which they hear, and even warmly attached to the form of worship which they use, are nevertheless, from want of professional acquaintance with the controverted topics, unable to repel the objections, with which they are continually plied by those of different persuasions. And this state of things is becoming more and more common, as the different divisions of the Christian world are more intermingled in society, and the points of difference between them more familiar subjects of discussion, not only in the pulpit or the public prints, but in the offices and parlours of the laity. From such intercourse there must necessarily arise in many minds a feeling of uneasiness at not being able to defend what is really believed to be true; and this feeling is not only disagreeable, but in its tendency unfriendly to a warm and active zeal for the cause which is assailed. There are but two ways in which strong unwavering attachment to a church can be secured. The one is, by keeping its members in ignorance of all that has been said, or can be said, against it; the other, by placing the bane and antidote at once before them. There was a time, when the first of these two methods was not only the one commonly adopted, but the one really entitled to the preference; when wise and good men had abundant reason to believe that the interests of truth would be promoted, by confining controversy to the clergy, or to theologians by profession, and leaving private Christians to the quiet enjoyment of those religious privileges which were afforded by their own com-



munion. The continuance of this course, if it were desirable, is now impossible. The general diffusion of religious and ecclesiastical intelligence, and the growing frequency of such topics in the ordinary intercourse of life, have made it necessary, that the discussion of these subjects should have reference not only to the clergy but the laity, and that books should be written not only to silence or convert gain-sayers, but to quiet the minds of such as have been harassed, though not won, by the efforts of opponents. On this ground we regard the course pursued by Bishop Onderdonk, in the case referred to, as both politic and right ; and on the same ground, we approve of all judicious efforts to relieve the minds of Presbyterian laymen from the uneasiness produced, not only by learned and ingenious, but even by weak and frivolous objections, when repeated with sufficient perseverance. There is indeed a peculiar necessity in our case, above most others, arising from the bold and even arrogant assumption of superiority, not only on the part of priests and prelates, but of Episcopal ladies and gentlemen, among whom the consciousness of apostolical extraction seems to be becoming more decided, not without a very sensible effect upon the manners and the tone of social intercourse. The same cause which, among the rude and low-bred, would produce a gross and undisguised contempt of those whose only hope is in uncovenanted mercy, may be seen, in higher circles, to generate a tone and air of courteous compassion, which is not a whit more pleasant to its objects, because known by them to be without the slightest colour of right or reason, though they may not be able to detect the sophistry, on which it professes to be founded. Now in justice to this large class of our most intelligent and pious laymen, it is right that the pretensions, which are thus continually meeting them in private life, should be considered and disposed of, in a public way, with due regard to their accommodation. We view with satisfaction, therefore, every skilful effort to detect imposture and demonstrate truth, in reference to this most hackneyed subject. We are aware, that such efforts are discountenanced by some, who regard all controversies as frivolous, except a few, which they have taken under special protection. But whatever may be the intrinsic importance of the questions in dispute—and some of them are of the greatest moment—we cannot venture to consider any controversy frivolous, which occupies and agitates the minds of an en-

lightened laity. This circumstance alone would make the subject an important one, even in comparison with some which are eagerly discussed, and which afford employment to a few minds, but are destitute of practical and public interest. Still less are we affected by the clamour from without, which every new attempt to set this matter in its true light, draws forth. Those who engage in this controversy must expect to hear, that their appearance is an implied confession of defeat, a desperate attempt to change the ground of conflict, and a practical abandonment of all that has been hitherto achieved or claimed. They may expect to hear this proclaimed most loudly by the very men who have abandoned their own ground, and nullified the reasoning of all their predecessors. This *ruse de guerre* is now too old to affect any but the inexperienced. It is not even practised by the veterans of the adverse host, who wisely leave it to the raw recruits. The sound in question commonly proceeds from weak and empty vessels. Bishop Onderdonk is evidently well aware that new defences of the truth may be required, without any abandonment of those already made. Upon this ground he proceeds, both in his theory and practice. It is somewhat remarkable, indeed, that the only Protestant Episcopal writer in this country, who has done any thing towards building up the fabric of prelatical church-government by reasoning, should be so much more courteous and moderate, than some pugnacious neophytes, whose claims to the attention of the public are yet to be discovered. It is natural enough that the latter should allege, and for aught we know believe, that every new argument against Episcopal pretensions is a virtual admission of defeat. It is no less natural that, when this stale device proves unavailing, they should raise the cry of persecution, and complain of the uncharitable attacks which are continually made upon their injured innocence. The absurdity of such complaints is evident. Attacks upon high-church pretension do not involve the unchurching of high-churchmen. We deny that they are the only true church. They deny that we are a true church at all. If attempting to disprove this false and foolish dogma is an attack upon Episcopacy, we shall be glad to see it made and made again, as often as the changes of the times require a modification of the form, in which the truth has been exhibited already. We are glad to see that Mr. Barnes has not allowed himself to be deterred,

by any of these clamours, from contributing anew his quota to the service. We cannot sufficiently admire and applaud his indefatigable diligence, and watchful observation of the public wants and exigencies. He does not study or write merely for his own gratification or improvement. He has still an eye to the state of the book-market, and the varying demand for works of certain kinds. This habit tends to enhance the value of his publications so far as to make them popular and readable. We are so well satisfied of his discretion *quoad hoc*, that his selecting any topic for discussion, through the press, is, of itself, sufficient evidence to us, that it has taken hold already of the public mind. The little work before us is indeed not wholly new. It contains the substance of two articles, published in the Christian Spectator of 1834 and 1835. They have now, however, been mostly re-written, and with great improvement, both in form and substance. The author has evidently gained more insight into the true state of the questions at issue, and the history of the controversy. The improvements made consist both in additions and omissions. The form of a review has been exchanged for that of a consecutive argument. In effecting this, the author has endeavoured to divest the treatise of its controversial form. He seems indeed particularly anxious to disclaim the controversial character. If by this he means an undue asperity of tone and temper, it would be much better to let the volume speak for itself. "Good wine needs no bush." If, however, his words are to be strictly understood, we can see no use, and very little meaning, in attempts to show, that a book of controversy is not controversial. Such disclaimers, though the spirit which they manifest is good, and well calculated to disarm an adversary, may do harm, by exciting the suspicion of insincerity in some, and that of cowardice in others. The same objection lies with less force, against the somewhat turgid compliments to Protestant Episcopacy, which have been retained, but with which we are not disposed to quarrel, especially as Mr. Barnes has been pleased to omit some allusions of a very different kind, and designed to take effect in a very different quarter. The facts of this case are somewhat curious and instructive, and may not improperly be stated here. The first review of Bishop Onderdonk's tract in the Christian Spectator, opened with an expression of surprise that it had been so little noticed, and a sneering reference to

some who thought themselves particularly called and qualified to do such work, but who were now found wanting. The allusion implied, of course, that those who had thus failed to meet the enemy were unable to do it, and that the reviewer was under the disagreeable necessity of doing it himself. Now this would have been all very well, if the reviewer's will could have been taken for the deed. But what was the fate of the argument thus brought before the public, as a succedaneum for the delinquent services of those who considered themselves champions of the Presbyterian cause, but had deserted it in the day of battle? It has now been circulated eight years, in the same volume with the tract which it refuted, by the Protestant Episcopal Tract Society, and is constantly referred to, by the zealots of that sect, as a monumental proof that the bishop's argument is utterly irrefutable. The author is lauded, to be sure, but with that most humiliating kind of praise, which is often lavished on the conquered by the conqueror, in order to exalt himself. After this, we are not surprised, that Mr. Barnes has here thought proper to omit the premature reflections, into which he had been betrayed, upon the cowardice or sloth of his weaker brethren.

But without dwelling upon these comparatively trivial matters, we proceed to state that there are other changes more essential, which the author has forborne to make, in reconstructing his argument. This naturally leads us to the merits of the work, and to a statement of our general judgment with respect to it. That judgment is, that in this little volume are contained the materials for a perfect refutation of the bishop's tract. We are deliberately of opinion, that not one of his arguments is without its answer, either direct or indirect. And while we thus judge of the argument, as a whole, it gives us pleasure to add, that its details are, for the most part, highly satisfactory. This is especially the case, with respect to the usage of official titles, and the proofs of episcopacy drawn from forced interpretations of detached expressions. Much of this matter, we believe, is new, and it affords convincing evidence of the author's careful study of the inspired text. With some of his exegetical remarks we are not entirely satisfied: but this is not the place to state objections, nor, if stated, would they materially detract from the truth of the general judgment just expressed. The plan of Mr. Barnes's work is this. The volume is divided into four



unequal chapters. The first is introductory, designed to show the propriety and necessity of making the argument entirely scriptural. The reasons given are, because the whole subject is one of mere revelation; because the Fathers are without divine authority to decide the question; because the word of God requires the appeal to be made to itself; because the Fathers were not in a situation to afford the necessary knowledge; because the decision of the question, by their aid, is practically impossible; and because the propriety of appealing exclusively to scripture is conceded by eminent episcopal authorities, and especially by Bishop Onderdonk. The second chapter is a brief but comprehensive statement of episcopal pretensions; and the third, which constitutes the body of the work, a refutation of them. The three claims here examined are the claims to the exclusive right of ordination, confirmation, and disciplinary supervision. With respect to the first, the argument is two-fold, first, that the apostles had no exclusive right of ordination, and secondly, that they have no successors. The distinctive function of the apostolic office is made to consist in attesting the resurrection of Christ, in proof of which the author appeals to the account of the election of Matthias, to other incidental statements in the Acts of the Apostles, and to the case of Paul. That the Apostles, as such, had no successors, is maintained upon the two-fold ground, that no succession is required, predicted or asserted in scripture, and that no provision is there made to secure it. Under the former head, the burden of proof is shown to rest on the affirmative side of the question. Under the latter, there is a detailed examination of the proofs derived by our opponents from the cases of Matthias, Barnabas, James, Andronicus and Junia, Timothy, Titus, the elders of Ephesus, and the angels of the seven churches. To this negative argument, the author adds another, drawn from the practical concessions of episcopalians, and the express testimony of Hooker and Whately. With respect to the right or rite of confirmation (which two words the author seems occasionally to confound,) he states the adverse doctrine, shows that the rite has no divine authority, urges some common-place objections to it, and, which we think much more important, exposes the absurdity of the arguments founded on the word *confirm*, and the laying on of hands by the apostles. With respect to the right of super-

vision and discipline, he goes into a detailed examination of the cases in Ephesus and Corinth, which are alleged in proof of the opposite doctrine. Having thus disposed of the episcopal pretensions, the author states, in a positive form, what he believes to have been the organization of the apostolic church. This forms the subject of the fourth and last chapter, where he treats, first, of the officers of the apostolic church, whether temporary, as apostles, prophets, deaconesses, and "the seventy;" or permanent, as bishops, otherwise called preachers, pastors, teachers, evangelists, ruling elders, and deacons. He then considers the powers of these officers and of the church, and undertakes to show, that Presbyters ordained, and that the churches were empowered to administer discipline. To these sections another is added, intended to show that the primitive churches were organized without a prelate, and without three orders of clergy.

We have already expressed a favourable opinion of this plan, in the general. It is not, however, free from all objection. The chapter on confirmation seems to us misplaced, and rather to impair than increase the strength of the whole argument. The *right* of confirmation is a very trifling part of what is claimed by bishops; and as to the *rite* of confirmation, its lawfulness, expediency, and scriptural authority, this is not a question between us and Episcopalians, as such, since other reformed churches have retained the usage. Its decision, therefore, does not necessarily affect that of the general controversy. And we are more and more disposed to regard the labour spent upon collateral questions, as not only fruitless, with respect to the main point at issue, but as positively doing harm, by distracting the attention, and obscuring the true *status quaestionis*. Such discussions may be highly useful in a separate form. We question nothing but their relevancy in an argument against the exclusive claims of episcopal church government. It does not follow, because confirmation is unscriptural, that episcopacy is so likewise; nor, on the other hand, because that rite is of apostolic origin, that none but prelates can administer it. This makes the case of confirmation wholly different from that of ordination, the power to perform which is essential to orderly succession in the ministry. Other objections to the plan of the treatise have occurred to us, but of minor importance, and relating chiefly to minute points of arrangement, with

which it is not necessary to detain the reader. We shall, therefore, proceed to state some points of a more general nature, in which we differ from the author, and regard his argument as less effective than it might have been. The first of these is one of great importance, and lies very near the foundation of the system. We mean the precise relation borne by the apostles to the church, and the distinction which existed between them and other ministers. Bishop Onderdonk maintains, that the apostles, as ministers, or office-bearers in the church, were superior to Presbyters, and that their distinctive right was that of ordination. Mr. Barnes, not content with disproving, as he clearly does, the latter of these propositions, denies the former also, and maintains, if we correctly understand him, that the apostles had no ministerial superiority to Presbyters, but were distinguished from them, merely as witnesses of Christ's resurrection, and as being clothed with miraculous powers. We are not sure that the latter was meant by the author to be included, as one of the distinctive signs of an apostle. This seems to be implied in some of his arguments, but is not, we think, explicitly asserted. In either case, there can be no doubt, that the author denies the ministerial superiority of the apostles. There is, indeed, some confusion and obscurity of language upon this point. In some parts of his argument he seems to deny merely the exclusive right of ordination, as belonging to the apostolic office. If this were all, we should have nothing to urge in the way of objection. It is demonstrable, that Presbyters, as such, ordained, during the lifetime of the primitive apostles. But this view of the author's intention is at variance with the general scope and tenor of his argument. He evidently builds his opposition to the alleged superiority of the bishops as successors of the apostles, upon the two facts, that they have no successors, and that they were not superior to Presbyters, as ministers, or rulers of the church. Now this last is one of the positions, taken in the original review of Onderdonk's tract, which we could have wished to see better defended or abandoned altogether. We are persuaded that it will strike most readers as a paradox, and thereby injure the effect of the whole argument, even of those parts which have no dependence on it, as is happily the case with such as we consider most essential. It is no small advantage to the side, which we, with Mr. Barnes, espouse in this dispute, that it is free from paradoxical hy-

potheses, gratuitous assumptions, and constrained interpretations. As a general thing, it takes the language of the scripture in its obvious meaning, and supplies comparatively nothing by conjecture or tradition. Now this is an advantage which we cannot well afford to lose; one which we cannot throw away, without the sacrifice of that strong hold which our views have always had upon the great mass of intelligent and independent minds, as doctrines which appeal to common sense, and make no use of ingenious subtleties and specious paradoxes. We are much afraid, however, that this last description is the highest praise that can be justly given to Mr. Barnes's doctrine, that the apostles, as ministers or rulers of the church, had no superiority to Presbyters. We believe that such superiority appears, not only to ourselves, but to the vast majority of those who read the scriptures, as scarcely less clear than the existence of a ministry at all. It does seem to us that a continuous perusal of the New Testament, with an eye to the question of church government, would leave no fact more distinctly and prominently impressed upon the memory, than the fact, that the apostles, as apostles, possessed and exercised a controlling power over the organization and government of the primitive church, restricted by no local bounds, and wholly independent of that local government by Presbyters, which they introduced and left behind them, as the only ordinary permanent *régime*, to which the church, after their departure, was to be subjected. We believe, that elders exercised the highest powers of ordinary government, within local bounds, but that in order to invest them with those powers, and to bring that system into operation, the apostles were invested with a general ambulatory power of government and discipline, as distinct from the parochial rule of elders, as it is unlike the diocesan rule of modern bishops. With this hypothesis the whole tone and tenor of the New Testament perfectly agree. It solves all cases of apostolical interference in the government of particular churches. It is one of the few points, on which Episcopalians and their opponents have been commonly agreed, owing, as we suppose, to the clearness with which the truth appeared, to both sides, to be taught in scripture. We cannot, therefore, see it given up or denied, without demanding evidence far more conclusive than any which the author now before us has adduced.

From the strength of these expressions, and of the



conviction which they indicate, it may be inferred that we regard this error as vitiating the whole argument in which it is included. The inference is natural. We are bound to explain, therefore, how it is that this result does not really follow. In order, to do so, we must refer to the main doctrine of episcopacy, which our author is opposing. It is this, that bishops are superior to Presbyters, as the successors of the primitive apostles. Here are two propositions in the form of one; first, that the apostles were, as ministers, superior to Presbyters; second, that modern bishops have succeeded them in all their rights. If either of these can be disproved, the other may be granted, without affecting the conclusion. We should have been disposed to grant the first, and controvert the second. Mr. Barnes has chosen to deny both; but his denial of the first cannot, of course, weaken his argument against the second, which is in itself and independently conclusive. Since he has proved to our satisfaction, that the apostolic office was a temporary one, we care comparatively little for his error, as we cannot but regard it, with respect to the peculiar rights and functions of that office. The question, after all, on which the controversy hinges, is the permanent or temporary design of the apostleship. On this part of the subject, Mr. Barnes not only reasons learnedly and ably, but proceeds upon a sure and incontestable hypothesis. His argument, as to its essential features, therefore, is not vitiated by what we believe to be the error now in question. At the same time, we should have been pleased if subsequent research had led him at least to modify his former views, so far as to leave the question of apostolical superiority an open one among those who, on every other point of any moment, are prepared to abide by the doctrines here propounded. There is another fault, which may be charged upon this little work, in common with most other writings on the same side of the question. It does not state so distinctly, nor expose so fully, as the interests of truth appear to us to require, the *πρωτον ψευδος* of the adverse doctrine, the assumption that church government, external organization, is a matter of primary moment in the Christian system, and the chief security for truth and holiness. This being assumed, it is no wonder that men grope for the obscurest hints and most ambiguous indications of a certain polity, although the general tone and the express declarations of the scripture

do unquestionably teach us to regard church government as something, not indeed without importance, but of derivative and secondary moment. One of the most essential facts, in reference to this whole subject, is the silence and comparative indifference of scripture, as to those things which by some are now exalted to an equality with the weightier matters of the law and gospel. The advocate of Presbytery often errs by trying to dam up some particular stream from this fountain of error, while the fountain itself continues unobstructed. Some merely close one channel for the sake of opening another, and commit the same mistake, in their defence of the true system, which those whom they oppose commit, in vindication of a false one. When they ought to be destroying the foundations of error, they are merely trying to renew the superstructure. This is often the result of an impatient feeling, produced by false and arrogant pretension, on the part of others. Men are naturally disposed to say, we have stood long enough on the defensive; let us assert our own rights more boldly. But we regard it as a strong proof that Presbyterians are in the right, as to this matter, that their position is a defensive one, and that their aim is to pull down unscriptural pretensions, without erecting others in their room. They are indeed, under strong temptations to assume a higher ground, and to maintain, not only the divine right, but the binding and exclusive obligation of the Presbyterian system. By so doing, they would be enabled to retort the taunts of their opponents, and resist their vain assumptions upon equal terms. But this is a temptation to be manfully resisted, as it has been, in our own day, with astonishing success. Patient resistance to unscriptural pretensions, not by substituting others of the same kind, but by showing the absurdity of all, is an important part of our vocation. Those especially who undertake to controvert the claims of prelacy, should guard themselves against this insidious error, and make it an essential part of their performance to exhibit clearly both the letter and the spirit of the New Testament, as to the comparative importance of mere polity and organization. By doing this more fully and directly, we believe that Mr. Barnes would have rendered better service to the cause which he maintains, than by gratuitous assurances that this is not a controversy, or, at least, that his share of it is not controversial.

With these exceptions, the importance of which we are

very far from wishing to exaggerate, the little work before us may be safely recommended, as a seasonable, able and successful contribution to the cause of truth, and an additional answer to the tract of Bishop Onderdonk. We say additional, because that argument has been already indirectly answered, in every exhibition of the truth upon this subject, since its first appearance. The cry that it has never been, and never can be answered, will no doubt continue; and so far as this cry may affect the minds of Presbyterians unacquainted with the merits of the case, it is an evil. For the benefit of such we may observe, before we close, that they are apt to misconceive the true state of the controversy, by imagining that all which is maintained on one side is denied upon the other. It is not to be forgotten that a large extent of ground is common to both parties, and that where they differ, they differ in the conclusions which they draw from the same premises. In the Bishop's tract, for instance, no small space is occupied in stating propositions which no Presbyterian disputes, and only the remainder filled with inferences which all Presbyterians utterly deny. It may be natural, but surely is not rational, to argue, that because no one attempts to call in question that which all believe, the residue is equally beyond a doubt. If a member of a legislative body should propose a long preamble, full of truth and common sense, but followed by a resolution, which the majority regarded as absurd, could it be said, that no one had been able to refute his argument, because no one attempted to disprove the truths, on which the falsehood was gratuitously grafted? Now the grand merit of the tract in question, as a specimen of controversial writing, lies in the peculiar tact, with which the author superadds what we regard as illogical and false conclusions to a string of undeniable premises. To refute it is to show the gratuitous and arbitrary nature of the inference, and this has repeatedly been done; but because the truths, and even truisms, which occupy a large part of the work, are not refuted also, we may expect to hear it called unanswerable *ad infinitum*. Another circumstance, which favours this deception, is the fact, that the conclusions drawn from undisputed premises are not only illogical, but in many cases so peculiarly fantastical, as to be quite intangible to argument, and *de facto* incapable of refutation. When, for instance, one man sees, in the commission to the twelve apostles after our Saviour's resurrec-

tion, their promotion to a new rank in the ministry, and insists on this as an argument in favour of episcopacy, we, who can see no such thing there, are reduced to the necessity of meeting the assertion with a simple negative. Now this is precisely the character of nearly all the Bishop's arguments. He has certainly exhibited surprising ingenuity in giving such a shape to his reasonings as render it, in this sense, impossible to touch them. By this means he has given to himself, and to the cause which he espouses, the advantage of appearing to be left without reply, because, in a majority of cases, a bare negation is the only answer possible. It matters not how often this negative is repeated, nor how fully it may tally with the unsophisticated judgment of most readers. So long as there is not a detailed and formal refutation of the premises, as well as the conclusion, it must go for nothing with that class of readers, from whom the cry in question commonly proceeds. A refutation, which would satisfy such minds, we acknowledge to be as impossible as a demonstration on astronomical principles that "the man in the moon" has no real existence. To the argument, that he is there because men think they see him there, the only answer is that we do not see him, and therefore he is not there. To us this is conclusive, but to others it is not so: and by such our negation will of course be regarded as a mere evasion meant to cover our retreat. Between such parties all debate is idle, and we feel no more disposed to quarrel with one man for believing that he finds high-church principles in the scripture, than with another for believing that he sees the man in the moon. And yet as there are other minds, to which a correct knowledge of what has been ascertained as to the surface of that planet would be a sure preventive of their ever taking up with the vulgar superstition of the man in the moon, so there are minds, from which the high-church doctrines may forever be excluded, by a clear exhibition of the principles of church organization as revealed in scripture. So far as Mr. Barnes has contributed to such an exhibition, he will, no doubt, have the satisfaction of allaying nascent doubt and quieting uneasy apprehensions, not arising from the force or plausibility of argument, but merely from the boldness and persistency with which the most unfounded claims may be habitually urged.

Having been led to make some observations on the present state of the episcopal controversy, we shall avail our-



selves of the occasion to suggest a few additional considerations on that subject, not with any view to a disussion of the merits of the question, but for a purpose scarcely less important, that of calling the attention of our readers, and especially of those who have not watched the progress of the controversy in its recent stages, to its actual posture, and the relative position of the parties, at the present moment. This is by no means a matter of mere curiosity. A due appreciation of the arguments, on both sides of this question, depends more than some may be disposed to think, upon accurate acquaintance with the grounds, the conditions, and the previous incidents, of the dispute. We have already hinted at a seeming disposition, on the part of some who advocate episcopal pretensions, to make much of alleged changes in the ground assumed by us, while, at the same time, they allow the public to imagine, that the position of the other side has undergone no alteration. We have also seen, with some surprise, that certain Presbyterian writers tacitly concede the truth of this assumption, by treating episcopacy, even in attacking it, as one indivisible invariable system. The injurious effect of this mistake is twofold. In the first place, it unjustly yields to our opponents the advantage which invariably attaches to consistent uniformity, compared with vacillation and caprice. And in the next place, it enables them, by showing as they may easily do, the irrelevance of certain Presbyterian arguments, if aimed at one phase of episcopal opinion, to persuade many credulous or careless readers, that they are equally irrelevant, in reference to every other, or rather that there is no other form of the episcopal theory, against which the arguments in question can be urged. To this advantage our neighbours have no right, and we propose to deprive them of it, by a simple statement of the facts, as they exist. So far, then, is the name *Episcopacy* from denoting a determinate, invariable, system of opinion, even on the subject of church-government, that it includes extremes the most remote and contradictory. Of this sufficient evidence is afforded by the popular distinction between High Church and Low Church, both in England and this country. Without, however, undertaking to determine the specific difference between these celebrated titles, and the sects or parties which they severally designate, we shall proceed to set before the reader a still more nicely graduated scale of subdivisions among those who glory in the common title of

Episcopalian. At the bottom of this scale, not in point of common sense or moral worth, but of pretension and exclusiveness, we place the few Episcopalians in England, and the fewer still in these United States, who seem to be such by mere accident or force of outward circumstances, and who are so indifferent to all distinctive principles and forms, that they could pass into a different communion, with scarcely any conscious sacrifice of sentiment or inclination. We do not vouch for the existence even of a solitary specimen of this kind in America, unless imported from the mother country, where we can testify to its existence, at no very distant date. Next above these, upon the principle of graduation which we have propounded, must be rated those Episcopalians, who decidedly prefer their own to every other church organization, but exclusively upon the ground of taste, association, or expediency. Above these is another class who, in addition to the reasons just recited, or instead of them, prefer episcopacy on the ground of its superior antiquity and apostolic origin, without, however, urging it on others as obligatory. Next to these are such as teach not only that episcopal church-government is ancient and of apostolic origin, but also that it is enjoined in scripture, and that those who hold to any other form are guilty of a culpable departure from the rule there given; but without ascribing to this sin the power to annul the virtue of all ministerial acts, and the claim of those communions, which are guilty of it, to be recognized as branches of the Christian church. Another step upon the ladder brings us to a class distinguished from the one preceding by its doing what the latter refuses to do, insisting on episcopacy as essential to the being of a church, and making this the summary and final test of any man's relation to God's "covenanted mercies." This is essentially the highest rank attainable, in theoretical or practical exclusiveness; and yet within it there is still a subdivision into those who make allowances for providential breaches of succession, and for times of ignorance at which the churchman, by divine example, is allowed to wink, and those who, by maintaining the perpetual, absolute, and indispensable necessity of this organization to the being of a church at all, have reached the last round of the ladder, the sublime of nonsense. Here are six distinguishable classes, all Episcopalians, that is, all believing in diocesan episcopacy, so far as practically to prefer it, and yet differing among them-

selves, as to some essential principles, more widely than some of them differ from any Presbyterian whatever. It may be said, indeed, that these distinctions have relation merely to the motives, which induce a preference of episcopacy, while the system is itself the same in every case, the episcopacy under which low-churchmen live being precisely that to which their high-church brethren are more zealously attached. But although this is true, with respect to Episcopalians themselves, there is no small difference between the phases, which we have described, when considered in relation to the controversy between them and others. The diversity of grounds, on which the several classes plead for their favourite church-organization, enables skilful disputants, on that side of the question, to elude the force of many arguments, by interchanging the hypotheses, assumed by the different schools or parties, whenever a logical necessity for that manœuvre suddenly arises. Thus the man who has been arguing for the necessity of this organization, as the only safe one, because the only one as he says sanctioned by apostolical example, is no sooner met with arguments, which go to prove the want of such example, than he skips to the adjacent ground of those who plead for its expediency and salutary influence, and there pursues the fight as if he never had been standing upon any other spot. It is in vain that we call for proofs of its apostolic origin, or bring proofs of its recent date. Be it so, says the opponent, but behold the blessed influence of this *régime* upon the churches which live under it. Begin to call this fact in question, and before you can array your proof, the nimble adversary is away upon another point, and answers you by saying that when God commands we must obey, without inquiry into the effects of such obedience. A knowledge of these practices will put it in the power of some readers to estimate more justly, than they otherwise might do, the value of the bold assertions, which they sometimes hear, that such and such arguments are utterly irrelevant and inconclusive. An argument designed to prove, that the episcopal organization is not essential to the being of a church, is certainly not relevant, much less conclusive, against the *lawfulness* of that organization. Yet by mutual substitution, and by suddenly changing the mark after the arrow is discharged, the minds of many are so far confused as to imagine, that because a course of reasoning does not prove what it was never meant to prove,

it does not prove the very point it was intended to establish.

But it is not merely the diversity of principle among Episcopalians that we wish to bring before the reader, but the singular discrepancy which exists, among those holding the same doctrine on the subject, as to the mode, in which the truth of their opinions is to be established. We have seen that some prefer episcopacy as the most salutary system of church-government; some as the most ancient; some as obligatory; some as essential to the being of a church. It might, however, be expected, that all those who are agreed in either of the two last propositions, would be equally agreed in resting their belief upon the same authority. But this is very far from being the true state of the case. Of those who are unanimous in making an episcopal organization the test of catholicity, some do so expressly on the ground, that it is clearly taught in scripture, while others, and among them the most strenuous adherents to episcopacy as an indispensable condition, teach, that it is not at all enjoined in scripture, and employ this fact, as a convincing proof, that some of the most sacred duties are made known to us exclusively by catholic tradition. Yet nothing is more common than to find the authority and arguments of one of these two classes wielded against those who are assailing the opinions of the other. It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader that between these two schools of high-church episcopacy, there is a more irreconcilable variance of principle, than between one of them and their common enemy. An Episcopalian and a Presbyterian, however zealous for their respective systems, may agree in acknowledging the word of God as the supreme and final arbiter of their disputes. If so, the points of difference between them are as nothing in comparison with those of mutual agreement. But the points of difference between the two sorts of Episcopalians here referred to, are of such a nature, that the one can succeed in establishing its own position only by subverting the position of the other. The Puseyite cannot possibly demonstrate, that episcopacy, though divine in origin and absolutely binding, is known to be so only by tradition, without thereby disproving, that its necessity is taught in scripture. Yet these antipodes are brought together, and familiarly referred to, as near neighbours, when the object is to magnify the triumphs of episcopacy and the discomfiture of its opponents. This kind of misrepresentation may, in certain



cases, be the result of controversial artifice, but we are well persuaded that with many, and especially with some who deal most largely in colloquial discussions of the subject, it arises from sheer ignorance, an innocent persuasion, that the name "Episcopacy" guarantees the unity of all who bear it, and that when its champions turn their arms against each other, all the blood that flows, though on the same side of the battle-field, is that of enemies, and all the victories achieved in this inglorious and suicidal contest between one Episcopalian and another, are so many triumphs over the unhappy Presbyterians. Here, then, is another most instructive fact, which we advise the reader to bear constantly in mind, and use upon occasion, to wit, that the advantages, which prelatists so loudly boast of having gained in controversy, are, in many cases, nothing more than the advantages which one kind of episcopacy gains over another, to the disgrace and injury of both.

But let us look a little further into this imaginary unity. Let us single out that class, which we have spoken of, as holding the necessity and imperative obligation of the system, but on scriptural authority. Here, at last, we might expect to meet with some degree of uniformity. But even here, we find the same contrariety of principle and argument. Between the doctrine that the "bishops" of the New Testament were bishops in the modern sense, and the doctrine that they were Presbyters, there is not only a marked difference, but irreconcilable repugnance. If, indeed, it were a question of mere names and technicalities, upon a common basis or hypothesis of facts, the variation might be trivial. But let it be observed that the position to be proved, is that a superior order of clergy is essential to the full organization of the church, because such an order is distinctly recognized in scripture, as a part of the system originally instituted. Let it also be observed, that we are now speaking of those who profess to rest exclusively upon the testimony of the scriptures. That is to say, they insist on the necessity of 'bishops' in the modern sense, because the original existence of that order is so clearly taught in scripture. We ask where, and one voice answers, in the various passages which speak of 'bishops,' while another simultaneously replies, in those which speak of the apostleship as permanent. If, in reply to one of these assertions, you proceed to show that the primitive presbyters and bishops were identical, you are

charged with a misrepresentation of the ground on which 'episcopacy' (one and indivisible) maintains that the necessity of bishops is revealed in scripture. Sometimes, the tone assumed is that of virtuous indignation at the *malu fides*, which could lead even a polemic to suppress the fact, that 'episcopacy' entertains no such opinion. Unable to resist the shock of this severe reproof, you tacitly admit your error, and prepare to combat what has just been stated as the genuine episcopal hypothesis, by showing that the apostolic office is a temporary one, when you are coolly asked what bearing that can have upon the question, since the formularies of the church itself, in the ordination offices, both English and American, identify the 'bishops,' not with the apostles, but with the ἐπίσκοποι of the New Testament. And this you find to be the simple truth. The Church of England, and its daughters, do undoubtedly, in most emphatic terms, interpret what is said in scripture of the qualifications for the office of a bishop, as applying to the case of a diocesan prelate. For if this is not really implied in the appointment of those passages as lessons at the consecration of a 'bishop,' that appointment is either a deliberate perversion of the scriptures, or a tacit acknowledgment that they contain no account of the qualifications for the most essential office in the church. Here is another fact, to which we invite the attention of our Presbyterian readers; the fact that when Episcopalians claim the praise of having proved that their prelates are the successors of the primitive apostles, and not of the primitive bishops, they are really charging their own church with error, and denouncing some of her most solemn offices as palpably unscriptural.

It would be easy to pursue this subject further, and to show what complex contradictions have been introduced into the theories of some high-church Episcopalians by the rise and spread of Oxford new light. An ambitious eagerness to seize and to appropriate the grand results of these astonishing discoveries, has blended with a no less strong desire to hold fast the old-fashioned high-church doctrines, so as to produce an effect absolutely ludicrous, and none the less so as the new views thus adopted and engrafted on the old ones, have been sometimes only half intelligible to the catechumen. In addition to the large class of discrepancies thus produced, we might proceed to show the total want of uniformity among Episcopalians as to the nature of the ministry itself, of ordination, and of apostolical succession; some denying the

transmission of official grace through a series of incumbents, others affirming it; some ascribing to the bishop the apostolic power of conferring the Holy Ghost, which others understand to have been temporary merely; some making all the orders equally essential to the ministry, while others give that honour to the bishop only; some allowing to presbyters, as such, the right of government, in due subordination to the bishop, while others clothe the latter with exclusive powers of discipline, and some even go so far as to make all the official acts of presbyters derive their efficacy from the bishop, whose agents and representatives they are. We have no doubt, that a detail of this kind would abundantly suffice to show, that the most familiar terms in the episcopal vocabulary may have not only different but inconsistent meanings, in the mouths and books of different Episcopalians. As a 'practical improvement' of these facts it cannot be amiss, for those who pay attention to this controversy, always to observe, when anything is said, as to the doctrines or achievements of 'episcopacy,' which of the Episcopalian sects it is that speaks or writes, in order to determine what the language means.

If it be said that Presbyterians are equally divided, we deny it, and maintain that the appearance of disunion has arisen in a great measure, from the injudicious mode, already censured, of exhibiting our doctrines. Presbyterian writers have too often cast their statements of the truth in moulds furnished by their adversaries. To a complex system of unscriptural pretensions, they have sometimes opposed a scheme far more scriptural but little less complex. They have taken the details of episcopacy out of their frames and niches, and attempted to fill these up with something better. But in making this attempt, they have disagreed among themselves, in consequence of having loaded the essential principle, in which they were agreed, with arbitrary and conventional minutiae of mere detail. As soon as any one perceives, as most enlightened Presbyterians do now, that these details are separable from their fundamental doctrine, and that this is eminently simple, the appearance of disunion vanishes. A characteristic difference between the Presbyterian and Episcopal hypotheses, however the latter may be modified, is this, that the one asserts a great deal and proves little, while the other, like the scriptures, asserts little and proves all. The essential doctrine of our system of church government is this, that God has entrusted the ad-

ministration of his word, his sacraments, and the discipline of his house, to A MINISTRY, whose right to act is therefore a divine one, though bestowed for the benefit of the church at large ; that this divinely constituted ministry is ONE, possessing in itself all the powers necessary for its own maintenance and propagation ; and that all divisions and gradations which exist within this ONE MINISTRY, although not necessarily unlawful, are of human institution, and cannot be obligatory, much less essential to the being of a church. In short, the Presbyterian principle is that of A DIVINELY INSTITUTED MINISTRY, in opposition to no ministry at all, or one deriving its authority from men, and of ONE MINISTRY in opposition to two, three, or more, jointly or severally requisite to constitute a Christian church. On these points all Presbyterians are agreed. On these points let them be contented to insist. Collateral and minor points are proper subjects of investigation and discussion by themselves ; but in relation to our controversy with Episcopalians—and it is of this exclusively that we are speaking—our strength lies in simply and distinctly setting forth the few essential principles which we maintain, in contrast with the fanciful and complicated theories which we oppose. The attempt to strengthen such a demonstration by asserting the divine right of ‘synodical and classical assemblies,’ in all points as they are among ourselves, or disproving that of surplices, and liturgies, and confirmation, must impair the strength of our defences by concealing them, by overlaying them with things good in themselves, but forming no part of the naked rock, on which our fortress is immovably established. The more we can make that rock stand out to view, in its impregnable simplicity, the more effectually shall we make the weakness of all other systems to appear ; and this is the defensive method, which we have already, in this article, so strongly recommended ; not a mere resistance to each petty effort made against us, but a continued and repeated exhibition of the truth, as it is taught in scripture, taking just as much pains not to add, as not to take away, from that which we believe to be essential. A direct exhibition of the truth thus made, necessarily includes a refutation of all opposite errors, and its bearing upon this result might easily be pointed out, with far more effect than could be looked for, from an empirical reply, in form, to every jumble of incongruous objections, which our adversaries may think fit to throw together. With these desultory hints to such as



may be called to buckle on their armour in this warfare, we dismiss the subject till another opportunity.

---

ART. V.—*The General Assembly of 1843.*

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, met, agreeably to appointment, in the Central Presbyterian church in the city of Philadelphia, on Thursday, the 18th of May, A. D. 1843, at 11 o'clock, A. M.; and (Dr. Edgar, the moderator of the last Assembly being absent) was opened with a sermon by the Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge, D. D., from Acts xv. 14. "Simeon hath declared how God, at the first, did visit the gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name."

After the sermon, Dr. Breckinridge, being the last moderator present, took the chair and opened the session with prayer. Dr. Breckinridge presided at the organization of the Assembly, according to the precedent set some years since at Pittsburgh, when it was decided that, in case of the absence of the moderator of the preceding Assembly, the last moderator present, whether in commission or not, was the proper person to preside until a new moderator was chosen. In our Form of Government, ch. 12, §. 7. it is said, "The General Assembly shall meet at least once every year, on the day appointed for the purpose, the moderator of the last Assembly, if present, or in case of his absence, some other minister shall open the meeting with a sermon, and preside until a new moderator be chosen." This rule seems inconsistent with the usage under which Dr. Breckinridge acted; and as cases might arise in which it would be a matter of importance to decide who was the proper person to preside at the opening of the Assembly, the committee of Bills and Overtures reported the following preamble and resolution, which were adopted, as we are informed, unanimously:

"Whereas there exists a difference of opinion as to the proper person to open the session of the General Assembly, in the case the moderator of the Assembly, immediately preceding, be not present; therefore,

"*Resolved*, That it is the deliberate judgment of this General Assembly, that by the Constitution of our church, no per-

son is authorised to open the sessions of the General Assembly, or to preside at the opening of the said sessions, except the moderator of the Assembly immediately preceding, or, in case of his absence, a commissioner to the General Assembly, selected for the purpose, by the other commissioners met at the time and place fixed for such meeting." This resolution was obviously not designed to censure Dr. Breckinridge, the propriety of whose action in the premises, being agreeable to usage, was universally conceded.

After the Assembly had been called to order, the permanent clerk reported the roll of commissioners in attendance, the whole number of whom, including those subsequently reported, was one hundred and fifty-nine.

### *Disputed Elections.*

The committee of elections reported in the case of the Rev. David M. Smith, that it appeared to the satisfaction of the committee, that the Presbytery of Columbia, failed to form a quorum at the time appointed for their stated spring meeting; that there were present two ministers and ruling elders from a majority of the churches; that those present requested the Assembly to receive Mr. Smith as their commissioner, in which request two of the absent ministers have expressed their concurrence in writing; and that it is believed the appointment of Mr. Smith would have been unanimous had the Presbytery formed a quorum. In view of these facts the Assembly decided that Mr. Smith could not, agreeably to the Constitution, be admitted to a seat. On the one hand it was urged that the Presbytery being a permanent body, might express its will, if not regularly as to form, at least substantially and effectively, even when not in session; that as the will of the Presbytery constituted the essence of a commission, we have in the present case all that is essential; and that the reception of Mr. Smith, could afford no precedent for the reception of commissioners when the will of the Presbytery appointing them was not satisfactorily known. On the other hand, it was contended, that although a Presbytery is a permanent body, it can only act when in session; that the assent of the several members of our national congress to any legislative measure, would have no force, unless that assent was given when the body was regularly convened; that the Assembly had no authority to set aside the express prescriptions of the Constitution, and that all precedents which violate important principles are dangerous.

*Board of Foreign Missions.*

On Tuesday morning, the 23rd, the Anniversary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, was celebrated in the General Assembly. Walter Lowrie, Esq., Corresponding Secretary of the Board, presented the Annual Report, and made some extended remarks thereon, reviewing in brief, the operations of the Board during the past year, and those proposed for the current year. During the year one missionary has been sent to Lodiaua, three to Western Africa, and one to the Creek Indians. Mr. Lowrie gave a brief history of the prospects of each of the Missions, and he dwelt especially upon the importance of a Mission to China, and the immediate establishment of stations at Hong Kong, Amoy, Ningpo, and Chusan; with eight missionaries, one physician, and a printer. To accomplish this, the sum of \$20,000 a year would be required for a few years. The Rev. Professor Green, Dr. Leland, and Rev. Mr. Murray addressed the Assembly in behalf of the objects of the Board.

Mr. Lowrie, the Secretary of the Board, stated that the receipts, during the past year, from all sources, were \$56,159 95, from which deducting discounts and balances of last year, \$54,308 89 were left for the services of the year. During the same period, the expenditures amounted to \$54,374 31, leaving a balance against the Treasury of \$65 42. Also, \$3,000 had been received from the Bible Society towards printing the Sacred Scriptures in the North India, and \$2,200 from the American Tract Society, for printing approved Religious Tracts in the same country.

The committee to whom the report of this Board was committed reported first as to the operations of the Board and secondly as to the method of obtaining funds. On the former branch of the subject, they submitted the following propositions which were adopted.

“The General Assembly recognise, with a solemn sense of obligation, with unfeigned gratitude, and with mingled emotions of humiliation and hope, the great work of giving the gospel to the world, committed to our church, in part, by her exalted head, and conducted by the Board of Foreign Missions. And they acknowledge that they are bound to persevere and increase in this work of faith and labour of love. Approving the management of this department of Christian effort as exhibited in the report, and hoping an enlargement of exertion, and an increase of success will be

recorded during the current year, they adopt the following resolutions.

1. *Resolved*, That the Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Missions be approved, and referred to the Executive Committee for publication.

2. *Resolved*, That it is exceedingly important to enlarge and strengthen the Missions of our Church at almost every point both with additional laborers and increased means of usefulness; and, if the door shall be open, to establish other Missions during the present year.

3. *Resolved*, That Missions among the Indian tribes on our western border have a peculiar claim on the church in our land.

“In the view of this Assembly no pastor discharges his whole duty who neglects to enlighten and impress his people in regard to their duty on the great subject of Foreign Missions. Therefore

4. *Resolved*, That much good has been found by experience to result from the circulation of the missionary papers of the Board among the churches. It is therefore urged upon pastors and benevolent individuals to diffuse as widely as possible among our churches these papers, and especially the Foreign Missionary Chronicle, the price of which is so low as to bring it within the reach of all.

5. *Resolved*, That particular attention ought to be given to the training of our children and youth in the Sabbath Schools and churches in the knowledge and love of the Missionary cause.

“And whereas the great empire of China is in the providence of God open to the Christian missionary, and the wide-spread moral desolations of that ancient people present strong and pressing claims for the bread of life; and whereas qualified men are prepared to go on this errand of love and mercy, and are only waiting till the necessary means be afforded,

6. *Resolved*, That the claims of China be and they hereby are presented to the prayers and the liberal support of the churches; and without deciding in favour of a special effort, the General Assembly do hereby authorize the Board to receive donations from individuals and from churches, in aid of this mission; but they would remind the churches that the wants of China, great and pressing as they are, ought not to be supplied at the expense of existing missions, and that these can only be sustained, and at the same time, the mission to China carried forward, by a support increased and enlarged above that of previous years.”

When the committee reported on “the method of obtaining funds,” their report was referred to Messrs. Hoge, Murray, Janeway, Green and Atkinson, to report to the next Assembly.

#### *Board of Domestic Missions.*

On Wednesday morning, the 24th of May, the anniversary of the Board of Domestic Missions was held in the General Assembly. The Rev. Dr. Wm. A. McDowell,



Secretary of the Board presented the annual report, of which the following is a brief abstract.

“The number of missionaries now in the field is two hundred and ninety-six, who have laboured in twenty-three states—and fifteen to twenty are strictly itinerants. The number of persons admitted on examination to the communion of the church, during the year was three thousand six hundred, and on certificate from other churches four thousand eight hundred. Fifty new churches have been organized, and extensive preparations are being made to organize others. Seventy houses of worship have either been built, or are now building. There are nine hundred schools, in which upwards of thirty thousand children are taught. The temperance cause is progressing. The past year has been one of exertion eminently blessed by the Lord—revivals have been numerous, general and powerful. The receipts at the treasuries at Philadelphia, Louisville, and Pittsburgh, and other sources, during the year, was \$35,760 99 the total disbursements, \$29,999 41; and the balance on hand is \$3,761 55. Checks are in hand and drafts now due, however, which will more than consume the balance. The engagements for the ensuing year are very extensive, and the demand for funds will be greater than during any preceding year.”

On the recommendation of the committee, to whom this report was referred, the following resolutions were adopted.

1. *Resolved*, That in view of the facts disclosed in the report, the marked success which has attended the efforts of the Board during the past year, this Assembly is emphatically called on to record its gratitude to the great Head of the Church, who has thus honoured his word, and glorified His gospel through their instrumentality.

2. That the sustaining in the whitening fields of missionary labour, of more than three hundred ministers bringing unto dying men the Bread of Life; the additions unto the Church of our Redeemer, through their instrumentality of between four and five thousand souls—the organization of fifty new churches—the erection of not less than seventy houses of worship, and the catechetical Sabbath school instruction of more than thirty thousand children and youth; all demonstrate the importance of the Board, and its utility as an agency in extending the Redeemer's kingdom throughout our beloved land. The results of the past year declare in no doubtful manner, the special approbation of the great head of the Church.

3. That the opening before us of yet wider fields of usefulness, and the increasing cry which cometh up alike from the South and the West, the East and the North, call loudly for increased effort, greater self denial, and more earnest prayer: that we may be enabled to meet the exigency of the times, the claims of God, and the calls of dying men beseeching at our hands the gospel, and the ordinances of God's house.

4. That our Presbyteries be recommended to take special order on the subject of Domestic Missions, and annually to inquire particularly, what the several churches are doing in this department of Christian duty and benevolence; and also, specially to inquire into the destitutions within their own bounds; which said destitutions, brought before the Presbytery, and spread under their order, before the churches would, it is believed, constitute the basis of the most effective appeal to the benevolence of the people in behalf of missions generally.

5. That the report of the Board of Missions be approved by the General Assembly, and with its objects and views, be affectionately commended to the attention, and Christian benevolence of the Synods, Presbyteries, Sessions,

and members within our communion ; and that it be returned to the Board for publication.

The subject presented in the fourth of the above resolutions, was more distinctly brought before the Assembly by an overture offered by the Rev. Mr. Atkinson, which was adopted, and is as follows : “ Resolved, That it be enjoined on the Presbyteries, to take such order for the organization of the churches under their care, for a systematic effort to aid in the education of indigent candidates for the ministry, and in the efforts making to spread the glorious gospel of Christ throughout our own country and the world, as will secure the presenting these objects to every member of the church, at least once in every year, and that the Presbyteries require the session of each church to report their diligence herein at every spring meeting.” We beg to be allowed to call the attention of our brethren to this resolution as one of peculiar importance. It is obvious that in order to raise funds for the various necessary operations of the church the great desideratum is to have the claims of these several objects laid before every communicant and worshipper in our churches, that the call may be made to their hearts and consciences to do something for the salvation of their fellow men. How this is to be done is a question which cannot receive at all times, and in all places, the same answer ; but if the Presbyteries would make it a matter of conscience to see that it is done ; or at least, that the representatives of every church under their care should be called on at stated times to report how far they had endeavoured to accomplish this object, we are persuaded that the effect would be such as to gladden the hearts of the people throughout our whole land.

#### *Board of Education.*

The Anniversary of the Board of Education was observed by the General Assembly on Thursday morning, May 25th. The Annual Report was read by the Rev. M. B. Hope, the Corresponding Secretary, and addresses were made by several members. The following is an abstract of the Annual Report.

The Board of Education are enabled, (they trust with humble gratitude,) to report another year of remarkable prosperity. The supply of candidates has not only kept up, but is greater than that of last year, by more than sixteen per cent. : and the Treasury of the Board, has enabled them

promptly to meet every demand upon their funds. The number of candidates received during the year has been one hundred and one, making the whole number aided by the Board, one thousand three hundred and thirty. The number on the roll of the Board for the year just ended has been three hundred and fifty. Of these there were in their theological course, one hundred and sixteen. In colleges, one hundred and forty-two. In academies and private schools, sixty-six. Teaching temporarily, twenty-six. Total three hundred and fifty.

It is but justice to the Church to state, that this is not a full view of her Education statistics. There are scholarships in several institutions, and private foundations for students, which do not report through the Board. The whole number of beneficiaries in connexion with the General Assembly cannot be less than from four hundred to four hundred and fifty.

It is certainly a remarkable fact, that among so considerable a number of young men, there has been no call for discipline, on moral grounds, or defective piety, for the last three years. And within that period, we are not aware of a single case, where a young man has been seduced from the ministry, by the emoluments and honours of any secular profession.

Several causes have contributed to this happy result. Foremost in the number, we reckon that feature of our plan, which places the beneficiary in the solemn relation of a candidate for the ministry, under the care of the presbytery. The Board are sorry to say, that in some presbyteries this plan is not fully adopted, and where it is, the principle of presbyterial responsibility and supervision, is not always fully carried out, as they could desire. They contemplate, however, as soon as other and more pressing duties will permit, to address themselves to the task, of improving and carrying out this plan, with the concurrence of the presbyteries, and under the sanction of the Assembly.

Under the direction of the Board, a pastoral correspondence has been opened between the Corresponding Secretary and the candidates, which has been attended already with the happiest effects and which promises the greatest usefulness. This measure has disclosed the possession on the part of the candidates of a higher range of character, both in talents and piety, and especially in devotion to the Master's service, than we had ventured to expect. The strength of charac-

ter and determined purpose of these sons of the church, in wrestling with poverty, neglect, opposition, and trials of every sort, all borne with perfect cheerfulness—with their faces set like a flint towards the ministry, did not propriety forbid the exposure of their confidential correspondence, would impress the church as it has done the Board, with the inestimable value of the treasure which she possesses, in these candidates for the ministry.

Thirty-three of our candidates have finished their course of study, and are now entering upon the active duties of the ministry: and several others have been licensed to spend another year in study. Two have died, and seven have ceased to need aid.

The Board are gratified to state, that among the number who have finished their course, are two interesting coloured men, who have given great satisfaction during the progress, and since the termination of their studies; and both of whom have gone to Africa, to “proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound” in that oppressed and long benighted land.

The Board feel called upon to render special thanks for the goodness of God to them in regard to their financial affairs. While almost every other institution within our knowledge, has felt the pressure of the times, in the curtailment of its income, they have been blessed with an actual increase of resources fully adequate to the increase of their beneficiaries; and this, too, they are glad to say, agreeably to the hope expressed by the last General Assembly, without any increase of their regular agency.

The General Assembly will sympathize in the gratification felt by the Board in view of the fact, that notwithstanding the peculiar difficulties of the times, the receipts during the year, as shown by the Treasurer’s Report, have been \$29,104 16. And if to this there be added the sum of \$1,300, deposited for convenience in other places, and which has not yet passed through the hands of our Treasurer, it makes the actual receipts over \$30,000—which is an advance of twenty-four per cent. over those of last year, and fifty-one per cent. over those of the year before last: or in other words, the receipts of the Board have increased from nineteen thousand to thirty thousand dollars. We cite the fact in evidence of a greatly increasing interest in the cause, and of rapidly extending usefulness, under the favour and blessing of the Great Head of the Church.



The following resolutions were adopted by the Assembly in reference to this report :

1. *Resolved*, That the success which has crowned the labours of the Board demands the most devout and grateful acknowledgment to the God of all grace, on the part of this Assembly and of the church at large.

2. That the Assembly have received with peculiar gratification the evidence of so high a character on the part of their candidates and beneficiaries, and affectionately and cordially recommend them to the confidence, the prayers, and the support of the churches.

3. That the Assembly commend especially that feature of the plan of Education which places the great responsibility in the selection, training and supervision of the candidates upon the Presbyteries ; and that it be recommended to those Presbyteries which co-operate with the Board, not only to adopt this measure, but to carry it into operation with the utmost practicable vigilance and care, both in the selection of candidates and their prompt dismissal if they should seem to be unworthy of continued support.

4. That in the deliberate and solemn judgment of this Assembly, the cause of Education is fundamental to the prosperity and progress of our Church, if she would take that high and noble pre-eminence, which is within her reach, in the great work of the world's regeneration ; and that it be warmly recommended to the churches for a far more generous sympathy and support.

5. That it be recommended on the one hand, to the Board to encourage their candidates to engage in active means of doing good during the progress of their studies, and especially during periods of vacation from study, and on the other hand, to pastors who may have it in their power, to take them under their care at such times, and to direct their labours so as to cultivate a practical knowledge of the subordinate duties of the pastoral office, and a personal acquaintance with men and manners, along with intellectual and theoretical education.

Whereas the Presbyterian Church is now fully organized with its different Boards to raise up and educate her ministry and to sustain them amid the wastes of our own and foreign countries, it is of essential importance that a systematic plan of benevolence be devised, which will secure the annual presentation of the claims of all our Boards to all our Church members ; and it is hereby earnestly recommended to the several Presbyteries, and to all our ministers and churches to take action for the attainment of this great object.

The closing paragraph of the above report declares it to be "essential that a systematic plan of benevolence be devised, which shall secure the presentation of the claims of all our Boards to all our church members." There can be no two opinions as to the importance of this personal application to all connected with our church who profess to love and serve the Redeemer. A formal report was made, it will be remembered, on a new method of raising funds for all the Boards. Whether the above suggestion that a systematic plan of benevolence should be devised, has reference to the same plan we do not know. The object here contemplated, however, is the very one which our Boards, as at present organized, are endeavouring, with constantly increasing success, to accomplish. It strikes us as peculiarly



important that they should not be interfered with. Every change in our system of operations, as a change, is an evil. It tends to destroy confidence, and of necessity produces confusion and delay. Those engaged in conducting the benevolent operations of the church, are becoming better fitted for their work, more accustomed to the instruments with which they have to operate, and better acquainted with the field they have to cultivate. Any new machinery for accomplishing this same work, must take years to bring into successful operation, even if the new plan should not be inherently defective. We say this not because we do believe that no improvement may be made in the mode of reaching our people and of inducing them to give, but because we are persuaded that no one system will suit all parts of the church, and because we believe that any radical or extensive change (such as that of forming a new Board of agencies and funds,) would be attended with great, if not ruinous evils. We do not mean to discuss the merits of the plan suggested in the Assembly, for that is not before the churches. But as this is a subject in which all connected with our church have a deep interest, we think we may be allowed to call the attention of our brethren to a few plain principles and facts, the truth and justice of which we presume all will admit. It cannot be denied that any extensive change in the mode of conducting any great work, is of itself a great evil, which nothing but urgent reasons can justify us in occurring. Do any adequate reasons exist for a radical change of our present mode of sustaining the operations of the Boards? We cannot see them. The Boards certainly possess the confidence of the church to a degree as great as we can ever expect so large a body of men to agree in any thing. Less and less is said, or can with any show of justice be said, against them or their measures. In the recent Assembly, as fair a representation of the church, as could well be had, there was not one word of disapprobation to the best of our knowledge, uttered by a single member of the house. Strong expressions of approbation and confidence were passed by unanimous votes with regard to each of the Boards. The warmest interest was manifested in their measures and success. There can be no reason for change, therefore, on the ground of want of confidence in our present system.

Does the inefficiency of our Boards call for any radical change of our present mode of operation? Look at the

last reports of those Boards. Look at the increase of the resources of the Board of Education from nineteen to thirty thousand dollars in two years; look at the great increase in the number of its beneficiaries, now amounting to three hundred and fifty, and to the high character they bear for piety and devotedness. Look, too, at the report of the Board of Domestic Missions, which seemed to fill the Assembly with surprise and gratitude. Think of fifty new churches being organized, of upwards of eight thousand members being received into communion, three thousand six hundred of whom being new members; think of thirty thousand children being in a course of instruction in the schools under the care of these missionaries. Surely this is an encouraging report of the proceedings of the past year. The report of the Board of Foreign Missions gave no less satisfactory proof of their efficiency. These results have been accomplished during a year of great pecuniary embarrassment, and while many kindred societies are involved in serious difficulties from their declining resources. That less, far less is done by our church than might and should be accomplished, is indeed to be admitted with sincere humility. But why is this? Is it to be ascribed to some fault in the system, to the want of due energy and wisdom in working that system, or to the want of liberality and zeal in the churches? Who does not know that the last is so much the more true and potent of these causes, that the others can hardly be taken into consideration, in accounting for the effect. We do not say that the mode of operation is incapable of improvement in its details, or that the system is carried out with the greatest possible energy, but we have no manner of doubt that no conceivable system, and no attainable energy would meet the real and grand difficulty, which lies in the low state of zeal in our own hearts. If any plan can be devised to make us all love the Saviour more, to be more devoted to his service, more liberal and self-denying, more solicitous for the salvation of our fellow men, something to the purpose will be done; but any thing short of this will be of little account. It cannot be said, therefore, that the inefficiency of our present mode of operation calls for any radical change of the system.

Will it be said that the expense attending our present method, calls for such change? As to this point there are two questions to be asked: Is the expense unnecessarily great? and secondly: Would it be less on any other equally effi-

cient plan? As to the former of these questions, to give a proper answer, we should compare the expense connected with our method with that of similar societies. The Board of Education report one agent, that of Domestic Missions, two, that of Foreign Missions, three. Can any society in this country or in Europe, be produced that gets on with a less amount of agency than this? Can any wise man wish to overturn our whole system to get rid of such an expense as this? We doubt not, the incidental good done by these few agents in preaching the gospel, in diffusing information, and in exciting zeal, is worth to the church a hundred fold more than all the outlay their support requires. The necessity for agents decreases just as the liberality, activity and zeal of the churches increase; and we are persuaded the expense arising from this source has been brought down to the lowest point the present state of our church will bear. We have often been surprised and grieved at the language used on this subject. We heard a worthy elder once say on the floor of the Assembly, that the congregation to which he belonged refused to contribute to the cause of Foreign Missions, because the agent who visited them received a larger salary than their pastor. It is possible that good men, might, without reflection, act on such a ground as that, but if any congregation should deliberately refuse to contribute twenty dollars to the Board of Missions, because fifty cents of that sum was to be expended in a way they thought unwise, it would be impossible to make others believe they cared any thing for the salvation of the heathen. When a man assigns a reason for his conduct altogether inadequate, it ceases to be a reason, it is merely a pretext. As to the second point, whether the expense would be less upon any other equally efficient plan, we can only say we have heard of no plan which would not in all probability double the expense, and endanger seriously the efficiency of the whole system. This matter, however, can only be properly discussed when any new plan is fully exhibited in all its details. In the meantime, we hope brethren will lay to heart, the wisdom of the homely maxim, *let well alone*. The spirit of change is one of the worst that can infect a church. While our Boards are going on from year to year, with increasing prospects of usefulness, it would seem to be most unwise to hazard every thing by the adoption of any untried plan. The material is too valuable for mere experiments. We have little doubt that the church will be dis-

posed to give great weight in all questions relating to the method of raising funds, to the judgment of the officers of our Board, whose exclusive attention to the subject has rendered them so much better acquainted with the whole business, than those whose attention is directed mainly to other matters. The great importance of this subject, and the fact that it has been referred to a committee to report to the next Assembly, render it proper that it should, before that Assembly meets, be made a matter of serious consideration.

*Board of Publication.*

On Friday morning, May 26th, the anniversary of the Board of Publication was celebrated in the General Assembly. After the reading of the Annual Report by the Rev. Joseph H. Jones, the Corresponding Secretary, several addresses were made. We have room only for the following abstract of the Annual Report.

During the year, the Board have printed twenty-one volumes of various kinds, containing in all 7,602,300 pages, besides 6,307,250 pages of new editions of stereotyped works. They have also published 1,751,000 pages of Catechisms and Tracts.

Though the number of pages published by the Board, within the past year, falls a little short of the amount published the preceding year, it is not because of any abatement of zeal or interest on their part. They have carefully weighed their responsibility as stewards, and the serious hazard of advancing any further than the zeal and interest of the church would warrant.

Among the books published during the year, are several of peculiar value to the Church at this time, when the doctrines of the Reformers and the authority of the Fathers are misapprehended by so many, and so grossly misapplied. The Board have also been deeply impressed with the importance of the publication of books suitable for the young, and they have used their best efforts to increase the number of this class of publications.

From the Treasurer's Report it appears that the money in his hands on the 1st of April, 1842, amounted to \$7,187 43. During the year ending April 1st, 1843, he has received in payment of subscriptions, and donations, \$6,610 43; from the sale of books, \$12,050 34. The amount expended is \$18,409 54. Leaving a balance in the Treasury, on the 1st of April, of \$7,438 80.



The sales of the year have been greatly restricted by the financial straits and perplexities of the country, yet the Board express "the painful conviction that the result is to be traced, in a degree, to other causes than the want of means"—to the "apathy of the church, notwithstanding the earnest appeals of the Board, the resolutions of the Assembly and numerous subordinate judicatories"—to a "want of energy and skill, in devising the most efficient modes of operation," &c.

Numerous friendly communications, suggesting various plans that have been tried by kindred institutions, have been received, but the appeal to such examples fails in force, from want of resemblance between their organization and that of the Board of Publication. The American Tract Society, for instance, to which reference has so often been made, is sustained, and her treasury replenished, by the yearly contributions of the churches, while the resources of the Board of Publication are limited, depending wholly on the product of sales.

The Board recommend a more general and energetic co-operation on the part of the Church—that Sessions, Presbyteries and Synods, not only pass resolutions recommending the publications to the churches, but take systematic measures to have the books procured, paid for, distributed and read. It is recommended that each Synod appoint a Standing Committee, to take such measures as they may deem proper to procure the books of the Board, and employ a travelling agent to circulate them throughout the bounds of the Synod.

The Board propose to supply each Synod with books, on a credit of six months, at twenty per cent. discount from the catalogue or retail prices, for approved paper, or at a discount of twenty five per cent. for cash.

The Board state, in conclusion, that they have been gratified and encouraged by the noble acts of certain friends of the Board, whose munificent gifts have furnished the means of stereotyping several valuable works, selected by themselves and approved by the Board.

The Assembly adopted the following report of the committee to whom this subject was referred.

"The Committee on the Report of the Board of Publication have reviewed the work performed, during the last year, by this Board, with great satisfaction. The character and the number of the works which they have issued, and the wide circulation which they have given to many theological treatises of sterling merit, fully evince the wisdom of this part of our plan of operation, as a church,

in order to increase the intelligence and piety of our own members, and to place before the public eye, in a true light, that system of faith and order which we have derived from the Bible. That the Board have faithfully and successfully administered the department entrusted to them, must be obvious to every intelligent and candid mind; and if they have not issued as large a number of copies of the works which they have published, as could be desired, the reason is found in the imperative duty of keeping the capital with which they have been entrusted by the Church, not only unimpaired but safe from probable loss. The committee recommend to the Assembly for consideration the following resolutions.

1. *Resolved*, That the report be approved, and be committed to the Executive committee for publication.

2. That the Board be instructed to extend the circulation of their publications as widely as possible; yet it is their imperative duty to preserve the funds from loss as far as practicable, and, especially, to keep on hand such a capital, as will enable them to do business to the greatest advantage.

3. That it be earnestly recommended to every Presbytery, or at least to every Synod, to establish a depository which shall be their own property, by collecting, on such plan as they may deem best, a sufficient sum of money to fill the depository on the principle of cash purchase.

### *Church Membership of Ministers.*

An overture from the Presbytery of Miami, brought up the question, whether ministers should have their names enrolled as members of particular churches? This question the Assembly answered in the negative. Several members agreed in favour of an affirmative answer on such grounds as the following: A minister without pastoral charge is not connected as a member with any particular church, unless his church relation is sustained and continued, notwithstanding his ordination. Again, cases may occur in which a minister may be deposed and yet not excommunicated, he is then no longer either a minister or church member; he is not subject either to a presbytery or session. It was also argued that our constitution does not authorise a presbytery to excommunicate [which we presume is a mistake]; the presbytery, it was said, may direct, but the session executes. If then a minister is excommunicated, how can the sentence be carried into effect unless he is enrolled as the member from some particular church, and when no longer a member of the presbytery, subject to the jurisdiction of its session?

The brethren who argued for a negative answer to the overture, contended that membership in a particular church necessarily involved subjection to the session of that church, but as the minister is not subject to the session, he should not be enrolled as though he were under its authority. The relation which a minister sustains as a member of pres-

bytery having jurisdiction over a session, is inconsistent with his subjection to that session as a church member. And although a ruling elder may, as a member of presbytery, be over a session, and yet as an elder, subject to its jurisdiction; yet as he is only a member of the presbytery during its sessions, and by special delegation, his relation to the church and to its session is essentially different from that of a minister. The General Assembly has decided that licentiates are members of particular churches, and subject to the jurisdiction of the session, until they are ordained; which of course implies that their relation to the church is changed by ordination; which is no longer that of membership in a particular church, but that of an overseer of a particular church and member of the church in general. When he ceases to be a minister, he becomes *de facto* subject to the particular church within whose limits he may reside.

This whole question seems to be one more theoretical than practical. There was no diversity of opinion as to the relation in which a minister stands to the church, but only as to the proper mode of denominating and expressing that relation. All admit that while he has a right to the privileges of a particular church, he is not subject to the jurisdiction of its session, and that he has no need of a letter of dismission and recommendation to entitle him to the same privileges in another particular church. Is he then a member of any particular church? That depends on what is meant by member, or on what membership implies. If it implies nothing more than a right to the privileges of the church for himself and children, he is a member; but if it also implies subjection, he is not a member. In all other cases it confessedly does imply subjection. It would seem very incongruous and of evil tendency, to express by the same term and in the same way, relations so essentially distinct, as those in which a pastor and private Christian stands to the same church. The decision of the Assembly, accordant as it is with the usage of all Presbyterian churches, will, we doubt not, meet with general approbation.

#### *Baptism of Orphans.*

A memorial was presented from the Presbytery of Lodiana, respecting the baptism of the orphan children of heathen parents, to which the Assembly returned the following answer.

*Dear Brethren*—You have submitted to us questions respecting a subject,

which, we have no doubt, is one of very great importance, in regard to the progress of religion among the heathen. We have seriously considered it, and give you here the result of our deliberations.

You present to us three questions, to which we reply, in the order in which the same are presented.

1. "Are all orphan children of heathen parents committed to the care of our mission, entitled to the benefit of the ordinance of baptism, without respect to their ages?"

We reply—certainly they are not.

You must make the same distinction that you would make, if their parents were alive and members of the Christian church and desiring to have them baptized—the same distinction which is made in Christian countries. We add—let those children only be baptized, in every case, who are so committed to the mission, or other Christian tuition, as to secure effectually their entire religious education. On this point, great caution is necessary.

2. You ask, (on the presumption that the preceding question is answered in the negative,) "Are those only to be baptized who have not attained to years of discretion?"

This question we answer in the affirmative.

3. Your third question is, in substance, as follows—"If those only who have not attained to years of discretion are to be baptized, at what age shall the federal right be supposed to cease, and personal responsibility to commence?"

Although it is not difficult to answer this question in accordance with the standards and the practice of the Presbyterian Church, yet the rule may frequently be found difficult of application.

Our answer to the question, however, is;—the officers of the Church must judge in each particular case, whether the proposed subject of baptism has arrived at years of discretion or not. We can adopt no other rule in our own practice, and we can recommend no other to you. We refer you to chap. ix. sec. 2, of our Directory for Worship.

If the person proposed to be baptized has acquired that maturity of mind, which renders him capable of making an intelligent profession of religion himself, he ought not to be baptized on the faith of another. Our Confession of Faith recognises the right to baptism of the infant children only of such parents as are members of the church. We do not doubt that in heathen countries, children of heathen parents ordinarily arrive at, what are called years of discretion, later than those who enjoy the advantages of Christian instruction in early life; but in a country where the religion of all consists in forms and ceremonies, great care should be taken that the Christian religion does not even appear to partake of the formality and emptiness of Mohammedanism and Paganism.

### *Lane Seminary.*

Certain memorials and papers respecting Lane Seminary, were reported to the Assembly by the committee on bills and overtures, together with a resolution to the effect that it is inexpedient for the Assembly to take any measures for commencing legal process in relation to that institution. This resolution, after debate was *unanimously* adopted. No member of the Assembly, as we are informed, spoke in favour of commencing any legal process for the purpose of obtaining control of the Seminary in question, though several seemed to



think it incumbent on the Assembly to do something in the case, and therefore a motion was made to postpone the consideration of the resolution offered by the committee of overtures, with a view to refer the subject to a committee to examine into the facts and to confer with the present authorities of the Seminary, which committee was to report to the next Assembly. This course was particularly recommended by the Rev. W. L. Breckinridge, who considered that the intention of the original donors was to found an institution whose professors should be under the care of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. The first donors were the Messrs. Lanes, strictly orthodox in their doctrinal sentiments, who made their overtures to the Rev. Dr. Wilson of Cincinnati; a fact sufficiently expressive of their intentions. Mr. Kemper, the next donor, was a Presbyterian minister, cordially connected with us. Mr. B. stated other facts in relation to the origin of the institution, which, in his judgment, went to prove that it was the design of its original founders to have it under the control of the church now represented by this Assembly.

Chancellor Johns said he had given strict attention to the deed, charter, and all the documents of the case, and was perfectly convinced that not the least particle of interest in the Lane Seminary was vested in the General Assembly, nor any power to interfere in case of the perversion of the trust. It was explicitly declared as an essential qualification of the professors that they must be members of the Presbyterian church in connexion with the General Assembly, but this gave no authority or power to the Assembly to interfere in case this qualification was disregarded. And hence the Assembly could not be recognised as a party in any court of law or equity to correct an abuse of the trust. He did not wish to be understood as intimating that the trust had not been abused, or that there was no remedy for the abuse, but simply that neither the obligation nor the power to apply that remedy rested with the General Assembly.

Dr. Hoge added the further consideration, which he said had great weight in his mind, that the present occupants had greatly improved the trust, by the erection of buildings, and in other ways, so that if it were offered to us to day we ought to reject it. He stated moreover, that a year after the organization of the Seminary its conductors applied to the Synod of Ohio for their countenance and aid, but the

Synod seeing that the charter did not secure the trust to the Presbyterian church, unanimously (or nearly so) proposed that if the trustees would procure such a change in its principles as to give the control to the Synod, or General Assembly, they would grant their patronage. But this proposal was rejected.

After these representations and arguments the motion to postpone the resolution of the committee of Bills and Overtures, was put and lost, and then that resolution, as above stated, was unanimously adopted. We hope this unanimity will convince the brethren more immediately interested in this matter, that the action of the Assembly in the case is not only wise but determined by right motives.

*Bi-centenary Celebration.*

The last Assembly appointed a committee to take into consideration the proper method for celebrating the two hundredth anniversary of the meeting of the Westminster Assembly. The Rev. Dr. Breckinridge, chairman of that committee, submitted an elaborate and instructive report on the history and services of that venerable body, which was committed and made the subject of the following report, which was adopted.

The Committee to whom was referred the Report on the observance of the Bi-centenary of the Westminster Assembly, having considered the subject, recommend it to the favourable consideration of the Assembly.

A correct knowledge of the character of that Assembly, of the purpose for which they were convened, of the difficulties of their position, of the arduous nature of their task, and of the results of their labours, shows the extent of the benefits which they have conferred on the interests of truth and freedom. And our Church in common with other churches, which have been formed on the same model, must feel that the occurrence of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of their meeting, is a deeply interesting period in the lapse of time, and may be greatly profited by its appropriate commemoration. It is, therefore, recommended to the Assembly, to adopt, with some modification, the propositions reported by the Committee of the last General Assembly;—as follows:

1. *Resolved*, That it is highly important that the venerable standards, prepared by the Westminster Assembly, as substantially adopted by the Presbyterian church, shall be more carefully studied, more perfectly understood, and more faithfully observed by all the members and office-bearers of this Church; and that the children of the Church be early and faithfully taught to understand and observe them.

2. That an accurate acquaintance with the history of the past trials, persecutions and faithfulness of the true Church, and especially of our own branch of it, should be diligently sought, particularly by those who are office-bearers in the Church; and, as one method of accomplishing this object, it is recommended that the 1st of July, when convenient to do so, and when not convenient, on such other day during the current year, as may be deemed expedient, be observed as a season specially devoted to the general instruction of our people, by the ministers, in the great facts connected with this subject.

3. That it is the ardent desire of this Church to maintain friendly and fraternal relations with all evangelical churches; and especially to be in more close and perfect union with those, who maintain and adopt our own formularies, or others of kindred spirit and form.

4. That the fourth proposition of the committee of the last Assembly, respecting the preparation of a Commentary on the holy scriptures, be referred to the Board of Publication, with instructions to report thereon to the next Assembly.

And, whereas a portion of our brethren of the Church of Scotland, are now contending for those great principles, which we and they have received from a common source,

5. That this General Assembly express deep and cordial sympathy with them in the trials they now endure, and the sufferings they may yet be called to bear; and earnestly pray that they may come forth from this "great fight of afflictions," in the full enjoyment of that "liberty, with which Christ makes his people free," and that, in the mean time, they may, in all their difficulties and troubles, be favoured with the guidance and consolations of the Holy Spirit of God.

Among the recommendations contained in the report presented by Dr. Breckinridge was one to the following effect: "That the Assembly take such order as shall be needful to cause to be prepared in convenient seasons, by competent persons chosen from time to time by the General Assembly, a complete, but comprehensive commentary on the whole word of God, expounded according to the system embodied in our standards, and so that this great and necessary work, being fitly accomplished, our congregations may have a standard exposition of our whole doctrine, and not be exposed, as now they are, in that regard; so that this work may be connected, at least in its origin, with this memorable occasion, and be published as it shall be from time to time prepared." As the reports of the debates in the Assembly are imperfect, we are not informed what was said in reference to this subject; but it seems that the Assembly decided on referring the matter to the Board of Publication.

The report also included a recommendation that special prayer be made for our suffering brethren of the church of Scotland, and that in the course of the current year a collection be made in their behalf in all our churches. For these recommendations the committee substituted a general resolution of sympathy. This on the whole was wise, for at that time there was no information of the actual separation of the non-intrusion party from the establishment, and no official information of the principles on which the new church was to be organized. The late arrivals from Great Britain have brought us this information; between four and five hundred ministers have given up all connection

with the established church, and together with the people adhering to them declared themselves the Free, or Protestant Church of Scotland. This great secession is one of the most important events in the history of Scotland. Since the Act of Uniformity there has been no such public and general sacrifice of interest to principle, and it cannot fail to secure the approbation and admiration of the Christian world. The low murmur of disapproval which escapes from the lips of a few of the old secession, who have not been able to overcome their early prejudices, is lost in the general acclamation with which this great event is hailed. There may be some diversity of judgment as to the wisdom of some of the steps of the non-intrusionists; whether it was for the best to pitch their battle on the veto act; or whether, when that act had been pronounced inconsistent with the law of the land, they ought not to have adopted some other method of accomplishing their object; but there can surely be no difference of opinion among Presbyterians as to the importance of the object for which these brethren have contended, or as to the impossibility of reconciling the legitimate independence of the church with the principles which have been established by the decisions of the Scottish courts. It is doubtless known that the present difficulties in that church have arisen principally from two sources. First, from the determination of the General Assembly not to allow a minister to be forced upon a congregation as their pastor, contrary to their own wishes; and secondly, from their assigning equal rights as members of church judicatories to all ordained ministers, whether pastors of regular parishes, or of chapels of ease, or unendowed churches. To accomplish the former of these objects, the Assembly in 1834 passed the veto act, enjoining upon all presbyteries to abstain from proceeding to the ordination and installation of any licentiate presented to a particular congregation, whenever a majority of the male heads of families, being members in full communion of the church, objected to his settlement. This act having been approved by a great majority of the presbyteries, became a law of the church. When a presbytery, acting under this law, refused to take on trial a presentee, with a view to his ordination and induction, against whom a great majority of the people objected, he applied to the civil court for an order for the presbytery to proceed with his trials, and if found qualified, to ordain and induct him as minister of the parish, the objections of the people



to the contrary notwithstanding. This order was granted. A majority of the presbytery refused to obey it, a minority consented, and did ordain and induct the candidate; for this disobedience to the law of the church they were deposed from their office in that church; this sentence the civil courts set aside; declared the minority, consisting of deposed ministers, the legal presbytery. They granted large pecuniary damages against the members of a presbytery for refusing to disobey the veto act. Some of the acts of aggression by the civil courts were peculiarly oppressive. A presbytery was forced to give effect to a call to which one solitary name, that of a tavern-keeper dependant on the patron, was appended, while the whole body of the people were opposed to it. Let it be considered that the call in Scotland is the same in substance as with us. It purports to come from the people, to declare their approbation of him and their desire to have him for their pastor. How can godly men consent to give effect to the solemn falsehood that the people call a man against whom they with one voice protest? How can they bear to hear the candidate declare before God that he has used no improper means to gain the call of a people, who at the very moment are opposing his induction? Yet to this degradation are the ministers and elders of the church reduced by the existing laws of Scotland. To this the non-intrusion party could not in conscience submit. Nor could they acknowledge the right of the civil courts to pronounce their spiritual acts invalid; to interdict their preaching and administering the sacraments in obedience to their own presbyteries; or to restore ministers or licentiates to their standing in the church, in despite of the authority of the church itself.

With respect to the second source of difficulty, it will be remembered that parishes are civil and ecclesiastical divisions of the territory of Scotland, of a very ancient date. Some of these parishes, once rural districts, are now populous villages or cities. Instead of including a number of people not too great for the superintendence of a single pastor, they embrace in many cases, a population of ten, twenty, or thirty thousand. It is principally this state of things that has given rise, not to the formal and civil division of parishes, but to the erection of several churches within the same parish. The ministers of these new churches are called ministers *quoad sacra*, and by an act of the General Assembly, seeing they were ordained to the

office of presbyters which entitles them to rule as well as to teach, were admitted to their full rights as members of presbytery. This right, a recent decision of the civil court has denied them. A minister accused of theft or some other gross immorality, was accused before his presbytery. He thereupon applied to the civil court to arrest their proceeding in the case, on the ground that certain *quoad sacra* ministers were allowed a seat in the body. The interdict was granted and the proceedings in the case arrested. All these and similar acts of encroachment, the non-intrusionists regard as not only inconsistent with the liberties of the church, derived from her Divine Head, but with the constitution of the Church of Scotland and with the stipulations of the Treaty of Union; and in this opinion they are sustained by a large part of the most learned members of the Scottish judiciary. In all these offensive decisions, we believe the Court of Sessions, has been divided in opinion, and generally in the ratio of seven to five. The following extract from the Protest presented to the late Assembly, at the time when the non-intrusionists withdrew from that body, state in few words the grounds of their complaint.

“1st. That the Courts of the Church as now established, and members thereof, are liable to be coerced by the Civil Courts in the exercise of their spiritual functions; and in particular in their admission to the office of the holy ministry, and the constitution of the pastoral relation, and that they are subject to be compelled to intrude ministers on reclaiming congregations in opposition to the fundamental principles of the Church, and their views of the Word of God, and to the liberties of Christ’s people.

“2d. That the said Civil Courts have power to interfere with and interdict the preaching of the gospel and administration of ordinances as authorized and enjoined by the Church Courts of the Establishment.

“3rd. That the said Civil Courts have power to suspend spiritual censures pronounced by the Church Courts of the Establishment against ministers and probationers of the Church, and to interdict their execution as to spiritual effects, functions, and privileges.

“4th. That the said Civil Courts have power to reduce and set aside the sentences of the Church Courts of the Establishment, deposing ministers from the office of the holy ministry, and depriving probationers of their license to preach the gospel, with reference to the spiritual status, functions, and privileges of such ministers and probationers—restoring them to the spiritual office and status of which the Church Courts had deprived them.

“5th. That the said Civil Courts have power to determine on the right to sit as members of the Supreme and other Judicatories of the Church by law established, and to issue interdicts against sitting and voting therein, irrespective of the judgment and determination of the said Judicatories.

“6th. That the said Civil Courts have power to supercede the majority of a Church Court of the Establishment, in regard to the exercise of its spiritual functions as a Church Court, and to authorize the minority to exercise the said functions, in opposition to the Court itself, and to the superior Judicatories of the Establishment.

“7th. That the said Civil Courts have power to stay processes of discipline pending before Courts of the Church by law established, and to interdict such Courts from proceeding therein.

“8th. That no pastor of a congregation can be admitted into the Church Courts of the Establishment and allowed to rule, as well as to teach, agreeable to the institution of the office by the Head of the Church, nor to sit in any of the Judicatories of the Church, inferior or supreme, and that no additional provision can be made for the exercise of spiritual discipline among members of the Church, though not affecting any patrimonial interests, and no alteration introduced in the state of pastoral superintendence and spiritual discipline in any parish, without the coercion of a Civil Court.”

These decisions of the highest civil tribunals, having authoritatively given the law establishing the Church of Scotland, an interpretation different from that which a large part of its members believe to be the true one, they have thereby established a new condition to the union between the Church and State. The Church therefore, was called upon to say, whether she could with a good conscience, submit to that new condition. To this question a large portion of her ministers, elders, and people have given a negative answer. They say, whereas they had formerly believed that “the State by the acts of the Parliament of Scotland, forever and unalterably secured to this nation by the Treaty of Union, had repudiated any powers in the civil courts to pronounce such decrees, [as those above specified,] we are now constrained to acknowledge it to be the mind and will of the State as recently declared, that submission [to such decrees] should and does form a condition of the Establishment, and of the possession of the benefits thereof; and as we cannot, without committing what we believe to be sin—in opposition to God’s law—in disregard of the honour and authority of Christ’s crown, and in violation of our own solemn vows, comply with this condition, we cannot in conscience continue connected with, and retain the benefits of the Establishment, to which such condition is attached.”

We think no one, after reading this exposition of the grounds of the secession of the non-intrusionists, can hesitate to admit that the principles for which our Scottish brethren contend are legitimate and important. They are the principles which lie at the basis of our own ecclesiastical organization; and which we, as a church, believe have the sanction of a divine right. The unfortunate declaration, therefore, of a few members on the floor of our own Assembly, that these brethren were not contending for the true principles of religious liberty, is by this noble Protest covered with confusion.

We think it no less clear the secession of our brethren was right and necessary. We have always maintained that outward union in the church is of great importance, and is never to be broken unless in order to preserve that union, we are forbidden to profess or preach the truth, or forced to profess what we do not believe, or are either prevented doing our duty or called upon to commit sin. We know no legitimate grounds for the secession of ministers from the church to which they belong, that do not come under one of the heads just mentioned. There is none among us who doubts that it would be sinful to submit the order and discipline of the church to the power claimed and exercised in Scotland by the civil courts, and therefore, no one, we presume, can doubt that our brethren were right in refusing such submission.

It has been said that these brethren do not "deserve" our sympathy because they are the advocates of a religious establishment. If by this is meant that they are in favour of a church supported and controlled by the State, their own protest shows the contrary. If it merely means that they are, to use the language of Dr. Chambers, "advocates for a national recognition and national support of religion;" that they believe it to be the duty of the State to sustain the teachers of religion, as they sustain the teachers of schools, it is true. But is this a point about which good men may not agree to differ? The question whether the ministers of religion should be supported by the voluntary contributions of the people; or by a tax upon the holders of property; or by permanent endowments, is one on which the church even in this country has only within a few years come to any thing like a unanimous opinion. Experience has taught us that the voluntary principle may be relied upon with as much confidence as that of governmental support; that it is free from many of the evils to which the other method is exposed, and that it is healthful in its influence on the people themselves. The peculiarity of our circumstances, the nature of our government, and the multitude of our conflicting sects, render the adoption of the opposite plan, in our case, not only undesirable, but almost impossible. But this surely is no reason why we should withhold our sympathy from men who agree with us so perfectly in doctrine; who are among the best and greatest men of their age; and who are making a sacrifice to sustain the principles which we hold in common, such as have seldom been made in

the history of the church; even though they do hold that the authority of Christ extends not only over individuals but communities, not only over the Church but over the State, and that as such the State is bound to do him homage and to sustain his cause. Though we may differ from them as to the idea of the State, and as to the nature and extent of its duties, we bid them Hail! May God be with them; we wish to suffer their reproach and be partakers of their sorrows. May our church never separate itself from such men, or from the principles for which they suffer.

As to the question whether we should attempt any general collection in behalf of our protesting brethren in Scotland, we think the Assembly acted wisely in postponing a motion to that effect, as premature. The disruption had not taken place; the facts necessary for enlightened action were not then known. But now that the separation has occurred, and the facts so full of interest are known, the question is fairly open. We hope that the commissioners to the next Assembly will come together determined not only to give the hand of fellowship to our Scottish brethren, but to recommend to all the churches, to send them a worthy testimony of that fellowship. We should not forget that about a century ago, we, in the time of our infancy and need, solicited the aid of the Church of Scotland; that her Assembly ordered a collection to be made in our behalf in all her congregations; that the College of New Jersey, built in a great measure with the funds thus obtained, stands a lasting memorial of the fellowship thus early felt and acknowledged between the two churches. We hope some not less imposing building may be erected in Scotland through the liberality of our churches, to bear a testimony not less enduring, that American Presbyterians are not unmindful of past benefits, or unfaithful to their principles. We shall not be the poorer for any thing we may take from the spoiling of our goods for such a purpose.

#### *Ruling Elders.*

The question was overtured to the Assembly of 1842, whether ruling elders had, under our constitution, the right to join in the imposition of hands in the ordination of ministers; and was decided by an unanimous vote in the negative. As this answer was given without debate and during the absence of some members who took an interest in the subject, a vote was taken to reconsider the subject; and



it was then laid on the table and passed over with other items of unfinished business to the late Assembly. In the meantime the Synod of Kentucky had decided in favour of this supposed right of elders, and a protest was entered by the minority against the decision. The Presbytery of West Lexington sent up an overture in the form of a resolution declaring it to be their judgment that, according to the constitution of our church, ruling elders have the right to unite with preaching elders in laying on hands in the ordination of ministers. The committee submitted a resolution declaring that neither the constitution nor practice of our church authorizes the ruling elders thus to participate in the act of ordaining ministers. This resolution became the topic of an extended discussion, and was finally adopted by the following vote: *yeas* 138; *nays* 9; *non liquet* 1; *excused from voting* 4. Of the *nays* one voted under instructions, his private judgment being in favour of the affirmative; and four were elders, so that the proportion of elders in favour of this new claim was not greater than that of ministers. Rev. Wm. L. Breckinridge was the principal speaker in opposition to the resolution of the committee and in favour of the right in question. His argument was sustained by the Rev. Mr. Cunnings, and we believe one other member. We present the best report of Mr. Breckinridge's speech that we have seen; borrowing it from the Presbyterian of June 3d. The report is necessarily imperfect and does not do justice to the ability of the argument, which was moreover greatly recommended by the liberal and courteous spirit which characterized its delivery. Mr. B., we think, did full justice to his side of the question, and said all that well could be said pertinently to the question; for, as he himself remarked, the real argument on that side is comprised in a very narrow compass.

Rev. W. L. Breckinridge stated that the subject came up in his presbytery in 1841; that it came before synod last year, in reviewing the records of presbytery, and that thirty-five voted in favour of the practice, twenty against it, and ten voted non-liquet. He conceived it to be simply a matter interpretation of the constitution—an inquiry into its meaning. It need not be inquired at present, what is the meaning of scripture? because it is a settled question that our book accords with scripture. He would not be understood as intimating that scripture is not the ultimate standard; but only that it was not necessary to appeal to it at this stage

of the question. The appeal is not to the Church of Scotland, however much we may venerate her. It is not her constitution that is in question, but our own. The question at present is not what the Assembly of Westminster Divines taught: he did not consider any of these opposed to him, but he would not bring up any thing which would turn our attention from the single point before us. He did not consider our own usage, or the usage of the framers of our constitution, as of consequence to the settlement of the question; but the simple point is—what says the constitution? The literal sense of the constitution, is the only point bearing directly on the question. Surely no one will think usage a safe interpreter, or capable of deciding the matter in debate. Usage sanctioned the plan of union; but was this considered a good argument for continuing it? It was discussed until the plan of union and the usage of thirty years were alike declared unconstitutional. . . . Let us admit that the alleged novelty of the practice in question is true; yet this is no argument to prove that the general usage, however old, is right. If novelty be a ground of valid objection, then the Reformation itself must be wrong. . . . There were some opinions connected with the subject, which, previous to coming to the main point, he wished to disclaim. He did not, for instance, believe in the *jus divinum* of Presbyterianism, or of any other form of church government. He was not prepared to unchurch all who did not agree with him in respect to the best form of the church. He believed that God has settled the great principles of ecclesiastical government; but not that he has defined any particular form. He did not believe in the warrant for ruling elders, in the sense of a *jure divino*; nor base his argument for that office on the principle of the common interpretation of the passage in Timothy, usually alleged in its support. Elders are ecclesiastical men, but not clerical. Their rights are, to a certain extent, coincident with those of the preaching elders; they are not the same as to official dignity. In Timothy, as will be seen by comparing the context, *elders* do not mean those who are such officially: but *aged* ecclesiastical persons, who on account of their years and experience, are worthy of veneration. It would be seen, therefore, that he did not derive his ideas of the superior dignity of the preaching elder from this passage. For certain purposes, and in certain acts, the honour and privilege of the two classes of elders

are the same. As for example, on this floor, where both are equal, except perhaps, in this, that the moderator must, by a provision of the constitution, always belong to the order of preaching elders, because it is proper that every meeting of this court should be opened with a sermon. From this equality of the two orders in all our church courts, he derived his first argument for their equal right to impose hands in ordination. The lowest judicatory, the session, owing to the structure of our system, presented an exception to our general remark on the courts. In this, the preaching elder presides only, and the ruling elders have all the power. . . . It is the sense of the constitution, that every court (above the session,) should consist of an equal number of the two orders, and that they should have the same dignity, power, and rights. In our Form of Government, ch. x., presbytery is defined and its powers enumerated. Here we find it consisting of two orders of ecclesiastical men, possessing a perfect equality of rights, and whose duty it equally is to ordain ministers. By the theory of the constitution, the presbytery consists of an equal number of preaching and ruling elders, and that all have equal rights and powers in that court. Ordination is to be performed by the whole body—by a body, the rights of whose members are all equal—and if done by the whole, certainly the constituent parts of that whole have equal right to participate. This is a simple and sufficient argument for the rights of the ruling elder, which cannot easily be set aside. But there are some objections which lie in the way of brethren, and which he would attempt briefly to remove. It is objected, that elders, in a session, may vote that a person may be baptized, but they cannot baptize him; so, in a presbytery, they may vote that a man may be ordained, but they cannot ordain them. The force of this is removed, by keeping in view the distinction between the action of a court, and the official act of a person belonging to the court—between a sessional or presbyterial act, and a personal, and individually official act. The baptism of a person is not a *sessional* act, but the ordination of a person is a *presbyterial* act; the parallel between the two cases does not hold, and therefore the objection founded on that supposed parallelism falls to the ground. Another objection is that an elder cannot take a newly ordained minister by the hand, and use the words prescribed in the constitution, “I give thee the right hand of fellowship, to take part in this

ministry with us." But the direction of the constitution is express, that *all* the members of Presbytery shall do this, and thus takes away every ground of scruple on this subject. The member that presides shall do it first, and then all the members of presbytery in their order. Is the member that presides, a member of the presbytery in any sense that the other ministers are not? Is he a member in any sense in which the elders are not? No one will maintain this. All are equally members of the presbytery, and have equal rights. But it is still objected, that an elder has no ministry, and therefore the prescribed form of words, in his mouth has no meaning. But the book is explicit in its direction, that all the members should give the right hand of fellowship, and there must be a sense in which the words in the mouth of an elder have a meaning. The elder has a ministry in the government of the church as well as the bishop; and with the utmost propriety, he can welcome the bishop to take part with him in that ministry. "And all the members of presbytery, *in their order*," &c. Here, the constitution indicates the two orders, of which presbytery is constituted, and who equally give the right hand of fellowship. "In their order"—does this mean successively? No—but that in their respective order, as bishops and elders, they shall perform the prescribed act. . . . He might meet other scruples, and produce additional considerations in opposition to the report of the committee, but he was unwilling to trespass longer on the time and patience of the house.

The principal speakers in favour of the resolution were Mr. Fraser, Mr. Baker, (elder,) Dr. Leland, the Chancellor Johns, Dr. Maclean, and Messrs. Junkin, Eagleson, Smith and Howard. The main argument, on the other side is, that the constitution declares that a Presbytery consists of ministers and ruling elders; that ordination is the work of the Presbytery; and therefore, as much the work of elders as of ministers. This, which is so much the most plausible, that it may be said to be the only argument in favour of the right in question, rests entirely on the meaning of the constitution. How is this to be determined? How do we proceed when we wish to ascertain the sense of a passage of scripture? The thing to be done is to find out what idea, Paul or John in using certain language, meant to convey. If we can ascertain that, we have that sense of the words which we must admit to be the true one,



and, in the case of a rule or precept, the one which we are bound to obey. To ascertain the sense which an apostle meant to express, we ascertain in the first place the literal, etymological meaning of the words. In a multitude of cases, this is enough. Very often, however, the words in themselves will bear different interpretations; to determine which is the true one, we ascertain how the author uses the same language in other parts of his writings; how it was used by cotemporary writers; how it was understood by those to whom it was addressed; how it is explained by the nature of the thing spoken of, by the design and connexion of the passage in which the language occurs, and by other declarations relating to the same subject; and finally how the conduct of the sacred writers and of those whom they instructed, interprets the language in question. If they so acted as to show they understood the language in a certain way, that is the way in which we are bound to take it. Paul calls Christ a sacrifice; but in what sense? in the sense of a propitiation? or in the sense in which we are exhorted to offer ourselves as a sacrifice to God? The words in themselves will bear either interpretation; but as we find Paul uses the language in reference to Christ in many places in such a way that it can only have the former of these senses; as in all cotemporary writers, this language was used to express the idea of a propitiation; as those to whom it was addressed universally understood it in that sense; as the effects ascribed to the sacrifice of Christ, such as pardon of sin, &c., show the sense of the term; as many declarations used in relation to the same subject admit of no other meaning; as the conduct of the apostles and their disciples in placing their hopes of acceptance with God, on the death of Christ, and in exhorting others to do the same, proves that they regarded it as a real propitiation, we are sure that this is the true sense of the language which they employ. We say that the constitution is to be interpreted by these same principles and that we are bound to abide by the sense thus elicited. Let it be admitted that the words presbytery, member, and ministry, as used in our book, may in themselves admit of the interpretation put upon them by the advocates of the other side of this question, yet if this interpretation is inconsistent with other parts of the book; if it is inconsistent with the sense in which this language was used by cotemporary writers; with the sense in which it was understood by



those to whom it was addressed ; if it is incompatible with the nature of the service spoken of, and the rights and duties of elders as elsewhere explained ; and if it is inconsistent with the practice of those who framed the constitution and of those who adopted it, then we are perfectly sure that it is not the true meaning of that instrument. As to the first of these points it is clear that a presbytery, in the sense of our Book, is a body of ministers regularly convened, in which ruling elders have a right to deliberate and vote as members ; that the ministers are the standing, constituent members, the elders, members only as delegated, for a particular meeting, and for the special purpose of deliberating and voting. This is the idea of a presbytery on which our whole system is founded ; and which runs through our whole constitution. An interpretation of any particular passage, inconsistent with this distinction, is inconsistent with the constitution. It is by virtue of this leading principle the presbytery often means the body of ministers who are its standing members, without including the delegated, any more than the corresponding members who may happen to be present. Hence, too, the presbytery is said to do what its standing members do, in obedience to the vote of the body ; and hence the word "member" is used only of ministers.

Again, the interpretation which makes the expression "the hands of the presbytery" include ruling elders, is inconsistent with the sense that language bears in all writings cotemporary with our standards, or of authority in Presbyterian churches. Thus in the Westminster Directory, whence our formularies were derived, this language is admitted to mean the hands of the preaching presbyters, because it can there have no other meaning, since the Directory elsewhere teaches that the work of ordination belongs to ministers. It has the same sense in Stewart's Collections, a book still of authority in Scotland, as it was formerly with us ; it has the same sense in all the publications of the age in which our Confession of Faith was formed, which are regarded as giving an authentic exposition of Presbyterian principles. This is the point to which Dr. Maclean principally directed his remarks ; and which he demonstrated in the clearest manner by abundant references to the works in question. What would be thought of an interpretation of an expression in the writings of Paul, which was inconsistent with the sense the phrase had in every other book in the Bible ?

Again, as the ministers and elders who adopted our constitution had been accustomed to understand the expression "hands of the presbytery" in the sense in which it is used in the Directory, under which they had so long acted, it is clear they must have understood it the same way, when that expression was transferred to the new constitution. And if it be a sound principle of interpretation that we must take the language of any document in the sense which it was designed to bear to those to whom it was addressed, then we are bound to take the constitution in the sense in which it was framed and adopted. That is its true sense; the sense in which it is obligatory on the church.

Again, the new construction of the passage in question, is inconsistent with the nature of the subject spoken of, and with the doctrine elsewhere taught in our standards concerning the office of the ruling elder. When it is said: God sits on a throne; or, This is my body, we know that the language is not to be taken literally, because the literal interpretation is inconsistent with the nature of the subject spoken of, and with what is elsewhere taught concerning God, and the Lord's Supper. So when it is said that the presbytery shall ordain, we know that the standing and not the delegated members are intended from the nature of the service. When it is said "some member" shall open the sessions of the judicatory with a sermon, the nature of the service, of necessity, limits the phrase to those members that are entitled to preach. So when ordination to the ministry is the subject, the language is of necessity confined to those members who are in the ministry; who can say to the newly ordained brother "we give you the right hand of fellowship, to take part in this ministry with us." The word ministry means ministry of the gospel, and in our standards it means nothing else. The language just quoted means and can only mean, 'we recognise you as a fellow minister of the gospel.' This act of recognition is from its nature confined to those who are in the ministry. Besides, as ordination is a solemn setting apart to a certain office, it belongs according to the doctrine of all churches, except the Brownist, to those who are clothed with the office conferred, or one superior to it, and which includes it. If ordination were merely induction into the order of presbyters, from which some members by a subsequent process, were selected to preach, and others to rule, then the service might from its nature belong to all presbyters; but as beyond dispute

ordination is an induction into a particular office, it cannot, according to our constitution, belong to any who do not hold that office. Ordination to the ministry is therefore as much a peculiar function of the ministry as preaching is. The construction of the constitution which would give ruling elders the right to join in the ordination of ministers, is no less inconsistent with what that constitution teaches of the nature of the office of ruling elder. Ordination is an act of executive power, which does not pertain to the ruling elder. They have the right to deliberate and judge, but the execution of the determinations of our judicatories belongs to the ministry. This argument was thus presented by Chancellor Johns: "The constitution of our church confers upon its officers three kinds of power—legislative, judicial and ministerial. The ruling elders are clothed by the constitution with the first two, legislative and judicial, and can carry with them nothing else place them where you may. Look at your elder in the lowest court, the church session. He sits here as a legislator and a judge. But the moment you have to execute the sentence which is passed in this court, it devolves on your minister as the executive. Trace the elder up to the presbytery or synod, there he appears as the representative of the church, but only with legislative and judicial power. When the constitution refers any act to this body, it requires that it be done in a constitutional manner, and by those possessing the requisite constitutional power. After the decree has been passed that a man shall be ordained, it follows that it must be done by those who are not defective in power. It is clear that the moment you decide that ordination is a ministerial or executive act, that moment you decide that it must be performed by those possessing ministerial or executive authority. The execution of the acts necessarily devolves on the competent parts of the body. A ministerial or executive act therefore can be performed only by ministers. Unless you make an elder a minister at once, I never can admit that he can perform an act belonging to the ministerial office. This distinction unlocks the whole difficulty. On this principle, the presbytery give the right hand of fellowship to a co-presbyter 'to take part of this ministry.' But ruling elders are not in the 'ministry,' and therefore even this act does not belong to them."

Mr. Breckinridge says a minister, *per se*, has no power to ordain, but only as a member of presbytery, and adds—

“The question comes to this, do ministers as such ordain, or is it as members of presbytery? If as the latter, and not as the former, then elders being equally members of presbytery, share in the act, and in the executive power vested in the whole body.” If the whole matter depends on the question, whether ministers, as such, ordain, or only as members of presbytery, we think it may be soon settled. Mr. B. appears to think that ministers and church courts get all their powers from the constitution; whereas the constitution is but the declaration of the powers which belong to ministers and judicatories, and the stipulations agreeably to which those who adopt it agree to exercise their respective functions. Suppose the constitution was out of existence, would ministers and courts have no power? Have not any number of ministers, no matter how or where convened, the right to ordain? Are not the ordinations by the ecclesiastical councils in New England valid, although such councils are not presbyteries within the definition of our book? An affirmative is the only answer that can be given to these questions; consequently ordination is a ministerial act; it is performed by ministers as such, and not merely as members of presbytery. It is true all the ministers of the Presbyterian church have entered into a contract with each other not to exercise this right, except under certain circumstances, or on certain conditions. They have agreed not to ordain any man who does not understand Greek, Latin and Hebrew; who has not studied theology with some approved minister, at least two years, who does not adopt our Confession of Faith and form of government. They have also agreed not to exercise this right unless regularly convened after due notice, that all interested and having a right to be present, may have the opportunity. The reason of all this is obvious. These ministers are connected with others; every man whom they ordain, becomes a joint ruler and judge over all the others; the others therefore have a right to a voice in his ordination, that is, to a voice in deciding under what circumstances or on what conditions ordination may be administered. But this does not prove that the power to ordain comes from the constitution, or that it belongs to ministers only when convened in what we call a presbytery. Any two or three ministers, and (according to Presbyterian doctrine, as we understand it,) any one minister has as full right to ordain as Timothy or Titus had. Presbyterial ordination is ordination by a



presbyter or presbyters, and not by a presbytery, in our technical sense of the term. This is surely the doctrine of the scriptures, and the only doctrine on which we can hold up our heads in the presence of prelacy. It is the only ground on which we can admit the validity of ordination by a single prelate, or by an ecclesiastical council, or, in short, of any ordinations but our own. If then, as Mr. Breckinridge says, the only question is whether ministers as such ordain, we think that even he, on reflection must admit that the right to ordain is inherent in the ministerial office, and does not arise from any provision of our constitution, or from the association of ministers and elders in the form of a presbytery.

Again, the new interpretation given to the constitution is contradicted by the practice of its framers, and the uninterrupted usage of the church. This consideration has been set aside as an argument from tradition. But no argument is more legitimate. No man can doubt that if we had authentic information how the apostles and their disciples acted in carrying out the commands of Christ, we should have the most satisfactory of all rules for the interpretation of those commands. Christ directed his disciples to celebrate the Lord's Supper as a memorial of him, and the conduct of the apostles and early Christians under that command, is the best possible proof of the perpetual obligation of the command. He directed them to teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Holy Trinity; the conduct of the disciples in baptizing whole households, is one of our best arguments in favour of infant baptism. Apostolic usage also is the main ground of our observance of the first day of the week as the weekly sabbath. The Protestant objection to the Roman doctrine of tradition is not that apostolic teaching and practice are of no authority, but that we have no authentic or satisfactory proof of what that teaching and practice were, except in the inspired scriptures. If papists will produce undoubted proof that the apostles understood the commands of Christ, and especially their own commands in a certain way, we will admit that such is the true way. So if our opponents will produce satisfactory proof that the framers of our constitution and those who adopted it, intended to express a certain idea by any of its provisions, we will admit that such is the true meaning of the instrument. As to the case in hand there is no room for dispute. The framers of our constitution find a certain expression in the Westminster Directory, under which they had long acted, and



where it had an undoubted meaning, they transfer that expression to the new constitution, and continue to act precisely as they did before, and the church has continued to act in the same way ever since. If this does not fix the meaning of the constitution, nothing can do it. No man, as far as we know, doubts or can doubt that the expression "laying on of the hands of the presbytery" was intended to mean the hands of the ministers, the standing members of the Presbytery, and that it has been so understood ever since. This being the case, we see not what shadow of proof there can be that such is not its meaning. Let it be remembered that while Presbyterians have ever contended for presbyterial ordination, they have always contended for *ministerial* ordination, and that no case of lay ordination, or of an ordination in which ruling elders participated, has been produced, or, as is believed, can be produced in the history of any Presbyterian church. Surely it is rather late in the day to begin to teach the whole Presbyterian world what are the first principles of their own system.

We have used above the expression *lay ordination*, without intending to decide whether ruling elders are laymen or not. This is a mere question of the meaning of a word. If a layman is one who holds no office in the church, then they are not laymen; and then too Dr. Lushington and other judges of the ecclesiastical courts in England are not laymen. But if a layman is a man who is not a clergyman, not a minister of the gospel, then they are laymen. The latter is certainly the common meaning of the word, which is used to designate those whose principal and characteristic business is secular, and not sacred, or clerical.

Finally, it was objected to the new doctrine that it was destructive of the office of ruling elder, by merging it into the ministry. The only satisfactory or constitutional ground on which the participation of elders in the ordination of ministers, can be defended is that they hold the same office, that they take part in the same ministry, or in short that elders are ministers. But this conclusion is subversive of the office of ruling elder and of our whole system. And *cui bono*, what good is to be attained, what evil cured by this new doctrine? It adds nothing to the dignity or usefulness of the elder's office. If it is a mere ceremony, it is not worth contending about; if it is a serious matter, it is so only because the principles on which the claim is made to rest, seriously interferes with our ecclesiastical constitution.

*Quorum of Presbytery.*

In answer to a question proposed in Overture No. 20, the committee reported the following resolution.

*Resolved*, That any three ministers of a presbytery, being regularly convened, are a quorum competent to the transaction of all business, agreeably to the provision contained in the Form of Government, ch. x. § 7. This resolution was adopted, *yeas* 83, *nays* 35.

We have seen no report of the debate on this motion, but from the protest presented by Messrs. Breckinridge and Junkin, for themselves and twenty other members, we gather that the leading objections to the ground taken by the Assembly were substantially as follows. 1. It was said to be in opposition to the letter and spirit of the constitution, which declares a presbytery to consist of all the ministers and one ruling elder, from each congregation within a certain district. As a presbytery is said to consist of ministers and elders, these form its constituent elements; and the body cannot be formed of only one of its constituent elements. The section which says that three members regularly convened, and as many elders as may be present, constitute a quorum of presbytery, shows that at least one elder is indispensable in order to the regular organization of a presbytery.

2. In sec. 10 of ch. x. which provides for the calling of extra meetings of presbytery, it is required that at least two elders should join in the call for such a meeting, and that due notice should be given to the session of every vacant congregation. This was supposed to prove that the elders are an essential part of the presbytery, and that the constitution designed to guard against any assumption of power by the ministry, to the neglect or exclusion of the eldership.

3. The decision of the Assembly was declared to be opposed to principles essential to the nature and existence of presbyterianism. It was represented as an essential element of presbyterianism that God's people govern themselves, and manage their ecclesiastical affairs, in accordance with his word, and by their own chosen and ordained representatives. The elders are declared to be the representatives of the people, to exercise discipline and government in connexion with the ministers. If this principle be destroyed the whole system is destroyed. Admit the principle that the ministry may, without the presence of any representatives of God's people, transact the business of the people, and you lay

our glorious system of representative republicanism in ruins; and over those ruins you may easily pave a highway to prelacy and popery. As every act which a presbytery may perform, affects the interest of the members of Christ's body, they are entitled to be represented; and it was wise in the framers of our constitution to provide that the people's business should never be done, unless the people had at least one representative to see to their interests, and to watch those encroachments of the ministerial order, which had resulted in one papaey and might lead to another.

4. The decision of the Assembly was uncalled for and tends to weaken the importance of the eldership, by representing that their presence in our presbyteries is not necessary and might be undesirable.

5. The impatience of the house prevented a full and fair discussion of the question; and the chief reasons urged in favour of the decision were drawn from extreme cases, not likely to occur, and which were injurious to the eldership as supposing they would be so negligent of their vows as with any frequency to absent themselves from our church courts.

Rev. Messrs. Breckinridge and J. Montgomery subjoined for themselves to this protest an expression of their opinion that the above decision appropriately, and of necessity, flowed from the decision previously made, that the constitution does not authorize ruling elders to unite, by the imposition of hands, in the ordination of ministers. Against both of these decisions they desired to protest, striking, as they believed them to do, at the fundamental principles of the constitution.

To these protests the Assembly recorded an answer, with the help of which we construct the following brief reply. The protest seems to proceed on an erroneous idea of the nature of a presbytery; as though it were a creature of our constitution. A presbytery is a number of presbyters regularly convened. Their powers belong to their office; and they are clothed with that office by their ordination. A number of ministers episcopally ordained, might associate themselves together and form a presbytery, and would, according to the doctrine of presbyterianism, have the right to ordain, and to exercise all the powers of discipline and government over their own members, and over the congregations submitting to their watch and care, that belong to any presbytery in the world. It is therefore not

necessary to the existence of a presbytery that ruling elders should constitute a portion of its members.

If the doctrine which lies at the basis of this protest is true, that ruling elders are "an essential element of a presbytery," indispensable to its nature and existence, then there was no such thing as a presbytery in the world for a long series of ages; then we must deny the validity of the orders, or at least of the early ordinations of all Protestant churches, for it is certain that their ministers were not ordained by presbyteries of which ruling elders were members. There is nothing in the scriptures or in our confession that authorizes such a doctrine.

It may, however be said that although ruling elders are not indispensable to the existence of a presbytery; yet under our constitution the presence of one or more ruling elders, is necessary to the regular constitution and action of a presbytery in our church. This is a very different point; yet it would appear that the great reason for the adoption of the particular construction of the constitution presented in the protest, is to be found in the doctrine that ruling elders are essential to the existence of any presbytery. Apart from this preconceived idea of the nature of a presbytery, the constitution gives very little colour to the construction put upon it by the protest. When it is said that the presbytery "consists of all the ministers and one ruling elder from each congregation within a certain district;" the constitution merely teaches of what materials a presbytery may be composed: it says nothing as to what is necessary to its regular constitution. It does not say that a presbytery must consist of all the ministers, or that there must be an elder from each congregation. It is very rare indeed that a presbytery in point of fact consists of all the ministers and all the elders who have a right to be present. Thus the General Assembly, it is said, *shall* consist of an equal delegation of bishops and elders from each presbytery. But who has ever seen such a General Assembly? These clauses, therefore, teach nothing as to what is necessary to form a presbytery competent to proceed to business. But does not the section which says that any three ministers and as many elders as may be present, &c., shall be a quorum, teach that the presence of at least one elder is necessary for that purpose? We do not think this construction would be put upon that clause, by any who was not possessed with the idea that there can no presbytery without ruling elders. If



any number of ministers regularly convened is a presbytery ; and if our book recognises the right of elders to sit and vote as members of presbytery ; then we think the plain sense of the above clause is, That three is the smallest number of ministers that, in our church, can act as a presbytery, and when regularly convened may proceed to business together with any elders who may be present. The ministers constitute the presbytery ; they are the permanent members of the body ; in that body each session has a right to be represented by one elder. This, we consider the plain meaning of our Book. Elders have a right to come, and it is very important they should come, but they are not compelled to come, nor is their presence necessary to the constitution of the body.

Had the framers of our constitution intended to introduce the novel idea that there could be no presbytery, without ruling elders, they would doubtless have said, Three ministers and at least one ruling elder, shall be necessary to form a quorum. But as they have not said this, or any thing equivalent to it, we have no reason to suppose they intended to lay down any such rule.

2. It is further argued that the decision is hostile to what is declared to be a principle essential to the very nature and existence of presbyterianism, viz., that God's people should govern themselves, and manage their own ecclesiastical affairs, in accordance with his word and by their own chosen and ordained representatives. The first remark to be made on this argument is, that the decision protested against, has no special hostility to that principle. Ministers are just as much the representatives of the people as elders are. Both are chosen by the people to their stations in the church ; neither have any authority over any congregation, not voluntarily subject to their watch and care ; and at the same time neither derives his authority from the people, nor is either responsible to them. Both classes stand, as far as this point is concerned, in precisely the same relation to the people ; and a presbytery composed entirely of ministers, is no more hostile to the principle that "God's people govern themselves," than a presbytery composed entirely of ruling elders.

But, secondly, we demur to the principle itself. It is no part of our presbyterianism that God's people govern themselves, any more than that a family governs itself. In other words, in the Christian church, as in a Christian fami-

ly, the power and authority of the rulers do not come from the people, but from Christ. He committed the power to teach and rule to certain officers; and directed them to communicate the same authority to others. All the power they have comes from Him; the power goes with the commission, which is received in each case from the officers and not from the members of the church. This is just as true in the case of ruling elders as of ministers. The authority to exercise the power inherent in their respective offices, over any congregation depends on the will of that congregation, but not the power itself. If I am ordained a minister of the gospel, I have all the rights and privileges attached by Christ to that office; but I have no authority over any congregation that does not choose me as their pastor, or that does not voluntarily subject itself to the presbytery of which I am a member. Whether this is republicanism or not, we do not know, and are not careful to enquire, seeing we are persuaded it is the order which Christ has established in his own house for edification and not for destruction. We are persuaded also, that no man can show philosophically, that such power, or such a theory of the church, is peculiarly liable to abuse; or historically, that it has ever led to any serious or lasting evils. As in the case of a family, the authority of the parent, derived from God, and independent of the will of the children, is in general restrained within proper bounds by natural affection; so in the Presbyterian church the authority of its officers, though derived from Christ, is effectually restrained by two important limitations. The one is, that it neither extends over the conscience, nor is armed with any power to inflict civil pains or penalties. It is simply ministerial and spiritual. If Presbyterian ministers or elders inflict any censure contrary to God's word, it is, by their own doctrine, innoxious and nugatory. They pretend to no power, but to declare and execute the commands of Christ; and any man, who sees that their acts are not authorized by those commands, feels himself unhurt by any thing they can do to him. The other limitation is, that the submission of the people even to this ministerial and spiritual authority, is voluntary, enforced by no other than moral considerations, which submission is a matter of duty only when the rules of the word of God are adhered to. When we say that the subjection of the people to the legitimate authority of their spiritual rulers, is voluntary, we do not mean that they are

under no moral obligation to unite themselves to the church, and to submit to its discipline; but that this is a voluntary and rational subjection. It is free for them to decide with what church they will connect themselves, and how long that connexion shall continue, subject only to their responsibility to God. If the people wish more liberty than this they must go where the Bible is unknown. There is no tendency therefore in the decision of the Assembly to foster tyranny in the church, or to introduce popery; and we presume the protesters themselves feel very little uneasiness on that point. They cannot but know that the source of priestly power, is false doctrine. So long as the people have unimpeded access to Jesus Christ, and are not taught that it is only through the hands of their ministers, that they can obtain pardon and salvation, their liberties are secure. The truth makes and will ever keep men free.

3. The only other ground of protest is that the decision in question, tends to disparage the eldership and to discourage their attendance on our presbyteries. We cannot see the force of this objection. Does the clause declaring that only three ministers are required to form a quorum, tend to disparage the other members of the body, as though they were of so little account, that the presbytery can dispense with their attendance, and would be glad to have as few of them as possible? The complaint that the eldership are undervalued and denied their just influence in the church, is one of the most unfounded that can be made. The influence of a man in our judicatories depends far more on his personal qualifications than on his station. It is not to be expected that a weak and ignorant man, be he elder or minister, can have the weight with his brethren which a man of talent and learning, whether minister or elder, possesses. The protestants must have observed that there were elders on the floor of the last Assembly, who were listened to with a deference manifested towards few ministers, and whose judgments had a weight of which few clerical members of the house could boast. As far as we have observed, it is always the case, that, other things being equal, the influence of elders in our public bodies is greater than that of ministers. And what is much to their credit, they have sense enough to see and acknowledge it. These complaints of their being undervalued, are almost always from ministers; and are to the elders themselves matters of surprise and sometimes of amusement. The true influence

of any set of men depends in a great measure in their acting in their appropriate sphere. The influence of the clergy is not to be increased, by their acting as laymen; nor that of laymen by their acting as clergymen. The value of the office of ruling elder, we hold to be inestimable; but it depends upon his being a ruling elder, with rights, duties, and privileges distinct from those of the minister; on his being, in the ordinary sense of the word, a layman and not a clergyman.

### *Marriage Question.*

Overtures were received from the Synods of New Jersey and Alabama, and from the presbyteries of Troy, New York, West Lexington and the Western District, requesting the Assembly to send down to the presbyteries, the question, whether the Confession of Faith should be amended by striking out the last clause of the 4th section of the 24th chap., which says, "The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own, nor the woman of her husband's kindred, nearer in blood than of her own." These overtures were referred to the committee of Bills and Overtures, who reported, May 22, in favour of sending down the proposed question. Two of the committee, Dr. J: C. Lord and Rev. Hiram Chamberlain, dissented from this report, and recommended the adoption of a resolution declaring any such reference to the presbyteries inexpedient. When the resolution proposed by the committee came up, May 26, Dr. Hoge, moved to lay the whole subject on the table; on the ground that the consideration of it would lead to a long and unprofitable discussion of the merits of the case. This motion prevailed; *yeas* 83; *nays* 55. On the afternoon of May 29th, Dr. Leland, moved to take up the subject; urging that it was not proper to neglect the request of so many of the lower judicatories. He added that although he had always been opposed to such marriages, he was more opposed to refusing to apply, in such cases, to the constitutional source of power for a decision. Dr. Leland's motion was carried by a vote of 56 to 49. The motion was then advocated by Dr. Maclean, on the ground that the request was made by whole synods and presbyteries; that there was so much diversity of opinion in the church on the subject, that a reference to the presbyteries was the only way by which the question could be settled; that the Confession of Faith



ought not to contain any thing which hundreds of our ministers and thousands of our church-members, with whom the speaker fully sympathized, believed unauthorized by the word of God; that the other churches by which we are surrounded, the laws of the land, and the general sentiment of the country were in favour of the lawfulness of marriages which our book condemns.

Dr. Hoge and Mr. Breckinridge spoke against the motion, and the former moved that the whole subject should be referred to a committee of three, to report an amended form of the section to be sent down to the presbyteries. A motion, however, was made to lay the whole subject on the table, which prevailed: *yeas* 68, *nays* 63. On the following day, Dr. Hoge moved that the subject be again taken up, with a view to appoint a committee to report on the subject to the next Assembly. He said he made this motion not because he wished any change in this article in the Confession, which he believed to be, as it now stands, in accordance with the word of God, but simply because some of the brethren think we have not treated them and the judicatories of the church fairly in the disposition of the subject which we have made. The motion to take the subject up was carried: *yeas* 61, *nays* 54; and then without debate or division, it was voted to refer it to a committee of five to report to the next Assembly. It was at first determined to appoint this committee by ballot; but subsequently, on the nomination of Mr. Breckinridge, the following gentlemen were appointed, viz. Messrs. Hoge, Spring, Leland, Hodge and N. L. Rice.

That this is a difficult and complicated subject, must, on all hands, be admitted. There are three very distinct questions in relation to it, which ought not to be confounded. 1. Is the doctrine now taught on this point in our Confession in accordance with the word of God? 2. If so, ought the article in question, to be made a term of Christian and ministerial communion? 3. If not, is the striking out the clause proposed to be erased, the right remedy for the difficulty?

As to the first of these points there are avowedly three opinions in the church. The one that the Confession as it now stands is in its strictest sense in accordance with the scriptures, and therefore that the marriages in question are in such a sense unlawful as to be invalid in the sight of God. Separation of the parties, according to this view, is in all cases an indispensable requisite for admission to the pri-

vileges of the church. The second opinion is, that although the marriages in question are unlawful, i. e. contrary to the rule laid down in the scriptures, they are not, in all cases, (i. e. the remotest degrees of kindred forbidden in our Book,) invalid. The separation of the parties in such cases, so far from being a duty, would be according to this view, a sin. This view of the subject, we believe to be far more prevalent in the church than the other. Many brethren who are the most strenuous in their support of the Book are disposed to leave the parties already living in such connexions, unmolested in the enjoyment of their church privileges. But this they could not do, if they believed their marriages to be invalid. This second opinion is founded on the obvious principle of religious ethics that although, in many cases, it may be wrong to enter into certain engagements, yet the engagement when formed is binding. That this is a sound principle cannot be doubted, and admits, were it necessary, of abundant illustration. It was against the law of God for the ancient Israelites to form any treaties with the heathen; and yet, in many cases, such treaties when formed were morally binding. It is contrary to the divine will for any man to violate the law of the land, and yet in a multitude of cases, the municipal law regulating marriage, may be violated without rendering the contract morally void. In England, a few years ago, the law forbade any man but a minister of the established church to solemnize marriage; the ceremony could be legally performed only at certain places, and during certain hours of the day. Yet no one doubts that a marriage solemnized by a Romish priest, or a Presbyterian minister, or out of canonical hours, was valid and binding in the sight of God, though in one sense contrary to the law of God, by being contrary to the law of the land. But to take a case nearer to the point, God forbids in his word believers and unbelievers to be unequally yoked together. It is laid down as a principle meant to be conservative of the peace and religious character of families, that the people of God should not intermarry with his enemies. Should a minister of the gospel marry a gay, worldly woman, he would certainly violate this principle; and still more obviously would he act contrary to the divine law, were he to marry a skeptic or a heathen. But in no one of these cases would the marriage be invalid. In like manner, God has laid down the general rule that a man should not marry his near kindred. This law cannot be violated

with impunity; but it does not follow that every marriage inconsistent with it should be dissolved. About the principle there can be no doubt; whether it is applicable to the case of marriage, depends on the view taken of the general law of marriage. If that law is a moral one, in the highest sense of the term, then no engagement inconsistent with its provisions can be binding, any more than a man can bind himself to commit murder. But if it be a positive law, or only in a secondary sense moral, and therefore dispensable, then the principle is applicable, in all cases where the sacred obligation of the marriage contract is more obligatory than the positive law with which it is in conflict. If a man is in such circumstances that he cannot comply with both of two laws, it is a plain principle that the weaker law gives way, or ceases to be binding. If the law of the Sabbath conflicts with the claims of mercy, it is in that case no longer obligatory; for God will have mercy and not sacrifice. It is not our purpose at present to argue any thing; but merely to state what are the opinions prevailing in the church in relation to this subject. It is certainly true that while some brethren think all marriages forbidden in our confession are not only unlawful but invalid; a much larger number, while they believe them to be unlawful, i. e. inconsistent with the rule laid down in the scriptures on the subject, believe them to be, in the cases referred to, valid and binding.

A third opinion is that the law, as it now stands, is inconsistent with the word of God, forbidding what that word, and the laws of almost all our states, do not prohibit. How large this class of brethren is we cannot tell. In the northern portion of the church, they probably constitute a great majority; in the southern and western portions a minority.

The second question is, Whether the law forbidding a man to marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own, ought to be made a term of ministerial and Christian communion? This is a grave question. It seems plain that we are not at liberty to make every truth contained in the word of God, a term of communion. This is contrary to the express command of the apostle, and would render the unity of the church impracticable. It is only those things which are clearly revealed, and which are of such moment that ministers cannot differ about them and be qualified for the office of preachers in the same church, that should be included in the terms of ministerial commu-

nion; and only those about which Christians cannot safely differ, that should be embraced in the terms of Christian communion. Now it is said, we should be very sure that a thing is clearly revealed before we can make the disbelief of it, the ground of exclusion from the church. The fact that there is such an avowed diversity of opinion on the subject in question, is one of the arguments urged against the clause complained of being retained in our Confession of Faith.

Again, it is urged against the rule that it never was, and practically it cannot be uniformly enforced. Although in one part of the church it has been carried into effect, in another it has been suffered to lie dormant. So that we have, and ever have had, in our churches, and at times in our eldership and ministry, men in good standing, who have contracted marriages in violation of this rule. But even this is not the greatest difficulty. Such is the state of opinion in the church on this subject that uniformity cannot be attained. If it would violate the conscience of a northern presbytery to discipline a brother for such a marriage, it would violate the conscience of many of our presbyteries in the south, to pass the matter in silence. Where the sentiment of the church is against the marriage, it cannot be overlooked; where the opposite sentiment prevails it cannot be censured. We have heard of a minister who had scarcely more than twelve members of a large congregation who would consent to hear him preach, after his marriage with the sister of his deceased wife; and when he attempted to administer the Lord's Supper, all the elders declined serving. Such a man is as it were excluded from the ministry by public sentiment, before any church censure can be brought to bear upon him. Now what is to be done? This is a practical question. Shall we agree to differ? or must we separate on this point?

This introduces the third question. Is the erasure of the clause proposed to be stricken out, the proper remedy for the difficulty?

Practically it certainly will not reach it; for as the Book will still condemn marriages within the degrees prohibited in the word of God, all those sessions and presbyteries who think the marriage in question included in the prohibition, will feel not only authorized, but required to proceed just as if the Book were left unaltered. We shall have just the same diversity of opinion and practice without the clause that we have with it. We have heard it suggested that the best plan



would be to leave the Book as it is; and allow the several sessions and presbyteries (as they have ever been allowed,) to pursue their own course in the matter, the General Assembly not interfering to coerce obedience to the rule where the lower court does not feel called upon to enforce it; and acting only when a case is made, and brought up by appeal from some lower judicatory. This is substantially the very course the church has been pursuing the last fifty years; and it is the course we doubt not, in practice, that she will have to pursue for many years to come. This course is attended with no real hardship; because it admits of the free exercise of the different opinions which exist in the church on the subject. If a man is a member of a session or presbytery who are known to believe the word of God condemns such marriages, he acts with his eyes open when he contracts them. He has no right to force his brethren to tolerate what they think wrong; or to insist upon being a member of a body against the judgment and conscience of all his fellow members. It may be said that it is an anomalous state for a church to be in; one presbytery suspending from his office a minister for an act, which another presbytery passes without censure. This is very true. But it is, and for fifty years or more, has been the actual state of the church. And how can you help it? You cannot force all to think alike, and therefore you cannot make all act alike. You must either allow this diversity of opinion and practice, or you must split the church. Believing as we do that a decided majority of the church is in favour of the Book, substantially as it now stands, we suspect the course which would give the most general satisfaction is the one just suggested. Leave the Book unaltered and leave the lower courts to act under it according to the dictates of their own consciences.

Another strong objection against striking out the clause under consideration, is that it will leave the section in a state at once ambiguous and unsatisfactory. It will be ambiguous because it will then say "marriage ought not to be within the degrees of consanguinity or affinity, forbidden in the word." But there are not a few in our church who say there is no law relating to this subject in the Bible. Others, say that although the 18th ch. of Leviticus relates to marriage, it is no longer binding. Others say it is binding as far as the specified cases go, but no further. Others, say it is binding not only as to the specified cases, but as to the

degrees of which those cases are instances. Here are no less than four different views prevailing more or less in the church, and the Confession, if altered in the manner proposed, decides nothing respecting them, except indeed, by implication that some degrees are prohibited in the scriptures. If it were said, we must teach no doctrine inconsistent with what is taught in the word concerning original sin, it would be a very unfit clause for a confession of faith or bond of union among brethren.

The section would not only be ambiguous, but it would be satisfactory to no portion of the church. It would declare that such marriages can never be made lawful by any law of man or consent of parties, so as those persons may live together as man and wife. This is the clause which after all gives most trouble, and which the proposed alteration leaves in full force, applying to each and every case prohibited in the word. As a matter of fact, there can be no doubt that a very large number of our ministers and elders do not believe that all these marriages, though unlawful, are invalid. To them therefore, as well as to those who take more liberal ground on the whole subject, the section as it would stand, will be altogether unsatisfactory.

The mere striking out of the last section, therefore, appears to us to be the worst of all expedients. It cannot prevent the diversity of opinion and practice that now prevails; it would render the law in the highest degree ambiguous; and leave it as unsatisfactory to a large part of the church as it is at present. Whether the committee who have it in charge to report on this subject to the next Assembly, will be able to prepare any thing to meet all these conflicting views, remains to be seen. Dr. Hoge, we learn from the proceedings of the Assembly, is in favour of a modified form of the whole section, which, if we are correctly informed, differs from the present, mainly in this, that it does not pronounce all these marriages to be invalid, which is the common understanding of the Book as it now stands. A section which should affirm the continued obligation of the law of marriage, as contained in the 18th ch. of Leviticus; that should state what, in the judgment of the church, the intent and scope of that law is; and that should leave it open to the church courts to deal with each particular case according to its merits, might possibly be framed so as to meet the views of the great majority of our brethren.

*Case of the Rev. Archibald McQueen.*

As soon as the preceding subject was disposed of the Rev. Dr. Maclean proposed the following preamble and resolution: "Whereas the Rev. Archibald McQueen was suspended by the Presbytery of Fayetteville from the exercise of his ministry and from the communion of the church, for marrying the sister of his deceased wife; and whereas the General Assembly of the last year, affirmed the decision of the presbytery; and whereas, in the judgment of this General Assembly, the censure which has been inflicted hitherto submitted to, ought to be removed; therefore, Resolved, That the Presbytery of Fayetteville be directed to remove the aforesaid sentence of suspension, and to restore the Rev. Archibald McQueen to the communion of the church and the exercise of the ministry."

This unexpected motion added much to the excitement which the preceding question had produced; and Dr. M., while proceeding with his remarks was repeatedly called to order. The moderator, however, decided that he was speaking in order. At length the question was raised, whether the motion itself was not out of order, inasmuch as it proposed to review and reverse a decision of the last Assembly, a motion which this Assembly was incompetent to entertain. The moderator decided that the motion was in order, which decision was, upon appeal, sustained by the house. Dr. Maclean then proceeded with his remarks, advocating the restoration of Mr. McQueen; principally on the following grounds; first, the diversity of opinion in the Assembly, by which Mr. McQ. was condemned; some censuring him mainly because he had violated a rule of the church; others because the act charged merited in itself a limited suspension, while others thought he ought to abandon his wife before he could be restored. Secondly, he urged the excellent character of Mr. McQ. and the painful circumstances in which he was placed by the action of the church. Thirdly, the great hardship of leaving one man under this severe censure, while so many other men were allowed to remain undisturbed in the bosom of the church. He urged further the obsolete character of the law under which the sentence had been passed, and the respectful submission which Mr. McQ. had rendered to the painful sentence under which he laboured; and especially the consideration that the highest judicatory of our church, whether the old synod, or subsequently the General Assembly, had

never been disposed to take extreme action in such cases. In support of this last position he cited various decisions of our earlier church courts.

Dr Nott moved the reference of the motion to the same committee to which the proposal for an amendment of the constitution had already been referred. Both the reference and the original motion were strenuously opposed by Messrs. Junkin, Breckinridge, I. W. Platt, and Chancellor Johns. The last named gentleman remarked that this was a case of discipline. When we find where we are, then we know what rule ought to govern us. It being a case of discipline there is no doubt what course ought to be pursued. To take up such a case when the parties are out of court, the record gone, and all the pleadings out of view would be an unheard of proceeding. But viewing the matter in the light of a mere resolution it is a prejudging of the case. You may call it legislation, but the name will not alter the nature of the transaction. What would be thought of an appellate court, taking up a case already decided, and without hearing any of the parties, or calling for the record, sending it down with all the weight of its influence, in favour of a reversal of the sentence? And shall we send down a mandatory writ to the presbytery, which has the exclusive right primarily to judge in the case? Let us stop here. My great desire is to preserve the purity of this high ecclesiastical court. As in civil matters a judge must not express an opinion in advance, so here we should cautiously avoid the expression of an opinion on a case that may yet come up before the General Assembly by reference or appeal. Let Mr. McQueen, if he is so disposed, apply to his presbytery, and if they refuse to entertain his application or to do him justice in the premises, let him complain or appeal to the Synod or General Assembly; but I beseech you, moderator, let not this high court of final resort disqualify itself for such a review, by prejudging the case.

As soon as Chancellor Johns concluded, the previous question was called and sustained. The motion for commitment being thus cut off, the question on Dr. Maclean's resolution was then put and rejected by an overwhelming vote, very few voices being heard in the affirmative.

The principle involved in this case is one of no little importance. The question whether the Assembly had the constitutional right to entertain the motion to restore Mr. McQueen, or to order his restoration, is of course very dif-



ferent from the question, Whether it was expedient to pass such a motion, or whether the method proposed was the right way of reaching the end aimed at. Dr. Maclean supposed he had sufficiently guarded his motion from the objections so forcibly urged by Mr Johns, by avoiding all expression of opinion as to the decision of the preceding Assembly. It might be assumed that their sentence was perfectly equitable and just, and yet if it had been submitted to, and been endured for more than a year, it might be proper that it should now be removed. But has the Assembly the right, by a mere resolution, to inflict or remove a judicial sentence? A negative answer to this question does not appear to us to be sustained by saying that the Assembly has only appellate jurisdiction in such cases. This is a very prevalent doctrine, but its correctness, is at least a matter of doubt. It is certain that the Assembly of the Church of Scotland has ever claimed and exercised original jurisdiction, acting as the presbytery of the whole church. It is certain that similar ecclesiastical councils, have in all ages of the church, acted on the same principle. And our own Assembly, in some few cases, has done the same. It has taken up a foreign minister whom one of our presbyteries refused to receive, examined him touching his qualifications, and passed a vote of approbation, and authorized any presbytery to whom he should apply to receive him as a member. There may be cases in which the exercise of this right might be expedient and necessary. But whatever may be thought on this point, it should be remembered that the Assembly, though it is an appellate court, is a great deal more. There is no exact analogy between our judicatories, and the civil courts of the country, because in our civil government, the legislative, judicial, and executive functions are carefully distinguished, and in general committed to different hands; but with us all these powers are vested in the same bodies. The Assembly is the highest legislative, judicial and executive body in the church. It was not called upon to act as a court, but as the executive. It was not asked to review a decision but to remit a sentence; to do what the executive of a state does, when it grants a pardon or remits a penalty decreed by a judicial tribunal. The Assembly could not be called upon to inflict a sentence, without parties, without records, or without argument, for from the very nature of such an act, it could only be performed by the body in its judicial capacity.

But this does not prove that it might not remit even the most justly inflicted sentence, if the occasion called for the exercise of this executive grace.

Whatever may be thought of the abstract question of the right of the Assembly, in its executive capacity, to remit a sentence judicially inflicted, the arguments against its exercise, in the case under consideration, seem to us unanswerable. There is the general objection founded upon the difficulty of discriminating between the executive and judicial functions of such a body, or of preventing the one from interfering with the other. We do not see how the argument of Mr. Johns is to be disposed of, that the Assembly was liable to be called upon to sit judicially on the very question which it was then called upon to decide by resolution. The question whether the censure inflicted on Mr. McQueen had been endured a sufficient length of time, was one which he might at any time bring before the Assembly, by applying to be restored to the exercise of his office. This suggests another of the arguments urged against Dr. Maclean's motion, that it aimed at accomplishing in an irregular way, an object which could be attained by the ordinary operation of our system. It was not a case for which the constitution provided no remedy. The lower courts were open to Mr. McQueen, and to them he might at any time apply, and in case of their refusal, he could seek redress at the bar of the Assembly. There was great weight also in the objection urged by Mr. Breckinridge, that the Assembly was called upon to act in ignorance of the facts necessary for a proper decision of the case. They did not know that Mr. McQueen even wished to re-enter a church whose laws condemned his conduct; they knew not officially whether he retained any relation to the presbytery of Fayetteville, or whether he had connected himself with some other denomination. With what propriety then could the Assembly be called upon of its own motion, without any application from any quarter, to act in the business.

There is another consideration as it seems to us of great weight in this matter. The unavoidable consequence of acting on the plan proposed by Dr. Maclean must be a collision between the Assembly and the lower courts. Admitting that the Assembly has the right, of its own motion, to restore a man to the ministry, has it a right to force him on a reluctant presbytery? That the presbyteries may judge of the qualifications of their own members, is one

most certain and important rights; and one which they can exercise without responsibility to any higher court. They have a right to refuse to receive any man as a member whom they judge for any reason to be unsuitable. Could the Assembly force an abolitionist on a southern presbytery? Where a case comes up judicially from a lower court and the Assembly decides that their reasons for suspending him were insufficient, the operation of that decision is indeed to restore him to his standing in the body, but this is very different from directing a presbytery to receive into their confidence and communion a man who has no connection with them, and whom they consider unworthy or unsuitable for membership. We doubt whether any presbytery would be willing, in this extra judicial way, to receive any man against whom they had conscientious objections, on the simple direction of the General Assembly. If the Assembly chose to take the whole matter into their own hands, let them restore Mr. McQueen to his standing, and authorize any presbytery who saw fit, to receive him. This would be going great lengths, but it would be less objectionable than forcing him on a body whose consciences forbade their acknowledging him as a minister, in good standing. On the whole we greatly rejoice that a course so unprecedented and so liable to objection, was met by a vote of such decided condemnation.

#### *Temperance Question.*

This subject came up on the review of the minutes of the synod of Pittsburgh. It appears that the question, "Should a retailer of intoxicating drinks, knowing that they are used for the common purposes of beverage, be continued in the full privileges of the church, and certified as a member in good standing" was referred by that synod to a committee, who made a report which was adopted, and is to the effect, that no member of the church should be excluded from its privileges, except for some "offence;" that an offence, "is anything in the principles or practice of a church-member, which is contrary to the word of God; or which if it be not, in its own nature, sinful, may tempt others to sin, or mar their spiritual edification;" that the practice of retailing intoxicating drinks, need not be pronounced in its own nature sinful, but that it certainly tempts others to sin, and therefore is an "offence" within the meaning of the Book. But is it such an offence as ought to exclude those who

commit it from the privileges of the church? In answer to this question the report states that anything which would be a proper ground for debarring an applicant admission to the church, ought to be considered a sufficient ground of excommunication or exclusion; that anything which essentially impairs or destroys the evidence of Christian character is a bar to admission, and ought to be considered a ground for exclusion. In proof that the practice in question does destroy the credibility of a Christian profession, it is argued that "the man who, at the present time, is ignorant of the effect of the practice referred to, in tempting others to sin, and marring their spiritual edification, must be criminally regardless of what is going on around him. And he, who knowing this, perseveres in the practice, evinces a state of heart directly the reverse of that which is produced by the grace of God that bringeth salvation."

That this is not establishing a new term of communion in the church, the report argues because the old and acknowledged condition of communion, is credible evidence of Christian character, and as the practice of retailing intoxicating drinks has been shown to vitiate that evidence and to work a forfeiture of the privileges of Christian communion, we do but enforce the old condition. This report was "adopted by the Synod and recommended to be read in all the congregations within its bounds." When the committee of the General Assembly reviewed the minutes of that body, they recommended that they should be approved with the exception of the above report, because it virtually made "the retailing of intoxicating drinks a test of piety and a term of membership in the Presbyterian church."

This recommendation gave rise to a protracted discussion. Dr. Lord proposed as a substitute for the report of the committee, "That the records be approved except so far as they seem to establish a general rule in regard to the use and sale of ardent spirits as a beverage, which use and sale are generally to be decidedly disapproved; but each case must be decided in view of all the attendant circumstances that go to modify and give character to the same." Mr. Breckinridge moved the following as a substitute for Dr. Lord's proposition, or rather for the exception in the report of the committee, "But whereas the question has been made before this General Assembly whether the sale of intoxicating drinks, in all cases, shall be a bar to communion in the Presbyterian church, therefore, Resolved, That while



the Assembly rejoice in the success of the temperance reformation, and will make use of all lawful means to promote it, they cannot sanction any new terms of communion." This resolution was rejected, and that offered by Dr. Lord was finally adopted.

Did we not know how liable we all are to have our minds clouded and perverted about the plainest matters, and how easily the evil resident in our nature mingles with everything we do, we should be surprised to find good men differing about such a subject as temperance, and unholy feelings influencing the discussions to which such difference of opinion gives rise. We make this latter remark without any reference to the recent debates in the General Assembly, for we rejoice to believe that throughout the long, animated and exciting discussion, there was not, as one of the audience testifies "the least exhibition of rude deportment or unpleasant feeling." But how is it that there should be such diversity of opinion even in the Assembly on such a subject? To what does this diversity relate? Not to the sinfulness of intemperance; not to the prevalence of the evil, not to the amount of crime, degradation and misery of which it is the fruitful source, not to the duty of all men to endeavour by precept and example to oppose its progress, not to the great good that has been effected by temperance societies, not to the desirableness of continuing and extending the influence of the reformation already so happily begun; but mainly to certain questions in morals, which are indeed of great practical importance. We believe that the dissensions among good men on such subjects as temperance, slavery, and the like, arise in a great measure from the want of due discrimination somewhere as to the elementary principles of ethics. By elementary, we do not so much mean obvious, as ultimate. Men may agree that a thing is right, but differ as to the grounds of this judgment, and such difference will of necessity produce diversity in the reasons by which they enforce the duty, the means they employ to carry out their views, and the spirit which animates their endeavours. It makes all the difference in the world, whether a thing is wrong in itself, or for reasons extraneous to its own nature. If it is wrong in itself, it is always wrong; it is always the ground of reproach or censure; and it should be opposed in a way entirely inadmissible on the supposition that it is, in its own nature, a matter of indifference. It is evident that it is the prevalent doctrine

of our Temperance Societies, and of our self-called temperance men, that the use and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage is in itself an immorality. As to this point there can be no higher authority than the National Temperance Convention held at Saratoga, July, 1841, who declared, "That the tendency of all intoxicating drinks to derange the bodily functions, to lead to drunkenness, to harden the heart, sear the conscience, destroy domestic peace, excite to the commission of crime, waste human life, and destroy souls; and the rebukes and warnings of God in his word in relation to them, in connection with every law of self-preservation and of love, imposed upon all men a solemn moral obligation to cease forever from their manufacture, sale and use, as a beverage, and so unitedly call upon us as men and Christians, not to pause in our work until such manufacture sale and use, shall be universally abandoned." This declaration of the immorality of the manufacture, sale and use of all intoxicating drinks as a beverage, being founded, not on the peculiar circumstances of any time or place, but on the inherent nature and tendency of such drinks, is a declaration that their sale and use are, and always have been sinful. And as it is a fact, just as clear as any other fact contained in the scripture, that God and Christ did not prohibit, but allowed the use of such drinks, we cannot hesitate to say that the above resolution is infidel in its spirit and tendency, however many good men may have been cajoled or driven into the sin of giving it their sanction. It has produced, therefore, its legitimate effects in vitiating the arguments, the measures, and, to a lamentable extent, the spirit of the Temperance Society. It has led to a disregard of the authority of the word of God, to a shameful perversion of its meaning, to shocking irreverence in the manner of speaking of our blessed Redeemer. It has in all these and other ways tended to undermine the foundations of religion, and has given, in many places, an infidel character to the whole temperance movement. It has just as necessarily led to coercive measures in the promotion of the object aimed at, invoking the aid of church courts and church censures. It has produced a spirit of denunciation and censoriousness. Good men are represented as bad men, for no other reason than a denial of the false principle above stated, and for their opposition to the arguments by which it is sustained. We refer, as a single example, to the case of Dr. Maclean, one of the most disinterested of men, a man who has more moral

worth than would serve for an outfit for a whole generation of such men as ignorantly traduce him ; a man, who not only practices upon the principles of total abstinence, but has over and again signed pledges to that effect, who is yet constantly more or less defamed, because he refuses to submit his judgment and conscience to this new and self-created tribunal of moral principle and conduct. Just so long and so far as the false doctrine above stated, is maintained by our Temperance Societies, will it be the duty of the friends of religion and of temperance itself, at whatever cost to themselves, to bear their testimony against it, and resist all measures designed to establish and enforce it.

The New York Observer says in reference to the discussions in the Assembly, that "through the whole progress of the debate, not a single expression was heard that could be distorted by the most fastidious ear, into a support of that dogma of modern ultraism, which has so often jeopardized the temperance reform ; that 'it is a sin *per se* to use or sell intoxicating drinks.' All appeared satisfied, and many expressly declared their willingness to rest the cause on the broad ground of expediency so clearly set forth by St. Paul, in regard to both 'meat and wine ;' which they considered as a firm and ample foundation for the glorious superstructure." Our brethren of the Synod of Pittsburgh also, state that they do not affirm the practice of retailing intoxicating drinks, to be in its own nature sinful. We fear however there is often a great mistake made as to the proper place of expediency, as it is called, in questions of duty. The principle which the apostle lays down, Rom. xiv. ch. and 1 Cor. viii. ch., is that it is wrong for us to make such a use of our liberty, in things indifferent, as to lead our brethren into sin. This is the general principle, but it is subject to the important limitation that this compliance with either the scruples or weakness of others, must be "for their good to edification." If it would sanction any false doctrine, or tend to establish any false principle of duty, the compliance would itself be wrong ; because it is far more important, and far more useful for others, that the truth should be kept pure than that those who are weak or ignorant should not be offended. Paul's precept and example, as well as the very nature of the case, impose this limitation on the principle in question. To avoid giving offence, and to save the Jews from the sin of rejecting the gospel, without a hearing, he circumcised Timothy ; but when there was danger

that compliance would sanction the doctrine of justification by works, he refused to circumcise Titus. Christ would not comply with the conscientious scruples of the men of his generation, but consented to be called a sabbath-breaker and a wine-bibber, because he saw their good and the cause of truth required it. It was in the same spirit of enlightened Christian ethics that Luther urged his followers to observe certain religious days, adding however, if any man says you must do it, then go to your ordinary work, as hard as you can.

It follows, therefore, that any rule of duty founded on expediency must be variable. If I am bound to abstain from certain things only because the use of them would do my brethren harm, the obligation exists only when his real good would be promoted by my abstinence. If the obligation arises from circumstances, it must vary with circumstances. If it was Paul's duty at Jerusalem to have his head shaved and to keep the law; it was his duty at Antioch to disregard the law and to eat with the Gentiles. If it was his duty under one set of circumstances to circumcise Timothy, it was his duty under another to refuse to circumcise Titus. If it was his duty in Corinth to abstain from eating meat; it was his duty among the Essenes, who made religion to consist in such matters, to eat it. Thus we doubt not, in our day, it is a duty in many parts of the country to practice on the principles of total abstinence; in others no such obligation may exist; and we suspect in others it is an imperative duty openly to refuse to do it. If in any place such abstinence would countenance false doctrines, or false principles of morals, or sanction infidel sentiments, or add weight to infidel measures, we ought not to give place by subjection, no not for an hour. Let real love to our brethren, guided by the word of God, direct our conduct, and though we may not all act in the same way, we shall all act right.

It follows also from the very nature of expediency, that every man must be allowed to decide and act for himself. He is not to subject his conscience or conduct to the judgment of others in such cases. If a thing be indifferent in its own nature, if God has neither commanded nor forbidden the use of it, then I must decide for myself, whether it is right to use it or not. It is a question which no man can decide for me, and which depends on whether most good will result from using or not using the thing in ques-



tion; a point often exceedingly difficult if not impossible with any confidence to decide. This is the very principle which Paul so strenuously asserted. While he said it was wrong to eat meat with offence, (i. e. so as to cause others to sin,) he said also, Let not him which eateth not, judge him that eateth. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant, and to his own master he standeth or falleth. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks, and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks.

It is only stating what has already been said in another form, to say that expediency never can be the ground of any general and peremptory rule of duty as to any specific thing. The general principle is plain and admitted, but the application varies with every man's circumstances, and must be left to each man's conscience. All those general declarations therefore, of the duty of total abstinence, from the use of intoxicating drinks, if they do not rest on the false doctrine, that such use is in its own nature sinful, have no foundation at all. Expediency can only sustain the declaration that the use is wrong in certain circumstances; for if it is wrong under all circumstances, it is wrong in its own nature. Brethren evidently deceive themselves. They say they take the ground of expediency and then proceed to make declarations and lay down rules which can have no other foundation than the inherent evil nature of the thing denounced—Would Paul have laid down the general proposition, that eating meat offered to idols was “an offence,” which should exclude a man from the communion of the church? Does he not say the very reverse, and forbid our making the use or disuse of any thing indifferent in its own nature, a condition of Christian communion? Let brethren ponder the fourteenth chapter of his epistle to the Romans, and we are persuaded they will feel that all such general rules as that under discussion in the Assembly are anti-scriptural, and subversive of the true principles of morals, as well of Christian liberty and love. No one doubts that a man may make such a use of his liberty, as to dress, as to manner of living, as to eating or drinking, as shall clearly show he has not a Christian spirit, and for such offence he may be dealt with as the case deserves; but this is a very different thing from laying down the general rule that every man who dresses or lives in a certain way, or who

eats or drinks certain things, shall be excluded from the church. How can any one believe that every man that buys and sells wine, that has a vineyard, or who turns his apples into cider is, the world over ipso facto, proved not to be a Christian? Yet this is the length to which the principle involved in the minute before the Assembly must of necessity go. A man may use wine under circumstances which prove that he is a bad man; but this does not prove that the use of wine shows him to be wicked. He may retail intoxicating drinks in a way that shows he is not a Christian, but this does not prove that the act of retailing them vitiates the evidence of his Christian character. If a thing is right or wrong according to circumstances, it cannot be said to be in itself a bar to Christian communion.

It seems strange to us, that any one should contend that making the use or sale of intoxicating drinks as a beverage, in itself a proof that a man is not a Christian, is not adopting "a new term of communion." If you establish a new test of piety, you certainly thereby establish a new term of communion. If the fact that a man holds slaves, or that he sings Watts's psalms, or that he uses wine, is made to prove he is not a pious man, do you not, in the common and correct sense of the terms, make those things conditions of union with the church? And is it not plain that by so doing you violate the scriptures, place yourself above the Master, and undertake to prescribe rules for his house on your own authority and contrary to his will?

One of the greatest evils of these extremes, is that it forces those who oppose them into a false position. Because they oppose an erroneous and injurious method of promoting temperance; they are looked upon as opposing temperance itself; they are said to take part with the drunkard, and to stand in the way of all that is good. Did Christ favour the disregard of the Sabbath, because he exposed the error of the pharisees? Did he promote intemperance, because he resisted the ascetic doctrines of some of the Jews? So his enemies said, but was it true? If evil flows from these discussions about temperance, whose fault is it? Are they to blame who oppose false principles, or they who advance them? Reproach on either side is nugatory. The simple question is, what is true and right? May we not hope that brethren who agree in thinking not only that intemperance is a great sin, but that it is

a sin which calls for special watchfulness and zealous opposition; will agree as to the principles on which that opposition is to be conducted? We may be certain that if the principle on which the temperance reformation is made to rest, is not sound, the whole effort will come to a disastrous end. Those therefore are the best friends of temperance, who contend for the truth.

There were several other subjects brought before the Assembly, which we should be glad to notice, but we have so far exceeded our limits, that we must hasten to

*The Close of the Session.*

“The Assembly,” says one of the reports of the proceedings of the body, “was peculiarly happy in the choice of a moderator. Dr. Spring presided with dignity, impartiality and Christian courtesy, and probably the whole church could not have furnished one, who would have done more real honour to the moderator’s chair, and given more general satisfaction to the Assembly, than the individual that was selected.” At the close of its session the Assembly resolved to spend an hour in devotional exercises. Brief addresses were made by Dr. Hoge, Leland and the moderator; several prayers were offered and hymns sung, and the Assembly was finally dissolved after the apostolic benediction was pronounced. We believe an Assembly has seldom met, whose deliberations were conducted with greater wisdom, decorum and kind feeling, and the members appear to have separated with hearts warmed with new love for each other, their divine master and the church.

---

ART. VI.—*Mode of Baptism: A Correspondence between Rev. Howard Malcom and Rev. N. L. Rice.* With remarks by the latter. Lexington, Ky., Svo. pp. 28.

THE Reverend Mr. Rice, of Paris, Kentucky, delivered a course of lectures at Georgetown in the same State, during the last winter on the subject and mode of Baptism. He afterwards received a letter from President Malcom of Georgetown College, containing nine questions; of which, he says “You remember you made every one of these assertions and denials, and that in round set terms.” These questions he proposes to refer to “any professor of the ancient

languages of acknowledged ability in the United States," to be designated by Mr. Rice, and engages in behalf of a third person who is not named, to pay a hundred dollars if the umpire should confirm any one of Mr. Rice's alleged positions. This wager, bet, or "banter," as President Malcom elegantly styles it, Mr. Rice declines, partly because the method of adjudication was objectionable, partly because the propositions were not his. To this the President replies that he had written them down as he understood them "at the time," "upon the spot," but invites Mr. Rice to repeat his "points," in his own terms. Mr. Rice complies, but still declines the "banter," and repeats his offer of a written discussion with the President himself. The answer to this letter, dated three weeks after it, deserves to be extracted as a curiosity. It is as follows:

"GEORGETOWN, March 11, 1843.

"Dear Sir,—When I compare your assertions and denials in this town from the pulpit, with your letters, and with what I know you must know, I cannot regard you as a fair disputant, and would not enter the lists with you on any question.

"Yours respectfully,

"HOWARD MALCOM."

To this, as might have been expected, Mr. Rice returned no written answer; but informed Mr. Malcom orally that he proposed to print the correspondence, whereupon he received a very polite note stating that the author of the "banter," had informed Mr. Malcom that Mr. Rice's propositions were contained, not in the nine questions, but in the preamble, and expressing a fear that the preamble had been accidentally omitted in the President's first letter, by the person whom as he supposes, he had employed to transcribe the preamble and the questions. Mr. Rice in reply very briefly informs him that his first letter was apparently written in his own hand throughout, and that in it he had said, "Now you remember you made every one of these assertions and denials and that in round set terms." He does not remind him, however, that the "assertions and denials," had been given on his own authority, from notes taken "at the time," and "on the spot," so that neither their correctness nor completeness could depend on a "preamble" furnished by another person. In apparent oblivion of this important circumstance, the President replies—"As



I have inadvertently placed my friend's questions in an incorrect light by omitting his preamble, I now send you the whole document. It was the *whole document* which was in my mind when I wrote; and my saying 'you made all these assertions and denials in round set terms,' makes no definite sense (!) when the preamble is omitted; for the questions do not, all of them, express your assertions and denials." We quote this as the latest form of the *amende honorable* and invite particular attention to the tenderness with which the writer speaks of his own "false assertion,"\* as making "no definite sense," and to the coolness with which he speaks of having omitted the "preamble" which contained the points at issue, and inserted the "questions" which did not contain them, after having said expressly in his first communication, "if any acknowledged scholar in the Union, will affirm and deny just as you have affirmed and denied IN THESE NINE PARTICULARS," meaning thereby the one preamble! Besides which correspondence, Mr. Rice's pamphlet contains a clear and satisfactory discussion of the points at issue, which sustains entirely his well-earned reputation, as one of the ablest, and yet least offensive controversial writers of the present day. The only position here maintained from which we must dissent is that the phrases *ἀναστὰς βάπτισαι* (Acts xxii. 16,) and *ἀναστὰς ἐβαπτίσθη* (Acts ix. 18,) can only mean that Paul was baptized in a standing posture.

*Bickersteth's Treatise on the Lord's Supper, adapted to the services of the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States, with an Introduction, &c.* By G. T. Bedell, D.D. Fifth Edition, New York. Robert Carter. 1843.

THIS Treatise by one of the most prominent writers belonging to the class of evangelical clergymen of the Church of England, though specially adapted to the services of the Episcopal church, contains so much that is applicable to the services of all churches, that we are happy to find it has met with such a general circulation. The Lord's Supper is not an Episcopal service. It is the common heritage of all Christians; where all meet and forget the different names by which they are called.

\* "You, therefore, risk nothing by making your selection, except the being proved to have made many false assertions; not lies. Far from you, I am sure, would it be knowingly to utter what is not true."—Malcom's first letter, p. 4.

“*One Faith:*” or *Bishop Doane vs. Bishop McIlvaine on Oxford Theology, exhibited by extracts from the writings of the Diocesans of New Jersey and of Ohio* By a Presbyterian. Burlington. 8vo. pp. 68.

THE design of this pamphlet is to show the want of unity among the leaders of that sect which represents itself as an asylum from the divisions of all other churches. The mode of doing this is by extracts from the two distinguished writers mentioned in the title, printed in parallel columns, under appropriate heads, with comments by the editor, in different type, running across the page. The plan is well conceived and executed. The result is to show the popish tendency of Oxfordism, (which, by-the-bye, is hardly a fair name for the new light since the late proceedings of the University,) as approved by Bishop Doane and opposed by Bishop McIlvaine, on the subjects of justification, faith, baptism, penance, mortal and venial sins, purgatory, prayers for the dead, invocation of saints, holy days, transubstantiation, miracles, extreme and other unction, sacramental signs, marriage, monasteries, ceremonies in worship, use of Romish formularies, latin service, preaching, the doctrine of reserve, religious use of images, tradition and apostolical succession. The editor's conclusions are, that “Oxfordism” is a firebrand in the household of faith; that it is contrary to the articles of the Church of England; that it is essentially Romish; and it shows the fallibility of forms, as a means of preserving purity of doctrine. While he puts the new-school Episcopalians into this position, he places the two bishops so directly opposite to one another as to make his second motto perfectly appropriate. “I hear that there be divisions among you, and I partly believe it.”

*Address of the Board of Managers of the American Protestant Association; with the Constitution and Organization of the Association.* First edition of 15000. Philadelphia. 8vo. pp. 42.

THE Protestant Association owes its origin to a movement which took place in Philadelphia during the last autumn. It is composed of members representing twelve denominations, the Protestant Episcopal, the Methodist Episcopal, the Methodist Protestant, the German Reformed, the Baptist, the Lutheran, the Independent, and five distinct branches of the Presbyterian body. The avowed design of the Association is to unite and encourage pastors to instruct

their congregations in the difference between Protestantism and Popery ; to call attention to the necessity of a more extensive distribution and thorough study of the Holy Scriptures ; to circulate books and tracts on the history and tendency of popish errors ; to bring before the public mind the dangers which threaten our free institutions from that quarter. In pursuance of this general design, a committee was appointed to prepare and issue the address before us. It contains an exposition of the views entertained by the Associated Protestants, and a statement of reasons for early and general attention to the subject. The address is written with an unusual combination of earnestness, dignity, sound judgment, and good taste. It gives us pleasure to regard it as a sample of the style in which the Protestant Association means to do its work. The pamphlet exhibits evidence of accurate knowledge and enlarged views of the subject, with great zeal for the cause of truth, but without the extremes of misplaced levity and unhallowed rancour. Those who have been accustomed to regard the popish controversy as necessarily useless or pernicious, can scarcely read this temperate and able publication without some salutary influence, if not upon their judgments, at least upon their feelings. We are particularly pleased with one marked feature in the plan of this Association ; its proposing to accomplish much of the result at which it aims by means of pastoral instruction, rather than by crusading agencies and errant lecturers.

*The Hierophant or Monthly Expositor of Sacred Symbols and Prophecy.* Conducted by George Bush, Professor of Hebrew in the New York City University. Nos. I—VI. New York. Svo.

WE violate the law of editorial etiquette, which forbids one periodical to criticise another, for the purpose of inviting the attention of our readers to a work far more interesting than its title would lead many to expect. Journals devoted to a single subject, however extensive and important in itself, are seldom favourites with the public, beyond the circle of those who are personally or professionally interested. This disadvantage may, however, in the present case, be counterbalanced by the great and growing interest now generally felt in the subject of prophecy. It will also be counteracted, in the minds of those who know the author, by his literary qualifications for the task which he has un-

dertaken. Professor Bush is distinguished above most of our biblical writers by a copious and energetic style, a cultivated taste in general literature and a fertility of fancy, which although it may detract from the cogency of his reasonings, adds greatly to the beauty of his compositions. Into the truth of his peculiar doctrines this is not the time or place for us to enter. They are too various, and as yet too imperfectly developed, to be summarily dealt with in an incidental notice. We are glad to see, however, some valuable thoughts upon important points connected with the fundamental principles of interpretation, and not with any of the views peculiar to Professor Bush himself. We have spoken of him thus far as the sole writer of the work before us, although it is designed, as we understand it, to exhibit both sides of disputed questions. We have little doubt, however, that the largest and most valuable part of the contents will be the product of the editor's own pen. When we have added that the work, in addition to its prophetic contents, will continue the commentary on the Psalms, which was barely commenced eight years ago;\* that it will give brief notices of new works on biblical subjects; that it is handsomely printed in monthly numbers of twenty four pages, at the yearly price of a dollar and a half, we trust that we have said enough to add to the subscription list the names of some who might otherwise know nothing of the work, or underrate its claims to their attention.

*Comparative Claims of Home and Foreign Missions: a Sermon preached in the Second Presbyterian Church in Brooklyn, on the day of the Annual Contribution for Home Missions, April 2d, 1843.* By Ichabod G. Speneer, D. D. Published by request. Brooklyn. Svo. pp. 30.

THIS is, in fact, a strong and pointed argument in favour of preferring domestic to foreign missions, as an object of Christian benevolence. The preacher, it is true, takes pains to tell his hearers, and through them his readers, that he is merely suggesting questions which he wishes them to determine for themselves; but he makes no secret of the way in which he thinks they ought to be determined. He first shews the surprising disproportion between the revenues of these great charities, for some years past; then assigns some

\* See our volume for 1835., p. 73.



reasons for the comparative neglect of one ; and then some reasons for restoring the equilibrium, or rather for reversing the existing disproportion. We think that all the considerations here presented, ought to be deliberately weighed. Dr. Spencer's arguments cannot possibly do harm by making men do more for home missions ; and we greatly doubt whether any man who is influenced by them at all will be led to do less for the foreign cause. At any rate, we think it well that such views, as we know them to be entertained extensively, should be presented clearly and strongly to the public mind. The patronage on which the foreign work ought to rely is not that of ignorance or prejudice, or fashion, or submission to dictation, but that of enlightened and enlarged benevolence, which gives to one object with all the other objects full in view. While we fully believe that no harm will be done to the enterprise of foreign missions by any plea for the same cause at home, we think it possible that free discussion on the subject may incidentally do much good.

*The Family of Bethany : or, Meditations on the Eleventh Chapter of the Gospel according to St. John.* By L. Bonnet, late one of the Chaplains of the French Church in London. Translated from the French, with an Introductory Essay. By Rev. Hugh White. First American from the eighth London edition. New York : Robert Carter. 1843. pp. 256.

THIS appears to be a delightful little book, breathing the lovely spirit which would seem to suit the humble family to which our Lord was pleased to retire after the labours of the day ; and where he condescended to receive the tokens of reverence and love, after he had borne the cold neglect, or cruel mockings of the priests or people in Jerusalem.

*The Contest and the Armour ; to which is added Think on these Things.* By John Abercrombie, M.D. F.R.S.E. Author of *Inquiries concerning the Intellectual Powers, &c.* From the Fourteenth Edinburgh edition. New York. Robert Carter. 1843.

It is an indication of good, not to be lightly esteemed, that such works of practical piety as this and others of the same class, reach in a few years the eighth, tenth, or fourteenth edition, in the land where they were first published.

It is an evidence not only of the value of the works, but of the number of readers who find pleasure in books devoted to experimental religion. Those who have profited by Dr. Abercrombie's philosophical writings, will be glad to read this practical commentary on the apostle's exhortation contained in Eph. vi. 10—18.

*Eighth Report of the Association for the Religious Instruction of the Negroes, in Liberty County, Georgia; together with the Address of the Association.* By Rev. J. S. K. Axson. Savannah: T. Purse. 12mo. pp. 46. 1843.

WE have repeatedly taken a favourable notice of the Association which has published this eighth annual report. We have long considered its object as highly important; its labours as eminently disinterested and worthy of praise; and its results as growing in promise. It is impossible, we think, to read this pamphlet without feeling a deep debt of gratitude to the association which issued it; and without being convinced that the cause in which it is engaged is growing in extent and usefulness every year. It is delightful to find the owners of slaves becoming every day more interested in this cause, and more willing to incur expense for its aid; and it is plain that efforts in this cause are no longer confined to the state of Georgia; but are becoming more and more the objects of attention in South Carolina, North Carolina and Virginia, as well as in Alabama and Louisiana. Mr. Axson's address is instructive, faithful and animating in a very high degree.

*The Doctrine and Order of the Presbyterian Church, or the Points of Difference between the Old and New School. A Sermon.* By Rev. John C. Lord, D.D. Buffalo. 1843. pp. 24.

THE position occupied by Dr. Lord is one of great importance and interest. He has had the decision to break away from his former ecclesiastical connexions, to come out from the numerous, popular and prevailing party, and to cast in his lot with an unpopular minority. Such a change is a satisfactory evidence of the strength of his conviction of duty; and we hope will be the means of greatly extending his usefulness. He is already so extensively known as an able advocate of sound doctrine, that the public will be prepared to find in this sermon, a clear and forcible exhibi-

tion of the truth. In this expectation, they will not be disappointed. The compass of a single discourse, however, was too confined to enable the writer to enter at any length on the numerous topics which he felt it necessary to notice. He has not only presented a brief statement of the doctrines of the Presbyterian church in their logical connexion, and of the opposite errors of the new theology, but referred to the disorders as to matters of discipline prevalent in western New York, and concisely answered the chief popular objections urged against Old School Presbyterians in that portion of the church. In this brief notice we can do nothing more than commend this sermon to the attention of our readers, and express our high sense of the service which Dr. Lord has already rendered the church, and our sincere desire that he may both from the pulpit and the press, continue to promote the cause of truth and order with constantly increasing effect.

*Sermons* by the late John Campbell, D. D., of the Synod of New Jersey. With a Memoir by the Rev. John Gray, A. M., of Easton, Pa. Belvidere, N. J. 1842. 8vo. pp. 451.

To notice this volume, even tardily, is due to the respect we entertain for the memory of the author, and for the character of the editor. Dr. Campbell though a native of Ireland, spent most of his life in New Jersey, where he was held in esteem and affection by the churches which he served, and by all his brethren in the ministry. He was a man of strong native sense, uncommon energy of character, and a warmth of feeling which endeared him to all who knew him. To say that these discourses give a full impression of what he was as a preacher, would be extravagant, inasmuch as few written sermons do so, and because the extraordinary earnestness of his delivery cannot be conveyed on paper. Hence, as his biographer observes, some of his best efforts were at those moments of inspiration when he had least recourse to preparation. Many of his sermons, moreover, are mere skeletons, and some of those which are remembered with most admiration are either not to be found at all, or exist only in outline. Yet what we have here, presents him as an able, orthodox, and awakening, though a plain and unpretending preacher. The discourses are unequal, but they are all good and pro-

fitable, while several of them evince originality of conception and argumentative power. And we doubt not the collection has already been received with high gratification by the numerous friends of the deceased, especially as the publication is made for the benefit of his daughter, the widow of a clergyman, and of her destitute offspring.

*Apostolic Baptism. Facts and Evidences on the Subject and Mode of Baptism.* By C. Taylor, Editor of Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible. With thirteen engravings. New York: B. H. Bevier, 102 Nassau Street. 1843. 12mo. pp. 228.

THE substance of this work has been before the public for a number of years, and has been deservedly prized. The form in which it now appears renders it much more convenient and effective. On a subject so long and so ardently discussed, it is truly surprising how much of novelty, both as to fact and argument, is presented in this essay. Great ingenuity and great learning characterize the production. The argument from the ancient pictures is by no means that which strikes us most; but no reader should lightly pass over the examination of the original terms, which occupies the former part of the volume. While therefore these are positions on which we should not choose to rest our vindication, we cannot but consider the work of Mr. Taylor as deserving to stand among the most interesting recent publications on this subject.

*Practical Reflections on the Second Advent.* By the Rev. Hugh White, A.M. Curate of St. Mary's Parish. Author of Meditations on Prayer, &c. First American from the Sixth Dublin edition. New York. 12mo. pp. 240.

WHATEVER the opinions of the reader may be, in regard to the premillennial advent of the Lord Jesus Christ, he cannot fail to be impressed with the earnestness, reverence, and affection of this little work: and justice requires us to say, that these are traits which are conspicuous in many of the English writers on this subject. No one need take up the volume, with any hope of finding an elaborate discussion of the main question. It is much more truly a series of devotional reflections on the general theme; nor do we see that these, in most cases, do not as naturally flow from the common orthodox tenet, as from that of the millenarians.



*Millenarianism Defended. A Reply to Professor Stuart's Strictures on the Rev. G. Duffield's recent work on the Second Coming of Christ.* By George Duffield, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Detroit. New York. Svo. pp. 183.

THE Strictures of Prof. Stuart on Dr. Duffield's recent work were somewhat severe and disparaging; the Reply is in this respect far more objectionable, and has, we apprehend, greatly impaired the faith of Prof. S. in the author's "kind and gentle spirit." It is one of the most remarkable illustrations of captious controversy, we have read for a long time. Things great and small, criticisms well or ill-founded, grave objections, verbal corrections, are all made the grounds of almost equally severe complaint and retort. The literary character of the work is much below what we expected, considering the experience and standing of Dr. Duffield. In some instances he has clearly the advantage of his opponent, in argument; but the exposition of his views, as contained in this work, is so imperfect and confused, that the reader will find it difficult to arrive at any very definite conclusion, as to the matters or merits of the controversy.

*The Polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States: being an exposure of the spurious Origin of Methodist Episcopacy:—the tyrannical nature of the Government and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church:—the unjust and dangerous control of Church property by the Clergy of that Sect:—the superior provision made for their temporal support:—the mode of raising their supplies:—the moral machinery of Methodism, its religious character, fruits, &c. &c.* By Rev. G. W. Musgrave, Bishop of the Third Presbyterian Church of Baltimore. Baltimore: 1843. Svo. pp. 344.

WE regret that this work has come to hand at so late an hour, that we can give it only a passing notice. It is the result of a controversy into which Mr. Musgrave was reluctantly forced by "a Methodist" of Baltimore; and surely he has given his opponent full reason to wish that he had suffered him to remain quiet. The work which he has produced is a temperate and well-considered examination of the system of polity of our Methodist brethren, kind in its spirit, impartial and honest in its interpretation

of facts, abundant in its authorities and conclusive in argument. The polity of the Methodist society has been little understood by those out of its communion. Its outward forms are well known, but its internal discipline and order have been studied by few except those within its pale. They who have derived their notions of Methodism from the passing exhibitions of it which may have fallen under their notice, and who look upon it only as a fervent and enthusiastic form of religion, will be surprised beyond measure, if they will read Mr. Musgrave's review of it, to find what a compact and powerful system of discipline lies beneath its external manifestations. The society of Ignatius Loyola is the only one with which we are acquainted that surpasses it in its centralization of power. The surprising efficiency of the Methodist system, its power to maintain itself under circumstances where other denominations cannot well subsist, and its facility for the prompt circulation of influence throughout its vast extent, will be found upon examination to have been gained, as in the case of the society of Jesuits and all like institutions, by the sacrifice of other most important advantages. Mr. Musgrave has shown this most conclusively, and we recommend his work to the perusal of all who wish to comprehend the true genius and spirit of Methodism.

*Essays on the Church of God.* By John M. Mason, D.D.  
 Edited by Rev. Ebenezer Mason. New York: Robert Carter. 1843. pp. 258.

THE radical question in all controversies with Papists and Puseyites relates to the church. The rule of faith, apostolic succession, the power of the priesthood, the sacraments, are all subordinate to this. Grant the Papist his theory of the church, and all his other doctrines follow of necessity, or might as well follow as not. This is the point, therefore, to which the attention of Protestants should be especially turned. The war of posts has been carried on long enough. The republication of these clear and forcible Essays by Dr. Mason is a seasonable service. Although they contemplate a very different set of opinions from those now striving for the mastery, both in this country and England, they contain much that is of permanent value, and much that is specially applicable to our present circumstances. The name of their author is the voucher for their value.

## CONTENTS OF NO. III.

ART. I.—Report of the General Committee of Public Instruction of the Presidency of Fort William in Bengal. . . . .	333
ART. II.—1. Travels in North India, containing notices of the Hindus; journals of a voyage on the Ganges, and a tour to Lahore; notes on the Himalaya mountains and the Hill tribes. Including a sketch of missionary undertakings. By the Rev. John Lowrie, Assistant Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church. 2. An Address delivered in the Duane Street Presbyterian Church, N. Y., on the evening of Oct. 3, 1842. The day of Humiliation appointed by the General Assembly. By the Rev. George Potts, D. D. . . . .	349
ART. III.—Classical Studies: Essays on Ancient Literature and Art, with the Biography and Correspondence of eminent Philologists. By Barnas Sears, President of Newton Theological Institution; B. B. Edwards, Professor in Andover Theological Seminary. C. C. Felton, Professor in Harvard University. . . . .	369
ART. IV.—An inquiry into the Organization and Government of the Apostolic Church: particularly with reference to the claims of Episcopacy. By Albert Barnes. . . . .	386
ART. V.—The General Assembly of 1843. . . . .	407
ART. VI.—Mode of Baptism: A correspondence between Rev. Howard Maleom and Rev. N. L. Rice. Bickersteth's Treatise on the Lord's Supper. "One Faith:" or Bishop Doane vs. Bishop Melvaine. Address of the Board of Managers of the American Protestant Association. The Hierophant or Monthly Expositor of Sacred Symbols and Prophecy. Conducted by Professor Bush. Dr. Spencer's Sermon on the Comparative Claims of Home and Foreign Missions. The Family of Bethany. By I. Bonnet. The Contest and the Armour: to which is added Think on these Things. By John Abererombie, M.D., F.R.S.E. Eighth Report of the Association for the Religious Instruction of the Negroes, in Liberty County, Georgia; together with the Address of the Association. Dr. Lord's Sermon on the Doctrine and order of the Presbyterian Church, or the Points of Difference between the Old and New School. Dr. Campbell's Sermons. Apostolic Baptism. By C. Taylor. Practical Reflections on the Second Advent, By the Rev. Hugh White, A. M. Millenarianism Defended. By George Duffield. Musgrave on the Polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Dr. Mason's Essays on the Church of God. . . . .	469







