


W. SAMPSON
No. 5 PEACE STREET
New
Brunswick
N. J.





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1844.

No. II.

ART. I.—*History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles.* By Dr. Augustus Neander, Ordinary Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin, Consistorial Counsellor, etc. Translated from the third edition of the Original German, by J. E. Ryland. Complete in one volume. Philadelphia: James M. Campbell and Co. 1844. 8vo. pp. 331. *J. M. Alexander*

THE translator of this celebrated work has given us a brief memoir of the author, which is, in substance as follows. John Augustus William Neander, was born at Göttingen, January 16, 1789. His youth was spent chiefly at Hamburg. Having renounced Judaism, he began his academical studies at Halle, in 1806, and completed them at Göttingen, under the venerable Planck. After a short residence at Hamburg, he commenced, in 1811, at Heidelberg, as a theological teacher; and in 1812 became theological professor extraordinary. Here he published his work on the Life and Times of the Emperor Julian. The next year he was called to the University of Berlin. His work on St. Bernard soon followed. In 1818 appeared his history of the Gnostics. His next labour was the interesting and learned Biography of Chrysostom. In 1825, he published his 'Denkwürdigkeiten,' or Memorabilia of early Christianity. All these

were preparatory to his general Church-history, which is still in progress, and on which his reputation must be founded. In the University of Berlin, Dr. Neander's instructions are not confined to ecclesiastical history, but include lectures on systematic theology, and on most of the New Testament books.

To these particulars we may add, that the private life of Neander is characterized by a childlike simplicity, and that his days and nights are spent in a devotion to profound study, such as would appal an American scholar. In patristical knowledge, it seems to be admitted, that he has no superior living: and he has lived so long among the records of the Greek churches, that their language is possessed by him almost with the familiarity of a vernacular tongue. As a lecturer, Dr. Neander is free from all encumbrance of notes, and, though singular in his manner, is in a high degree attractive and awakening; as any one who reads a single chapter of his works, will be ready to believe.

It is impossible to name a writer of Germany, whose theological position it is more difficult to designate with precision. He must certainly be regarded as a friend of the gospel and an opposer of Neology. With the Deism of the cold, flat, sneering rationalists, he has no sympathy. Towards the other wing of the infidel army, that of the high-flying, transcendental, visionary, arrogant, pantheistic, philosophists, he has expressed not only repugnance but horror. He is a supernaturalist, and a resolute defender of the doctrines of grace: but this expression must not be interpreted by English or American ideas. If we place Neander near to Tholuck, it must be at a place more remote from our own ground, and in a region where mists obscure his exact locality. Accustomed to refer theology more to the heart than the head, he is led to undervalue logical statements; and to express himself even on fundamental points with a vagueness which tantalizes the reader. In this respect he is equally opposed to the blunt negations of rationalism, and to the positive daring of Hengstenberg. The forms into which his creed is thrown, are often so wide, that even a Sabellian might not scruple to adopt them. "We will adhere," says he, "to that *theologia pectoris*, which is likewise the true theology of the spirit, the *German* theology as Luther calls it." And again: "The doctrine of Christ was not given as a rigid dead letter in one determinate form of human character, but it was announced as the word of

spirit and of life with a living flexibility and variety, by men enlightened by the Divine Spirit, who received and appropriated it in a living manner, in accordance with their various constitutional qualities and the difference of their course of life and education." With these views, he is of course little concerned to reconcile apparent discrepancies in the New Testament teaching, by any reference to an analogy of faith.

In the statement of historical facts, Neander is eminently candid. It does not seem to be his object to maintain any one of the prevailing systems. It would, however, be too much to assert, that he has no favourite opinions to sustain. As the avowed friend of spiritual, against ritual Christianity, and as the sworn enemy of all despotism in the state, and all hierarchy in the church, of all intolerance in theology, and all restriction in speculation, he finds his chosen doctrines everywhere in the golden age of the fathers. His darling tenet may be said to be, that of the universal priesthood of individual believers. Every work he has written bears directly or indirectly on this point.

Thus zealous for spiritual rather than visible religion, for piety rather than logical precision, and for generals rather than particulars, it is not surprising that Neander should consider venial the aberrations of errorists and even of heretics, and that his own statements should contain many things which strike us, of a more rigid school, as perilously latitudinarian.

We have intimated that Neander is enlisted under the standards of no established system, philosophical or theological. Yet he has a system and a philosophy of his own. There is no writer known to us in whom the disposition to methodize particulars, and round off a theory, is more apparent. We shall be understood by all students of his works. Though a historian, it is remarkable that he seems never content with the bare statement of an event. His histories are not objective. A fact—as a fact—is nothing to him. No point in a narrative is valued, until it can be brought into some curve which he hastens to determine. Hence, as every reader has observed in his history, the theological systems even of heretics, are given with wonderful completeness. He places himself at the 'standing-point' of Cerinthus or Eutyches, and from this centre describes the whole circle. Each creed is *totus teres atque rotundus*. In a less degree, the same is true of his narration. *Lacunæ*

in the documentary statements are filled up with a confidence, which in any other writer would cause distrust, but which in our author proceeds most obviously from earnest conviction conjoined with a philosophic habit. But the consequence of this is, that however delightful may be the histories of Neander, we fail to rely on him as a perfectly unbiassed witness. In our opinion, many an inferior annalist, a Fleury, a Prideaux or a Lardner, is more to be relied on, in regard to a question touching bare facts. We should not therefore go with much confidence to Neander, as an umpire on a question touching the genuineness of a book, the practice of the church in baptism, or the nature of office in the early church; decided as his award on the last point might be in our favour.

Among the peculiarities of Neander's mode of presenting truth, there is one which is strongly marked in all his teachings, whether exegetical or narrative. It is that he gives us materials for a conclusion, rather than the conclusion itself. The amiable candour which leads him to withhold the force of his own authority, at the same time increases the difficulty of the reader in apprehending what he means. Whether it be in the exposition of a text, or the ascertaining of a historical fact, it is his method, almost without exception, first to present in their utmost strength the reasons of his opponents, and then to add his own; summing up in so slight and modest a way, that, but for the order, one would often be at a loss to know which was the author's judgment. After carefully perusing such a series of arguments pro and contra, we frequently have to study the case with severe application: no writer takes us back oftener over his own track. It is a trait of some great reasoners, such as Butler, Owen and Whately; while the exact reverse is characteristic of certain other great reasoners, such as Turretine, Chillingworth and Hill. It adds to the difficulty of discerning an author's position.

Similar difficulties arise from another grand peculiarity of Neander's mind, which has given occasion to some raillery in his native land. His motto is *free development*. It seems to be a part of his nature, to have no capacity for seeing anything in insulation. All the objects of his mind are *in fluxu*. He regards every fact as a transition-point from one state of things to another. Thus even errors and abuses are processes through which the cyclical motion must revolve. This turn of mind is obviously the effect

of that proclivity to philosophic system which we have noted, and the cause of that leniency with which he often appears to look on what is evil.

The work which we are reviewing first appeared in 1812. Since that time it has gone through two editions, the third bearing date August 2, 1842. It does not propose to give a complete history of the apostolic age, but more properly of the manner in which Christianity was developed out of Judaism. It might be denominated a copious commentary upon the Acts of the Apostles, with such a view of the Epistles as illustrates the subject named in the title. In five books, the author treats in order of the Christian Church before it spread beyond Palestine—of the spread of Christianity among the Gentiles—of the labours of James and John during the same period—of the Apostle John, as closing the apostolic age—and of the apostolic doctrine.

Viewed as a whole, we need scarcely say, it is a learned, candid, and truly fascinating book. It throws new light on an old subject. It takes us over a familiar but inexhaustible field, with a new guide, of incomparable abilities. There are a freshness and originality on every page such as one could scarcely dare expect on such a topic. The text is peculiarly flowing, in consequence of the peculiar method of the author, which transfers all citation and all polemical remark to the margin. But, for the same reason, the notes contain so much independent discussion, that, to prevent interruption, they should be reserved for separate perusal. This remark applies to all Neander's publications.

The first event of great importance which occurs in the history, is the effusion of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. And here, we acknowledge, the German tendency to tamper with inspired statements is apparent. There is an obvious anxiety to explain the wonderful phenomena on psychological principles; a disposition which in rationalists has eviscerated the body of divine truth, and which is as dangerous as it is unphilosophical. To shut out miracle, in whole or in part, is either to prescribe ways in which God shall operate, or to abridge omnipotence. Grant the latter, and even a child does not revolt at the supernatural. Never have we been able to perceive any gain in this paring away at the edge of a miracle. We learn nothing concerning the pentecostal glory, when it is surmised "that all which presented itself to them as a perception of the outward senses, might be, in fact, only a perception of the

predominant inward mental state, a sensuous objectiveness of what was operating inwardly with divine power, similar to the ecstatic visions which are elsewhere mentioned in Holy Writ." And we are amazed at finding Neander concluding, that "in the construction of the whole narrative we find nothing that obliges us to adopt the notion of a supernatural gift of tongues in the usual sense. The flames that settled on their heads appear as the natural symbols of the new tongues, or new language of that holy fire which was kindled in the hearts of the disciples, by the power of the Holy Spirit."

So also in regard to the vision of Peter, at Joppa, the obscurity is only transferred from the fact to the description, when Neander tells us, that "two tendencies of his nature came into collision. The higher, the power of the Divine, had the mastery over his spirit, and the power of sensuous wants over his lower nature. Thus it came to pass, that the Divine and the Natural were mingled together, not so as to obscure the Divine, but the Divine availed itself of the natural as an image, a symbolic vehicle for the truth about to be conveyed to Peter."

In regard to the conversion of the Apostle Paul, Neander takes higher ground; but even here there is what we consider an unreasonable solicitude to explain the miracle. The modus of a miracle cannot be explained. He conceives the whole, independently of all outward phenomena, as an inward transaction in Paul's mind, a spiritual revelation of Christ to his higher self-consciousness. Against the grosser instances of such interpretation, we would urge the very arguments which our author brings to bear upon Strauss; nay, the very arguments which all modern interpreters, Swedenborg excepted, have found valid against Origen and the allegorists. And as to the conversion of Saul, we find no difficulty in the belief of our childhood, that he heard the Lord Jesus in person.

From the acknowledged candour and learning of Dr. Neander, we presume there is no point on which his opinions will be sought with more avidity, than on the early constitution of the church. These opinions will be found, so far as they are received, to be absolutely fatal to prelacy. Of government, as of everything else, he holds the particulars to have been evolved gradually and under the stress of circumstances. But the importance of the topic will justify an extract of some length :

“As the believers, in opposition to the mass of the Jewish nation who remained hardened in their unbelief, now formed a community internally bound together by the one faith in Jesus as the Messiah, and by the consciousness of the higher life received from him, it was necessary that this internal union should assume a certain external form. And a model for such a smaller community within the great national theocracy already existed among the Jews, along with the Temple worship, namely, *the Synagogues*. The means of religious edification which they supplied, took account of the religious welfare of all, and consisted of united prayers and the addresses of individuals who applied themselves to the study of the Old Testament. These means of edification closely corresponded to the nature of the new Christian worship. This form of social worship, as it was copied in all the religious communities founded on Judaism, (such as the Essenes) was also adopted to a certain extent at the first formation of the Christian church. But it may be disputed, whether the Apostles, to whom Christ committed the chief direction of affairs, designed from the first that believers should form a society exactly on the model of the Synagogue, and, in pursuance of this plan, instituted particular offices for the government of the church corresponding to that model—or whether, without such a preconceived plan, distinct offices were appointed, as circumstances required, in doing which they would avail themselves of the model of the Synagogue with which they were familiar.

“The advocates of the first scheme (particularly Mosheim) proceed on the undeniably correct assumption, that the existence of certain presidents at the head of the Christian societies, under the name of Elders (*πρεσβύτεροι*) must be presupposed, though their appointment is not expressly mentioned, as appears from Acts xi. 30. The question arises, Whether even earlier traces cannot be found of the existence of such Presbyters? The appointment of deacons is indeed first mentioned as designed to meet a special emergency, but it seems probable that their office was already in existence. It may be presumed, that the apostles, in order not to be called off from the more weighty duties of their office, appointed from the beginning such almoners; but as these officers hitherto had been chosen only from the native Jewish Christians of Palestine, the Christians of Jewish descent, who came from other parts of the Roman empire, and to whom the Greek was almost as much their mother-tongue as the Aramaic, the Hellenists as they were termed—believed that they were unjustly treated. On their remonstrance, deacons of Hellenistic descent were especially appointed for them, as appears by their Greek names. As the apostles declared that they were averse from being distracted in their purely spiritual employment of prayer and preaching the word by the distribution of money, we may reasonably infer that even before this time, they had not engaged in such business, but had transferred it to other persons appointed for the purpose.”

“Hence we are disposed to believe, that the church was at first composed entirely of members standing on an equality with one another, and that the apostles alone held a higher rank, and exercised a directing influence over the whole, which arose from the original position in which Christ had placed them in relation to

other believers: so that the whole arrangement and administration of the affairs of the church proceeded from them, and they were first induced by particular circumstances to appoint other church officers, as in the instance of deacons."

"The institutions of the office of presbyters was similar in its origin to that of deacons. As the church was continually increasing in size, the details of its management also multiplied; the guidance of all its affairs by the apostles could no longer be conveniently combined with the exercise of their peculiar apostolic functions; they also wished in accordance with the spirit of Christianity, not to govern alone, but preferred that the body of believers should govern themselves under their guidance; thus they divided the government of the church, which hitherto they had exercised alone, with tried men, who formed a presiding council of elders, similar to that which was known in the Jewish Synagogues under the title of *πρεσβύτεροις*. Possibly, as the formal appointment of deacons arose from a specific outward occasion, a similar, though to us unknown, event occasioned that of presbyters. They were originally chosen as in the Synagogue, not to much for the instruction and edification of the church, as for taking the lead in its general government.

"But as to the provision made in the primitive church for religious instruction and edification, we have no precise information. If we are justified in assuming that the mode adopted in the assemblies of Gentile Christians, which in accordance with the enlightened spirit and nature of Christianity, was not confined to one station of life, or to one form of mental cultivation—was also the original one, we might from *that* conclude, that from the first, any one who had the ability and an inward call to utter his thoughts on Christian topics in a public assembly, was permitted to speak for the general improvement and edification.

"But the first church differed from the churches subsequently formed among the Gentiles in one important respect, that in the latter there were no teachers of that degree of illumination, and claiming that respect to which the apostles had a right, from the position in which Christ himself had placed them. Meanwhile, though the apostles principally attended to the advancement of Christian knowledge, and as teachers possessed a preponderating and distinguished influence, it by no means follows, that they monopolized the right of instructing the church. In proportion as they were influenced by the spirit of the Gospel, it must have been their aim to lead believers by their teaching to that spiritual maturity, which would enable them to contribute (by virtue of the divine life communicated to all by the Holy Spirit) to their mutual awakening, instruction and improvement. Viewing the occurrences of the day of Pentecost as an illustration of the agency of the Divine Spirit in the new dispensation, we might conclude that, on subsequent occasions, that spiritual excitement which impelled believers to testify of the divine life, could not be confined to the apostles. Accordingly, we find that individuals came forward, who had already devoted themselves to the study and interpretation of the Old Testament, and to meditation on divine things, and when, by the illumination of the Holy Spirit, they had become familiar with the nature of the gospel, they could with comparative ease develop and apply its truths

in public addresses. They received the gift for which there was an adaptation in their minds—the *χάρισμα διδασκαλίας*, and, in consequence of it, were inferior only to the apostles in aptitude for giving public instruction. Besides that connected intellectual developement of truth, there were also addresses, which proceeded not so much from an aptness of the understanding improved by its exercise, and acting with a certain uniformity of operation—as from an instantaneous, immediate, inward awakening by the power of the Holy Spirit, in which a divine afflatus was felt both by the speaker and hearers; to this class, belonged the *προφητεῖαι*, the *χάρισμα προφητείας*. To the prophets also were ascribed the exhortations (*παρακλήσεις*), which struck with the force of instantaneous impression on the minds of the hearers. The *διδάσκαλοι* might also possess the gift of *προφητεία*, but not all who uttered particular instantaneous exhortations as prophets in the church were capable of holding the office of *διδάσκαλοι*. We have no precise information concerning the relation of the *διδάσκαλοι* to the presbyters in the primitive church, whether in the appointment of presbyters, care was taken that only those who were furnished with the gift of teaching should be admitted into the college of presbyters. Yet, in all cases, the oversight of the propagation of the Christian faith—of the administration of teaching and of devotional exercises in the social meetings of believers, belonged to that general superintendence of the church which was entrusted to them, as in the Jewish synagogues; although it was not the special and exclusive offices of the elders to give public exhortations, yet whoever might speak in their assemblies, they exercised an inspection over them. Acts xiii. 14. In an epistle written towards the end of the apostolic era to an early church composed of Christians of Jewish descent in Palestine (the Epistle to the Hebrews), it is presupposed that the rulers of the church had from the first provided for the delivery of divine truth, and watched over the spiritual welfare of the church, and therefore had the care of souls.”

Concerning the general tenour of the history which follows, tracing the diffusion of Christian opinion, we find little to remark. At various points, our attention is arrested by adventurous opinions, but the observations are for the most part highly interesting, and fitted to throw great light on the New Testament annals. Seldom have we read a work which abounds more in new and original views of this attractive period. We may adduce, as a happy instance of what we mean, his account of the introduction of Christianity at Athens. No man living is, we suppose, more fitted by intimate acquaintance with the Grecian mind, to place himself in the very position of Paul on Mars Hill:

“Though the consequences which resulted from the apostle’s labours at Athens were at first inconsiderable; yet his appearance in this city (which in a different sense from Rome might be called

the metropolis of the world,) was in real importance unquestionably one of the most memorable signs of the new spiritual creation. A herald of that divine doctrine which, fraught with divine power, was destined to change the principles and practices of the ancient world, Paul came to Athens, the parent of Grecian culture and philosophy; the city to which, as the Grecian element had imbued the culture of the West, the whole Roman world was indebted for its mental advancement, which also was the central point of the Grecian religion, where an enthusiastic attachment to all that belonged to ancient Hellas, not excepting its idolatry, retained a firm hold till the fourth century. Zeal for the honour of the gods, each one of whom had here his temple and his altars, and was celebrated by the masterpieces of art, rendered Athens famous throughout the civilized world. It was at first Paul's intention to wait for the arrival of Silas and Timothy before he entered on the publication of the gospel, as by his companions who had returned to Berea, he had sent word for them to follow him as soon as possible. But when he saw himself surrounded by the statues, and altars, and temples of the Gods, and works of art, by which the honour due to the living God alone was transferred to creatures of the imagination—he could not withstand the impulse of holy zeal, to testify of Him who called erring men to repentance and offered them salvation. He spoke in the synagogue to the Jews and Proselytes, but did not wait as in other cities till a way was opened by their means for publishing the gospel to the heathen. From ancient times it was customary at Athens for people to meet together under covered porticoes in public places, to converse with one another on matters of all kinds, trifling or important; and then, as in the time of Demosthenes, groups of persons might be met with in the market, collected together merely to hear of something new. Accordingly, Paul made it his business to enter into conversation with the passers-by, in hopes of turning their attention to the most important concern of man. The sentiment with which he was inspired had nothing in common with the enthusiasm of the fanatic, who is unable to transport himself from his own peculiar state of feeling to the standing-point of others, in order to make himself acquainted with the obstacles that oppose their reception of what he holds as truth with absolute certainty. Paul knew, indeed, as he himself says, that the preaching of the crucified Saviour must appear to the wise men of the world as foolishness, until they became fools, that is, until they were convinced of the insufficiency of their wisdom in reference to the knowledge of divine things, and for the satisfaction of their religious wants; 1st Cor. i. 23; iii. 18. But he was not ashamed, as he also affirms, to testify to the wise and to the unwise, to the Greeks and to the barbarians, of what he knew from his own experience to be the power of God to save those that believe; Rom. i. 16. The market to which he resorted was near a portico of the philosophers. Here he met with philosophers of the Epicurean and Stoic schools. If we reflect upon the relative position of the Stoics to the Epicureans, that the *former* acknowledged something divine as the animating principle in the universe and in human nature, that they were inspired with an ideal model founded in the moral nature of man, and that [they recognised man's religious wants and the traditions that bore testimony to it;—while on the other hand, the

latter, though they did not absolutely do away with the belief in the gods, reduced it to something inert, non-essential, and superfluous; that they represented pleasure as the highest aim of human pursuit, and that they were accustomed to ridicule the existing religions as the offspring of human weakness and the spectral creations of fear;—we might from such a contrast infer that the Stoics made a much nearer approach to Christianity than the Epicureans. But it does not follow that the former would give a more favourable reception to the gospel than the latter, for their vain notion of moral self-sufficiency was diametrically opposed to a doctrine which inculcated repentance, forgiveness of sins, grace and justification by faith. This supreme God—the impersonal eternal reason pervading the universe—was something very different from the living God, the heavenly Father full of love whom the gospel reveals, and who must have appeared to the Stoics as far too human a being; and both parties agreed in the Grecian pride of philosophy, which would look down on a doctrine appearing in a Jewish garb, and not developed in a philosophic form, as a mere outlandish superstition. Yet many among those who gathered round the apostle during his conversations, were at least pleased to hear something new; and their curiosity was excited to hear of the strange divinity whom he wished to introduce, and to be informed respecting his new doctrine. They took him to the hill, where the first tribunal at Athens, the Areopagus, was accustomed to hold its sittings, and where he could easily find a spot suited to a large audience. The discourse of Paul on this occasion is an admirable specimen of his apostolic wisdom and eloquence: we here perceive how the apostle (to use his own language) to the heathens, became a heathen that he might gain the heathens to Christianity.

“Inspired by feelings that were implanted from his youth in the mind of a pious Jew, and glowing with zeal for the honour of his God, Paul must have been horrorstruck at the spectacle of the idolatry that met him wherever he turned his eyes. He might easily have been betrayed by his feelings into intemperate language. And it evinced no ordinary self-denial and self-command, that instead of beginning with expressions of detestation, instead of representing the whole religious system of the Greeks as a Satanic delusion, he appealed to the truth which lay at its basis, while he sought to awaken in his hearers the consciousness of God which was oppressed by the power of sin, and thus aimed at leading them to the knowledge of that Saviour whom he came to announce. As among the Jews, in whom the knowledge of God formed by divine revelation led to a clear and pure development of the idea of the Messiah, he could appeal to the national history, the law and the prophets, as witnesses of Christ; so here he appealed to the undeniable anxiety of natural religion after an unknown God. He began with acknowledging in the religious zeal of the Athenians a true religious feeling, though erroneously directed, an undeniable tending of the mind towards something divine. He begins with acknowledging in a laudatory manner the strength of the religious sentiment among the Athenians, and adducing as a proof of it, that while walking amongst their sacred edifices, he lighted on an altar dedicated to an unknown God.

“The inscription certainly as understood by those who framed it, by no means proved that they were animated with the conception of an unknown God exalted above all other Gods; but only that according to their belief they had received good or evil from some unknown God, and this uncertainty in reference to the completeness of their worship, enters into the very essence of Polytheism, since, according to its nature, it includes an infinity of objects. But Paul cited this inscription, in order to attach a deeper meaning to it, and to make it a point of connexion, for the purpose of pointing out a higher but indistinct sentiment, lying at the root of Polytheism. Polytheism proceeds from the feeling of dependence—(whether founded on a sense of benefits conferred or of evils inflicted)—on a higher unknown power, to which it is needful that man should place himself in the right relation; but instead of following this feeling, in order by means of that in human nature, which is supernatural and bears an affinity to God, to rise to a consciousness of a God exalted above nature, he refers it only to the powers of nature operating upon him through the senses. That by which his religious feeling is immediately attracted, and to which it refers itself, without the reflective consciousness of man making it a distinct object, is one thing; but that which the mind enthralled in the circle of nature—doing homage to the power over which it ought to rule—converts with reflective consciousness into an object of worship, is another thing. Hence Paul views the whole religion of the Athenians as the worship of a God unknown to themselves, and presents himself as a person who is ready to lead them to a clear self-consciousness respecting the object of their deeply felt religious sentiment.

“‘I announce to you Him,’ said he, ‘whom ye worship, without knowing it. He is the God who created the world and all that is therein. He, the Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made by human hands, he requires no human service on his own account—he, the all-sufficient one, has given to all, life, and breath, and all things. He also is the originator of the whole human race, and conducts its developement to one great end. He has caused all the nations of the earth to descend from one man, and has not allowed them to spread by chance over the globe; for, in this respect, every thing is under his control, he has appointed to each people its dwelling-place, and has ordained the various eras in the history of nations—their developement in space and time is fixed by his all-governing wisdom. Thus God has revealed himself in the vicissitudes of nations, in order that men may be induced to seek after him—to try whether they could know and find him: and they might easily know him, since he is not far from any one of us, for in him our whole existence has its root.’ As an evidence of the consciousness of this original relationship to God, he quotes the words of a heathen, one of themselves, the poet Aratus, who came from the native country of the apostle. ‘For we are the offspring of God.’ After this appeal to the universal higher self-consciousness, he goes on to say; since we are the offspring of God, we ought not to believe that the divinity is like any earthly material, or any image of human art. This negative assertion manifestly includes a positive one; we must strive to rise to the divinity by means of that within us which is related to him. Instead of carrying on the argument against

idolatry, the apostle leaves his hearers to decide for themselves—and presupposing the consciousness of sin—without attempting to develop it—he proceeds with the annunciation of the gospel. After God had with great long-suffering endured the times of ignorance, he now revealed the truth to all men, and required all to acknowledge it and to repent. With this was connected the annunciation of the Redeemer, of the forgiveness of sins to be obtained through him, of his resurrection as the confirmation of his doctrine, and a pledge of the resurrection of believers to a blessed life, as well as of the judgment to be passed by him on mankind. As long as the apostle confined himself to the general doctrine of Theism, he was heard with attention by those who had been used to the lessons of Grecian philosophy. But when he touched upon that doctrine which most decidedly marked the opposition of the Christian view of the world to that entertained by the heathens, when he spoke of a general resurrection, he was interrupted with ridicule on the part of some of his hearers. Others said, We would hear thee speak at another time on this matter; whether they only intended to hint in a courteous manner to the apostle that they wished him to close his address, or really expressed a serious intention of hearing him again. There were only a few individuals who joined themselves to the apostle, listened to his further instructions, and became believers. Among these was a member of the Areopagite council, Dionysius; who became the subject of so many legends. The only authentic tradition respecting him appears to be, that he was the principal instrument of forming a church at Athens, and became its overseer.”

When our author comes to discuss the ‘gift of tongues,’ we regret to find him involved in an obscurity to us impenetrable. After a sedulous perusal of what he says, we profess ourselves absolutely unable to determine, whether he thinks those who were thus endowed actually spoke in foreign languages, or not. “Such a person” says he, “prayed in the spirit; the higher life of the mind and disposition predominated, but the intelligent developement was wanting. Since he formed a peculiar language for himself from his own individual feelings and intentions, he was deficient in the ability to express himself so as to be understood by the majority.”

Upon the subject of the Christian Sabbath it is well known that a marked difference has existed, even from the time of the Reformation, between British Protestants and those of the European continent. Common as it is to charge the Calvinists of England and Scotland with a blind imitation of Geneva, it is certain that on this important point, they departed widely from the teachings of John Calvin. And we are disposed to ascribe to this fact, and to the kindred observance of family worship, the persistency of British Christians in spiritual Christianity. If lax views

of the Sabbath were defended at the time of the Reformation, a practice still more latitudinary has prevailed and increased. There is nothing in the domestic institutions of Germany, which more strikes a Scottish or American Presbyterian. It occasioned in us no surprise therefore, to find Neander advocating the extreme of the national opinion; especially as we had found even Hengstenberg writing against the British and American Sabbatarians. The opinions of our author may be thus stated: All days were in Paul's judgment, equally holy. He considers the reference of religion to certain days as foreign to Christian freedom. "A perfectly unquestionable and decided mention of ecclesiastical observance of Sunday among the Gentile Christians, we cannot find in the times of the apostle Paul, but there are two passages which make its existence probable." These are 1 Cor. xii. 1, and Acts xx. 7.

With this view of the Sabbath no one need marvel that Neander should deny the prevalence of infant baptism in the early church. In respect both to mode and subjects, his judgment is in favour of the Baptists.

From the plan of this work, a large part of it is necessarily occupied, in ascertaining the date and occasion of the apostolical epistles. This opens a field in which the peculiar genius of Neander delights to expatiate. His observations evince amazing research, profound acquaintance with antiquity, and a subtle and sagacious logic which derives proofs from the most casual and trifling facts and expressions. His labours in this kind may be compared with those of Paley's great work, the *Horae Paulinae*. If, unlike the latter, our author more frequently unsettles our confidence, we must attribute this to the characteristic difference of the men—one always seeking a resting-place of truth; the other a wide expanse in which to soar with freedom,—one the most British of Britons; the other a German of the Germans. Great light is thrown upon these parts of scripture by such researches and reasonings; yet we are frequently brought to a pause. All are not gifted with equal optics, and we are not ashamed to own that amidst the darkness which envelopes these remote productions, our author often manifests a clairvoyance in which we cannot follow him. Every reader has observed this tendency in Macknight; but in Neander it is still more predominant. He sees Judaism, where others see none; and Gnosticism, even in its specific divisions, where everything seems plain

without it. It is conceivable, we think, that the study of patristic records for many years may have a tendency to suffuse over the scriptural text references to heresies of later origin. A simpler hypothesis would often be nearer the truth. There is a school of German critics into whose heads it seems never to have entered, that a narrative, such as that of Matthew, could have been written, without an intention to combat any one heretical opinion. This remark is not intended however to detract from the great value which belongs to this department of Dr. Neander's book. His observations are mostly new and ingenious, sometimes felicitous and incontrovertible, and always modest and candid.

We own ourselves less gratified—nay, unfeignedly alarmed—when our learned author comes to sit in judgment upon the genuineness of particular books of scripture. What odium has been poured upon poor Luther, for having in a moment of oscitancy called the epistle of James an *epistola straminea*: but how would that good man stand aghast, could he return and see how his followers are dealing with the sacred canon! It is the field in which modern criticism chiefly vaunts itself. Scarcely a book of the New Testament has escaped the *obeliscus* of some Aristarchus; and we know not whether the doctor's hat could be duly conferred in Germany, on one who had not singled out some book for elimination.

It is amazing to observe with what self-possession modern writers sit in judgment on the writers of a remote age. This is genuine—that is spurious. Setting aside all traditional and diplomatic reasons, they found themselves entirely upon internal grounds. Having, on some hypothesis of their own, decided on the 'standing-point'—so they love to call it—of an author, they instantly reject whatever cannot be referred to this. Of writings in a foreign ancient tongue and a peculiar dialect, and only a few pages in length, they gravely determine the parentage, upon bare inspection. Of this presumption, we regret to say, Neander cannot be acquitted.

From the tone and style of a scriptural writing, modern German critics undertake to determine the genuineness. The experiment is hazardous in our language and our own day. Cowper informs us, that in the early edition of the Olney Hymns, there is one which, though marked as his, was written by Newton. Is there a man in England or

America, who, on purely internal grounds, would venture to point out that hymn? Has any critic discriminated between the respective portions of Pope, Swift and Arbuthnot, in their joint production? "Julius Scaliger," says the learned and elegant Mathias, "wrote and published an oration, without his name, against the famous tract by Erasmus, called Ciceronianus. Erasmus, having perused it, immediately, (and upon conviction as he thought) fixed upon Hieronymus Aleander, who was afterwards made an Archbishop by Leo X. and a Cardinal by Pope Paul the Third, as the author of the whole, or of the greatest part of it, by signs which he conceived to be certain and infallible. These signs were strong indeed. His phrasology, his manner of speaking, his peculiar diction, his habit of life, and even the very intercourse which Erasmus had with him. Nay, his genius and disposition were so evident, that Aleander could not be more intimately known to himself than he was to Erasmus. *Yet Erasmus was mistaken entirely.*" Our biblical critics forget altogether, that a man's style may vary with his temper, his object, his circumstances, and his time of life. Independently of external grounds, who would ascribe to Calvin both the Commentary on Seneca, and the Institutions; to Milton, the Masque of Comus and the *Defensio Secunda*; or to Fénelon, the 'Lettres Spirituelles' and *Telemaque*? Yet there are in Germany scores of scholars, whose tact enables them to pick out a Pauline epistle, as certainly as a bank-cashier can detect a counterfeit note.

No limit can be set to this freedom of judgment. De Wette cites several who attribute the Apocalypse to a disciple of John. Eichhorn pronounced it a drama on the fall of Judaism and Paganism. Semler condemned it as the work of a fanatic. Ammon thought the author and the editor of John's gospel to be different persons. Vogel, Rettig, Ballenstedt and Bretschneider, deny its authenticity. Schleiermacher rejects first Timothy, Eichhorn all the Pastoral Epistles. Schmidt throws doubt over the epistles to the Thessalonians. Cludius treats those of Peter in the same way. Baur and Schneckenburger consider Luke, in the Acts, as giving, not a faithful narrative of events, but an apologetic statement, to vindicate favourite opinions. Baur, in his Essays on the Romans, decides that Paul could never have written what occurs Rom. xv. 24, 28. He gives up the historical credibility of the Acts. Both

these writers agree that the discourse of Paul in the twentieth chapter was fabricated by the author. Kern maintains that the epistle of James was forged by a Jewish Christian, in the name of this apostle, to controvert the Pauline doctrinal views which prevailed in the Gentile churches. Gfrörer finds undeniable marks of falsehood in the account given of Cornelius. And it is significant, that even the sounder German writers, when called upon to combat such views, rehearse them without any approach to a shudder.

Lest we should seem to involve Neander in such charges of presumption, without reason, let us state one or two of the conclusions in the work before us. He regards the Epistle to the Hebrews as the work of a Jewish Christian, a learned and eloquent Alexandrian, who stood to Paul in the same relation as Melancthon to Luther. He denies the genuineness of the First Epistle to Timothy. "I cannot deny," says he, "that when I come from reading other Pauline Epistles, and especially the two other Pastoral Letters, I feel myself struck by the impression of something not Pauline. More particularly the mode of transition appears to me not in the Pauline style—as in ii. 7; iii. 1; iii. 15; v. 17, 18; and the relation of this epistle to the two other Pastoral Letters is also suspicious. I can indeed find reasons for allaying these doubts, but none which, taken altogether, can satisfy the unprejudiced lover of truth." Of the epistle of Jude, he says, that "even if genuine," it could not have been written by an apostle of that name, who was also a brother of James. And finally, he gives up the second epistle of Peter. "The principal marks," says he, "of the spuriousness of this epistle, are the difference of the whole style, compared with the first, and the use here made of the Epistle of Jude, which is partly copied and partly imitated." We must leave it to the serious reader to determine, how far an author holding such opinions, and maintaining them with learning and eloquence, is a safe guide for young theologians.

We dare not undertake to give the precise opinions of Neander, on the inspiration of the scriptures. That he holds an inspiration, in some sense, is apparent from almost every chapter of his works. That the degree and kind of divine influence fall far below what is regarded as orthodox among ourselves, it is easy to believe. The manner in which he interprets the book of Revelation, so remarkably

indicates the adventurous character of his speculations, that we ask attention to the following extract :

“ We remark in this book, the vivid impression which Nero's persecution of the Christians, his setting on fire part of the city of Rome, and especially his cruelties, had made on the minds of men. The story that Nero was not really dead, but had retired to the Euphrates, and would return again from thence (see my Church History, i. 137) appears here more fully delineated by a Christian imagination. He is the monster to whom Satan gave all his power, who returns as antichrist and the destroyer of Rome, who will force all to worship his image. The Roman empire at that time is set forth as the representative of heathenism, and of ungodly power personified, and in this connexion, under the image of the beast with seven heads (the seven Roman emperors which would succeed one another till the appearance of antichrist), Nero is signified as one of these heads (xiii. 3,) which appeared dead, but whose deadly wound was healed, so that to universal astonishment he appeared alive again. Nero reappearing after it had been believed that he was dead, is the beast “ which was, and is not, and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit—and yet is,” Rev. xvii. 8. Of the seven emperors who were to reign until the appearance of antichrist, it is said that five have fallen—one (Nero's successor) is now reigning, and the other is not yet come : and when he comes he must remain only a short time, and the beast which was and is not, is itself the eighth and one of the seven ; (Nero as one of the seven emperors is the fifth. but inasmuch as he comes again as antichrist, and founds the last universal monarchy following the succession of the seven emperors, he is the eighth.) Nero comes from the East, supported by his tributaries—the ten kings, (his Satraps, the ten horns of the beast) leagued with him to destroy Rome, and to make war on Christianity. The waters of the Euphrates are dried up, to make a way for Nero with his ten Satraps, xvi. 12, who, in his service, would burn and destroy Rome, xvii. 16. All this marks the time in which the Apocalypse must have been written, the change of the emperor after Nero, while the image of this monster was yet in vivid recollection, and men were disposed to depict the future in magnified images of the past ; it also agrees with this date, that the temple at Jerusalem is described as still in existence, i. 1, therefore it must be before the year 70. But in this book, I am struck with one contradiction, of which I have never met with a satisfactory solution. I shall rejoice to find that it has been explained by Dr. Lucke in his commentary, which I am anxiously looking for. In vii. 4, the whole number of believing Jews, is given as one hundred and forty-four thousand : and though this number may seem to be merely an assumed round number, yet the number of Christians then existing among the Jews, might not differ very greatly from it. See Acts xxi. 20. Besides these, an innumerable company of believers from all nations and tongues appear before the throne of God, from which the former as Jews are expressly distinguished. On the other hand, in xiv. 4, the hundred forty and four thousand appear as the company of the elect from the great body of Christians in the whole world, who present the model of a holy life, as belonging to which a life of celibacy

seems to be reckoned, a view which would not accord with John's sentiments. Origen has indeed noticed this contradiction, T. I. *Joh.* § 1, 2; but he avails himself of the allegorical interpretation; he thinks that in the first passage, the Jews in a spiritual sense, the flower of Christians out of all nations are to be understood; this opinion, which others also have adopted, cannot be correct, for it is evident from the other passage, that here only believers of Jewish descent are intended. As in the last quoted passage I can find nothing predicable of Jewish Christians, I cannot satisfy myself with the solution proposed by Credner in his *Einleitung*, p. 711."

The Sixth Book, which occupies more than a fourth part of the volume, is taken up with a view of the Apostolic Theology. Here, however, we must not look for a system of divine truth deduced from the whole scriptures, or even from the epistles taken jointly. The method of Neander is very different. Considering each of the sacred writers as an independent witness, he draws off the sum of his doctrine, from his own statements, without any aid from other sources, and without any anxiety to harmonize the divergent representations. He quotes with admiration the words of Nitzch, in regard to these different forms of doctrine: "To disown them in favor of a one-sided dogmatism, is to abandon that completeness and solidity which these modes of contemplating the Christian faith impart, while they reciprocally complete one another; it is to slight that by which scripture truth maintains its elevation above conflicting systems." The manner in which Neander arranges the results of his inquiry is highly characteristic. There is scarcely a great doctrine of Christianity, which we do not find shadowed here;—but only shadowed. We attempt to seize the definite logical assertion, and it eludes our grasp. The mind of the author seems incapable of viewing any one truth with a clear bounding demarcation. His statements fall in no case into any of the forms of scholastic definition. Familiar ideas meet us at every step, but so hazy is the medium, that we dare not assure ourselves of the recognition. One who had learned them previously might have his knowledge refreshed here; but he could not learn them here for the first time, with any distinctness. There is not even an allusion to any dogmatic, still less to any symbolical system. The names of Luther, Calvin, Socinus, and Arminius do not even appear. At the same time, we are not prepared to say that error is often prominently taught on any important topic. To express our meaning in a word, the grand defect of the scheme is its *vagueness*. The

author trembles at every turn, lest he ascribe to an apostle some refinement of doctrine, derived from modern speculation; and this fear leads him to understate the plain signification of the text.

Our meaning will be more apparent if we collect the opinions of our author on one or two points. For this purpose we select the doctrines of the Trinity, the Decrees, and the Atonement. If these doctrines are found any where, it is in the writings of the apostles. Let us see with how much distinctness they are seen there by our author.

With the doctrine of the Trinity, we connect that of the Person of the Mediator. That Neander is not a Socinian, is apparent from the affectionate reverence with which he everywhere, and unreservedly, speaks of the Lord Jesus Christ. That he is not an Arian, is quite as manifest, from his making the revelation of the eternal God in the man Jesus, the fundamental doctrine of the gospel. We wish he had made it as easy for us to pronounce him an Athanasian. That he is not, we are far from affirming: but we dare not undertake to prove that he is from his works. The word 'Trinity,' so far as we remember, does not occur in this sketch of apostolic theology. We read much of the divinity of Christ, much of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit; but the formulas are mostly such as Sabellius might have employed. This may be explained by reference to the author's known repugnance to dogmatic distinctions and scholastic terms: yet we lament to observe so little to impugn the tenets of such teachers as Praxeas and Noetus; so little to assure us of more than one Person in the Godhead; and so total an omission of the hypostatic distinction. But we would not judge prematurely: and we request the reader to interpret the statements which follow, in their most favourable meaning.

“Accordingly, Christ is considered by the Apostle as in a twofold sense *the head of the church of God*. He distinguishes the divine and the human in the Saviour, and, according to this twofold reference, exhibits him in a twofold though vitally connected relation to the creation and to the universal church of God. Paul and John, for the purpose of designating the indwelling divinity of the Redeemer, employed the idea already formed among the Jewish theologians of a mediating divine principle of revelation, through which the whole creation is connected with the hidden, inconceivable essence of God. A primeval self-revelation of the hidden God, antecedent to all created life, the *Word* by which that hidden essence reveals itself, (as man reveals the secrets of his mind by *speech*), as hypostasized in a spirit in which the essence of Deity is represented in the most per-

fect manner ; this constitutes a universal revelation of the divine essence in distinction from the partial, individualized revelations of God in the variety of created beings. This is a designation of the idea of a self-revelation of God, (corresponding to the oriental cast of mind which is more addicted to symbols and images than to purely intellectual notions), which the whole creation presupposes, in which it has its root, and without which no sentiment respecting God could arise in the human soul. We are by no means justified in deducing this idea from Alexandrian Platonism, though a certain mode of expressing it, may be traced to that source. On the contrary, this idea, which found a point of junction in the theophanies of the Old Testament, and in the theory of revelation lying at their base, formed a natural transition from the legal Judaism, which placed an infinite chasm between God and Man, to the gospel by which this chasm was taken away, since it revealed God communicating himself to mankind, and establishing a vital communion between himself and them. The ideas of a divine utterance, which prescribed its mode of being to the creation—of a word by which God operates and reveals himself in the world—of an angel representing God and speaking in his name—of a divine wisdom presupposed through the universe—were so many connecting links for a contemplation which ascended from a revelation of God in the world, to his most absolute self-revelation. And it was a result of this mode of contemplation, that the appearance of Him who was to effect the realization of the idea of the theocracy and was its end, to whom all its preceding development had pointed as the most perfect self-revelation and communication of God in human nature, was acknowledged as the human appearance of the Word, from whom the whole creation and all the early revelations of God, the whole development of the theocracy, proceeded. When the idea of the Messiah was freed from its popular theocratic garb, it would assume that higher element of the idea of a communication of the Divine Being in the form of human nature.”

In the same connexion, and as against Strauss and the disciples of Hegel, he says :

“ Thus, too, the doctrine of the Son of God, as the son of Man in the sense of John and Paul, was not a mere isolated element accidentally mingled with Christianity, but it is closely connected with the whole nature of its doctrines and morals. God is no more a God at an infinite distance, but revealed in man ; a divine life in human form. But this peculiar principle of Christian morals, the idea of the pure humanity transformed by a divine life, obtains its true significance only in connexion with the doctrine of the historical Christ, as the God-man, the Redeemer of sinful humanity which from him must first receive the divine life, and persevere in constant unreserved dependence on him. The self-idolatry of pantheism, which denies equally the God and the Christ of the gospel, rests upon an entirely different basis, and is essentially opposed to it.”

“ He who is the image of the hidden incomprehensible God, he in whom that God revealed himself before all created existence, he who carries in himself the archetypes of all existences, in whom all earthly and heavenly beings, all invisible as well as visible powers,

have been created, by whom and in reference to whom all things are created, who is before all, and in whom (in connexion with whom) all beings continue to exist,—the same being, therefore, who is the head of all, of the whole all-comprehending kingdom of God, is also the head of the Church which belongs to him as his body (by virtue of his entering into communion corporeally with human nature); since he, as the first born from the dead, has become the first fruits of the new creation among mankind, that he may be the first of every order of beings; as he is the *πρωτοτοκος πασης κτισεως*, so also the *πρωτοτοκος της καινης κτισεως*. According to his divine being deduced from the original of the divine essence before the whole creation, he forms the medium for the origination of all created existence; as the Risen One before all others in glorified human nature, he forms the medium for the new spiritual creation which proceeds from him among mankind. This combination of reference to the twofold creation which finds its point of union in Christ as the God-man Redeemer, is also made in the expressions by which Paul distinguishes the nature of Christian faith from heathenism; 1 Cor. viii. 6;—one God the Father, from whom all existence proceeds, and to whose glory we as redeemed are conscious that we exist; and one Lord Jesus Christ (the mediator in our knowledge of God as Christians), through whom all things are created, and through whom, by means of the new creation, our destiny will be realized, so that our life and conduct will be referred to God, and be subservient to his glory.”

“With respect to John’s idea of the work of redemption, we meet first in his writings with an account of the appearance of Christ in the flesh, and its immediate impression on his religious self-consciousness. The life of Christ as the humanization of the divine, of which the design was to give a divine elevation to man, is the self-revelation of the divine Logos (as the revealing principle of the mysterious essence of God) in the form of humanity, appropriated by him in order to communicate divine life to human nature, and to transform it into a revelation of divine life. John’s remarkable words, ‘The Logos became man, and we have beheld his glory as it was revealed in humanity,’ describe the nature of Christ’s appearance, and what mankind would become through him who is the central point of Christian faith and life. The same sentiments are expressed in his First Epistle, ‘We announce to you as eye-witnesses the manifestation of the eternal fountain of life, which was the Father, in order that you may enter into fellowship with it.’ He states as the essential marks of this manifestation of the divine glory in human form, that he appeared full of grace and truth; *grace*, which means the communicative love of God, God as love; and *truth*, according to John’s conceptions of it, as we have already remarked, is not anything speculative and abstract, but proceeds from the life, and embraces the whole unity of the life, and hence is one with goodness and holiness. Truth is the essential predicate of the inward unity of the divine life; and Christ (in John’s gospel) calls himself the truth and the life. Hence, the ideas of love and holiness are the two divine attributes which (as far as it is possible to reduce John’s pregnant words to precise intellectual notions) will most nearly express what he represents as the characteristic of the glory of

God revealed in the life of Christ, and agree with his using love and holiness in his first epistle as designations of the divine being."

After a careful examination of the work, these are the nearest approaches to the orthodox statement, which we have been able to find, and we submit them to the judgment of the reader.

Upon the second point, namely the Decrees of God, we shall not be so unreasonable as to demand of a philosophic German an acquiescence in the Augustinian or Calvinistic doctrine; albeit we regard the latter as the highest reach of philosophy on this subject. And we cite his statements, principally with the view of confirming our previous remarks as to the vague and unsatisfactory manner in which he expresses opinions concerning questions, on which the conflicting opinions of the church have been antipodal. It will be seen that, negatively, he is distinct enough, in his abjuration of Gomarism.

In the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, that *crux Arminianorum*, Neander acknowledges that there is something which might lead to the hasty opinion that Paul deemed the dispensation of grace to be irrespective of human determination—as if happiness and unhappiness were distributed among men by an unconditional predestination; and as if he deduced the different reception of truth among men from a divine causation arranging everything by unchangeable necessity. But this, according to our author, would land us in fatalistic Pantheism, and afford a fair ground of excuse to sinners. In the apostle's reasoning therefore, we are to see no more than a reference to that divine wisdom, whose proceedings are not to be calculated beforehand, according to any contracted human theory; and to a superabounding grace of God, which anticipates all human merit, reigns over all and explains all. He thus shows his view of the apostle's advice on this point to believers:

"The divine counsel of salvation must necessarily be fulfilled in them, nor could the accomplishment of this unchangeable divine decree be presented by anything which might happen to them in life; on the contrary all things would serve to prepare for its accomplishment, everything which they might meet with in life must contribute to their salvation. This is the practical connexion of ideas in Rom. viii. 28, &c., those whom God in his eternal intuition has recognised as belonging to him through Christ, he has also predetermined that they should be conformed to the archetype of his Son, since he having risen from the dead in his glorified humanity, must be the first-born among many brethren. But those whom he had predestined to this

end, he has also called to it; those whom he has called, he has also justified; those whom he has justified, he has also glorified. The train of thought is therefore this: first the divine idea of Christ, and of mankind contemplated in him, the divine counsel to realize this idea in believers; to conform them as redeemed to the archetype of Christ by the completion of the new creation. Then the gradual accomplishment of this counsel: first, the calling to believe (in the Pauline sense, the outward and the inward call are taken in combination for the production of faith), as believers they become justified, and with believing the realization of the dignity of the children of God begins in their inward life. That God gave up his Son in order to secure this blessing to them, is a sure pledge of their obtaining it, and that nothing which appears to stand in the way shall really obstruct, but on the contrary must serve to advance it. Consequently, this doctrine of predestination and election, in the Pauline sense, is nothing else but the application of the general counsel of God for the redemption of mankind through Christ as the ground of salvation to those in whom it is accomplished by virtue of their believing. The greatness and certainty of the dignity of Christians is thus evinced: but nothing is determined respecting the relation of the divine choice to the free determination of the human wills. When Paul, in Eph. i. 4. represents Christians as objects of the divine love before the foundation of the world, his object is to show that Christianity was not inferior to Judaism as a new dispensation, but was in fact the most ancient and most original, and presupposed by Judaism itself, the election in Christ preceded the election of the Jewish nation in their forefathers; and redemption the verification of the archetype of humanity through Christ and proceeding from him, is the end of the whole terrestrial creation, so that everything else appears as a preparation for this highest object in the counsel of creation in reference to this world."

Upon Redemption and Atonement, while the phraseology of Neander is altogether his own, his views, we are happy to say, bear a much closer resemblance to what we regard as saving truth. The doctrines of Redemption by Christ, and Salvation by Faith, are favourite doctrines. To Christ, as a personal Saviour, he delights to look, with all that affectionate reliance which belongs to the old German theology. Under strange and philosophic formulas, we seem now and then to detect the familiar doctrines of proper vicarious sacrifice, and satisfaction to divine justice: often, however, we find ourselves beyond our depth.

The teaching of Paul, according to Neander, distinguishes in the work of Christ, his doing and his suffering. To sin, which from the first transgression, has reigned over all mankind, he opposes the perfect holy life of Christ. "To the evil whose consummation is death, representing itself as punishment in connexion with sin by virtue of the feeling of guilt and condemnation founded in the conscience,

he opposes the sufferings of Christ as the Holy One ; which, as they have no reference to sins of his own, can only relate to the sins of all mankind, for whose redemption they were endured." Paul opposes to the one sin of Adam, the one holy work of Christ. As by one sin, condemnation and death spread among all mankind ; so from this one holy life of Christ, holiness and "a life of eternal happiness resulted for all mankind." Him who knew no sin, the sinless one, God has made a sinner, has allowed to appear as a sufferer on account of sin, that we might become through him the righteousness of God ; or such as may appear before God as righteous. But the atonement does not reconcile God to man, but man to God. (p. 252.)*

"The holiness of God manifests itself (according to the Panline connexion of ideas already noticed) in the life and death of Christ in a twofold manner. First, inasmuch as he completely realized (in opposition to sin which had hitherto been predominant in human nature) that holy law to which the life of man was designed to correspond,—made satisfaction to the moral order of the universe, and glorified God in that nature which was originally designed to glorify him. God has verified himself as the Holy One, since he forgives sin only on the condition of the perfect fulfilment of the law ; he has shown that he remits nothing from the requirements of perfect holiness, and we always bear in mind that this remission to those who through it obtain justification, is not a mere outward act, but becomes in all the cause and pledge of the fulfilment of the law. Secondly, inasmuch as Christ, as perfectly holy, underwent those sufferings which the divine holiness, considered as punitive justice in its opposition against sin, had suspended over human nature. We are not to conceive of this, as if God arbitrarily imposed these sufferings, or Christ had arbitrarily subjected himself to them ; but that it was grounded on the assumption of human nature in its present condition and relation to God—as the divine punitive justice revealed itself to them who were suffering the consequences of sin—and thus it was accomplished through the historical developement of the life of Christ devoted to conflict with the sin that reigned in the human race, and through his condescending to their condition from the sympathy of love."

* In justice to our author, the reader is requested to compare his statement in another work. After saying that the believer can never rest his justification on his own works, he adds ; "It would, indeed, fare badly with the Christian,

In the words last quoted, there are expressions which, however far they fall short of sound scriptural teaching on this point, nevertheless, when favourably interpreted, go further than anything in the book to free Neander from the charge of ascribing to the Atonement an efficacy only subjective.

Upon the subject of a general Judgment, Neander is obscure, and in regard to his opinion on eternal punishment he is studiously silent.* His idea of the Church is that of a purely spiritual body, independent of all external signs and all human intervention. He places in perpetual light the high-priesthood of Christ, and the universal priesthood of believers. The unity of the church consists in its union with its sole Head. It is to illustrate this principle, that all his historical labours have been undertaken. If the consciousness of this unity were retained, he believes that amidst all the differences of sect, this would be the most glorious bond of catholic union; and no outward constitution, "no system of episcopacy, no council, still less any organization by the State," could render the idea of a Christian church more real or concrete.

In looking back upon the ground over which this accomplished, ardent and delightful writer has led us, and in reconsidering the peculiarities of his scheme, both good and evil, we are more and more inclined to trace his singular deviations from the beaten way of orthodox divinity, to his grand characteristic opinion, that Christianity is a development. If this proposition is understood of subjective Christianity, nothing could be more safe or more important. The Kingdom of God, as light, as leaven, and as fire, will

if on such weak ground as this, he had to build his justification, if he did not know that 'if he confesses his sins, and walks in the light, as he is in the light, the blood of Jesus Christ his son cleanses from all sin.' Paul, therefore, refers even the redeemed, disturbed by the reproaches of conscience, amidst the conflicts and trials of life, not to the work of Christ *in them*, but to what the love of Christ has done *for them*, and which, notwithstanding their own continued sinfulness, remains sure." *Gelegenheitschriften*, p. 23.

* There is indeed a note on the subject; but to what extent it compromises the author, we leave to be judged. It refers to the salvation of all. "The doctrine of such a universal restitution, would not stand in contradiction to the doctrine of eternal punishment, as it appears in the gospels; for although those who are hardened in wickedness, left to the consequences of their conduct, their merited fate, have to expect endless unhappiness, yet a secret decree of the divine compassion is not necessarily excluded, by virtue of which, through the wisdom of God revealing itself in the discipline of free agents, they will be led to a free appropriation of redemption."

go on until it has reached new subjects, and affected all souls. Divine Truth will be—not more clearly revealed—but more fully comprehended; and the result will be the subjugation of all human minds on earth. But if the meaning is, that the objective revelation of truth is a developement; that, as the gospel was unfolded from the root of Judaism, so a future growth is yet to spring from scriptural Christianity, and perpetually bud and bloom into new truths and systems, in comparison with which the New Testament is but a germ,—we confess we regard the opinion as fundamentally erroneous. Such an assumption lies equally at the basis of the modern pantheistic theology and the figments of St. Simonianism. And the history of modern opinion in Germany teaches us, that there is no safety in any lower ground than that of the Reformers, and in the more rigid views of divine inspiration. If, as is maintained, theology is advancing, and maturing itself by new discoveries, the progress should bear a closer analogy with the march of other sciences. More positive truth should be brought to light. Dogmatic statements should be more clear and explicit. Definitions and distinctions should be precise and above the danger of mistake. Great principles having been ascertained, the more minute ramifications of truth should be made apparent. But instead of this, the whole tendency of German theology, including that of the work before us, has been a marked retrocession from all fixed points. Dimness and generality have succeeded to precision and unequivocal enunciation. Formulas have been adopted, which may be the vehicles as well of error as of truth. And the prospect was never less, than at the present moment, of anything like a new creation.

“I cannot agree” says Neander, “with the conviction of those who think that this new creation will be only a repetition of what took place in the sixteenth or seventeenth century, and that the whole dogmatic system, and the entire mode of contemplating divine and human things, must return as it then existed.” Neither can we; but at the same time we must protest against those who would sweep away as rubbish the whole of that glorious structure, with cries of *Rase it, rase it, even to the foundation thereof*. We have no respect for speculations which refuse all aid from those great spirits whom God raised up. They militate against their own theory of developement. Rejecting that theory, in its excess, we nevertheless do not believe

that every race is to lay a new foundation. The system of the reformers was not only a great advance upon that which it superseded, but was vastly superior to that which would now displace it. The same service which was rendered to Luther and Calvin by Augustine, may be rendered to Neander and Twesten by Luther and Calvin. Though we would not swear by the names of these masters, we would, if the question were inevitable, prefer the system of any one of them, as a whole, to that of the work under review. We would adopt the *Loci Communes* of Melancthon or of Peter Martyr, in preference to any dogmatic system which modern Germany has produced. Nay, we are so thoroughly convinced, that honest, bold and categorical declarations are better than wavering ambiguities and transcendental amphibologies, that, we would rather let a pupil take his chance of truth between two opposite systems, for instance those of Arminius and Gomar, than to refer him to the misty generalities of the ablest modern syncretist.

After all the alleged improvements in theological research, we never feel so much disposed to take down one of the old Latin dogmatic writers of the seventeenth century, as immediately on closing a fresh work from Germany. These antiquated writers have a thousand faults, it may be; they are stiff, they are prolix, they are technical, they are intolerant and austere, they are scholastic in their distinctions, but they have one great merit—they always let us know what they mean. Their atmosphere, if wintry and biting, is clear. They boldly march up to difficulties, and beard even those which they fail to conquer. Their dialectic was an armour of proof, which might be used as well on the wrong as on the right side, but it was of the finest temper, and of such weight as to be unwieldy to champions of our day. The frequent perusal of their disquisitions has a value independent of the truths evolved. It promotes patient thought, prompts to exact definition, whets the discriminative acumen, and exercises the intellect in logical strategy. Especially does it beget a repugnance to dreamy contemplation and the use of vague diction for concealment. It is precisely this point in which lies the great difference between the two classes of writers. It is a difference not so much of opinion or system, as of intellectual habitude. The clearness which we applaud, is found not only in Turretine Rivet, and Chamier, but in Crellius, Grotius and Le Clerc. That objects are made more luminous in the writings of the

orthodox, we readily grant ; for whatsoever doth make manifest, is light. It is this description of writers, and this style of disquisition, which we would unhesitatingly recommend to young theologians. They have one obvious claim upon our preference, that they accord in their chief peculiarities with the characteristic of the American, or what is the same thing, the British mind. It is the school from which proceeded the clear-sighted and unambiguous Bulls, Pearsons, Chillingworths, Tillotsons, Baxters, Watsons, Edwardses, and Paleys, of a former age. On the other hand, the taste for German writers on dogmatic theology, is factitious, alien to the genius of the Anglo-American mind, and productive, wherever it exists, of debilitating and rhapsodical musing.

Our current of remark has led us into some strictures, which do not apply in all their force to the great writer before us. Indeed we are afraid it may seem to border on arrogance, that we should have ventured to take any exception to the works of a venerable theologian and noble scholar, who is perhaps the most celebrated professor of Germany, and whose works we never open without instruction and delight. But however sincere our feeling of all this may be, the duty of pointing out error, according to the measure of our ability, is imperative. While the work of Neander remained in its German dress, we felt no desire to take it up, though within our reach ; but now that it has appeared in a translation, from the press of a popular and enterprising publisher, we have seen no way to escape from our conviction.

J. V. Moore

- ART. II.—1. *The Missionary Chronicle*: Containing the proceedings of the Board of Foreign Missions, and of the Board of Missions of the Presbyterian Church and a general view of other benevolent operations. Vol. XII. January, 1844.
2. *The Missionary Herald*: Containing the proceedings of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, with a view of other benevolent operations. Vol. XL. January, 1844.

THE Missionary enterprise is at present, unquestionably, the characteristic movement of the church. Whatever be

the feelings or pursuits that obtain in any part, or even the whole of the visible communion of saints, yet there is none at once so deep and pervading, and none that possesses so fair a claim to the privilege of naming the ecclesiastical age in which we live, as the increased zeal of Christians to extend the Master's Kingdom. This feeling exhibits itself, not only in the embodied efforts that are made through Missionaries abroad, and Missionary organizations at home, but in a seemingly increasing desire to know the whole ground on which this responsibility rests. We find an increase of books and periodicals bearing on this general subject, which seems to indicate an increasing desire in the public mind to investigate and understand the facts and reasonings on which this enterprise is founded. These various productions, with their countless variety of motives, statements, arguments and illustrations, present us with a tolerably correct view of the mind of the church, in this matter.

In looking over these publications, and especially those which stand at the head of this article, we have been struck with the fact, that although many of them are the productions of Calvinistic pens,* and the two periodicals named are the official organs of the most prominent Calvinistic bodies in the country, yet there is so little that is peculiarly Calvinistic in their mode of treating this subject. Motives are drawn from the condition of the heathen, the promises and threatenings of God, and the general principles of duty; but few if any are drawn directly from those peculiarities of doctrine that constitute so important a part of their creed.

Several causes may have contributed to produce this omission. The missionary organizations of the present day were instituted at a time of comparative reaction in doctrinal fervour. The panting combatants on the field of polemics had tacitly concluded an armistice. Whilst this truce continued a new field of action seemed suddenly to open to the energy and enterprise of the church, and the attention of her champions was directed from what were

* We feel called upon to apologize for the use of the word Calvinism so often in this article. It is a serious evil to designate the truth of God by the name of a man. There is not a principle included in the system called Calvinistic, which was not held by Luther and the English Reformers, and which was not taught by single theologians merely, but by large bodies of men, even in the Romish church.

regarded as matters of theory in which they must differ, to matters of practice in which they could agree. With some, these doctrinal peculiarities were not brought to bear on this department of effort, because they were not brought to bear on any part of practical Christianity, being regarded as mere theoretical speculations having no point of contact with the usual tenor of the Christian life. They were viewed with that indifference which is the natural result of the comparative coldness if not ignorance that so frequently attends the mere didactic investigation of truth.

With others the omission has been more studied and intentional. Regarding the Missionary cause in the light of a great Catholic movement of the church, they feared to bring these distinctive doctrines to bear fully upon it, lest they should be charged with sacrificing to sectarian bigotry the interests of a world. As it has so often been charged on Calvinism that it tends to chill the warmth of sympathy and cut the sinews of effort, they feared to connect it with the cause of missions, lest by such an association the latter should bear some of the odium and hostility that are heaped on the former.

Whatever may have been the cause of this course, its propriety may justly be questioned. Truth is the measure of duty; and these doctrines if they are true at all must cast their roots deep into the heart of the Christian system. Hence it would seem strange if they had no bearing whatever upon the great work that God has entrusted to his church. Moreover by this course we furnish a plausible support to the charges of those who oppose these doctrines, that they are merely speculative and esoteric, and that when active at all, we are so not in consequence but in spite of our creed. The impropriety of this course is still more strikingly obvious when we find that it runs counter to the example of God himself. Whatever we may think of the Calvinistic system, its most prominent doctrine, that with which it usually stands or falls, is that God has a people, whom he has chosen from the sinful world, and whom he has determined to bring to himself by the use of the means of grace. It is precisely this doctrine however that we find God himself on one occasion using as a motive to perseverance in missionary labour. When the great missionary to the gentiles was on one occasion discouraged by the blasphemies and opposition of the Corinthians when the gospel was brought to them, we are told that God ap-

peared to him by night in a vision and said, "Be not afraid, but speak and hold not thy peace; for I am with thee and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee, for I have much people in this city."* This declaration of God, (which must refer to these who were afterwards to believe, and not to those who had done so already, as they were fully known to Paul), embodies the very principle for which we contend. It presents the doctrine of an elect, chosen band, who were yet mingled with the luxurious and blaspheming Corinthians, as the motive for perseverance in those labours by which they would be ultimately called to those privileges that awaited them. And might we not rise still higher and ask, what, according to our view of the economy of grace, were the grounds on which the great missionary system was originally instituted? What were the motives that actuated the Divine Missionary in coming to live, to suffer, to teach and to die on the earth? Were they not what are called the peculiar doctrines of the Calvinistic system? Was it not to rescue his own sheep, to redeem his own church that the great shepherd laid down his life? If then we believe that these doctrines were the great motives that operated when the missionary enterprise was devised in eternity and begun in time, we cannot surely regard them as devoid of practical bearing in carrying forward this work to its completion.

In accordance with these suggestions we propose to offer some remarks, on the influence of the doctrines of grace, commonly called the Calvinistic system, on the missionary enterprise.

In proposing this subject for discussion, we do not mean to cast any aspersion on other systems of doctrine, or endeavour to assert that they have an unfavourable influence on the cause of missions. This would be at once unkind and unnecessary. Nor is it our object merely to attempt a defence of this system from the charges of its opponents, that it tends to chill and close up the heart in stoical apathy. If we did nothing more than this our efforts would be little better than a bootless play at polemics. Our principal aim will rather be, assuming that we believe these doctrines as they are contained in our standards, to endeavour to draw from them fresh motives for diligence and encouragement in the great work of the world's conversion.

* Acts xviii. 9, 10.

We may remark farther, that it is not necessary to our design to show that in point of fact those who have held these doctrines have been most energetic in the cause of missions. Our object is not so much to show historically what their influence has been, logically what it ought to be; not so much their actual as their legitimate influence. We admit, and in reference to many instances, we rejoice to be able to make the admission, that some who adopt other and diverse creeds have made most noble efforts in this most noble cause. These facts, however, can prove nothing adverse to the favorable influence of the Calvinistic system on this department of Christian effort. Error may produce activity as well as truth. Although truth is in its own nature brighter than error, yet this force is only felt in fact by truthful minds. Men usually differ more widely in their sentiments than they do in their conduct. There is a moral and spiritual inertia which prevents them from carrying their principles whether good or bad, fully and consistently into action. Hence we often find fewer good works than we might have expected among those who hold the truth, and fewer bad works than we might have feared among the advocates of error.

There cannot be faith without works, but there may be works without faith. Indeed so congenial to the human heart is a justification by works, that in many cases the farther men depart from the purchased though priceless salvation of the Bible, the more scrupulous do we find them in the discharge of what they regard as good works. Hence the Romish penitent, the Jewish bigot, the Mohammedan dervish, and the Hindoo fakir, will perform labours and make sacrifices for false religions that could rarely be exacted from professors of the true. And even in the work of extending particular dogmas by missionary labour, no men have been more indefatigable than the wily and treacherous Jesuits; and no missionaries have been more zealous and self-denying than we have sometimes seen the turbaned emissaries of the prophet of Mecca. Yet no one on these grounds, would for an instant think of questioning either the truth, or the practical tendency of the doctrine of justification by faith alone.

On the same grounds then, when we see men who hold what we are constrained to regard as error more energetic in the cause of missions than those who hold the truth, we account for it on one of the following suppositions.

Either the latter to some extent are holding the truth in unrighteousness; or the activity of the former is the result of that feverish and delirious strength that is sometimes imparted by error and enthusiasm; or the error that they hold has not been carried into practice; or, what we hope may be the most frequent explanation, the truth that is interwoven with their system has operated so powerfully as to neutralize the error, and they act from the same love to God and man that inspires those whose doctrinal views are more correct, because they have been sanctified by the same Spirit independently of the errors of their creed. Laying aside these cases, together with those who have hypocritically made these doctrines of grace a pretext for that callous and cold-blooded indifference to the condition of the perishing heathen, that flowed from their own graceless hearts and not from the doctrines they thus slandered; and making the necessary allowance for the inconsistency of the human heart, its natural aversion to these humbling truths, and its imperfect sanctification in this life, we are better prepared to approach the consideration of the legitimate influence of the Calvinistic system of doctrine on the missionary enterprise. In further prosecuting this design, we will bring forward some of those motives and states of mind that seem to be most important in the missionary character, and endeavour to show that they are not only legitimately but eminently fostered by the Calvinistic system.

The first we adduce is our *estimate of sin*. The work of missions was instituted for the destruction of sin. This is grounded on the fact that sin is an evil. The man, whether infidel in theory or practice, to whom sin is no evil admitted and felt, is a man who can never appreciate the missionary feeling. Just so far then as we regard sin to be an evil, will our sympathies and efforts be excited for its removal. That system of doctrine, therefore, which gives the strongest representation of the evil of sin, will be most likely to call forth our sympathies and stimulate our efforts in the great work of its destruction.

That such a representation is given by the Calvinistic system, cannot we think be doubted by any one who is even slightly acquainted with its details. It teaches that the evil of sin is so great, that by the offence of one man, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; that by sin came death and all the woes of life, not as mere natural and hereditary calamities, but as the wages of that sin; and that it subjected to the sway of the pale monarch, even the ten-

der infant that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, by the personal violation of a known law. And so deep and damning is the stain left by sin on our souls, that no washing of our own can cleanse it; the blot can be removed by nothing but blood, and that the blood of the lamb of God, the infinite Redeemer. And so sternly, by its teachings, does justice demand against this foul evil that every transgression should receive a just recompense of reward, that it cannot be forgiven by a mere act of sovereignty. The bleeding and suffering victim of Calvary hung not upon the cross as a mere theatrical display of the evil of sin, but he bore our sins in his own body on the tree, and was made a curse, and even sin for us before we could be made the righteousness of God in him. And so deep has been the stain left on every part of our nature, that not only is it not all washed away when the soul is first laved in that fountain that is opened to the house of David, but the last lingering blots of its pollution are only removed by the drops from that fountain that mingle with the cold waters of death.

When we view sin in this light, as an evil so foul, so pervading, so destructive; as that, the punishment of which wrung out the agony of the uncomplaining Saviour; as that, from which as an evil felt, but not comprehended, the blind nations of the earth, in their strange and wild, but often significant ceremonies, are darkly feeling after an unknown deliverance without which they must perish; in a word, when we look at in the light in which it is represented by the Calvinistic system, there is surely that which is peculiarly and eminently calculated to call forth our deepest sympathy with a world that is crushed by it, and our cordial hatred of the foul and tenacious evil, that like a dreadful night-mare has so long brooded over the earth.

Another motive of great efficacy in the missionary character is love and gratitude to God.

If there were nothing impelling us to labour for the removal of sin but the intrinsic wretchedness of the sinner, our sympathetic feelings would lead us to engage in the work of missions. But when to the love of man is added the love of God as a motive to action, sympathy expands into religion. The nature and efficacy of this love to God, will ordinarily depend on the view we take of his relations to us. We may be bound as rational creatures to love the being who is infinitely excellent. With the Epicurean we may create a Deity, who, though the *beau ideal* of all per-

fection, shall be perfectly isolated from his creatures, and may attempt to love so beautiful an abstraction, but this love at best will be but cold and shadowy. Distinct however from this general and abstract affection, or at least one of its most glowing types is a love of gratitude, that is excited in view of our estimate of God's benefits to us. This affection our Saviour has distinctly recognised as not only a common and natural but also a legitimate spring of action when he said "To whom little is forgiven the same loveth little." According to the rule of Jesus Christ himself, in these words, the strength of this affection will ordinarily be proportionate to the estimate we make of the amount of benefit received. Whatever system therefore represents the gifts of God to us individually as greatest and freest, will naturally lay the broadest foundation for that grateful and constraining love which forms so important an element in the missionary character. Such an exhibition of the love of God do we think is made by the Calvinistic system. Representing the evil of sin as peculiarly great, it of course magnifies the deliverance from that evil which is effected in our redemption. And it teaches that this redemption was not fortuitous but designed, and designed from eternity; not constrained by the demands of justice, but the effluence of free and sovereign mercy; not made for us because it was foreseen that we would become God's friends by the exercise of our free-will, but made that we might become God's friends because it was foreseen that without it, we would continue to be God's enemies; making us not merely redeemable but redeeming us: not merely salvable but saving us; cumbered with no condition of merit but unconditional demerit; leaving nothing unprovided, nothing dependent solely on our weak and corrupt hearts, but working in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure; not giving us a hope that may be wrested from us in an hour of trial, but assuring us that, as our unworthiness was not sufficient to prevent the Spirit from entering our hearts, that same unworthiness will not drive him away. We are enabled to say, "I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God that is in Christ Jesus our Lord." They who think, either, that God was bound in justice to offer them salvation; or that this salvation was designed for them in no more special

sense than for those who were in hell when it was wrought out; or that they have had a most potent and essential agency in the work of regeneration, cannot surely feel that they owe so much to God as those who believe the opposite opinions.

When God then requires of us, to proclaim his glory to every creature, shall not gratitude lead us to do something for him who has done so much for us? Shall we refuse to say "come," to the wretched and perishing millions of the earth, when called to do so as a testimony of our affection to Him, who fixed his eye of love upon us from the far depths of eternity: who wrote our names in his unblotted book, and who with his own Son has given us all things pertaining to life and godliness? Having done everything for us, shall we do nothing for him when the motive is, "freely ye have received freely give?" Surely, the man who believes himself to have been a wretch so vile and helpless by nature as this system represents him, and rescued from merited damnation by a redemption so priceless yet so free; so undeserved yet so sure; and bestowed not at random but by an eternal purpose of mysterious grace on him; will be ready to give to the cause of God in the propagation of this truth, not merely his paltry pelf, but the uncoined treasures of his heart.

It is also essential to the missionary character, that it include strong faith, and an humble self-renouncing dependence on God in our prayers and efforts.

In carrying the gospel to the heathen, as in every other work for God, with faith we can remove mountains, without it an atom will impede us. If the system we are considering tends to call forth the strongest exercises of faith, it will in this respect have a favourable influence on the missionary enterprise. That this is the case, we think will be evinced by a moment's reflection.

One of the principal objections usually urged against this system is, that it demands too much implicit credence in what we regard as the plain declarations of God, however unable we may be fully to reconcile them with other declarations he has made, or with the deductions of our own reason. It is undoubtedly one of the characteristics of our system, that it is not careful to travel behind the record, and seek other verification of its statements than the authority on which they have been made. However this may operate against the reception of the system at first,

yet after it is once received, a stronger exercise of faith must certainly be demanded continually to act upon it than is required by those systems that are more entirely within the grasp of human reason, which less sternly assert, and unlike the system that Paul held, have less necessity for asserting, "Nay, but O man! who art thou that repliest against God?" In this, it evinces its origin in the Bible, which is usually content to lay down the formulas of truth, to rest on their own intrinsic evidence, or on the authority by which they are announced. It is this peculiarity that makes Christianity a religion of faith. Were there nothing unsupported by mathematical demonstration, nothing that could not be explained fully by logical or critical apparatus, there would be as little virtue in the belief required by the Bible, as there is in that demanded by natural science. The great philosophical excellence of the Bible scheme of faith is, that it demands for its reception an anterior preparation of heart, and hence is alone of all other systems of belief adapted to the reformation of the world. This peculiarity does not consist in an absence of evidence, but a demand for the best and surest evidence, the internal witness of the truth, the force of which finds a response in the higher and better parts of our moral and spiritual nature. This peculiarity in the mode of presenting the truth, and in the demand that is made for faith in that presentation, characterises alike the Calvinistic system and its source, the Bible; and its legitimate influence on the minds of those who embrace it, tends to cherish that faith that is so important an element in the Christian and therefore in the missionary character.

Again, in another aspect of this faith which is by no means contradictory but only supplementary to that just given, its strength, in praying and labouring for the spread of the gospel, will depend somewhat on our opinion as to the certainty of success. If there were no certainty in human action, and no specific design to be accomplished by God in every movement of his people, they might well fear that their efforts were often gratuitous and misdirected. But believing that they are simply carrying out the designs of God himself in all that they do for the glory of his name, they may feel confident that whilst their immediate designs may fail, and their labours not accomplish that which they expected, yet God's design shall never fail, and their labours shall bring about precisely what

God has determined. Can we not then pray and labour for the world's conversion with a stronger faith, on account of our belief that God has decreed to give the heathen to his Son for an inheritance? And that he has decreed these very prayers and labours as a part of the means? And that he has a chosen people among the heathen, whom he has determined to save, and whom he is able to convert by his own almighty power in the use of the instrumentalities he has already ordained? Surely if uncertainty tends to engender doubt, certainty should produce faith; and if fear of failure makes the heart waver, confidence of success should make it firm.

It is however essential to this faith that it should be accompanied with humble, self-renouncing dependence on Divine power in our exertions. No noise of human tools is to be heard in the erection of that temple, which is founded on the apostles and prophets, and of which Jesus Christ is the chief corner-stone; no human arm is to uphold the ark of God, even though it may seem ready to fall; for the work is performed not by might nor by power but by the Spirit of the Lord. If then the Calvinistic system has a tendency to cherish this spirit of self-renouncing dependence on God, it will thus far be favourable to the missionary cause.

It is a stereotyped objection to this system, that by giving too much prominence to Divine efficiency, it destroys all necessity, and hence all stimulus, for human effort. Although the objection itself is a misrepresentation, yet the truth of which it is a perversion, is one of the most precious parts of the system. Whilst it teaches the necessity of effort and the sin of neglect as strongly as they can be taught, it also teaches that these efforts are not to be regarded as of themselves at all adequate to the result. Man is regenerated not only by sovereign grace but by sovereign power. It teaches that mere moral suasion will not raise the dead; that the mere sowing of the seed, will not give the increase; that the mere preaching of Paul will not open the heart of Lydia. Like the prophet we must cry, though our voices be echoed only from the bleached bones of the valley. Like the priests who compassed Jericho, we must sound the trumpet of the gospel, believing that the walls and battlements of Satan will soon lie prostrate at our feet. This is the Christian paradox, when we are thus weak then are we strong. Our faith will grow stronger in God as it grows weaker

in ourselves, and will be like the weakest plants that have the strongest tendrils.

It is also essential to the missionary character that it embody unflinching firmness and perseverance in the midst of discouragement and trial. The end is so vast, and the means in themselves so feeble and inadequate, that there is need of all that can inspire firmness or impart encouragement in this great and arduous undertaking. Can we again draw on this system for these states of mind?

The first point has to some extent been anticipated. The man of faith is a man of firmness. Faith if not identical at least is closely connected with firmness, and alike with it is the opposite of wavering. The great reason then why the most eminent supporters of the Calvinistic system have been so remarkably distinguished for their indomitable firmness, is that they have been so eminently characterised by faith. There is something in the constant conviction that we must rest not on human but divine efficiency in the last resort, and that we are stayed not on the fluctuating decisions of self-determining wills, but on the eternal purpose of the eternal God, that gives energy and stability to our efforts, and causes the arms of our hands to be made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob. Believing that we are immortal until our work is done, we rely on the same infallible purpose to guide, which we hope to protect, and go forward inspired by the cry of onset, "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon."

The doctrines we have been considering, are also eminently calculated to furnish motives to encouragement and perseverance in those trying circumstances, so often encountered in the prosecution of missions. We can conceive of few situations more imperatively demanding encouragement, than that of the missionary: who, perhaps solitary and unaided by the counsel and efforts of those on whom he has hitherto relied, cut off from the cheering sympathies and associations of a Christian land, stands on the threshold of one of the teeming cities of the east, glittering with its countless minarets and pagodas; and sees before him the myriads of its idolaters, ignorant, degraded, deceitful; prejudiced against him and the self-denying religion he proclaims; bound by every tie of interest, appetite, association and hereditary feeling to the indulgent superstition of their fathers; and hedged in by innumerable and seemingly almost insurmountable obstacles of language, habits and

laws. But when the heart of the missionary is ready to sink within him at the hopeless prospect, this system whispers to him in the name of the Lord, his cheering words to Paul at Corinth, "Be not afraid for I have much people in this city." God's work is here for you to do, or you would never have been sent hither, and though you may labour through a life of discouragement, yet this life of discouragement is a part of God's plan for converting the world. You may die without seeing a solitary fruit of your labours; but are they therefore in vain? Are the first rays of the dawning light, the first drops of the coming shower, the first germ of the budding oak, though feeble and obscure, therefore useless or in vain? Are the drops that filter silently through the dripping rock, though unseen and uncared for by man, the less certainly hastening on by God's direction to swell the gurgling fountain or roll in the mighty river?

Thus if the missionary be inspired with the whirlwind impetuosity of the present day, which is impatient of every process that does not end in a quick and exciting result, and cannot trust God farther than it can see the palpable workings of his power, this system points him to nature, elaborating the best and grandest results of her mighty plan, by slow and gradual processes; and tells him that the same God is working in the same way, by means over which he has the same perfect control, to accomplish a similar purpose that was formed from eternity. Its language is, "though the vision tarry wait for it, for at the end it shall surely come, it will not tarry."

Does his heart sink with discouragement as he sees the wickedness and degradation of those with whom he has to deal, and compares them with the means he possesses for their removal? It tells him that the election of God is not of works but of grace; not because of holiness but to holiness; and his calling not by moral suasion acting upon the yielding heart, but by the invincible Spirit of God. What if the infatuated enemies of God and their own souls, be as mad against the truth as was Saul of Tarsus, yet they may as soon and as unexpectedly be converted. What if years of labour have been expended, and wickedness seems to have yielded scarcely a jot, yet at God's own time, his Pentecostal power will suddenly come, and as in the South Sea Islands or among the Karens of India, multitudes will be gathered in of such as shall be saved.

Does he fear lest the new-born convert may yield to the

seductive blandishments that assail him, and relapse into his former idolatry, and thus all the labour bestowed upon him be lost? It tells him that nothing can separate them from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord; once gained they are gained forever, the charter of their title to heaven having this seal: "The Lord knoweth them that are his." Thus when the love of many waxes cold, and the brightness of their example is dimmed or eclipsed, the perseverance of the saints becomes to a desponding missionary or a desponding church the sheet-anchor of hope.

Are labourers cut down just as they enter the field, or in the midst of usefulness? It assures him that this is not a mere casualty, but designed by God to hasten on the desired consummation; by strengthening the faith, increasing the dependence and humility, or quickening the exertions of those that remain.

Does he fear lest by the inroads of vice, superstition and infidelity, together with the beleaguering hosts of the beast and the false prophet, the pure and evangelical church of God may perish? It tells him that whatever may happen the church is safe. It has been destined from eternity to ultimate triumph, has been purchased by the priceless blood of the only-begotten, and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it. It is a vine of the Lord's right hand planting, and had it been destructible, it would long ere this have perished. It was planted in an hour of deadly strife with a mightier foe than human arm ever grappled; it was watered with a richer blood than was ever poured out on a field of glory; it has been rocked by the storms and tempests of centuries; the moss and hoar of ages have covered the scars of its wounds; the sword of the Jew and the battle-axe of the Roman lie shivered at its root; and a thousand creeping parasites of error and superstition have grown from its soil, spreading their rank and noxious foliage over it, and threatening to smother it with their baleful shade; in fine, all has been done to uproot and destroy it, that could be done by earth or hell, yet it stands, and shall stand forever, "for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

Leaving the a priori investigation, let us for an instant turn to the evidence of facts, and inquire, whether the conclusions to which we have arrived in the foregoing reasonings, are sustained to any extent by facts, to that extent at

least that practice usually sustains principle. Has it been the practical effect of this system, to cultivate the traits of character to which we have alluded ?

If we have not mistaken the voice of history, it will be found to testify, that the men who have been most zealous and most willing to sacrifice and suffer for the truth, are men who were distinguished by their adhesion to these doctrines. Without entering into any extended specification of names, we appeal to the attentive reader of the history of the church, whether the most eminent witnesses of the truth in the dark ages, the men who laboured and suffered most for their opinions, were not to a man, the disciples of Augustine ; whether the "few noble," into whom was concentrated the missionary spirit of the church, were not men moulded by these doctrines. Those within the Romish church, in whom we recognise most of the type of genuine Catholicism in religion, such as the Port-Royal Jansenists, and those without her, who contended most manfully and successfully against her corruptions, were men who held and prized these doctrines. The Calvinists of Holland flung down the gauntlet at the feet of Spain, and sealed their devotion to the truth with their blood. The Calvinistic Hugonots of France, and Puritans of England were the men who most freely watered with their tears and blood, the seed-thoughts of civil and sacred truths in the old world and in the new. The Calvinists of Scotland possess the noble pre-eminence of being the champions of Christ's crown, of pouring out more blood and treasure for this glorious truth than any other division of the army of God. We are willing that any Calvinistic community be selected at random, in which these doctrines in their purity have been held, and compared with any other community, similarly situated other wise, in reference to all those traits of character that are available for any department of Christian effort, and we are content to abide the result of a candid comparison.

But leaving these general examples, if we come down to particular instances, we shall find our former conclusions completely verified. We pass by Paul and Peter as illustrations not because we think them beside our purpose, for we recognise them as furnishing the most perfect examples of the legitimate influence of these doctrines, but because it is unnecessary here to contend for disputed ground. What

must be the legitimate influence of doctrines that kindled the light of the great Augustine, that glorious star in the church's bright galaxy, whose broad disc, catching the sinking light of the apostolic days, flung it forward through a thousand years of darkness, whose bright orb never set during the darkest hour of that long and cheerless night of the church's hope, but was a polar star to the faithful witnesses of every age? What is the tendency of a system on which the character of Martin Luther was formed, that man of mighty faith, who coming forth, a lonely monk, from his solitary cell, with the word of God in his hand and the love of God in his heart, raised a voice that all the thunders of the Vatican could not drown, a voice whose very echoes are the household words of religious freedom? It is idle to talk of that system as enfeebling that moulded the iron man of Geneva, the strong and high-hearted Calvin; who turning away in his own sunny France from as bright a path of glory as ever glittered before a youthful eye, went to a land of strangers, a lonely, friendless and persecuted exile, to toil and suffer for an ungrateful people, and though bowed down with labour, disease and penury, outliving all that his heart held dear, left alone in the world and taunted with this very bereavement as the blasting mark of Divine displeasure, yet self-poised or rather God-stayed in his great and magnanimous spirit, moving onward solitary and unaided in his high and stern career, trampling alike on the seductions of wealth and menace of power, until he had planted the standard of Reformation on that munition of rocks against which the gates of hell shall never prevail. And look at the Puritan the very child of Calvinism, and whether you see him raising a voice in the Halls of Westminster which shook England's throne to the centre; girding on a sword before which the haughtiest powers of Europe quailed; or when vanquished retiring with his unconquered heart to the fastnesses in the rocks, and making the mountain glen and midnight air to ring, with the hymns of his lofty cheer; or braving the perils of a wintry ocean, a cheerless coast, and a savage wilderness, only that he might kneel on the naked granite and offer a free prayer to the God of his fathers, wherever you see him you find him the same stern, lofty, unflinching man of adamant. Can the system that produced such men be unfavourable to any department of effort? Has it been so in fact upon missions? Who first of the Reformers went forth to tell

the heathen of the unsearchable riches of Christ? A band of Genevan Calvinists. Who were the most instrumental in God's hand, by their personal toils, and privations in awaking the modern spirit of missions in the church? Brainard, Eliot, Edwards—Calvinists. And who were the first to give an embodied impulse to that spirit? The records of missionary organization will answer, British and American Calvinists. By them it was begun, in a great measure carried on, and many of its brightest trophies under God obtained. These facts we think are sufficient to prove, that the actual influence of Calvinism has, to a degree at least sufficient for the argument, been favourable to the missionary enterprise.

The length to which our remarks have been protracted rather than a conviction of having completed the discussion, warns us to come to a close. It remains for each one who holds the system we have investigated, to see that he furnishes another illustration of its influence, and not a new instance of its abuse. As yet, with all that we can adduce historically in favour of the point discussed, there is barely enough to save the argument, not to illustrate it; enough to show the tendency but not to exhibit the influence of these doctrines. Let us see to it, that whilst holding and contending for the truth we do not neglect to send it to the perishing; and that it be not said to us after all our vociferous applause and contention for our pure and noble system, "thou wicked and slothful servant, out of thine own mouth will I condemn thee."

ART. III.—*The History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, comprising the civil History of the Province of Ulster, from the accession of James the First, with a preliminary sketch of the progress of the Reformed Religion in Ireland during the sixteenth century, and an appendix consisting of original papers: By James Seaton Reid, D. D., minister of the Presbyterian Church, Carrickfergus. Waugh and Innes, Edinburgh, 1834. Two volumes. 8vo.*

Melrose Alexander

These volumes, though they have been for some years before the public, in Europe, have not, till lately, reached our hands. And our design in noticing them now is not to

write a critique on the history which they contain, but to extract from them information respecting a branch of the church, with which Presbyterians in these United States have a more intimate connexion than with any other body of Presbyterians. It is common to represent our church as having derived its origin from the Church of Scotland; and remotely this was the fact; but its immediate origin was from the Presbyterian church of Ireland, whence came most of the fathers who laid the foundation of that system which has now become so extensive as to include more than a hundred presbyteries; and this notwithstanding the separation of nearly a moiety of the body, within a few years past. But when we speak of our church as deriving its origin from any ecclesiastical body in Europe, we would not be understood to mean that our first presbyteries were erected by any order or by any authority of any foreign Presbyterian body, for this was not the fact. But several ordained ministers having emigrated from the north of Ireland, settled in the middle colonies; particularly in Pennsylvania, Delaware and Maryland, united together in presbytery, which under existing circumstances, they had a right to do, and were joined from the first by some ministers from New England, who were willing to adopt the Presbyterian system. We do not utter it as a matter of complaint, but merely to make known the historical fact, that until very recently our church has never been noticed or recognised by any foreign Presbyterian church. We are, therefore, free from any special obligations to any foreign church; but this does not release us from the obligation to fraternize with all true members of Christ's church, wherever they may dwell; and to aid them by our prayers; and this obligation we especially feel in regard to those who have the same form of doctrine, the same system of church government, and the same rules of discipline which we have adopted. Not only did our first ministers come to us from Ireland, but the people who composed the first Presbyterian congregations were from the same country. Indeed, it may be truly said, that the emigration of many Presbyterian people was the inducement for enterprising Presbyterian ministers to cross the ocean and take up their residence in a new country. Little did the fathers of the Presbyterian church know the importance of their own labours, and the extent to which the tender vine which they planted would in one century spread its branches.

As our opportunities of becoming acquainted with the church of our forefathers, in Ireland, had been inconsiderable, we were gratified to find that a learned Presbyterian minister of Ireland had with much labour composed a history of his own church; and having now enjoyed the pleasure of perusing it, we feel disposed to present to our readers such parts of the history as are most interesting, and to separate our account, as far as possible, from the civil history of the country, which would not only be uninteresting to most of our readers, but is in fact exceedingly confused and perplexed. We deem it unnecessary to go back to the first propagation of Christianity in this island. It will be enough for our purpose to remark, that prior to the reformation, in the sixteenth century, no part of Christendom was involved in a thicker darkness of ignorance and superstition than Ireland. This assertion will be easily credited by all who are well acquainted with the present state of a large part of the population of that country. There were some peculiar reasons why Ireland was in a lower state of improvement than the neighbouring Island of Great Britain. As it was every where the policy of the Romish church to keep the people in ignorance, so also it was unhappily the case that the jealousy of the British government, by prohibiting the free use of the Irish language, with a view of introducing the English, was adapted to promote the same end. Before the reformation, the benefits of the art of printing had not been extended to Ireland. The instruction given by the clergy had no tendency to dissipate the darkness, but rather to increase it, for most of what they communicated served rather to rivet the bonds of superstition, than to enlarge and improve the minds of the people. The inculcation of the doctrines of religion and duties of morality, formed no part of the preaching of the times, which consisted of silly legends of pretended saints and martyrs.

During the reign of Henry VIII. the reformation made small progress in Ireland; except that he made his authority as head of the church to be acknowledged, endeavoured to induce the clergy and to break off all connexion with Rome, and suppressed some of the monasteries; but the people were entirely unprepared for a reformation and submitted to these changes more from compulsion than from conviction and good will.

In the reign of Edward VI. the English liturgy was introduced into many of the churches; but very little real

progress was made in the work of reformation. Two excellent men, BALE and GOODACRE, were made bishops, and laboured indefatigably to promote the knowledge of the true religion among the ignorant people. "Of Bale," says our author, "we possess many authentic memorials which show him to have possessed, not only the fidelity, piety, and learning of a reformer, but also the zeal, energy and courage essential to the character of a champion of the truth. Deeply convinced of the ruinous errors of popery, he attacked and exposed them without reserve. For this honest boldness he had been twice imprisoned in England, by the ruling clergy. Owing to the favour of Lord Cromwell, he obtained his liberty; and after the melancholy death of his patron, he retired to the continent, where he spent eight years in habits of intimacy and friendship with Luther, Calvin, and other celebrated continental reformers. At the accession of Edward VIth. he returned to England, and in 1552 was offered the see of Ossory. He could not, however, for some time be prevailed on to accept it, alleging his age; being then nearly sixty, also his poverty, and his ill health, as sufficient to excuse him from so arduous a charge. At the personal solicitation of the sovereign himself, Bale at length consented, and in conjunction with his friend and colleague, Goodacre, was solemnly set apart to his office on the 2d of February, 1553." He refused to be consecrated according to the Romish ritual; and his firmness on this occasion, had a salutary effect on the timid friends of the reformation.

Of the manner in which he performed the duties of his high office, we have some account left from his own hand. "My first proceedings were these,—I earnestly exhorted the people to repentance for sin, and required them to give credit to the gospel salvation; to acknowledge and believe that there was but one God; and him alone, without any other sincerely to worship; to confess one Christ, for an only Saviour and Redeemer, and to trust in none other man's prayers, merits, nor yet deservings, but in his alone for salvation. I treated at large both of the heavenly and political state of the church; and helpers, I found none among my prebendaries and clergy, but adversaries a great number. I preached the gospel of the knowledge and right invocation of God. But when I once sought to destroy the idolatries and dissolve the hypocrites' yokes, then followed angers, slanders, conspiracies, and in the end

the slaughter of men." While he thus preached the truth, he laboured with the utmost diligence to correct the vices of his clergy, whom he found plunged in the grossest licentiousness. He at once abolished the idolatrous service of the mass, and sought to lead the people to the knowledge and love of true religion. But he was not permitted long to go on in his begun work of reformation; for on the demise of Edward VI. he became the object of violent persecution, and was again obliged to fly for safety to the continent. On the accession of Elizabeth, Bale returned to England, but never entered again into the episcopal office.

The death of Edward VI. gave a complete check to the work of reformation in Ireland, where it had been barely commenced. Every thing went back to its former condition, and the high offices in the church fell again into the hands of the devoted servants of the Pope. A day of jubilee was observed throughout the kingdom for the happy restoration. The number of Protestants was so small, and they lived in so much obscurity, that it was not thought necessary to exercise great vigilance toward them; and during the violence of the Marian persecution in England, many persons took refuge in Ireland, where they remained unmolested. Some of these little colonies brought their ministers with them, who privately officiated among them even in Dublin; and thus by the providence of God, when Protestantism appeared extinct, the seeds of reformation were again sown among the people.

At the accession of Elizabeth, another revolution in the church, of course, took place; and it is a remarkable proof of the flexible consciences of the ecclesiastics of those times, that of nineteen prelates, who had conformed to popery under Mary, only two now adhered with steadfastness to their profession. While the laws now established protestantism, and required conformity to the English liturgy, the great obstacle to a thorough reformation in Ireland, arose from ignorance of the English language, among the great body of the people. If measures had been taken to have the liturgy translated into the language of the people, and the Bible and other suitable books extensively circulated, the result would have been widely different from what it was. This measure, and also the supplying of congregations with pious and able pastors, were strongly recommended to the queen by Sir Henry Sydney, to whom the government of Ireland was then committed. But this ad-

vice was not followed; in consequence of which neglect, innumerable evils have continued to arise in that unhappy country, to this day. This enlightened statesman also projected the plan of the Dublin University; although it was not commenced until 1590, and students were first admitted in 1593. One chief object of this institution was to raise up ministers for the national church. The liberal spirit of the governors of the university appears from the fact, that the two first fellows elected, were Presbyterians from Scotland. Their names were Fullerton and Hamilton. It is also a fact, that the first two regular provosts of the college were non-conformists. The first of these was Walter Travers, one of the most celebrated of the English puritans, who had been silenced by Whitgift for his non-conformity. His successor was Henry Alvey, an equally zealous Puritan.

At the accession of James I. to the throne of England, Ireland was in a very unhappy state of ignorance and superstition. The course of administration of the British government toward Ireland, at this time, was conciliatory and kind; customs and usages which were injurious, but which had obtained the force of law, were abolished. The natives were, for the first time, admitted to the privileges of citizens, and put on an equality with English residents. The estates of the nobility, held before by a very precarious title, were secured to them with all the formalities of law; and courts, which had been intermitted in the southern provinces for two centuries, and had never before been established in the north, were held in every district of the country; so that justice was now administered to all classes of persons.

As James manifested a disposition to check the arrogance and tyranny of the Romanists, a conspiracy was formed against his government by some of the nobility, but this was detected before the time of its execution arrived, and the earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell, who were principals in the plot, fled in dismay. Soon afterwards, however, another insurrection took place in the north of Ireland, under O'Dogherty, who was slain, and his followers were scattered. In consequence of these treasonable and rebellious acts, an extensive portion of the province of Ulster reverted to the crown. About half a million of acres of land, including no less than six counties in this province, were forfeited. These lands James wisely determined, to plant with Eng-

lish and Scottish colonies. Here we have the origin of Presbyterianism in the north of Ireland. The moral and religious condition of Ulster at this time was truly deplorable. The account given by a Protestant prelate was as follows: "In many places there is no minister at all; in many places a minister as good as none, even a dumb dog that cannot bark; an idle shepherd who is not apt to teach, nor able to confute. In other places a lewd and scandalous minister, whose not gospel-like behaviour is a stumbling-block to them that are without." In consequence of the indolence and insufficiency of such a clergy, divine service had not, for years together, been used in any parish church throughout Ulster, except in some city or principal town.

This project of colonization was not the first which had been formed, in relation to Ulster. In 1559, under queen Elizabeth, an attempt of this kind had been made on a smaller scale, in regard to the counties of Down and Antrim, but the design was very partially carried into effect.

The person employed by the king to execute his plan of colonization, was Sir Arthur Chichester, whom he appointed deputy of the kingdom in 1605. His first care was to have the six forfeited counties surveyed, after which he allotted the lands to three classes of persons—British undertakers, who engaged voluntarily in the enterprise; servitors of the crown, consisting of civil and military officers—and natives, whom it was expected this confidence and liberality would render loyal subjects. The land was divided into portions of two thousand, fifteen hundred, and one thousand acres; and the proprietors, besides other conditions, were bound to settle forty-eight able men, above the age of eighteen, of English or Scottish descent, upon the largest divisions, and upon the less in the same proportion. In the year 1610, the land began to be generally occupied. On account of the nearness of Scotland, and the hardy and enterprising character of her population, most of the colonists were from that country. They first occupied the north-eastern parts, but soon spread themselves extensively through the country. The southern and western parts were principally occupied by the English, between whom and the Scotch there existed the most friendly cooperation. Londonderry was built and occupied chiefly by emigrants from London; hence its name. Coleraine was also settled by the English. But the Scottish settlers were far more numerous; and the king was pleased to have the Scotch

come over. Many English, however, had large estates of land bestowed on them.

In the year 1615, an Irish parliament and convocation were summoned to meet, when such laws were enacted and such regulations made, as rendered secure the possessions of the colonists. All the sees were filled with protestant bishops, and instead of adopting the articles of the Church of England, which some wished, Archbishop Ussher was requested to draw up a set of articles; which gave entire satisfaction to the parliament, and to both houses of convocation. This confession is, in its main features, as decidedly Calvinistic as that of the Westminster Assembly; and includes, in nearly the very same words, the nine Lambeth articles, which the Puritans strove, in 1604, at the Hampton Court conference, to have introduced. No power of instituting ceremonies in religion was granted; and a conformity to the doctrines laid down was the only term of communion. In consequence of the adoption of this sound and liberal system, for the Irish Church, many ministers removed to Ulster.

The first colonists, both from England and Scotland, were not of the most religious and orderly of the people; but generally adventurers, and such as fled from debt, or who wished to mend their broken fortunes. Even the Scottish people, who flocked in great numbers to Down, Antrim, Londonderry, &c., are represented to have been an irreligious people, who seemed to engage in this enterprise rather to fly from God, than to follow their own mercy. But God followed them when they fled from Him. For awhile, indeed, ignorance and vice prevailed in an awful degree among the colonists; but the mercy, by which God, in his providence, followed them, was the arrival among them of a band of faithful ministers, whose labours were remarkably blessed to the conversion of many souls of this irreligious multitude. Of these, the first, in the order of time, was the Rev. Edward Brice, M. A., who had for many years been a settled minister in Stirlingshire: but being persecuted in his own country, he was finally obliged to fly, and passed over into Ireland, where among the colonists he had some friends, especially the Rev. William Edmonstone, who had once been his neighbour, in Scotland. Mr. Brice, after being in Ireland some time, was promoted by the bishop of the diocese, to be prebendary of Kilroot: which was an honour more nominal than real. He here had an opportunity of preaching the gospel without re-

straint, and without renouncing any of his Presbyterian principles. In his old age, Mr. Livingston speaks of him in the following terms: "He was an aged man ere I knew him, and came not much abroad: in all his preaching, he insisted much on the life of Christ in the heart, and the light of his word and spirit on the mind; that being his own continual exercise."

In the adjoining parish of Carrickfergus, was settled the Rev. Mr. Hubbard, a puritan minister from England, who had been episcopally ordained, but from principle renounced his connexion with the Established Church, and became the pastor of a non-conforming congregation, in Southwark, London. But being here much oppressed, he and his flock resolved to remove to Ireland. His wish having been signified to Sir Arthur Chichester, to whom he had been known in the university, he invited him to settle, with as many of his people as might choose to emigrate, in Carrickfergus, which he did about the year 1621. Blair speaks of him as "an able, gracious man." But he was not long spared to the church and to his flock. He died in the beginning of the year 1623; scarcely two years after his removal. His people, who had removed to Ireland to enjoy the ministry of their beloved pastor, now mostly returned to England and settled in the vicinity of London.

Soon after the death of Hubbard, we find the Rev. James Glendinning, preaching and lecturing in Carrickfergus. He was a native of Scotland and had been educated at the University of St. Andrews, but had removed, early in life, to Ireland. At Antrim was settled, the Rev. John Ridge, M. A., a native of England. He had been ordained deacon by the bishop of Oxford, but feeling a repugnance to the order and ceremonies of the Established Church, he removed to Ireland, in 1619, where he was patronized and presented with a parish by Lord Chichester. Blair styles him, "The judicious and gracious minister of Antrim." Livingston's testimony respecting him is, "that he used not to have many points in his sermon, but he so enlarged on those he had, that it was scarcely possible for any hearer to forget his preaching."

Contemporary with these, there were excellent ministers settled in the county of Down. Among these was the Rev. Robert Cunningham, M. A. He had been chaplain to the earl of Buccleugh's regiment, in Holland, but on the return of

the troops to Scotland, he went to Ireland, and by bishop Echlin, was presented with a living, which on the roll of the diocese for 1622, is styled Holywood and Craigavad. He was supported by Sir James Hamilton, afterwards Lord Claneboy. Of him Livingston says, "To my discerning, he was the one man, who most resembled the meekness of Jesus Christ, in all his carriage, that ever I saw, and was so far revered by all, even by the wicked, that he oft trembled with that scripture, 'wo be to you when all men speak well of you.'"

In the neighbouring parish of Bangor, was settled that famous apostle of the north of Ireland, the Rev. ROBERT BLAIR, who had been a regent or professor in the College of Glasgow, but being much opposed by Cameron the principal, who had been advanced to that station with a view of introducing prelacy, he resigned his situation, and being invited to Ireland, by Lord Claneboy, came to that country, in 1623. We have from himself the circumstance of his settlement, in Bangor: "When I landed in Ireland, all things smelling of a root called rampions (wild garlic) my prejudice was confirmed against the land. But, next day, travelling towards Bangor, I met, unexpectedly, with so sweet a peace and so great a joy, as I behoved to look thereon as my welcome thither; and retiring to a private place about a mile from Craigfergus, I prostrated myself on the grass, to rejoice in the Lord, who proved the same to me in Ireland, which he had been in Scotland. Nevertheless my aversion to a settlement there continued strong; and when my noble patron renewed his invitation and offers, I was very careful to inform him what accusations had been laid against me of disaffection to the civil powers, and that I could not submit to the use of the English liturgy, nor Episcopal government, to see if either of these would prevail with him to pass from his invitation. But he having been informed by a minister present, of my altercations with Dr. Cameron, said, 'I know all that business,' and as to other difficulties in the way of my admission, he was confident of obtaining a free entry for me, which he effected. So all my devices to obstruct a settlement there did evanish and took no effect, the counsel of the Lord standing fast in all generations."

"Having been invited to preach by the patron, and by Mr. Gibson, the sick incumbent, I yielded to their invitation, and preached there three Sabbath-days. After that several

of the aged and most respectable persons in the congregation came to me by order of the whole, and informed me that they were edified by the doctrine delivered by me; entreated me not to leave them; and promised if the patron's offer of maintenance was not large enough, they would willingly add to the same. This promise I slighted, being too careless of competence and comfortable provision, for I had no thoughts of any greater family, than a boy or two to serve me. But on that part of the speech imparting the congregation's call, I laid great weight, and it did contribute more to remove my unwillingness to settle there than anything else. Likewise the dying man (Mr. Gibson) did several ways encourage me. He professed great sorrow for his having been a dean, and condemned episcopacy more strongly than ever I durst do, and charged me in the name of Christ, and as I expected his blessing on my ministry, not to leave that good way wherein I had begun to walk—and then drawing my head towards his bosom, he laid his hands on my head and blessed me. After a few days he died, and my admission was accomplished as quickly as might be, in the following way; the viscount Claneboy, my noble patron, did at my request, inform the bishop how opposite I was to Episcopacy and their liturgy, and had the influence to procure my admission on easy and honourable terms. Yet, lest his lordship had not been plain enough, I declared my opinion fully to the bishop at our first meeting, and found him yielding beyond my expectation. The bishop said to me, 'I hear good of you, and will impose no conditions on you; I am old and can teach you ceremonies, and you can teach me substance, only I must ordain you, else neither I nor you can answer the law nor brook the land.' I answered him, that his sole ordination did utterly contradict my principles. But he replied both wittily and submissively, 'Whatever you may think of Episcopacy, you account a presbytery to have a divine warrant; will you not receive ordination from Mr. Cunningham and the adjacent brethren, and let me come in among them in no other relation than a presbyter?' This I could not refuse, and so the matter was performed, on the tenth of July, 1623."

Mr. Blair was one of the most eminent ministers at this time, in Ireland, and contributed more than any other to the revival and establishment of true religion in the province. "He was a man," says Livingston, who knew him intimately, "of notable constitution both of body and mind;

of a majestic, awful, yet affable and amiable countenance, and carriage, thoroughly learned, of strong parts, deep invention and judgment, and of a most public spirit for God. His gift of preaching was such, that seldom could any observe withdrawing of assistance in public, which in others is frequent. He seldom ever wanted assurance of his salvation. He spent many days and nights, in prayer alone and with others, and was vouchsafed great intimacy with God."

Shortly after his settlement at Bangor, Mr. Blair was the means of inducing Mr. James Hamilton to devote himself to the service of the church. He was nephew to Lord Claneboy, and had been educated for the ministry in Scotland; but had hitherto acted as agent for his uncle. Mr. Blair, observing in this young man both piety and talents, proposed to him to enter the ministry; but he proceeded cautiously, and with Mr. Cunningham made private trial of his endowments; and being satisfied with his gifts, he invited him to preach in his pulpit in the presence of his uncle, who till then knew nothing of the design of introducing him into the ministry; but though there was some fear that he would be reluctant to lose so faithful a servant, yet he manifested no displeasure, but, on the contrary, was highly gratified. In a short time, therefore, Mr. Hamilton was ordained by Bishop Echlin, about the year 1625, and stationed at Ballywater, where he was both diligent and successful in the work of the ministry. And though he might readily have obtained promotion in the Episcopal church, yet the Lord did graciously preserve him from being ensnared by those baits, and made him very instrumental in promoting his work. Livingston gives his character in the words following; he was, "a learned and diligent man but his gift of preaching was rather doctrinal than exhortatory."

The seven ministers, whose characters have been given above, constituted the first band, who laboured with apostolic earnestness, to remove the ignorance, formality and profaneness which characterized the greater part of the early colonists of the north of Ireland. Possessed of the true missionary spirit, and inspired with a holy zeal to propagate the gospel, they commenced with vigour the work of evangelizing the land. And though few in number, and beset with many difficulties, they were favoured with an extraordinary, if not an unprecedented measure of

success. A remarkable improvement in the habits and manners of the people was speedily effected. The thoughtless were roused to serious inquiry on the subject of religion, and the careless were alarmed, and urged to self-examination. The profane were in a great measure silenced, and the immoral reclaimed, while obstinate opposers of the gospel were converted into its willing and decided supporters. The revival of religion which occurred at this time, subsequently attracted great attention both in Scotland and England. The fame of it extended even to America; and it has frequently been referred to by writers of the last century, as one of those sudden and extraordinary manifestations of divine grace upon a careless people, with which the church has been occasionally favoured. It seems proper, therefore, to enter somewhat into detail, in giving an account of this work of grace; and in doing this we shall for the most part employ the very words of our author. He observes, "that this spirit of religious inquiry and reformation, which in a short time pervaded a considerable portion of the counties of Down and Antrim, was, no doubt, the natural, as it is the promised result of that devotedness and fidelity by which the Presbyterian ministers in this part of Ulster were so eminently distinguished. Yet it appears to have first manifested itself under the ministry of the weakest of these brethren, whose limited attainments and ill regulated zeal were providentially overruled for the furtherance of the gospel.

"The circumstances connected with this revival, deserve to be noticed. Mr. Blair coming over to Carrickfergus from Bangor, and occasionally hearing Mr. Glendinning preach, perceived some sparkles of good inclination in him, but found him not solid but weak, and not fitted for a public station among the English, he therefore advised him to remove into the country among his own countrymen. The good man received this counsel in good part, and in accordance with it went and settled at Oldstone, near the town of Antrim. Here God made use of the ministry of this pious, but half-deranged man to begin a glorious work of grace; so that it was evident to all men, that it was not by might, nor by power, nor by the wisdom of man, but by the Spirit of the Lord, that this awakening and reformation were produced. When Mr. Glendinning arrived in this place, and observed the carelessness and profaneness of the people, he was led to preach to them the terrors of

the law, and the wrath of an angry God against the wicked. His hearers finding themselves condemned by law of God, fell into such anxiety and terror of conscience, that they looked on themselves as altogether lost and damned. And this was not only the case with one or a few, but multitudes were seized with deep conviction, made to cry out, 'Men and brethren what shall we do to be saved.' Such was the impression of these awful feelings of religion on their bodies, that many fell down, as it were in a swoon, and an eye-witness testifies, that in one day he has seen a dozen carried out as dead. And these were none of the weaker sex only, but some of the boldest spirits, who had been notorious for their desperate enterprises and exploits. 'I have heard one of them,' says the narrator, 'then a man of great bodily strength, and now a man strong in faith, declare that his end in coming to the church was to consult with his companions how to devise some mischief. And yet at one of these meetings he was so caught, that he was fully subdued.' But why speak of one, there were multitudes, who not only sinned but gloried in it, and feared no man, who became patterns of sobriety, fearing to sin because they feared God. And this work of God's grace, was not confined to the lower and middling classes: it reached the honourable family of Sir John Clotworthy, he, and his mother and his lady, became eminent trophies of divine power, for they received the gospel most cordially, and became eminent as examples of genuine religion, and their example was followed by others of the gentry of the place, among whom was Capt. Norton, of Templeton."

These religious excitements continued for a considerable time, during which the ministers were indefatigable in improving the favourable opportunities thus afforded for extending the knowledge and influence of the gospel. The people, awakened and inquiring, needed instruction; many of them being not only alarmed but desponding, greatly desired the instruction and guidance of ministers. The judicious exhibition of evangelical doctrines and promises, by these faithful men, was in due time productive of those happy and tranquilizing effects, which they naturally produce when cordially received. The broken-hearted were bound up and comforted; the spirit of bondage and sin gave way to a spirit of freedom and love; the oil of joy was poured forth instead of mourning; and the spirit of heaviness exchanged for the garments of praise and thank-

fulness. The religious feelings of the people prompted them to meet often together for religious fellowship and prayer, besides the stated services of the sabbath. Hence originated those monthly meetings at Antrim, which afterwards attracted so much attention. Stewart, an eye-witness of the scene, from whose narrative the preceding statement has been taken, gives the origin of these meetings as follows: "When, therefore, the multitude of wounded consciences were healed, they began to draw into holy communion, and meeting together privately for edification; a thing which in a lifeless generation is both neglected and reprov'd. But the new life forced it among the people, who desired to know what God was doing for the souls of their neighbours, who they perceived were wrought on in spirit, as they had been. There was a man in the parish of Oldstone, by the name of Hugh Campbell, who had fled from Scotland, but God caught him in Ireland, and made him an eminent and exemplary Christian. He was a gentleman of the house of Duckett Hall. After this man was healed of the wound given to his soul by the Almighty, he became very refreshful to others who had less learning and judgment than himself: he therefore incited some of his neighbours, who were fighting the same fight of faith, to meet at his house, on the last Friday of the month; where and when, beginning with a few, they spent their time in prayer, mutual edification and conference, of what they found within them. This meeting was continued at Hugh Campbell's house, until the attendants became so numerous, that the pastors thought it expedient that some one of them should always be present, to prevent what hurt might follow." "Accordingly," says Blair, who carries on the narrative from the time that that of Stewart abruptly closes, "Mr. John Ridge, the judicious and gracious minister of Antrim, perceiving many people on both sides of the Six-Mile Water, awakened out of their security, made an overture that a monthly meeting should be set up at Antrim, which was within a mile of Oldstone, and lay central for the meeting of the awakened persons; and he invited Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Hamilton and myself, to take part in that work, who were all glad of the motion and heartily embraced it. Mr. Glendinning was also at the first glad of the confluence of the people; but not being invited to bear a part in the monthly meeting, he became so emulous, that to preserve popular applause, he watched and fasted won-

derfully. Afterward, he was smitten with a number of erroneous and enthusiastic opinions—and embracing one error after another, he set out on a visit to the seven churches of Asia.”

The removal of this minister was no loss to the cause of religion, although he had happily been made the instrument of awakening many to a sense of its extreme importance. Had it not been for the judicious ministers at hand, able to guide the people in the time of their excitement, the good work might have been marred and disgraced, if not overthrown. His place was very soon supplied by equally zealous, but more judicious ministers from Scotland. For the report of this great revival having reached that country, and it being made known that there was freedom in Ireland for the exercise of the ministry, several of the brethren came over, and were valuable assistants in promoting the work of the Lord. The first of these was Josias Welsh, son of the celebrated John Welsh, minister of Ayr, and grandson to John Knox, the Scottish reformer, by Elizabeth his third daughter. He had been educated in Geneva, and, on his return to his own country, was appointed professor of humanity in the University of Glasgow, which situation he filled until the introduction of prelacy, under Dr. Cameron, when he was forced, in order to keep a good conscience, to resign his office. Blair says of him; “A great measure of that spirit which wrought in and by the father rested on him, and finding of how zealous a spirit he was, I exhorted him to hasten over to Ireland, where he would find work enough, and I hoped success too.” He accordingly came over about 1626. Mr. Welsh preached for a while in the vacancy left by Mr. Glendinning; and having received ordination from his kinsman Knox, bishop of Raphoe, he was soon after settled at Templepatrick, as chaplain to Captain Norton. “Here,” says Livingston, “he had many seals to his ministry, and, being much exercised in his own spirit, much of his preaching was an exercise of conscience.” And Blair adds, “he did with great eagerness convince the sinner, and sweetly comfort the dejected.”

The next year, (1627) came over Andrew Stewart, and settled in Donegore, a parish contiguous to Antrim and Templepatrick. According to Livingston, he was a man “very streight in the cause of God.” And Blair calls him, “a learned gentleman, fervent in spirit, and a very success-

ful minister of the word of God." The next who followed from Scotland was George Dunbar, M. A. He had long been minister of Ayr, and had been twice ejected by the High Commission Court, for his resolute attachment to the Presbyterian cause, which James I. was then labouring to subvert. He had also been cast into prison at Blackness. Upon his arrival at Ulster, he first preached at Carrickfergus; afterwards he laboured for a time at Ballymenas, and then came to Larne, where he settled, and where he laboured most diligently, and with much success. He complained one day, while preaching, that he was afraid that none had received any benefit from his labours, when a man arose in the congregation, and said that he had received benefit. And not only in this man, but in many others, a great change was in a short time apparent. Among these was the remarkable case of Andrew Brown, a man deaf and dumb, who had lived a loose and vicious life; but when it pleased the Lord to work a change on several in the parish of Larne, a very sensible change was observed in him; not only in forsaking his former loose courses and company; but in joining himself to religious people, and attending on all the exercises of God's worship in public and private. He ordinarily, morning and evening, used to go alone to prayer, and would often weep at sermons—and exhibited such marks of grace on his heart, that by the advice of all the ministers he was admitted to the communion of the Lord's supper. Here, as in Antrim, there were various persons who became the subjects of violent bodily agitations, especially during the time of divine worship; and some were disposed to think that these questionable symptoms were evidences of the work of the Spirit. Mr. Brice and Mr. Dunbar however, with great prudence and care examined into the views and exercises of the persons thus affected, and did not discover in them any deep sense of their sinful state, nor any ardent pantings after a Saviour. Wishing, however, to have a thorough examination, they invited the brethren also to come and converse with those persons; and the result was, that it was believed to be a mere delusion and cheat of the destroyer, to slander and disgrace the work of the Lord.

After Dunbar, the next labourer raised up to carry on the work of the Lord in Ireland, was Henry Colwort or Calvert. He was a native of England, and had been ordained by Knox bishop of Raphoe, May, 1629, and was

settled at Oldstone. "This able minister," says Blair, "being of a fervent spirit and a vehement delivery in preaching, and withal very diligent, was a blessing to that people." And Livingston speaks of him as one, "who very pertinently cited much scripture, in his sermons, and frequently urged private fasting and prayer." But last though not least among the ministers who settled in Ireland, was John Livingston, who had been silenced in Scotland by Archbishop Spotswood on account of his opposition to prelacy. For sometime he continued to preach in private, by stealth, as he found opportunity, and had calls from several parishes, but the bishop uniformly opposed his settlement. At length an opportunity offered for his removal to Ireland; being invited to that country by Lord Claneboy. As it was necessary for him to receive episcopal ordination, before he could be settled in any parish, since they all belonged to the Irish Establishment, he took letters from Lord Claneboy, his patron, to Knox, bishop of Raphoe, who, when he came, told him he knew that the reason why he applied to him was on account of his scruples respecting episcopacy and ceremonies, as Mr. Josias Welsh and some others had done before; and that he thought his old age was prolonged for little other purpose, than to do such offices; and that he would send for Mr. Cunningham and two or three other neighbouring ministers to be present, who after sermon should give him imposition of hands; but he said "although they performed the work he must be present: and although he durst not answer it to the state, he gave me the book of ordination, and desired, that anything I scrupled at, I should draw a line over it, on the margin, and that Mr. Cunningham should not read it." But he found that the book had been scored already, so that he had no occasion to mark anything.

Mr. Livingston was one of the most learned and eloquent preachers, who visited the north of Ireland, and probably, his success has not been surpassed by that of any minister in modern times; and no one suffered more in consequence of unshaken attachment to the principles of Presbyterianism. Besides the above mentioned ministers, who laboured in Ulster at this period, there were two excellent men, who were introduced into the sacred office in that province. The one was John McClelland; the other, John Semple; faithful auxiliaries to the older ministers. The aim of all these was the same;—the revival and extension of true re-

ligion, in this desolate land. Rarely has the church of Christ, in any country, experienced so sensible an increase in so limited a period, as under the ministry of these brethren. And the reason is obvious; rarely has she enjoyed such faithful servants. They were truly "instant in season, out of season," labouring to instruct the people, and by every means to promote practical godliness in the churches committed to their care. Their intensity of zeal and untiring diligence in their work, if ever equalled, have seldom been surpassed. Mr. Blair's account of his own labours at Bangor, may serve as a sample; and furnishes a model worthy of imitation by other ministers. "My charge," says he, "was very great, consisting of about six miles in length, and containing above twelve hundred persons come of age, besides children who stood greatly in need of instruction. This being the case, I preached twice every week besides the Lord's day; on all which occasions I found little difficulty as to matter or method. But finding still that this fell short of reaching the design of a gospel ministry, and that the most part continued vastly ignorant, I saw the necessity of trying a more plain and familiar way of instructing them. And, therefore, besides my public preaching, I spent as much time every week as my bodily strength would hold out with, in exhorting and catechising them. Not long after I fell upon this method, the Lord visited me with a fever, on which some, who hated my painfulness in the ministry, said scoffingly, that they knew I could not hold out as I began. But in a little space, it pleased the Lord to raise me up again, and he enabled me to continue that method, the whole time I was there. The knowledge of God increasing among the people, and the ordinance of prayer being precious in their eyes, the work of the Lord did prosper in the place, and in this we were much encouraged by the assistance of the holy Mr. Cunningham, and by the good example of his little parish, Holywood. For, knowing that diversity of gifts is entertaining to the hearers, he and I did frequently preach for one another; and we also agreed to celebrate the sacrament of the Lord's supper, four times in each of our congregations, annually, so that those persons in both parishes who were thriving in religion, did communicate together, on all these occasions."

Here it may be remarked, that Blair, and the other ministers whom we have mentioned, in celebrating the Lord's supper, adhered to the ritual of the Church of Scotland.

They used tables placed in the centre of the church, and communicated in a sitting posture. Lord Claneboy, Blair's patron, having been accustomed to the rites of the English Church, was with difficulty reconciled to this simple, but scriptural method, and when he and his lady first attended Blair's communion, there was danger of some confusion, as they insisted on receiving the sacrament, kneeling. Blair scrupling to administer it to them in that posture, reasoned with him on the subject, but Claneboy was obstinate; but as his pew was near the table, it was agreed that he should communicate there, as he promised that he would not kneel. Blair says, "For peace sake I rashly yielded, but was so much discomposed by it next day, that when I came to the public, I was for half an hour so deserted of God, that I was about to give over the work of that day. But the Lord in great mercy pitied and helped me. For preaching on the words of the institution, 1 Cor. xi. and handling these words, 'This cup is the New Testament in my blood,' I found light and comfort flowing into my soul; and with this assistance I went to the table and administered the sacrament. My patron, and especially his lady, when the action was ended, professed their great satisfaction with that day's service, and proved my most tender and real friends, ever after." From this we see how rigid these ministers were, in avoiding every thing which had the remotest semblance of giving idolatrous worship to the mere elements of the sacrament.

The condition of those ministers and churches was, indeed, very peculiar. They were in connexion, nominally, with the Established church of Ireland; but were in principle strict Presbyterians; and in their congregations the Presbyterian order and discipline were observed as exactly as in Scotland. "In my congregation," writes Blair, "we had both deacons for the poor and elders for discipline; and so long as we were permitted to use it, the Lord blessed that ordinance." Livingston, now settled at Killinchy, pursued the same method of discipline, as Blair. He found the people tractable, but exceedingly ignorant; so that at first he saw no prospect of doing good among them, but it pleased the Lord in a short time to bring some of them to understand their condition. He also had elders to assist in governing the church, and deacons to receive and distribute the collections for the poor. The session met regularly once a week and were strict in bringing to account such members

as walked disorderly. The religious sentiments of all these ministers were what is called Calvinistic; and these, at this period, were universally maintained throughout the three national churches of the empire. While, therefore, they willingly subscribed to the articles of the Irish church, which as we have seen were strictly orthodox, they were careful to avoid every act which would even seem to favour prelacy. Though they had as yet no presbytery organized, they enjoyed many of the benefits of presbyterial meetings, from the monthly meeting at Antrim, concerning the origin of which we have already spoken. "We used," says Livingston, "to meet the first Friday of every month, at Antrim, where was a good and a great congregation; and that day was spent in fasting, and prayer, and public preaching. Commonly two preached every forenoon, and two every afternoon. We used to come together the Thursday night before, and staid the Friday night after the meeting; and consulted about such things as concerned the carrying on the work of God; and these meetings among ourselves were often as profitable as Presbyteries or Synods. Among all the ministers, there never was any jar, or jealousy; nor among the professors. All their contention was to prefer others to themselves. And although the gifts of the ministers were very different; yet it was not observed that the people followed any to the undervaluing of others. Many of these religious professors had been both ignorant and profane; and for debts and want, and worse causes, had left Scotland. Yet the Lord was pleased by his word to work such a change, that I do not think there were more lively and experienced Christians, any where than were at this time in Ireland. I have known them to come several miles from their own houses to communions, to the Saturday's sermon, and spending the whole Saturday night in several companies, sometimes a minister being with them, and sometimes themselves alone in conference and prayer. They have then waited on the public ordinances the whole Sabbath, and spent the Sabbath night in the same way, and yet at the Monday's sermon were not troubled with sleepiness, and so they slept not till they went home. In those days it was no great difficulty for a minister to preach or pray in public or private, such was the hunger of the hearers; and it was hard to judge whether there was more of the Lord's presence in the public or private meetings." This statement of Livingston, is fully corroborated by Blair, who says: "The

blessed work of conversion, which was of several years continuance, spread beyond the bounds of Antrim and Down, to the skirts of neighbouring counties, and the resort of the people to the monthly meetings and communion occasions, and the appetite of the people, were so great, that we were sometimes constrained in sympathy to them to venture beyond any preparation we had made for the season. And, indeed, preaching and praying were so pleasant in those days, and hearers so eager and greedy, that no day was long enough, nor any room great enough, to answer their strong desires and large expectations."

The singular success which attended the preaching of the gospel in Ireland at this period, is attested by another writer. Fleming in his, "Fulfilling of the Scriptures," says, "I shall here instance that great and solemn work of God, which was in the Church of Ireland some years before the fall of prelacy, about the year 1628, and some years after, which, as many grave and solid Christians yet alive can witness, who were then present, was a bright and hot sun-blink of the gospel—yea, it may with sobriety be said, to have been one of the largest manifestations of the Spirit, and of the most solemn times of the down-pouring thereof, that almost since the days of the apostles hath been seen. I remember, amongst other passages, what a worthy Christian told me, how sometimes on hearing the word, such a power and evidence of the Lord's presence was with it, that he hath been forced to rise and look through the church and see what the people were doing, thinking from what he felt on his own spirit, it was a wonder how any could go away, without some change upon them. And then it was sweet and easy for Christians to come thirty and forty miles to the solemn communion which they had, and there continue from the time they came until they returned, without wearying, or making use of sleep; and but little meat or drink; and, as some of them professed, did not feel the need thereof, but went away most fresh and vigorous, their souls so filled with a sense of God."

They were not permitted, however, to proceed without opposition; and this arose from several quarters. First, from the Romanists, who now assumed more than their wonted boldness, from the prospect of a marriage between Charles I. and the Infanta of Spain. The friars educated at Salamanca challenged the ministers to a public disputation, on the points of difference between them and Protestants. Blair and Welsh deemed it their duty to accept this chal-

lenge ; but after the topics of discussion had been mutually agreed on, the friars shrunk from the contest, and no further trouble was experienced from this quarter. Next, they were troubled with a society of separatists, who hearing of the free course of the gospel in Ireland, came over from England, and expected to make many converts to their sect. The brethren of Ulster, upon examination, found that they were ill informed ; or that they were disposed to conceal their true sentiments. They utterly failed, however, of effecting any breach in the peace and unity, by which the churches at that time were happily distinguished.

An English conformist, by the name of Freeman, created some trouble. He was very zealous in propagating his opinions ; and challenged all the evangelical ministers of Ulster, to a public contest. Mr. Blair was appointed by his brethren, to meet him. Freeman came, attended by his patron, a certain Mr. Rawley, and, like all Arminians, commenced with an attack on the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination and reprobation ; but Mr. Blair so confounded him with arguments from scripture, that he was completely silenced, so that Mr. Rawley publicly renounced his fellowship. After which, it is said, he was deserted of his people, and became very dissolute in his practice.

These ministers were properly the founders of the Presbyterian Church in Ulster, although, through the connivance of the bishops, they were permitted to remain within the establishment, enjoying its support, while they refused to perform any acts which might be interpreted as favouring prelacy, against which they all manifested a conscientious and determined opposition. Neither were they required, during the period of which we have been treating, to conform to the liturgy of the church ; they regulated, as we have seen, the discipline and worship of their congregations, according to the usages of the Church of Scotland. But about the year 1626, bishop Echlin began to manifest some jealousy of these brethren. Blair informs us that he wrote to him to be ready to preach at the triennial visitation of the archbishop ; for, though Ussher was then in England, he had appointed two bishops and a doctor to be his deputies. But before the day arrived, Echlin sent an oral message to Blair, informing him that his place would be supplied by another ; but he having received a written appointment from the bishop, determined to prepare a sermon, which was grounded on 2 Cor. iv. 1 :

“Therefore seeing we have this ministry,” &c. In this sermon, he undertook to show, that Christ our Lord had instituted no bishops distinct from presbyters, which he proved first from scripture, and next from the testimonies of the fathers, in the purest times of the church; and lastly from the almost unanimous testimony of the reformers and more modern divines; not forgetting to rank their learned archbishop Ussher among the foremost of his witnesses. He concluded his discourse, by exhorting the bishops to use with moderation the power which usage and human laws had put in their hands. It is truly remarkable that for this sermon he was not called to account; except that the bishop of Dromore said privately to him, that he ought to be as moderate toward them, as they had been to him, and then bade him farewell.

The object of bishop Echlin, in appointing Blair to preach at this visitation, was, doubtless, to entrap him. But the device having failed, he thought of another; for knowing that one of the judges who came annually to the northern district was a zealous advocate for the liturgy, &c., he directed Blair to prepare a sermon to be preached at the assizes. This bold man did not shrink from the service assigned him. He says he came to the place, committing the matter to the Lord. As it was Easter, the judges were expected to communicate, and on Saturday, some one suggested, that it would not be seemly to spend the whole day before the communion in secular business, and proposed a suspension, to hear a sermon. It was inquired whether any one could be found ready to preach: the person who made the suggestion answered, that he would be responsible that Mr. Blair would preach if asked. Accordingly, the court adjourned, and Blair preached before their honours, and also, the next day, agreeably to appointment. After sermon, one of the judges sent for him to his chamber, and professed the satisfaction which he had from his preaching, and especially the last sermon, in which he said he had opened a point which he had never heard before, viz.: “the covenant of redemption made with Christ the Mediator, as the head of the elect;” and entreated him to go over again the heads of his sermon with him. And as he went on, he opened his Bible, and referred to the proofs adduced. And finally he protested, that if his duties did not confine him to Dublin, he would remove to the north, for the sake of living under such a ministry. He warned

him, however, when he was sent for at supper, to be cautious of what he said, because his colleague was zealous for the English ceremonies. "Thus," says Blair, "did the only wise Lord, to whom I had committed myself and my ministry, break this snare also, and bring me off with comfort and credit."

Blair and Livingston, about this time, (June, 1630,) had paid a visit to Scotland, and were both present at the memorable meeting at the kirk of Shots, where so many souls were hopefully converted under the preaching of Livingston, on Monday after the communion; said to have been not fewer than five hundred. As these two brethren were connected with the Episcopal Church of Ireland, their assisting in the services of the great meeting at the Kirk of Shots, gave umbrage to the bishops of Edinburgh and Glasgow, who transmitted to Ireland, a complaint of their uncanonical, and as it was called, schismatical conduct. Bishop Echlin, in whose diocese they lived, was much inclined to act upon the complaint, but he was a timid man, and did nothing, until Sir Richard Braton, a violent adherent of prelacy, came as a judge into the northern district. By his advice and influence, both Blair and Livingston were suspended by the bishop from the ministry. Ussher was then primate of all Ireland; with him Blair had a friendly acquaintance; immediately upon being suspended, he appealed to the archbishop; and his expectations of relief were not disappointed. He wrote to Echlin to relax his erroneous censure, which the bishop obeyed promptly, and Blair and Livingston were restored to the exercise of their ministry.

The opposition of the prelatists in Scotland did not cease; but they laid in a complaint before Archbishop Laud, against Blair, Livingston, Dunbar, and Welsh. These accusations were transmitted to the bishop, and he was directed to bring these clergymen to trial; but he chose to proceed against them in a different way. He cited Blair and Livingston to appear before him, and also Dunbar and Welsh, and required them to conform to the liturgy, and to give their subscription to that effect. They alleged, that there was no law nor canon in that kingdom requiring this. He proceeded, however, to depose all four of them from the gospel ministry. This occurred in May, 1632. Application was again made to the primate, but he said, that as the judges had been applied to, and had di-

rected a process, he could not interfere; and when application was made to the judges, they evaded all action in the case, by referring the deposed ministers to the king for redress. Blair determined to go in person and apply to the king, and having, by the aid of Livingston, who had gone to Scotland, obtained letters of recommendation from some of the chief nobility in Scotland, he betook himself to London; and after some difficulty, procured access to his majesty, and obtained from him a letter addressed to a person high in office, directing that the ministers should have a new trial; but this person having gone to England before Blair arrived in Ireland, nothing could be done. The ministers, while under this censure, did not go into the pulpit, but stood below and instructed the waiting people.

As soon as Lord Wentworth, to whom the King's letter was directed, returned to Ireland, Blair went to Dublin and delivered it. But instead of finding favour with this arbitrary nobleman, he met with nothing but abuse, and reviling of the Scottish Church. The situation of the ministers was now so bad and their prospects so dark, as to Ireland, that they determined to look out for some other residence, where they might enjoy religious liberty, and so turned their eyes towards New England. Livingston, and a Mr. Wallace, were deputed to visit the country, and ascertain its condition. But though these brethren went to London, and thence proceeded to Plymouth to take passage to America; on account of various untoward circumstances, they were induced to return to Ulster, and it was agreed among them, to continue awhile longer to endure the oppression under which they were suffering.

In the year 1634, Lord Castlestewart, a friend of the Presbyterians of Ulster, applied to Wentworth to direct the suspension of the four ministers to be removed, as they had violated no law, and had broken no engagement; and he prevailed so far as to get the deputy to write to Bishop Echlin to remove the sentence of deposition for six months. When Blair received the account of this unexpected release, he says he was unable to sleep for three successive nights; and the joy of their people cannot be expressed. And as the liberty was only for a limited time, they all resolved to improve the opportunity to the utmost; so that the people made more progress in the ways of God than ever before. This joy, however, was soon damped by the death of Mr. Welsh

and Mr. Stewart. Both these men died in the triumph of faith; and the latter on his death-bed uttered many speeches foreboding great calamities about to come on the evangelical church in Ireland, which, by the good people of that day were considered prophetic. The descendants of this eminent saint have been conspicuous in Ulster, among the zealous and influential friends of Presbyterianism, to this day.

Upon the death of Echlin, in July, 1635, Henry Leslie, a determined enemy of the Presbyterians, was appointed his successor. The liberty for a season enjoyed by the ministers was now taken away, and they could preach only in private houses. They, therefore, again turned their thoughts to New England, and having received encouragement from the governor and council of the infant colony, set to work to build a ship of one hundred and fifty tons burden, which they named "The Eagle-Wing," intending to set sail the ensuing spring; but so many obstacles arose, that they could not get off at the expected time. The new bishop required a subscription of conformity from all the ministers of the diocese; of these, five refused, and assigned their reasons. These were Brice, Ridge, Cunningham, Calvert and Hamilton. The bishop, wishing to retain these men in the church, preached a famous sermon on Matt. xviii. 17, on the "Authority of the Church." Leslie was an able controversial writer, and his ability is manifest in this discourse; which was published in the form of a treatise. He also dealt with these non-conformists in private, but without success: they stood firm.

He now proposed to debate the matter with these five brethren, in public, which offer was immediately accepted by them; and Mr. Hamilton was appointed by them to conduct the conference in their name. Accordingly, on the 11th of August the discussion commenced, in the presence of a large assemblage of the nobility, gentry and clergy of the diocese. It was conducted according to the forms of syllogistic reasoning, and great readiness and acuteness were manifested by Hamilton, and more forbearance by the bishop, than could have been expected from his sermon. Bramhall was present to encourage his brother, and very frequently mingled in the controversy, but in a very arrogant and disorderly manner. The discussion was continued with good temper and great spirit, for several hours, when Bramhall interrupted the conference, and adjourned the

meeting, first to the afternoon, and then till the next morning. But it was never resumed, as Bramhall persuaded Leslie to proceed against the ministers at once. On the next day, therefore, when they firmly maintained their ground, and refused to subscribe to the liturgy, they were forthwith deposed from the ministry. The other ministers in the diocese, who were of the same sentiments with these brethren, signed the canons, and retained their places. These severe proceedings hastened the preparations for the intended emigration to New England. This little colony, amounting to one hundred and forty persons, resolved for the sake of conscience and religious liberty, to seek a habitation in the wilds of America. Among them, were the distinguished ministers, Blair, Livingston, Hamilton, and M'Clelland; and John Stuart, provost of Ayr, Andrew Agnew, Charles Campbell, John Sumerville, Hugh Brown, Andrew Brown, and the deaf mute from the parish of Larne.

But although this little but important colony set sail for New England, and passed over more than half the distance, yet it was not the will of Providence that they should ever reach the New World. For having enjoyed favourable winds and weather for the first part of their voyage, they were now met by adverse winds and furious storms which disabled and shattered their vessel; so that it was judged by all on board, expedient to return. The determination, however, was not taken suddenly, but after much prayer and solemn consultation. They arrived in Scotland on the 3d of November, and Blair and Livingston returned to Ireland, where they remained in retirement, but preached whenever they found opportunity. But the prelatists did not suffer them to enjoy their quiet long. A certain person who had attended their preaching went to Dublin and informed against them. But here again there was a remarkable providence in their favour. Andrew Young, a servant, heard orders given to have horses provided, to go and bring to Dublin two deposed ministers; upon which he immediately called for his own horse, and made so much despatch, that he reached Belfast before the civil officers, and gave warning to Blair and Livingston, who immediately passed over to Scotland; whither several other deposed ministers came about the same time.

The west of Scotland became at this period an asylum for the oppressed people of Ulster. These strangers took

up their residence, chiefly in the shires of Ayr and Galloway, where they were harboured and kindly entertained by the people. The name of Fergus M'Cabbin deserves to be transmitted to posterity, for the noble part which he acted in relation to these persecuted people. Possessing a considerable patrimony, he kept, like another Gaius, open house for ministers and people, insomuch that his friends said that he would certainly exhaust his estate. But the event was that the Lord prospered him more than ever, and, instead of being impoverished as they predicted, he grew richer; and this prosperity continued until his dying day. David Dickson, also, then minister of Irvine, but afterwards conspicuous in the ecclesiastical history of Scotland, distinguished himself by his kind attention to these poor emigrants. Blair, Livingston, Cunningham and Ridge, were liberally entertained by him for a considerable time; and though with no small hazard to himself, he often permitted them to preach. Cunningham and Ridge ended their pilgrimage at his house. Livingston has given a particular account of the death of Cunningham, who, all agree, was one of the holiest of men, and his death was in perfect congruity with his life. The presbytery of Irvine, in a body, visited him on his death-bed, whom he exhorted to be faithful to God and his cause, and to oppose the service-book which was then urged on them by the bishops. "The bishops," said he, "have taken my ministry from me, and I may say my life, for my ministry is dearer to me than life." Just before his death, his wife sitting by his bedside with his hand in hers, he did by prayer recommend to God the whole church, the cause of God in Ireland, the parish of Holywood, of which he had been pastor, his suffering brethren in the ministry, and his children. And in the end, he said, "I commend unto thee this gentlewoman, who is no more my wife;" and with that, loosing his hand gently from hers, he in a few minutes breathed out his life.

In the year 1638, memorable in the ecclesiastical annals of the Church of Scotland, the prelates were deposed, and the Church of Scotland resumed its rights, and again enjoyed that liberty in religion, for which she has always contended. Blair was now settled as colleague to Mr. Wm. Annan, at Ayr, whence he was afterwards translated to St. Andrews; Livingston was first chosen pastor of Stranraer, from which place he was ten years afterwards

removed to Ancrum in Teviotdale; Hamilton was first settled at Dumfries, whence he was translated to Edinburgh; Dunbar was installed minister at Calder, in Lothian; Calvert was settled at Paisley; M'Clelland in Kircudbright, and Mr. John Semple became the minister of Carsphairn in Galloway; Mr. Samuel Row was ordained colleague to Mr. Henry Macgill at Dunfermline, and Mr. Robert Hamilton was settled in Ayrshire. These nine ministers, banished from Ireland but now comfortably settled in Scotland, were all zealous promoters of the measures of reformation now adopted in the Scottish Church. No less than four of the nine brethren mentioned above, were sent as commissioners to the famous Assembly of 1638, namely, Blair, Livingston, M'Clelland and James Hamilton; and took a prominent part in the proceedings of that body. The prelati- cal party objected to the legitimacy of this Assembly, on the ground that delegates were received as members, who had actually been deposed by the Church of Ireland, to which they belonged, and were still lying under censure. Mr. Blair, in his own name and that of his brethren, arose, and made what the judicious Baillie calls, "a noble extempore speech," showing most clearly that the censure was in every respect unjust; and in fact was inflicted on account of their conscientious adherence to the discipline of the Church of Scotland. Mr. David Dickson, who was well acquainted with these brethren, and with the treatment which they had received in Ireland, gave his testimony to the same effect, that the censures thus inflicted on them were altogether unjust, and, therefore, null from the beginning; and that the Church of Scotland, having no dependence on the Church of Ireland, was under no obligation to regard her censures.

The attachment of the people of the congregations to these ministers was so great, that many of them removed from Ulster to the west of Scotland, to enjoy the privilege of their ministry; and, on the days of their stated communions, many crossed over for the purpose of attending them. At one time no less than five hundred persons came from the county of Down, to Stranraer to receive the ordinance of the Lord's supper, from the hands of Mr. Livingston. At another time he baptized eight and twenty children, brought over for that purpose by their parents, who were unwilling to receive sealing ordinances from the prelati- cal clergy of Ireland. The most oppressive measures were continued against the non-conformists of the north of Ireland, by Wentworth, at the instiga-

tion of Archbishop Laud, whose directions in matters relating to the church, he implicitly obeyed. But of all the oppressive acts carried into effect, that of what was called, **THE BLACK OATH**, was the most intolerable. The purport of this oath was, 'that they would always render obedience to the commands of the king, and never enter into any covenant or engagement contrary to this oath.' All Scottish residents in Ulster, above the age of sixteen, were required to take this oath. Every attempt to have introduced a qualifying phrase, 'of just commands, legal commands,' failed. Commissioners were sent into Ulster to administer the oath, which was taken by the people on their knees, and by women as well as men. Many, however, refused to take the oath, by whom the severest penalties were endured; not only by being subjected to heavy pecuniary mulcts, but by being dragged to prison, and chained in loathsome dungeons. Some respectable families were sent for to Dublin and there tried, and so cruelly treated, that they were utterly ruined, and lay in prison for years.

The Presbyterians in Ulster, though deprived of their ministers, met together in secret, and joined together in social worship; in which meetings, pious laymen presided, and expounded scripture, and gave exhortations to the people. Those who fled to Scotland introduced these private meetings there, which occasioned a famous controversy; for Mr. Guthrie of Sterling complained of them to the General Assembly of 1640. Soon however, by the wonderful revolutions of the wheel of providence, their great persecutors, Wentworth (now Lord Strafford,) Laud, and Charles himself were visited with an awful retribution.

As soon as the Long Parliament had got the chief power into their hands, the Presbyterians of Ulster forwarded a petition to them, laying open the heavy grievances under which they had long laboured; and earnestly requesting a restoration of their liberty and their religious privileges. This petition, which contained a true representation of the various and cruel acts of oppression, of which their rulers had been guilty, was not without effect; for when Lord Strafford was tried, fourteen of the articles of accusation related to his illegal and cruel treatment of the Scottish inhabitants of the north of Ireland, among which the 'black oath' was particularly mentioned. Besides this, the parliament redressed the grievances of these suffering people, by repealing all the laws and ordinances, under which they had been so grievously oppressed.

The horrid scenes of the rebellion and massacre of Protestants in the year 1641, we shall pass over; because, although the Presbyterians suffered with other Protestants, yet as a body, they suffered less than any other class. As we have seen, their ministers, and many of the people, had fled to Scotland: and those who remained, were at first unmolested by the Irish rebels, in conformity with the royal commission; and this gave them an opportunity of supplying themselves with arms, and standing on their defence. The number of lives sacrificed, during this massacre, has been variously estimated at from 150,000 to 200,000. But by Roman Catholic writers a very different face is attempted to be given to the whole transaction. Dr. Reid animadverts with severity on the account given of this matter by Matthew Carey of this country, in his, *Vindiciæ Hibernicæ*.

The Presbyterians remaining in the north of Ireland were in a great measure destitute of the ordinances of religion; but they retained their religious principles with as much constancy as they did their lives, and properties; until the return of their banished ministers and people, after peace had been restored.

It is remarkable, that though so many eminent Presbyterian ministers had successfully preached in the north of Ireland, no presbytery was organized in that country until the year 1642, when the chaplains who accompanied the Scottish troops, formed themselves into a regular presbytery. This event occurred on Friday the 10th of June, 1642. The ministers composing it were five in number, and their names were Cunningham, Peebles, Baird, Scott, and Aird. Mr. Simpson and Mr. Livingston were in the country, with their regiments, but were not present on this occasion. The sermon was by Mr. Baird, who preached on Psalm li. 13: "Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion, build thou the walls of Jerusalem." A moderator was appointed, probably Mr. Baird, but Mr. Peebles was appointed clerk, which office he retained until his death; a period of thirty years. At this first meeting, the presbytery passed several regulations respecting the appointment of elders, and catechetical instruction in their respective regiments. They also appointed a fast, and expressed their sympathy with the suffering Protestants of Bohemia and Silesia; and also with the distractions of the people of England, produced by the contest between the king and parliament. And for the present, they agreed to hold weekly meetings of the pres-

bytery, and to have each meeting opened with a sermon ; and for the subject of their presbyterial exercises, they selected the book of Isaiah.

No sooner was the fact known, that a presbytery had been formed at Carrickfergus, than numerous applications were received from congregations to be received under their care, and to obtain from them the preaching of the gospel. The presbytery advised that elderships should be immediately established in these congregations, and that as soon as possible they should endeavour to settle ministers over them. This proposal of the presbytery was altogether in accordance with the wishes of the people ; and they applied to the presbytery to send them ministers, such as they approved. Accordingly, in a short time, twelve or fifteen congregations in the counties of Down and Antrim were regularly organized with a minister and a bench of elders. But there being found a deficiency of preachers, for the wants of the people, they made application to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland for a supply. And the parishes of Bangor and Ballywalter earnestly petitioned that their old pastors Blair and Hamilton, the one now settled at St. Andrew's and the other in Edinburgh, should be restored to them. The petition of the churches in Ulster was forwarded by two ministers, Messrs. Campbell and Gordon, and met with a favourable reception from the Assembly. This matter being referred to the Commission, they resolved to send over to Ireland, in succession, some of their ablest ministers ; and as Mr. Blair and Mr. Hamilton had been specially called for, they put them at the head of the list ; they were appointed to go to Ireland and remain there four months, preaching the gospel and administering ordinances. For the next four months they appointed Robert Baillie, professor of divinity in the university of Glasgow, and John Livingston, minister of Stranraer, who had formerly preached with such wonderful success in Ireland, as well as in Scotland.

Agreeably to appointment, Mr. Blair, former minister of Bangor, and Mr. James Hamilton, former minister of Ballywalter, went to Ireland, and were cordially received by the newly formed presbytery, and most joyfully by the people, many of whom remembered them, and had been savingly benefited by their former labours. They found many, who, under all their trials, had remained uncorrupted, and whose attachment to gospel truth and Christian liberty re-

mained unabated. Multitudes, from all quarters, flocked to hear them, and many came forward to declare themselves in favour of Presbyterianism. But these experienced brethren proceeded with great caution. In reorganizing the churches, they would admit none to communion who did not possess a competent degree of religious knowledge ; or who did not fully approve of the constitution and discipline of the Presbyterian church. As there were many who had conformed to prelacy, and some who had taken the black oath, none of these were received, until they publicly acknowledged their errors and renounced them. The same course was pursued in regard to such as had fallen into irregular conduct in their way of living.

The chief business of these missionaries from Scotland, was to organize new congregations, upon the strict principles of discipline which have been mentioned, and to cement the union of the people, thus formed into churches, by administering to them the Lord's Supper. The parish churches were now crowded with zealous worshippers, and once more resounded with the voice of prayer and thanksgiving. They "came to Zion with songs and joy upon their heads." The labours of the missionaries were truly great. Mr. Blair preached, usually, once every day, and twice on the Sabbath. During this short visit to Ireland, both ministers and professors enjoyed "many sweet and soul-refreshing days of the gospel, and some solemn, high sabbaths." Mr. Hamilton pursued a similar course, and both of these brethren, extended their missionary labours, as far as they could, with safety, on account of the hostile bands of the papists. Their labours, however, were principally within the counties of Down and Antrim, where most of the Presbyterians resided. The current in favour of Presbyterianism was so strong, that a number of Episcopal ministers came forward and joined the presbytery ; but they were not received until they acknowledged their former errors, and were not admitted as members of the presbytery until they were installed in some congregation. Some ministers had come over from England who were opposed to infant baptism, and attempted to set up separate congregations, against whom the presbytery directed their attention, and so instructed and warned their people that no schism was made in the churches under their care. Before leaving Ulster, Mr. Blair and Mr. Hamilton, assisted in the ordination of two ministers, who were connected with the army as chaplains.

As soon as Messrs. Blair and Hamilton returned, Mr. John Livingston fulfilled the appointment of the General Assembly, and took with him Mr. James Blair, minister of Portpatrick, in the place of Prof. Baillie. Livingston pursued much the same course of labour, as Mr. Robert Blair, preaching every day, and more than once on the Sabbath; and during his stay he attended many communion seasons; and in this time the presbytery observed another solemn fast day. When these two brethren returned to Scotland, the presbytery sent another petition to the General Assembly, earnestly requesting more ministerial aid. They also deputed one of their number, a delegate to this venerable court, who was recognised as a member of that body.

In the year 1643, the Westminster Assembly, called by the Parliament of England, convened on the first day of July. The Solemn League and Covenant intended to bind the two nations of England and Scotland by a religious bond, for the defence of the true religion, having been generally sworn by all classes in Scotland, and by the Parliament and Westminster Assembly, and by all who adhered to them, was sent over to Ireland to be there taken also. The person commissioned to be the bearer of this instrument from Scotland, was the Rev. James Hamilton, minister of Dumfries, who had accompanied Mr. Blair to Ulster, as related above. He arrived at Carrickfergus about the last of March, 1644. The presbytery convened on the first of April, when all the members were in attendance, and several other ministers from Scotland, commissioned by the General Assembly to visit Ireland. The presbytery approved entirely of all the proceedings of the Westminster Assembly, and of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland; and they were fully prepared to take the Solemn League and Covenant themselves, and to urge the same upon their people, which was every where sworn with great solemnity and affection. Indeed, the meetings for this purpose, appeared to be marked with evident tokens of the divine presence. In the year 1645, that indefatigable and successful preacher, John Livingston, again visited Ireland, by the appointment of the General Assembly. On this visit he had the satisfaction of aiding in settling the Rev. David Butler at Balymena, and the Rev. Archibald Ferguson in the town of Antrim. Several congregations used great exertions to retain Mr. Livingston himself, and actually presented calls before the presbytery, which however, he did not see his way clear to accept. Attempts were also

made by Mr. Hamilton's former flock, to recall him, but these were also unsuccessful. But during the years 1645, and 1646, many young ministers came over from Scotland, and settled in the vacant churches in Ulster. These young men, though inexperienced, acted with great zeal and diligence, in preaching not only in their own parishes, but in destitute places around. And although their temporal advantages, in this unsettled country, were small, they appeared to take delight in their work, and greatly encouraged and aided one another in promoting the interests of the church.

The Presbyterian cause was also greatly strengthened about this time, by a commission sent over from the English parliament, whose influence was exerted to promote the interests of the presbytery. In the year 1646 also, Mr. Ferguson, minister of Antrim, and Mr. John Edmonstone, elder, were appointed delegates to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, by whom they sent a petition for more ministerial aid. The people of Ireland did not cease their efforts to obtain the labours of the Rev. John Livingstone, for this year also, a call was sent over for him, and for four other distinguished ministers of Scotland; but though the General Assembly consented to their going to Ulster, their congregations refused to part with them. But several young ministers were induced to come over and settle, among whom was the Rev. Patrick Adair, who for half a century was a rich blessing to the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. He was settled at Cairncastle; and another valuable minister added to the presbytery this year, was the Rev. Anthony Kennedy, who became minister at Templepatrick. The presbytery also had the pleasure of ordaining several young men educated among themselves.

For several years everything was in a state of confusion and turmoil in the north of Ireland; and the history of the Presbyterian Church, during this period, is so entangled with civil and military affairs, that we are obliged to pass it over. But in these troublous times, the Presbyterian Church continued to increase, for in the year 1655, the number of ministers had risen to eighty. The presbytery now divided itself into three meetings, and soon afterwards into four, which meetings acted as large committees, subject to the control of the presbytery, until it was constituted a synod.

After the restoration of Charles II. the Presbyterians in

Ireland, in common with their brethren in England and Scotland suffered great oppression. But at the revolution the Presbyterian cause in Ireland revived again. To a man, they were friends of the revolution, and as soon as they understood that King William had arrived in London, the Presbyterians of Ulster sent a deputation of some of their most respectable members, to welcome and congratulate him on his arrival and accession to the throne. Among them were the Rev. Patrick Adair, the Rev. John Abernethy and Col. Upton. This deputation, when they arrived in London, prepared and presented to King William a very loyal and affectionate congratulatory address, in the name of the whole body of the Presbyterians in the province of Ulster; to which they received a very gracious answer, and the promise of £800, to aid in the support of the clergy. A letter was also sent by their hands on their return, addressed to Schomberg, the king's deputy in Ireland, in which the king expressed the high sense which he entertained of the loyalty, fidelity and services of the Presbyterians of Ulster, and directed him to give protection and support to them and their ministers. Schomberg discovered a disposition to carry the king's orders completely into effect; so that under his fostering influence the Presbyterians enjoyed ample protection and toleration. And when King William, in person, visited Ireland, a few months afterwards, he found them a much more respectable and influential body than he had anticipated, and not unworthy of peculiar favour. With alacrity, therefore, he redressed their grievances, and vindicated their rights; and to him, in a great measure, may be ascribed, under God, the subsequent prosperity of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.

Unhappily, in the early part of the eighteenth century, error began to creep into a church, which had hitherto adhered rigidly to the doctrines of the reformation. These errors were not openly vented, but the wrong tendency of a number of ministers was manifested by an opposition to creeds of human composition; and especially to subscription to the formulas of orthodox doctrine. An earnest contention now arose among them on this subject, which greatly agitated and injured the Presbyterian Church. This controversy was carried on not only in their church courts, but from the press; numerous pamphlets, and shorter papers, were put into circulation. The particular errors, to which there was a leaning at this time, in many min-

isters, both in England and Ireland, were those which belong to the Arian school. This corrupt leaven continued to ferment in the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, near a century; until at length some of the members of the synod of Ulster openly avowed Arian sentiments, and wrote in their defence. And towards the close of the eighteenth century, the heterodox opinions of Dr. Priestley were circulated to a considerable extent, among the Presbyterians of the north of Ireland. Those who adopted these Unitarian opinions, were denominated "new lights." About the commencement of the nineteenth century, the conflict between the orthodox and Arian parties in the synod of Ulster, became very warm; and it was found that doctrines so opposite, in regard to a fundamental point, could not be peaceably preached and propagated in the same communion. The orthodox party, being still the most numerous, determined to exclude from their body, all ministers who refused to subscribe the Westminster Confession of Faith. Matters soon came to a crisis, and a separation between the sound and the unsound was effected, but not without a violent struggle.

After the secession from the Scottish Church in 1732, a number of seceders settled in Ireland, and ministers went over from Scotland and formed churches there, distinct from the Synod of Ulster. These professed to be much more strict in adhering to orthodoxy, and maintaining discipline, than the other Presbyterian Churches; which, not without reason, were accused of great laxity in both respects. Accordingly, there was little friendly communion between these bodies, until the period when the Arians were cast out of the synod of Ulster. Finding now, that there existed no barrier between the two denominations which ought to keep them separate, since they both adhered to the same Confession of Faith, Form of Government, and Directory for Worship, it was after mutual conference and mature deliberation determined to coalesce and form one body. This union greatly increased the numbers of the Presbyterian body, and, having now more synods than one, they have constituted a General Assembly, and are in a more flourishing condition than ever before.

Ever since the donation of King William, it has been customary with the British Government, to make a grant called the *Regium Donum*, of which all the ministers who are willing to receive it, partake, and which is a great help to their support.

We were pleased to learn from the preface of the author, that it was his purpose to issue a third volume, bringing down the narrative to our own day. Whether this concluding volume has appeared, we are as yet uninformed.

Charles Scodge

ART. IV.—*The Claims of the Free Church of Scotland.*
By Thomas Smith, D. D. 1844. pp. 146.

THE delegates from the Free Church of Scotland have been cordially received by the evangelical churches of America. If, in some instances, any backwardness has been exhibited as to pecuniary contributions, it is to be attributed not to want of liberality, nor to want of sympathy with our Scottish brethren, nor to want of faith in the principles for which they are contending, but to the want of a due appreciation of the subject. It requires time to get the public mind aroused to the importance of such a movement. There is, in the first instance, an ignorance of the facts of the case; and when the facts are known, their bearing is not soon or easily apprehended. In Scotland this subject has been under discussion for years; the public mind is imbued with it; the people feel that their dearest rights and most precious interests are at stake; the matter has taken hold on their heart and conscience, and they are not likely to let it go. Men coming from a community all on fire with this one subject, must be painfully impressed with the ignorance and consequent apathy of the Christian public in America. This apathy, however, is unavoidable, until the case be fairly understood, and then we doubt not it will give place to an intelligent interest. Let the case be fully apprehended; let it be seen that the authority of Christ is the real point in dispute; let it be known that the standard which the Free Church has unfolded is no sectarian, or national banner, but the common banner of the church, that it is the banner under which we are rallied, and "which floats over the crystal battlements of heaven," and then no man who intelligently believes that "Jesus Christ is Lord," can fail to take an interest in the subject, or can stand an idle spectator of the conflict. "They who are not with me are against me." They who do not take sides with the truth, when it is called in question, oppose

it. They who stand with their arms folded, or with their hands in their pockets, while the friends of Christ are contending with the powers of this world, will have their portion with the world. The only question, therefore with the Christians of America is, whether the cause of the Free Church is indeed the cause of Christ. If it is, there is no danger of their being backward to espouse it. To suppose otherwise would be to suppose they had no zeal for their Lord, and no sympathy with his people. It would be to suppose that it is no longer true of the "body of Christ" that when one member suffers, all the members suffer with it, and that when one member rejoices, all the members rejoice with it.

Is then the cause of the Free Church the cause of Christ?

Andrew Melville announced the radical principle involved in the present controversy, when he took king James by the sleeve and calling him God's silly vessel said, "Sir, as I have divers times before told you, so now again must I tell you, there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland; there is Christ Jesus the king of the Church, whose subject king James is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member. Those whom Christ has called and commanded to watch over his church and govern his spiritual kingdom, have sufficient power from him to do this both severally and jointly, the which no Christian king should control, but fortify and assist, otherwise they are not faithful members of his Church. We will give you your place and give you all due obedience, but again I say, you are not the head of the church. You cannot give us that eternal life, which even in this world we seek for; and you cannot deprive us of it. Permit us then to meet in the name of Christ, and attend to the interests of that church of which you are the chief member. Sir, when you were in your swaddling clothes, Christ Jesus reigned freely in this land, in spite of all his enemies; his officers assembled freely for the ruling and welfare of his church, which was ever for your welfare, defence and preservation, when these same enemies were seeking your destruction."

Here is the gist of the controversy. The church of Scotland has always held and testified, in prison and at the stake, First, that "there is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ," and that He "as king and head of the church hath therein appointed a government in the hands of church officers distinct from the civil magistrate." Secondly, that the

officers in whom is vested the government of this church, derive their authority not from the civil power, but are members appointed thereto by the word of God;" and that this "power ecclesiastical flows immediately from God and the mediator Jesus Christ." Thirdly, that this power is purely "ministerial, not lordly, and to be exercised in consonance with the laws of Christ, and with the liberties of his people." Consequently that the Bible and not the law of the land, is the statute book of the church; that the Bible and not the civil law must decide who are to be admitted to the church privileges or excluded from them; who are to be ordained to ecclesiastical office or deposed from it; who are to be instituted pastors of particular congregations or separated from them. Fourthly, that "this government of the church, thus appointed by the Lord Jesus, in the hands of church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate, or supreme power of the state, and consequently flowing directly from the head of the church to the office-bearers thereof, to the exclusion of the civil magistrate, comprehends, as the object of it, the preaching of the word, administration of the sacraments, correction of manners, the admission of the office bearers to their offices, their suspension and deprivation therefrom, the infliction and removal of church censurers, and, generally, the whole 'power of the keys.'" Fifthly, that the people have an inalienable right to determine who shall exercise this ecclesiastical government over them, that is, they have a right to elect their own church officers. "It appertaineth to the people," says the First Book of Discipline, "and to every several congregation to elect their minister." The Second Book of Discipline teaches, "ordinary and outward calling has two parts—election and ordination. Election is the choosing out of a person or persons most able for the office that vaikes, by the judgment of the eldership and consent of the congregation." It declares that "none should be intruded upon any congregation, either by the prince, or any inferior person, without lawful election, and the assent of the people over whom the person is placed."

That these principles are true we shall not attempt to prove. It is enough for our present purpose that they are included in the standards of our own church, and substantially in the standards of all the evangelical churches of this country. That there is a government of the church, distinct from that of the state; that Jesus Christ is the only

head of the church ; that all ecclesiastical power is derived from him ; that this power includes the right of discipline and of determining who shall be appointed to office in the church ; and that the people have a right to a voice in deciding who are to be their spiritual teachers and rulers, are principles recognised by all the Protestant churches of America. By common consent, therefore, we must hold that those who contend and suffer for these principles, contend and suffer for the truth.

That these are the principles of the church of Scotland will not be denied. Most of them are expressed above in the language borrowed from her standards, and they are all included in her "claim of rights." We have no doubt also that these rights not only belonged to that church as a church, but that they were recognised and guaranteed by acts of parliament and solemn treaties. Such has been the repeated judgment of the highest civil courts in Scotland ; and such is still the judgment of her most distinguished judges and lawyers. The Confession containing the principles above recited was formally and repeatedly ratified, at different periods, by the Scottish parliament, and especially in the first parliament under William and Mary. The opposite doctrine, viz. that the king, the supreme power in the state, was judge "in all matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, as well as in things temporal," was "finally and expressly repudiated and cast out of the constitution of Scotland, as inconsistent with the Presbyterian church government." This was the very point of contention between the church and James VI. In 1612 when prelacy was established, the doctrine of the king's supremacy was established with it ; and when in consequence of that attempt on the liberty of the people, the throne of Charles I. was overthrown, that doctrine fell with it. When prelacy was a second time established under Charles II. the same doctrine was inserted in the "Test Oath," for refusing which so many of God's people were put to death. And when after twenty-eight years of persecution, the church and country, were delivered from the tyranny of the Stuarts, an act was immediately passed repealing all the laws asserting the supremacy of the crown in ecclesiastical matters, and all oaths requiring such acknowledgment were done away. "By which enactments, any claim on the part of the sovereigns of Scotland to be supreme rulers in spiritual and ecclesiastical matters, as well as in temporal

and civil, or to any power, by themselves or their judges holding commission from them, to exercise jurisdiction in matters or causes spiritual and ecclesiastical, was repudiated and excluded from the constitution as inconsistent with the Presbyterian church government then established, and still subsisting under the statutes then and subsequently passed, for its security and maintenance, ‘without any alteration to the people of this land in all succeeding generations.’ ”*

This denial on the one hand of the right of the civil magistrate to judge in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, and the assertion that all such power belonged to the church, was legally ratified and confirmed at the time of the union of the two kingdoms of England and Scotland. At that time the parliament of Scotland passed an act, commonly called the Act of Security, confirming the previous acts establishing the Presbyterian church, and expressly providing and declaring, “That the aforesaid true Protestant religion, contained in the above mentioned Confession of Faith, with the form and purity of worship presently in use within this church, and its Presbyterian church government and discipline—that is to say, the government of the church by kirk sessions, presbyteries, provincial synods and general assemblies, all established by the aforesaid acts of parliament, pursuant to the claim of right, shall remain and continue unalterable.” It was further enacted that all succeeding sovereigns should swear and subscribe “That they shall inviolably maintain and preserve the foresaid settlement of the true Protestant religion, with the government, worship, discipline, right, and privileges of this church, as above established by the laws of this kingdom, in prosecution of the claim of right.”

It was further enacted, “That the said act of security, with the establishment therein contained, should be held and observed in all time coming as a fundamental and essential condition of any treaty of union to be concluded betwixt the two kingdoms, without any alteration thereof, or derogation thereto, in any sort forever.” This act, and the settlements therein contained, were accordingly incorporated in the treaty of union, and subsequently in the separate acts of the Scottish and English parliaments ratifying the union.

* Claim of Rights.

With regard to the right of the people to a voice in the choice of their pastors, the facts of the case are substantially these. As has been already shown, the principle that no minister should be settled over a congregation contrary to the will of the people, was explicitly stated in the Confessions adopted by the church in 1560 and 1581.

The government, however, under James and Charles I., succeeded in enforcing patronage and partially in establishing prelacy. In 1638, at the time of the Second Reformation, the General Assembly resolved, "That there be respect had to the congregation, and that no person be intruded in any office of the kirk, contrary to the will of the congregation to which they are appointed." Eleven years afterwards the Parliament of Scotland passed an act to the effect: "That patronage and presentations to kirks is an evil and bondage, under which the Lord's people and ministers of this land have long groaned; that it hath no warrant in God's word, but is founded only on the canon law, and is a custom Popish and brought into the kirk in the time of ignorance and superstition." The act proceeds to abolish all patronage, and to recommend to the next General Assembly to determine on some "standing way" for filling up vacant parishes. The Assembly accordingly directed: 1. That when a congregation became vacant, the presbytery should send some minister to preach to the people, to exhort them to fervent prayer to the Lord to send them a pastor after his own heart, and to inform them that the presbytery would send men to preach on trial, and if they desired to hear any particular minister they would endeavour to secure his services. 2. That at a suitable time after, another minister should be sent to preach, and inform the people that the election was about to take place. The session then met, and under the presidency of the preacher, made the election, "and if the people, upon intimation of the person agreed upon by the session, acquiesced and consented to the said person," the matter was reported to the presbytery, who took the necessary steps for his ordination. 3. If the majority of the people objected to the choice of the session, the matter was to be reported to the presbytery, and if that body did not find that the objections "were grounded on causeless prejudices," they were to appoint a new election.

Charles II., on his restoration in 1660, abolished all the laws made during the establishment of presbytery; turned

out about four hundred ministers from their parishes; set up episcopacy; and not only intruded new ministers on the churches; but forbade, on pain of fine, imprisonment or death, any man to leave his own parish church.

■ When this tyranny ended in the expulsion of the Stuarts, and the calling of William, the prince of Orange, to the throne, an address was presented by the people of Scotland, to that prince, praying, among other things: "That laical patronages be discharged, as was done in the parliament of 1649, and the people restored to the right and privilege of election, according to the warrant of God's word."

The church wished and endeavoured to obtain the restoration of the act of 1649. This, however, William opposed, and the Church, worn out by a long persecution, submitted to a compromise, agreeably to which the parliament abolished patronage, and enacted that "In case of the vacancy of any particular church, and for supplying the same with a minister, the heritors (being Protestants) and the elders are to name and propose the person to the whole congregation to be either approved or disapproved by them; and if they disapprove, that the disapprovers give their reasons to the effect that the affair be cognosed upon by the Presbytery of the bounds, at whose judgment and by whose determination, the calling and entry of a particular minister is to be ordered and concluded." In accordance with this act, the call to the minister was substantially in the following form, "We heritors and elders of the parish of — being assured of the ministerial qualifications of you, Mr. — have agreed *with the advice and consent of the parishioners of the parish aforesaid, to invite and call, &c.*" This act, though not all the church desired, is represented as having worked well. There could be no presentation without the consent of the elders, who were the representatives of the church, and all calls were made out in the presence of the congregation and in almost all cases with their consent. During the twenty-two years this act was in force, only fourteen cases of disputed settlements occurred, out of the estimated number of six hundred and sixty.

This was the position in which the matter stood at the time of the union. The act of 1690 by which patronage was abolished, was one of those established and confirmed by the act of Security, and the Treaty of Union, and declared to be unalterable in all time coming. Notwithstanding this solemn stipulation, in 1712 an act was introduced abrogating

the act of 1690 and restoring the rights of patrons. By this act the presbyteries were required to "receive and admit in the same manner such qualified person or persons, minister or ministers, as shall be presented by the respective patrons, as the persons or ministers presented before the making of this act ought to have been admitted."*

This act was so obviously in violation of the Treaty of Union, that it is necessary to inquire how it came to be passed, and how it came to be submitted to. It is well known that Queen Anne, towards the close of her reign, lent herself to the machinations of the enemies of the revolution, by which the protestant succession to the crown was secured. Her ministry, with Bolingbroke at its head, were in correspondence with the Pretender, and directed all their efforts to secure his accession to the throne. One of their objects in furtherance of this design, was to weaken and overthrow the Scottish church, and to disgust the Scottish people with the Union. The restoration of patronage was the first step towards the attainment of the object in view. The evidence of the correctness of this representation is abundant. In a letter preserved in the Wodrow MSS. written by one who had been a bishop, to another episcopalian, the writer, after saying that the restoration of prelacy was the great end at which they should aim, adds, "The matter must first be sounded at a distance, and a just computation of our strength made, and some previous settlements made, such as restoring patronage and the granting indulgence, with liberty to possess churches and benefices, and this will undoubtedly make way for an entire re-establishment of the ancient apostolic order of bishops; for our Queen, having right, as patron to a great many churches, she will still prefer those of our persuasion to others; and the rest of laical patrons, partly through inclination and partly through interest to please her majesty, will follow her example."†

Lockhart of Carnwath, the leader of the party in the House of Commons, at that time, says; "As my chief, my only design, in engaging in public affairs was to serve the king (i. e. Pretender) so far as I was capable I had that

* For the facts above stated see, Collection of Acts of Parliament and Assembly concerning patronage; and Begg's History of the Act of Queen Anne.

† Dr. Welsh's evidence before the House of Commons. See History of the Act of Queen Anne 1711, by the Rev. James Begg, p. 36.

always in view. . . . And in order to prepare those who I knew would not assist the king, out of a principle of loyalty, (I mean the west country Presbyterians,) for receiving impressions that might prevail with them on other topics, I had in concert with Dr. Abercromby been at a good deal of pains to publish and disperse amongst these people papers which gave them from time to time, full accounts of what were likely to be the consequences of the Union, and showed how impossible it was for the Scots to subsist under it. And I pressed the toleration and patronage acts more earnestly, that I thought the Presbyterian clergy would be from thence convinced that the establishment of their kirk would, in time, be overturned, as it was obvious that the security thereof was not so thoroughly established by the union as they imagined.”* We have here the distinct avowal by one of the principal agents in passing the act for the restoration of patronage, that it was designed to subvert the Church of Scotland, and that it was known to be a violation of the treaty of union by those who passed it. Bishop Burnet, a contemporary historian says, the measure was framed “on design to weaken and undermine the Presbyterian establishment,” since “it was set up by the Presbyterians from the first beginning as a principle that parishes had, from warrants of scripture, a right to choose their own ministers.” As a farther evidence of the animus with which this act was passed, it may be stated that the delegate of the church at that time in London, found other bills prepared to be laid before Parliament, one for abolishing all General Assemblies; and another for compelling presbyteries, “under certain penalties to settle any licentiate, who received a presentation without further form or trial, and especially without any form of consulting the parishioners.”†

Professor Hutchinson in his *Treatise on Patronage*, 1735, says, “Matters continued in a very easy manner till the year 1711, when the late Queen’s ministry, intending to defeat the Hanover succession, took all methods to harass such as were firmly attached to it, which the Presbyterian clergy and gentry ever were, both from principle and interest. An act, therefore, was obtained restoring patrons to their power,

* Lockhart Papers, vol. i. p. 417. Every one knows what James II. intended by his “Toleration Act,” and the Jacobites under Queen Anne had the same object in view by what they called their act of Indulgence.

† See Begg, p. 39.

though in the most direct opposition to the articles of the union, and the public faith of the nation then given in that sacred treaty upon which is founded his majesty's title to the crown of Scotland, and the very parliament of Great Britain itself."

It is essential to a proper understanding of the present controversy in Scotland to understand the real nature and design of this act. The testimony adduced above is sufficient to prove that it was known and recognised as a violation of the treaty of Union; and that it was intended as an incipient measure for the overthrow of the Presbyterian church. It is also important to know how it was then regarded by the church itself, as a proof of its true intent, and also to show that the portion of the church which now defend patronage and this act on which the right rests, are not the true representatives of the Church of Scotland. As soon as the bill was introduced into parliament, a commission of three ministers was deputed by the church, to repair to London to remonstrate against its passage. They were heard by counsel before the House of Lords and in their address to the Queen they declare the act to "be contrary to our church constitution, so well secured by the treaty of Union." This address the General Assembly *unanimously* approved and embodied in an act, thereby giving it the sanction of the whole church. And Wodrow states that at the meeting of the Commission of the Assembly, "It was owned by all, that patronages were a very great grievance, and sinful in the imposers, and a breach of the security of the Presbyterian constitution by the union."* The Commission complained of the special injustice of this act, inasmuch as the act of 1690 which abolished patronage, gave the patrons as a compensation a right to the tithes, which did not belong to them, upon condition of their paying a certain portion of them to the incumbent. "Notwithstanding which advantageous concession to the patrons, this bill," say the Commission, "takes back from the church the power of presentation of ministers, without restoring the tithes which formerly belonged to her, by which the patrons come to enjoy both the purchase and the price."

As soon as George I. came to the crown, the Assembly sent up a strong remonstrance against the act restoring pat-

* Hetherington's *History of the Church of Scotland.* New York edition, p. 331.

ronage ; and that remonstrance was repeated annually from 1712 to 1782. Nothing can more clearly prove that what is now regarded, by those in authority, and by the moderate party in the church, as consistent with the original compact between the state and the church, was in fact a violation of that compact and was universally so considered at the time of its perpetration and for two generations afterwards. The state of feeling on this subject is clearly stated by Prof. Hutchinson in 1735, "The direct pleading for patronages in Scotland was so odious to all men of piety, that not one of the clergy, not a king's chaplain, a politician-clergyman among them dared to open his mouth in favour of them in their assemblies and synods. . . . All honest men among the clergy abhor them."

Thus this unjust encroachment was made on the liberty and rights of the church. If it is asked how it came to be submitted to ? The answer is to be found in various causes. The men who decided the course of the church at that time were not men of the nerve and power of Knox, Melville, or Henderson. The church had not long before emerged from a period of bloody and harassing persecution of nearly thirty years continuance, and was indisposed to renew the contest. It was confidently hoped that remonstrance would in the end be effectual for the removal of the grievance. Important interests were from the first enlisted in support of the abuse, and the zeal and fidelity of the church soon began to decline under the operation of the act itself. There are two other reasons which deserve to be specified. The first is, that the act was not at first enforced with any kind of rigour. Patronage, says Mr. Begg, is like the thumb-screw, easy at first, but with every turn of the screw it becomes tighter and tighter until it gets to be insupportable. "Patrons often stood aside and allowed the people to choose ; no presentee received a presentation unconditionally till twenty years after the act of Queen Anne was passed." It was therefore brought slowly and cautiously into operation. Another reason of the submission of the people to this unconstitutional and unjust act was that it never received the harsh interpretation which has recently been put upon it. The courts have of late decided that the presbytery is bound, under pain of fine or imprisonment, to induct any qualified presentee the patron might choose to name. But the act of Anne purported to repeal the act of 1690 "in so far as the same relates to the presentation of

ministers by heritors and others therein mentioned," and to vest the right of presentation in the patrons, and the presbytery was obliged to induct such presentee in the same manner as before the passage of the act. The whole effect of the act, therefore, as to this point, was to take the presentation from the heritors and elders and vest it in the patron. But the right as vested in the heritors and elders was subject to the consent of the people and the judgment of the presbytery, and, therefore, when transferred to the patron, it was subject to the same limitations. Accordingly, in 1735 and 1749 the Court of Sessions decided, that they had no right to interdict a presbytery from inducting as minister of a parish another person than the presentee of the patron; that they could only decide who was legally entitled to the stipend.* The actual operation of the act was therefore in general this. The patron nominated to the presbytery a minister to the vacant church; the presbytery sent the candidate to preach to the people; they, if satisfied, sent him a call to the effect "We the heritors, elders and parishioners of the parish of —— do hereby call and invite you to take charge and oversight of this parish, and to come and labour among us in the gospel ministry." This call was laid before the presbytery and if found in order, i. e. to come, in fact, from the persons in whose names it was presented, the presbytery proceeded to the examination, and if satisfied, to the ordination and induction of the minister.

Now it is evident that if these steps were faithfully adhered to, patronage, though liable to great abuse, as experience abundantly shows, was not of necessity, a serious practical grievance. The patron had not the right of appointment, but merely that of nomination, subject to the approbation of the people, and the consent of the presbytery. In most cases the practical abuse arose from the presbyteries themselves, who wickedly held that a call was regular if signed by a single parishioner; and in many cases insisted on ordaining and inducting the presentee, in despite of the opposition of the people. If the presbytery found the call in order, the civil courts gave effect to their decision; but no case ever occurred, until the recent controversy, in which, when the presbytery refused to recognise the call, the civil courts interfered to compel them.

* See Memorial to Sir Robert Peel, by the Convention of Ministers and Elders. 1842.

During the declension of religion and the reign of "moderation," as it is called, in the latter half of the last century, it often happened, as just stated, that the presbyteries found the call, which was an essential step in the settlement of a minister, in order, when it was no call at all; and if the presbytery was too conscientious to be guilty of the outrage, the General Assembly forced them to do it, and even in some cases actually deposed from the ministry those who refused thus to violate their conscience. In 1834 the party in the church, headed by Dr. Chalmers, who had always opposed these forced settlements, gained the ascendancy in the General Assembly, and immediately passed an act, obliging the presbyteries to give the call of the congregation its due weight; that is, not to consider that a call which was no call; in other words, not to proceed to the settlement of a minister, unless the people were at least quiescent and abstained from actual opposition. This was the whole intent and force of the Veto Act. It simply forbade the presbyteries from proceeding until one essential step in the process had been taken. The law forbade them to proceed without the nomination of the patron, unless that nomination was delayed more than six months; the constitution of the church forbade their proceeding without the call of the people, or without the examination of the candidate. The first step was the nomination; the second, the call; the third, the examination by the presbytery into the learning, orthodoxy and character of the presentee. These steps were always taken; though in practice, the second was often a mockery. The Assembly enjoined that it should be a reality; that unless that step was taken the process was to be arrested.

Was this act of the Assembly right? and if right was it legal? That it was right is clear, because, by the law of God and the nature of the case, a Christian people should have a voice in deciding who is to be their religious guide. This is one of the necessary adjuncts of the right of private judgment; of liberty of conscience, of the right to worship God according to our own understanding of his will, and of ministering to our own spiritual growth, and to the religious education of our children. To say that a man whom I disapprove of shall be my spiritual instructor and the educator of my household, is to deny to me one of the most obvious and important of the rights of religious liberty, of that liberty which God has given his people, and

which no man, without sin, can take from them. The Assembly, therefore, did but say, that neither they nor their presbyteries, should be parties to the crime of violating this divine right of the people to a voice in the election of their pastor.

It is no less evident that the act in question was in accordance with the constitution of the Scottish church. This is plain, not only from the repeated recognition of the principle of the act in all the standards of the church, by the unanimous and long continued opposition to the act of Queen Anne, by which that principle was endangered; but also, and pre-eminently, from the existence and form of the call. What is that call? "We, the elders, heritors, and parishioners of the parish of —, being satisfied with your qualifications, do cordially invite and call you to become our minister." What does this mean? What does it imply? Does it not recognise in the clearest terms that the people have a right to call, nay, that they must call in order to open the way to the induction of the minister? The existence of this usage supercedes the necessity of any other arguments or evidence that the principle of non-intrusion, or of the right of election, is a principle of the church of Scotland.

If any man wishes to feel the full force of this argument, if he would see not merely the propriety but the moral necessity of the Veto Act, let him read any account, shocking from its profanation of sacred things, of the intrusion of a minister on "a reclaiming congregation." Let him take the recent Marnoch case. The pastor of the parish of Marnoch, being infirm, employed as an assistant a Mr. Edwards, who, in the course of three years, rendered himself so obnoxious to the people that the aged minister was obliged to remove him. On the death of the incumbent, this Mr. Edwards was presented by the trustees of the Earl of Fife, the patron, as minister of the parish. When the call was offered for signature, it was signed by one of the heads of families on the roll of the communicants; at the same time dissents were recorded by the six elders composing the session, and by two hundred and fifty-four heads of families. This call the presbytery ultimately declared to be in order; that is, they declared a call signed by one man, resident in the parish, to be the call of "the elders, heritors, and parishioners." Mr. Edwards, in answer to the usual constitutional questions, declared that he had used no undue

methods, either by himself or others, to obtain the call of the people, though he had no such call; and that zeal for the honour of God, love to Jesus Christ, and desire to save souls were his great and chief inducements in entering the holy ministry. He was thereupon ordained, and settled, "a minister without a parishioner, a man without a friend." No person of correct moral feeling can hesitate to pronounce this whole transaction an outrage; a grievous sin in the sight of God, which no law of man could justify or palliate. The General Assembly, in forbidding presbyteries to settle men under such circumstances, did but say they ought not and must not sin against God, against his people, and their own souls. That the veto act therefore was a righteous act, an act which fidelity to God required the church to pass and to uphold, is as plain a case as was ever submitted to the moral judgment of men.

Whether it was a legal act, an act within the legal competency of the Assembly to pass, that is, whether the laws of the land allowed the people to have an effective voice in the choice of their pastor, is a different question, and is doubtless a point about which honest men differ. That it was legal even according to the statutes of the civil law, we think may be fairly inferred from the following facts. First, all the law officers of the crown pronounced it legal at the time of its passage. Secondly, those judges of the Court of Session most distinguished for talents and learning, concurred in that decision and still adhere to it. Thirdly, those who decided against the legality of the act, rested their decision on the unconstitutional act of Queen Anne, above referred to, and upon an interpretation of that act, in opposition to all the previous judgments of the civil courts; it having always been held that the right of patronage was restored by that act, subject to the limitation of the consent of the people, or the judgment of the presbytery that such consent was withheld on the ground of "causeless prejudices." And, fourthly, the British parliament has within a year passed a declaratory act, asserting the law to be in substance what the Free Church maintained it to be, viz., that the presbytery was not bound to induct a qualified presentee, but had a discretion in the case.*

* It is well known that the law Lords in the House of Lords, by whose votes the Auchterarder case was decided against the Free Church, especially Lords Brougham, Cottenham and Campbell, entered a protest against Lord Aberdeen's church bill, declaring that if the averments of that Bill were true,

The question as to the legality of the act, however, though important is still subordinate to the moral question. Whether legal or illegal, whether the law of the land required or forbade the forcible intrusion of a minister upon a congregation, it is plain that the thing ought not to be done, and that the church was bound to refuse to do it, whatever might be the consequence. She accordingly did refuse. The civil courts then began a course of coercion and usurpation, novel even in the history of Scotland. They imposed heavy fines on presbyteries which refused to ordain and instal men whom the people refused to call. They declared the sentence of suspension and deposition passed by the church courts to be null and void, and reinstated ministers regularly deposed, into their offices; they interdicted ministers, sent for that purpose, preaching in congregations declared to be vacant; they declared that the church courts had no right to erect new ecclesiastical parishes. It was not of course maintained that the church could divide parishes considered as civil divisions of the country, or throw any new burden upon them. But where a parish contained from ten to sixty thousand people, the church by voluntary contributions, erected and endowed new places of worship, organized new congregations, and ordained ministers over them. In this way, in the course of ten years, about two hundred new congregations had been created at an expense of a million and a half of dollars. By the constitution of the church, the pastors and elders of these congregations had the same right to sit and vote in church courts, as any other ministers or elders. The civil courts denied them that right, and quashed the proceedings of the bodies in which they were allowed to vote. In these, and various other ways the liberties of the church were openly infringed.

The question then is, could the Scotch church, consistently with obedience to God, submit to be thus controlled by the civil courts? Could she consent to be forced by the law of the land to do what the law of Christ forbade? Could she, consistently with her fundamental principle that Christ, and not the civil magistrate, is the head of the church, admit that the state should prescribe the rules of

their judgment rendered in the Scottish Church case, was erroneous and contrary to law. Thus the House of Lords in their judicial capacity pronounced the law to be one thing, and in their legislative capacity declared it to be another thing!

her procedure in ordaining or deposing ministers, and at its own pleasure force her to ordain, or interdict her from deposing? It is clear that this was a case in which the church had to choose between obeying God or man; between duty and interest; between the honour, influence and emoluments of establishment, and the contempt, the weakness and poverty of dissent.

The principles then involved in this controversy are in the highest degree important. Christ has established a church and has given it a government distinct from that of the state, and its officers, in the administration of that government, must follow his directions and not the directions of men. The truth on which this doctrine rests, is essential not merely to the prosperity of the church, but to the vitality of religion. The soul must be brought under the conviction of its allegiance to Him that died and rose again that He might be the Lord of the dead and of the living. We must as individuals as well as a church, feel that Christ has a right to reign in us, and to rule over us; and that his will must be the rule of our conduct. It is this truth which the Free Church has so asserted as to bring it in living contact with millions of minds; and in so doing has conferred an inappreciable blessing on the world. We doubt not that the clear exhibition of this truth among our churches, by the Scottish delegates, will be a means of spiritual good, for which all our contributions will be a most inadequate compensation. Nay, were we to increase those contributions an hundred fold, we should still be their debtors, if they only make us feel more than we have hitherto done, that Jesus Christ is indeed our Lord. It is this more than anything else, that has interested us in their mission. We have felt under some of their addresses as we never felt before; we have had clearer views of the intimate connection between the practical recognition of Christ's kingly office and the life of God in the soul; and we think we see one of the principal sources of that strength of character, elevation of mind, and constancy in trials, which Scottish Christians have so often exhibited. Let any man with this principle before his mind, read the history of Scotland, and he will have the solution of the mystery of servant girls and labourers dying on the gibbet or at the stake, for a question of church government. Let him contrast the bearing of Knox, Melville, or Henderson when they stood before kings,—we will not say with the slavish adulation of the

unworthy bishops of king James, but with the spirit of such good men as Crammer, and they will see the difference between believing that Christ is king, and believing that the king is the head of the church.

This therefore, is far from being an abstract principle, it is a truth of vital, practical importance; which enters into the religious experience and moulds the religious character of men. This immediate and constant contact between the soul and Christ, not only as its priest but as its sovereign, restrains and elevates it. To serve God and to serve man are extremes separated by an infinite distance; and it is only when the service of men is considered as part of the service of God that it ceases to be degrading and withering; and when a case occurs in which the service of God conflicts with the service of men, then, if a man perceives the contrariety and yet chooses the latter, he is guilty of rebellion against God; and if he does not perceive it, when it actually exists, this wrong moral judgment is itself a sin, and its influence is evil and only evil on his own spiritual state. When our obedience terminates on men; when we violate the scriptural rule which requires us to do service as to the Lord and not to men, then we sin against our souls, we withdraw ourselves from the elevating presence and service of God, to bow at the feet of man the lowest of his rational creatures. If this is true even in reference to the external service due to magistrates and superiors, it is pre-eminently true when such superiors pass beyond the limits of their legitimate authority. There is nothing more degrading, nothing more hurtful to the religious feelings, than to yield obedience to men in those things which God has reserved to himself, that is, matters of faith, of conscience, of worship, of church order and discipline. This has long been one of the most fruitful sources of heresy and irreligion in the church. As a living principle, therefore, as a source of inward spiritual life, as a necessary element of all true elevation and independence of character, and as a divinely appointed means of securing a real and practical adherence to the scriptures as our rule of faith and practice, the distinctive truth for which the Scottish Church is contending, and which by her testimony has been brought to bear with increased force on so many minds, is of the utmost practical value and importance.

If this truth is important to the individual Christian it surely is to the church, which is but the community of

Christians. And it is important to the church, not only as a means of elevating the piety of her members, but to direct her action as a society. Unless she practically recognises the principle that Christ is her head, that her authority is derived from him, and must be exercised in obedience to his word, she sinks from a divine institution into an engine of the state; from being the family of God, to being one form of the world, governed by worldly men and worldly principles. As soon as it is admitted that the world, that is, the mass of society in its organized capacity as the state, and through its constituted authorities, may decide what the church must teach, what must be its terms of ministerial or Christian communion, whom it must admit and whom exclude from ordinances and office, in a word, when it is admitted that the statute-book, and not the Bible, is to be the rule of the teaching, government and discipline of the church, then the great distinction between the church and the world is done away, and the divinely appointed security for purity of doctrine and discipline is destroyed.

When Henry VIII. chose to renounce the authority of the Pope, the whole nation did the same; when he commanded them to believe and teach the doctrines of Rome, they obeyed; when Edward VI. proclaimed the protestant faith, people and ministers made haste to profess it. When Mary ascended the throne they became Romanists, and when Elizabeth succeeded her, they became Protestants. In all these changes, there were many who remained steadfast, but the mass of the people and clergy changed as the court changed. This right of the state in its representative authority to decide what the church must believe and teach, the Stuarts attempted to enforce in Scotland, and there the battle for the independence of the church, that is, for its right to regulate its faith and practice by the word of God, was fought, and has again been asserted. This is a right essential to the church's accomplishing her vocation, a right which she is not at liberty to surrender. Though we may think that this is a matter about which we are secure, it is not the less our duty and privilege to aid those who suffer for its assertion. And it is by no means certain that we shall not be called upon ourselves to contend for this same principle. However that may be, it is certain, on the one hand, that our Scottish brethren are now suffering for that truth, and on the other, that it is a truth essential to the purity and prosperity of religion, and consequently their cause is the cause of Christ.

We have also felt more deeply than ever before, the connexion of this doctrine of the headship of Christ, of the direct allegiance of the soul to him as the person on whom our obedience should terminate, with all true and secure liberty, civil as well as religious. What is commonly called the spirit of liberty in the world, is rarely anything more than a compound of pride and malignity. He only is a freeman who serves God rather than man, and who obeys men as doing service to the Lord, and the only true spirit of liberty is the determination to be in that sense freemen. All history, and especially the history of Europe, teaches us that when the spirit of liberty is disconnected from religion, when it does not arise from a sense of our relation to God and a determination to obey him rather than men, it becomes little better than a proud estimate of ourselves, and a malignant hatred of all our superiors; a spirit which strives to pull down what is above, and keep down what is below us. There is no liberty either secure or blessed which God does not give, which does not flow from a purpose to call no man master but Christ. To bring the great truth of Christ's authority over men, clearly before the public mind, and to impress it upon the heart of Christians, is, therefore a signal service, even in relation to civil liberty and the permanency and well-being of our civil institutions. If the people could only be brought to feel that they are bound to obey all lawful enactments of men out of a regard to Christ, and bound, as part of their allegiance to him, to disregard all human enactments which conflict with his revealed will, we should then have a firm foundation laid for all our liberties. This practical recognition of the kingly office of Christ has very much declined among us. We receive the doctrine but we do not live by it. It is not his will, but expediency, or right, or usage which is commonly consulted. If the truth, which we admit as an article of our creed, can be turned into a principle of life, we shall be unspeakably the gainers. And we firmly believe that this is an effect which the addresses and sermons of our Scottish brethren are eminently suited to produce. We doubt not, therefore, their visit will be a blessing to the country.

Our first and great reason then for believing that the cause of the Free Church of Scotland is the cause of Christ, and therefore entitled to the sympathy and support of all Christ's people, is that they are simply asserting Christ's right to

reign; they are maintaining the obligation of Christians and Christian churches to make his revealed will the rule of their conduct; they are enforcing and exemplifying the duty of obeying him rather than men, and in despite of the commands of men to the contrary. We wish to have a part in this testimony; we wish to be on their side; to share in their struggles; to participate in their reproach and bear their burden; we wish to acknowledge their Lord as our Lord. When men are contending for so great a truth and at so great a sacrifice, we cannot but think it to the last degree narrow and contracted, to quarrel with their saying *sibboleth*, instead of *shibboleth*, on the abstract question of the duty of the state to sustain Christianity. Every man who holds that religion should be taught in our public schools, goes the whole length with the Free Church, as far as the principle involved in the question is concerned. That constriction of the throat which makes men strain at gnats is apt to be a fatal disease.

We have spoken of the great truth of Christ's right to reign over his own people, and to rule in his own church, as one that exerts an effective influence in the formation of religious character. We see its power in every part of Scottish history, and its efficacy is now again exhibited in the character and conduct of the Free Church. We very much doubt whether the world has seen for two centuries such a revival of genuine religion as is now, and has been for some years in progress in Scotland; and we should be greatly at a loss to point to any church on earth, which is now exhibiting such an amount of Christian energy and excellence. Where is the church of which it can be said that all its ministers and all its members are submitting to daily self-denial for the support of the truth and the extension of the gospel?

When it became apparent that they could not, with a good conscience, remain in the establishment, four hundred and seventy ministers, about two hundred licentiates, perhaps two thousand elders,* and about one million of the people, at once seceded. The sacrifice involved in this step, we are not prepared to appreciate. We cannot enter into the feelings of these brethren in regard to the church of their birth, of their fathers and their country. Ties were

* The number of adhering elders reported in October last, from very imperfect returns, was 1680.

there sundered which have never here existed. In this country also the social position of a man depends almost entirely upon his personal qualities; in Europe more depends upon the accidents of birth and station. In England the difference between a minister of the established church, and a dissenting minister, is as great as between a captain in the army and a militia captain. We may affect to think this of little consequence; but the influence of such considerations is greater than we are willing to acknowledge. The men who are superior to them are great men.

The pecuniary sacrifice made by the ministers is more tangible. Many of them had salaries from two to four thousand dollars, the average was perhaps about a thousand dollars. Thus an annual aggregate income, punctual and certain, of five hundred thousand dollars, was given up, for one far less in amount and in a great measure precarious. This sacrifice occasioned a general and instantaneous change in the mode of living in the great body of the clergy. The relinquishment also of their manse and glebes, where many of them had lived in peace for years, to seek a new and uncertain home, must have cost many a severe pang. The sacrifice on the part of the people has been quite as great. They have given up the churches in which they were accustomed to worship and around which their fathers lie buried; and they relinquished the right to have a ministry supported for them. Such a sacrifice for principle made by five hundred ministers and a million of people, is one of those events which happen but once in many generations. It is a blessing to live in an age in which such a proof of the power of religious conviction is given to the world.

These determined men, in leaving the establishment, assumed at once the task of building churches for all their congregations, of sustaining their own ministers, of carrying on all the missionary and other benevolent operations formerly pertaining to the united body; and of providing the means of education, professional, academical and elementary, for the whole church. They have addressed themselves to this Herculean task, with a wisdom, an unanimity and energy for which we know no parallel.

As to the building of churches, the thing to be accomplished was to erect, within the year, seven hundred places of worship, each capable of seating six hundred people, and costing on an average five hundred pounds. The sum

required for this purpose was, of course, three hundred and fifty thousand pounds. To this must be added the cost of the sites, which in towns is a serious item, so that the whole amount necessary for the object, is over two millions of dollars. In five months more than one million was actually raised. When it is recollected that Scotland is a poor country, and that very few of the aristocracy or of the wealthier classes have joined the secession, this must be regarded as an unexampled effort. To accomplish this great object, it was necessary to make common cause. It would not do to let the wealthier congregations build their own churches, while the poorer parishes remain unsupplied. It was therefore agreed that no expensive church should be erected by the rich, until all the congregations were furnished with a suitable place of worship. This was a novel species of self-denial. It was also determined that while each locality did what it could towards the erection of its own church, a general fund should be created, which should be apportioned to the weaker congregations according to their necessities. This great burden of building so many churches, has come upon them suddenly, the work must be done at once, and it must be done in addition to all the ordinary duties of a church. It is this sudden, indispensable demand for an expenditure immensely beyond the ordinary capabilities of Christian enterprise, that forms the ground of the just appeal of the Free Church to the aid of their fellow Christians. It is not for assistance in sustaining her ministers, in educating her people, or in sending the gospel to the destitute, but in meeting a sudden and great emergency, that she looks for the aid of other churches. Her people, in many places, are unsheltered, worshipping in barns, under tents, or on the highways; and she asks those living in ceiled houses, to assist in sheltering them. It is unspeakably more important to us than it is to them, that we should answer this appeal aright. We ought to bring this case home to ourselves. In ordinary times, it is easy for each family to provide its own residence, but if a sudden calamity renders a whole community houseless, how is it then? It is not always easy, even in ordinary times, for every congregation to build its own church; but suppose that in a single year every presbyterian, or every episcopal church in the land was to be re-erected; would not that be an emergency in which we should feel that we had all the right that Christian brother-

hood or human fellowship can give, to look around for help?

We have seen that the Free Church determined to make common cause, to create a common fund, to meet the demand for new churches, and that the amount raised has already exceeded all expectation. Let us see what plan was adopted for the support of the gospel. At the time of the Reformation, the Church of Scotland was possessed of large landed estates, and was entitled to a tenth of the produce of the soil of the whole kingdom. The estates were seized by the crown and the nobles; and the tithes in many cases abolished, or given to laymen. What remained of them, was given to the landowners, when patronage was abolished, upon condition of their paying a part as a stipend to the minister; and when patronage was restored they retained the possession of the tithes subject to the same condition. This plan of supporting the church by tithes, introduced throughout Europe, was designed to throw open the means of religious instruction, free of all charge, to the whole community. The clergy were supported not by the rich, not by the landowners, not by the tenants, but by a portion of the common property belonging neither to landlord nor tenant, but to the whole community. It is not our purpose to descant on the merits or demerits of this system, but to state it. The advantage which is patent to every one, and which recommended it to the judgment of so many good and great men in all ages of the church; is, that it designed to make the gospel accessible to all, and to take it and sustain it even among those who were not willing to receive it. It was this end that the Free Church desired also to accomplish. It was easy to have churches built and supported in populous and rich places, but to sustain the ministry among the poor and even the irreligious, was a more difficult task. The ministers determined as to this point also to make common cause, to raise a general fund, out of which every preacher of the gospel should receive a sum adequate to his comfortable support. But as the same sum would be in one place an adequate, and in another a very inadequate salary, it was determined that while all received a common sum from the common stock, each congregation should supplement, as it is called, i. e. add to the salary of its pastor, according to its own ability and choice. To secure the money necessary for the general fund, eight hundred associations were soon formed in

all parts of the church, which make weekly or monthly collections. This fund is appropriated: "1. To defray the expenses of administration and agency. 2. To pay whatever salaries may be charged upon it, and the allowances to preachers and ordained missionaries employed by the church. 3. To appropriate the residue to provide an equal dividend to each ordained and officiating pastor of a congregation, and to such ministers, as, having been pastors of congregations, shall have been otherwise employed under the authority of the church, or declared *emeriti*. 4. This dividend shall not exceed £—— per annum, any surplus beyond that being applicable to the extension of the church, or the maintenance of schools."* It is intended to make the dividend to each pastor, five hundred, and if possible seven hundred and fifty dollars, a year.

To supplement the salaries, that is, to add to the sum received from the common fund, dependence is placed on the collections made every sabbath at the church door. The pews or seats are to be free, or let at a very low rate, designed merely to meet the incidental expenses of the congregation, for fuel, lights, &c. The plan of entirely free seats, is the one which seems likely to be generally adopted.

This is a beautiful scheme. It is founded on the brotherhood of the church. It assumes that all the ministers being engaged in the same work, have the same right to a competent support. At the same time it makes provision for the inequality, as to the expense of living in different places. Provided a congregation makes a fair contribution to the general fund, it may give, uncensured, what it pleases to its own pastor. It serves also, greatly to enlarge the views and feelings of the people. If a poor woman, as one of the delegates remarked in our hearing, is asked to give six pence a week to support her pastor, she may hesitate, but if you tell her it is for Scotland, for all Scotland, to support all the ministers of the church, her heart is enlarged; her prayers and blessing go with her mite, and she feels elevated and blessed in giving. Its tendency to increase the liberality of the people, which is to them a great good, is therefore obvious. A congregation cannot but feel inclined to give more freely to a great national object, than one which makes no such demands on their conscience and

* Proceedings of the General Assembly in October.

feelings. We have heard it said that Dr. Gordon's church in Edinburgh has subscribed twenty-five thousand dollars a year to the sustentation fund, while it supports its own pastor, or at least raises the dividend which he receives from the common fund, to an adequate salary. The committee of distribution sent Dr. Chalmers a check for three hundred pounds as his salary as professor, but as his fees had equalled his emoluments from his chair in the established church, he returned it all to the fund. Besides its healthful action on the church, this plan accomplishes the important object of sustaining the gospel in the poorest parishes in the country, and of sustaining it well, so that the necessity of resorting to teaching or farming, as a means of support, is not imposed on the pastors. By making the seats free, the church is thrown open to the poor, the invidious distinctions of wealth are not obtruded into the sanctuary and the freest access is given to the preaching of the gospel. In a letter addressed to the session of one of the new churches, a gentleman after detailing the plan above stated, says "You see from the above that nothing is to be done in the way of exaction. The gospel is to be freely preached to all who choose to avail themselves of the offer. None are to be excluded on account of their poverty. . . . He that giveth much shall not be preferred; he that has little to give shall not be slighted; he that has nothing to give shall not be despised. In so far as the congregation provides directly for the support and comfort of its minister, the "collecting plate, while it receives, will conceal also the contribution of each."

As to the success of this whole scheme we can only state that Dr. Chalmers reported to the Assembly in October last, that enough had been contributed to the sustentation fund, to authorize a dividend at the rate of one hundred and fifty pounds (about seven hundred and fifty dollars) a year to each minister. But the exigency of the church for the building fund, was so great that a large part of the contribution for the support of the clergy, had been diverted to that object. A dividend, therefore, at the rate of only four hundred dollars a year was declared for the first six months. This is certainly, most encouraging; and there is every prospect that the plan will be completely successful. Whether a similar plan can be introduced into our church, is worthy of serious consideration. Our great dispersion, and the immense extent of our country, renders combined action

much more difficult with us, than in such a limited sphere as Scotland. Still, if some Chalmers should arise, to organize the plan; and with the eloquence of benevolence urge it on the church, we should not despair of its success even in America.

It has ever been the glory and blessing of Scotland, that education has gone hand in hand with religion. The school house has always stood near the church. The system of doctrines contained in the Shorter Catechism has there, more thoroughly than elsewhere, been the real pabulum of the people. And to this fact, is, in a great measure to be attributed, whatever of mental or moral superiority distinguishes their national character. This is the great source of that discrimination of intellect, that firmness of purpose, that logical adherence to principle, that independence of character, which appear so conspicuously in Scottish history. True to the noble principles of their fathers, the Free Church has at once directed her energy to the thorough religious education of the people. If she has her building committee, her sustentation committee, she has as early and as vigorous her education committee. Here as well as in other matters, her schemes are wise, large, and practical. The committee state in their report to the Assembly in October, that they must discriminate between what is essential and what is desirable, between what is indispensable at the present moment and what they must aim to accomplish. The whole scheme embraces the founding of theological seminaries, of a college or university, of grammar, elementary and normal schools; requiring an outlay of a million of dollars.

For the present one theological seminary is deemed sufficient, and it has already gone into operation, with Drs. Chalmers, Welsh, Duncan and Cunningham as its professors. We learn, that Dr. Chalmers has been lecturing, through the winter, to a class of two hundred and nine theological students.

The speedy establishment of an university, seems to be contemplated with confidence. We have seen a letter from Sir David Brewster, urging the necessity of the enterprise, though it is for the present postponed for more pressing demands.

The principal object for the present, is to secure a sufficient number of elementary schools. These schools are always placed under the supervision of the session of the church, and the especial charge of the pastor. The presby-

tery has the general directions of all the schools within its bounds, and is expected to visit or inspect them twice a year. The teachers are appointed, and in a measure sustained by the church, and religious instruction, on the basis of the Westminster Catechism, is made, not the work of any one day, but of a portion of every day in the week.

It is stated in the report to the Assembly, in October, from the imperfect returns at that time received, that three hundred and sixty school-masters, having the estimated number of twenty thousand pupils, had already adhered to the Free Church. The important normal school at Edinburgh, with its intelligent principal and all its teachers and pupils, passed over to the new body, leaving behind them the valuable library and other appurtenances of the institution. We learn from the last "Missionary Record" that the school in question is in a very flourishing state, the total number of pupils is about six hundred, of whom thirty are preparing to be teachers. This is an increase of two hundred pupils, since the disruption. The children of this school have subscribed fifty pounds to the scheme for building school-houses, and their teachers have raised the subscription to £110 8s. 4d. The infection of benevolence and zeal has, therefore, taken hold even on children.

As in leaving the Establishment, the Free Church had to abandon their places of worship, so also they lost their schools and the whole apparatus of instruction. There is the same demand, therefore, for new schools as for new churches. To meet this demand, the Rev. Robert McDonald, of Blairgowrie, devised a scheme for raising two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and has devoted himself to carrying it into effect. From the success which every where attends his efforts, it is probable the whole sum is by this time secured. The February number of the Missionary Record of the Free Church, says Mr. "McDonald is more successful than he ever anticipated, however sanguine his hopes were. There is no doubt, whatever, of the whole sum of £50,000 being realized, and that too, within a very short time. He visited Perth, Greenock, Glasgow and Edinburgh; and in each of the two last named places about £8000 were subscribed. In no village or glen has he propounded his scheme, without meeting a ready response to his call, and he has never held a meeting at which less than £100 have been collected. In the village of New Haven £274 were subscribed." This last named place is

described as a small fishing village. All this is doing while the building, sustentation and missionary schemes are pressed with equal zeal and success. It is very evident that something has touched the soul of Scotland and she is herself again.*

The Rev. Mr. Lewis of Dundee, who is now in this country, states in one of his Tracts, the following facts, which we here mention as illustrative of the efficacy of this scheme of parochial school instruction in connexion with the church. In 1745, at the close of the last rebellion, there were about 500,000 highlanders, speaking the Gaelic language. The great majority of them were papists, and little better than savages, requiring a standing army to keep them in subjection. The Church of Scotland planted among them two hundred churches and two hundred schools, all furnished with ministers and teachers speaking Gaelic. These people now constitute the most thoroughly presbyterian, pious and peaceable portion of the population of Scotland. The great body of them, as might be expected, have gone with the Free Church. In the county of Sutherland with a population of twenty-four thousand, not four hundred remain in the establishment. In Ireland at the same period, 1745, there were about two millions of people speaking the Celtic, and in the same condition of ignorance and barbarity as the Scottish highlanders of that day. They have increased to something like three millions, and are as ignorant and barbarous as they were a hundred years ago. This difference between the two countries, and it is a difference which, as to its results in this world and the next, is beyond computation or conception, is, under God, to be referred to the fact that the Church of Scotland planted a minister and school-master, speaking the language of the people, in every parish of her Celtic population; and that the established Church in

* The success of any scheme of benevolence depends mainly on the energy with which it is prosecuted, and the state of the people to whom it is presented. Still it may interest our readers to know what Mr. McDonald's plan is. He proposes to raise £50,000 for 500 schools by getting:

500 persons to give one shilling to each of the schools, yielding in all,	£12,500
1000 giving six pence to each	12,500
2000 giving three pence	12,500
6000 giving one penny	12,500

9500 giving at the above rates yields, £50,000

The subscriptions are payable as the building of the schools proceeds.

Ireland did not. We have here an example and a warning. If we plant a church and school, side by side, in every community in this country, we shall have a population equal to the best part of the population of Scotland; if we do not, they will be like the worst part of the population of Ireland.

Difficulties are so rapidly clustering around the system of public schools generally adopted in this country, Romanists and infidels are so strenuously striving to banish the Bible and religion from all such institutions, that it surely becomes all evangelical churches to consider what is their duty in the premises. Wherever there is a church there may be a school; and the same people who organize the one should organize the other. If assistance is necessary to sustain the teacher, it may be afforded just as in hundreds of cases it is afforded by our missionary societies to sustain the pastor. The plan proposed in Scotland, is, to furnish from a central fund, a salary of seventy-five or a hundred dollars to every school-master, to be "supplemented" by the community in which he labours. Here is a field worthy of the highest talent and greatest energy of the church.

If half the ability and time which are spent on unimportant or injurious contentions, were devoted to devising and executing a scheme by which a sessional school should be established in connexion with every presbyterian church in our country, future generations would rise up and call us blessed. Why should not our General Assembly appoint a board or committee for elementary schools? Would not such a board have as wide and as important a field of labour, as that which belongs to any institution of the church? Of all the incidental blessings which we anticipate to attend the mission of our Scottish brethren, it will be the greatest and most permanent, if they are the means of awakening the zeal of our evangelical churches to this important subject.

In addition to building churches, sustaining the ministry, and providing the means of professional and elementary instruction, we stated that the Free Church assumed the responsibility of conducting all the benevolent operations, carried on before the disruption. They had to renounce their missionary funds and property, but they wrote to their missionaries, that they were willing to receive and sustain them all. And it is one of the highest testimonies to the

goodness of their cause, and one of the clearest manifestations of the divine favour, that the whole corps of missionaries, as well those to the Jews as to the heathen, have left the Establishment and adhered to the Free Church.

The mode by which these benevolent operations are carried on, is very similar to our own. The church has what are called the "Five Schemes:" 1. The scheme for the conversion of the Jews. 2. For education. 3. For foreign missions. 4. For domestic missions. 5. For Colonial churches. For each of these objects a large committee is appointed, and under it a smaller executive committee, with its convener or chairman, who has the principal management of its concerns. By delegation from these several committees, a joint committee called the general Board of Missions and Education is formed, "for attending to and regulating certain matters common to them all; such as organizing and keeping in operation a system for maintaining and increasing the contributions to the Schemes, publishing the Monthly Record, &c."*

The annual amount contributed by the whole church to these schemes was about 120,000 dollars. The year before the disruption it was 26,000 pounds. The contributions by the Free Church alone bid fair to equal if they do not exceed that sum. Last year, as stated by Mr. Dunlop to the Assembly, the contributions to the scheme for the conversion of the Jews, after deducting legacies, was £3,863, this year more than four thousand pounds have already been reported. The Indian mission embracing thirteen missionaries, was taken on hand when there was but £372 in the treasury, "we have now to rejoice," says the Record, "in very little short of six thousand pounds contributed for the mission." All the other schemes seem to be equally well sustained. Most of the work committed to the Home Missionary committee having been transferred to the building and sustentation schemes, less will appear under that head, though immensely more has been done for the objects embraced under it. When we remember that two hundred ministers, who formerly voted and acted with the evangelical party, remain in the establishment, the fact that the seceding portion of the church has fully sustained the benevolent operations formerly resting on the united body, and that this has been done in the midst of unexampled demands for the

* Proceedings of the General Assembly, May 1843.

building, school, and sustentation funds, it certainly exhibits extraordinary devotedness and zeal.

We have written this article with two objects mainly in view. The first is a selfish one; we wish our own churches to know what the Free Church is and is doing; we wish them to understand their principles, and their modes of operation, because we have much to learn from them. The truths which the Free Church is now holding up to the world, for which she is bearing testimony by suffering, are truths essential to the vigour of spiritual life in the church and its members. They are truths which we all admit, but which we have let slip. We have not felt as we ought that Jesus Christ is our Lord; that he must reign in us and over us, as individuals and as a community; his priestly, more than his kingly office, has filled our minds and hearts. We should take both, and live by both; we must live by faith not only in his atonement and intercession, but also in his authority and protection. He is our master and we must have no other. Feeling personally our short-comings in this matter, we have thought it might be useful to call the attention of our readers to the truths which this Scottish movement has brought so prominently to view. The plans also adopted by the Free Church for the support of the ministry, and especially for the support of schools and the promotion of religious education, are worthy of the serious consideration of the churches in this country. We have a similar work, and on a larger scale to perform; and it is well to ask, whether we cannot learn something from them, as to the best way of doing it. Our second object was of course to minister what little we could to aid the cause of the Scottish delegation to this country. This, however, is a very subordinate matter. With such principles at work, and with such men engaged in her service, we have no doubt of the success of the Free Church. Her cause is the cause of Christ, and must succeed. Its success cannot be materially promoted or retarded, by the few thousand dollars more or less, which American Christians may see fit to give. But it is of immense importance how we feel on this subject. To be hostile or to be indifferent, would be a sore calamity. "We have heard," said the eloquent delegate from Wales to the Scottish Assembly, "that Christ is suffering in this country, and we have come to look upon the bush that burns and is not consumed." If Christ is there suffering in his church, we must all admit that it would be for us a

grievous evil, not to believe it, and not to feel and manifest our sympathy. If we make a mistake on this subject, and through that mistake, remain indifferent, we shall suffer loss.

We have only one thing more to say. The testimony of the Free Church "is not a Presbyterian, it is a Protestant testimony. The great Reformation was a recovery of the truth. The truth made men free. The believer stood in his essential dignity—having Christ for his master, and owning and tolerating no other. He claimed the right of private judgment. He repudiated, as an invasion of his birth-right, all lordship over the conscience. He insisted on dealing direct with God—no man coming between. He demanded that the conscience should depend on, and hold of the Lord alone. Church rulers are no keepers of the people's conscience. They have no warrant to lord it over the heritage. The people must be left free to obey Christ, and Christ alone. Thus the testimony borne now to the honour of Jesus, is the very testimony borne by Luther and Melancthon, and the other worthies of the great Reformation. The question lies deeper than the particular controversy which has raised it. It is at the root of all civil and religious liberty. It is—let it be reiterated again and again, in the ears of all men—the question of PROTESTANTISM. It is the question of the right of private judgment; the right of each Christian man to depend on Christ alone, and therefore independent of all authority, civil or ecclesiastical, in the discharge of his duty to Christ."*

The appeal then of the Scottish Church is made to Protestants and not to Presbyterians. It has been cordially responded to by Wesleyans and Independents. Of the hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars received from England, the greater portion was from the Wesleyans, and the work there is but just begun. In this country the appeal is not yet generally understood. When it comes to be apprehended, we cannot doubt that it will reach every heart that wishes Jesus Christ to reign.

* We have gathered these sentences from the introduction to the proceedings of the Scottish Assembly held in May, 1843, as reported in the *Edinburgh Presbyterian Review*.

ART. IV.—*The Little Stone and the Great Image; or Lectures on the Prophecies Symbolized in Nebuchadnezzar's Vision of the Golden Headed Monster.* By George Junkin, D. D. President of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. Svo. pp. 318. Philadelphia: 1844.

By Prof. J. A. Alexander,
 THE public has certainly no reason to complain of a deficiency of labourers in this department. How far the multiplication of interpreters of prophecy deserves to be regarded as a matter of rejoicing, may be made a question. We are glad however, that among the many who feel bound to undertake this difficult and delicate employment, one occasionally comes forth, who is not "of imagination all compact," and who is not disqualified by exclusive devotion to a study which, above most others, calls for the corrective influence of varied knowledge and discursive habits, to prevent a zeal for truth from degenerating into monomania. On this ground, we are glad to find a man of Dr. Junkin's standing in the literary and religious world, and one who has been chiefly known in other walks of learning, and whose tendencies are rather to matters of fact than to those of visionary speculation, coming forward to take part in these discussions. Of his work, which comes commended to our notice, not only by the author's name, but also by the handsome style in which it is got up, we shall now proceed to lay a brief account before our readers.

It is due to Dr. Junkin to observe, in the first place, that this is not an extemporaneous effusion, but a work deliberately constructed and repeatedly re-written. The lectures here published have been thrice delivered, once at La Fayette College, once to a more promiscuous audience at Easton, and once at Miami University. This fact, distinctly stated in the preface, precludes any charge of undue haste against the author, and, at the same time, any claim on his part to indulgence on the score of haste and want of time. The praise of diligence it is impossible for any one who reads the volume to withhold. The prophecies expounded, the illustrative parallels from scripture, and the historical analogies, have all been zealously and sedulously studied. As the author's labours have had reference in every case to oral delivery, the form of lectures has of course been retained. This is, in some respects, a favourable circumstance, in others, not. The personal address and the practical application of the subject at brief intervals,

have no doubt given liveliness and point to the performance; but it is equally certain that the attempt to comply with the customary forms of sermon-writing has occasionally made the author tiresome and obscure where he would otherwise have been perspicuous and entertaining. Our critical experience has taught us, to our sorrow, that it is not the numbering of paragraphs or the labelling of sections that gives clearness to a composition. Nor is it always found in company with high professions of exactness and precision, which in fact are rather suited to excite suspicion of confusion in the writer's mind. The very first lecture in the series now before us, is an instance of the bad effect which we have represented as occasionally springing from too rigid an adherence to the mere conventionalities of pulpit composition. After stating, as the doctrine of his text (Rev. i. 3,) that the study of the prophetic writings, especially of those ripe for accomplishment, and the belief and practice of the doctrines they teach are greatly conducive to human happiness, the author proceeds, in farther prosecution of his subject, to consider, first, the duty of diligently reading and studying the prophetic writings; then, how the knowledge of their contents greatly conduces to men's happiness; and thirdly the motives to such diligent study, after which he winds up with four practical reflections. Under all these heads the author's observations are appropriate, pious, and judicious, but the plan of the discourse, as we have stated it, renders repetition unavoidable to a degree which, though it might add force to an oral address, is not a little trying to the patience of a reader. This is an inconvenience, we admit, which, though it might be lessened, could not perhaps be wholly excluded from a work constructed in the form of lectures; but whether the true inference from this consideration is that this form has been unwisely retained, or that the single inconvenience specified is counterbalanced by the advantages peculiar to this method, is a question which we shall not undertake to determine. We are certainly not disposed to wonder that the author, after a third laborious preparation of his matter for delivery, was not inclined to undertake the new toil of re-casting it for publication, which, without material change of substance, might have cost as much time and exertion as the previous composition. At all events, the volume as it is, may justly claim the praise of having been produced by diligent and conscientious labour, the result of which is evident, not only in the collection and com-

parison of parallel scriptures, but also in the full yet concise exhibition of historical facts, sufficient of itself to make the work a most instructive one. The labour of such compilations, it is true, has been much abridged by previous writers. We can readily believe, however, that our author who is characteristically active and unwearied, has not been contented to receive his information altogether at second hand, but rather chosen, as he had opportunity, to draw upon original authorities.

Another pleasing feature of the work is its manifest honesty and candour. This may seem to be but slight praise of a work which undertakes to expound an important portion of the word of God ; but no extensive knowledge of books is needed to apprise us of the fact, that even where the principles are sound and the general intentions pure, the particular arguments and expositions may be marred by an obvious desire rather to confirm a preconceived hypothesis, than to ascertain the truth. Of this there are no traces in the work before us. That the author is sometimes hurried away, by his desire to solve a difficulty or clear up an obscurity, into conclusions which a sober judgment must repudiate as untenable, is no doubt true ; but we see no traces of a general purpose to establish a theory at all costs and hazards ; and nothing seems to us more truly characteristic of the author than the simplicity and *bonhomie* with which he pleads for his most questionable notions.

Closely connected with the quality just mentioned is the uniform vivacity with which the whole is written. Whatever variation there may be in other respects, the author's spirits never fail him. They seem indeed to rise in proportion to the difficulty of the subject, so that when he has most reason to be cast down he really displays most courage. This happy temperament cannot be without effect upon the reader. We have seldom found a book upon a serious subject less tiresome even when least convincing or instructive. This effect could only be secured, in many cases, by a sacrifice of what may be called the dignity of authorship, and the adoption of a manner always familiar, and in some cases perhaps too colloquial. In no case, however, is there any compromise of that which is far more important than the author's dignity, we mean that of his subject, of the scriptures, of religion. These are always not merely treated with respect, but held up to the reverence of others, a proceeding for the sake of which we can forgive, nay admire, the

author's occasional forgetfulness of self. With a great majority of readers, we have no doubt, this unwavering vivacity and earnestness will add much to the argumentative and practical effect of the whole treatise.

It is scarcely necessary to inform our readers that this work, so far as we have seen, is marked not only by great doctrinal correctness, but by warm zeal for the Calvinistic system, although very far from being controversial or sectarian in tone or temper. There is indeed a slight peculiarity of manner which might be described as a pugnacious air, as if the author constantly assumed that his positions were of course to be assailed, and therefore threw into his assertion of them a becoming spirit of defiance to all enemies. We have no idea that this manner is indicative of any evil temper or propensity to quarrel; for we trace it in connections which preclude that supposition, and accompanied by positive expressions of a tolerant and charitable spirit. But we do not on this account the less regard the singularity in question as unfortunate and a violation of good taste. Although every assertion of a truth does really involve the negation of all errors inconsistent with it, this is no reason for giving to the simple allegation of the truth a controversial or polemic form, in anticipation of objections or denials which may never come. When they do come, then of course the mode of statement must be changed; and therefore these remarks have no relation to those parts of Dr. Junkin's work, in which he is disproving the erroneous views of others, but to those in which the statement of his own opinions, without explicit reference to any adverse doctrine, has the appearance of being directed against some invisible opponent. All this, however, is a mere peculiarity of manner, and as such detracts nothing from the truth of our remark that this is not a controversial or sectarian work, any further than that character is necessarily involved in its being calvinistically orthodox.

A natural accompaniment of this theological character is the pure and healthful moral tone of the whole work. Especially when looked at in the light of an address to educated young men—and to such it has been twice delivered and is now inscribed—it is deserving of great praise, for having brought so many interesting facts of history and prophecy to bear upon the duties of life, both private and official. We are sure that no intelligent young man could hear or read this course of lectures, with that feeling of respect

for the lecturer which he deserves, without receiving a most salutary impression of a moral nature, whatever might be his opinion as to the correctness of the views here exhibited in reference to prophecy. This moral quality, combined with the vivacity and earnestness already mentioned, lead us not only to desire but to hope that Dr. Junkin's work may have a wide circle of attentive readers among the educated youth of our country. We say *of our country*, not as words of course, nor because we take for granted that the book will not be known abroad; but because there is something about it which entitles it peculiarly to reputation and success at home. The quality to which we now refer can hardly be made fully intelligible to any but a reader of the work itself. It may, however, be described as a peculiarly American and patriotic spirit, such as we have never met with, to the same extent, or with such fulness of development, in any book of a religious nature. It is not simply that the author makes an application of the doctrines which he finds revealed in prophecy, and in the rest of scripture, to the wants and duties of his countrymen especially. He does much more. He has his eye upon America throughout, as one of the great subjects of prophecy. He tells us himself that one capital object of the book is to show the bearings of true religion upon the interests of free government, by exhibiting a condensed view of that great conflict which has been waging in the world ever since the rise of the first great monarchy under the auspices of Nimrod, the conflict between government by physical force and government by moral law, the great image of Nebuchadnezzar being the symbol of the former, the little stone of the latter. This view of the prophecies in question (including a large part of the Book of Revelation) is what gives to Dr. Junkin's exposition its distinctive character, and in elaborating this he must of course give special prominence to our own country as the great example of a regulated freedom. But it is not merely from this general view of the design of the prophecies which he interprets, that his book derives its marked American character. The same effect results, in a still higher degree, from the specific application of a very different and interesting prophecy to events in which this country is not only to be deeply and pre-eminently interested, but to act a leading and decisive part. There is something singularly novel and interesting (we say nothing now of its truth or probability) in the connexion thus established be-

tween prophecy and American politics, the American navy, and other matters commonly regarded as exceedingly remote from questions of biblical interpretation.

The effect of those peculiarities which we have been describing is not at all impaired by the habitual tone of confidence in which the author treats his subject. Whatever may be the negative value of a dubious and hesitating manner in preventing rash conclusions, there can be no doubt that an appearance of determined self-reliance is much better suited to command the attention and the faith of the majority of readers. There is something agreeable in following the lead of one who does not seem to know what it is to falter in action, or to waver in opinion. At the same time, it cannot be denied that there are certain inconveniences attending this impressive mode of writing, as for instance its inevitable tendency to generate the habit of confounding all degrees of probability, and treating everything as equally certain, the effect of which is, sooner or later, to destroy the very confidence which this dogmatic tone at first produces. When the reader finds himself required to believe, that one side of a difficult alternative is certainly, or obviously, or evidently true, that one scale of a balance, which appears to him as nearly *in equilibrio* as possible, is kicking the beam in the most palpable manner, he will be very apt to doubt the truth of similar assertions, even in cases where the evidence is really convincing. The positive manner in which Dr. Junkin sets aside adverse opinions and asserts his own, not only where he is most clearly in the right, but also where the question is at best extremely doubtful, though it certainly relieves his exposition from the charge of insipidity and want of character, has also the effect, which we have just described, of generating doubts as to his judgments even when they are best supported. The reader must be often disappointed when he finds a very cavalier rejection of some old hypothesis, for instance in relation to the apocalyptic seals and trumpets, followed by the assertion of another, which, for aught that he can see, has nothing more to recommend it but the author's very respectable authority. That the author himself has no design to arrogate undue importance to his own decisions, is abundantly apparent from his express disclaimers of infallibility, and the pains which he occasionally takes to say that what he gives as the true meaning of a prophecy, is only to be looked upon as probable, a caution often needed to prevent

the natural conclusion from his language that he meant it to be understood as absolutely certain. After all, however, the effect of a little occasional excess in this way would be trifling, if it always had respect to matters of opinion and of doubtful disputation, in which case the reader might soon become familiar with his author's manner, and make due allowance for it, or perhaps consider it as adding more to the vivacity and interest of the discussion than it detracts from its correctness and precision. But this charitable judgment can hardly be expected to extend to matters of fact, of which many readers of the work are as well qualified to judge as the author, so that even slight mistakes, asserted in a positive undoubting manner, may create a prejudice against the soundness of the author's views in reference to matters which are not at all effected by such blunders. When English readers, for example, find it stated, as a reason for expecting the speedy re-establishment of popery in England, that Prince Albert, though a Protestant at present in profession, is a Papist by birth, education and connexions, they will scarcely fail to lay the flattering unction to their soul, that one who is mistaken in relation to the present may perhaps be mistaken in relation to the future. It is also not unlikely that the learned Mr. Faber would be apt to discredit Dr. Junkin's disavowal of all claim to be a prophet, when he finds himself prophetically raised to the episcopate, under the name of 'Bishop Faber,' through the book and in the index, without allowing time for a *congé d'élire* or even for a *nolo episcopari*. These are trifling errors, and would not deserve to be recorded, except as illustrations of the statement, that even such mistakes as in themselves can scarcely be accounted blemishes upon the work, are greatly magnified to many readers by the confident tone of the remarks with which they stand connected, and may lead to most unreasonable inferences as to the worth of arguments and statements which are wholly independent of them, and entirely free from error. The same remark may be applied to other minor inaccuracies, most of which are chargeable upon the printer, or the corrector of the press, or the American practice of dispensing with the aid of an educated proof-reader, even in cases where the learned languages are introduced. It may be hypercritical to note the fact that every Hebrew word which we have met with in this volume (not, we think, more than three or four in all) is a misprint; but it will not

be amiss to add, that where the author is so distant from the press, it would be better to avoid the insertion of such matter, than to run the risk of errors, which, although they may have no effect upon the great majority of readers, are offensive to fastidious scholars, and do great injustice to the literary reputation of our native authors, more especially in Europe.

We have now, we think, said all we can say in the way of exception to the style and method of the work before us, and although the space which our strictures have occupied is large in comparison with that devoted to a statement of its merits, this arises from the fact that the latter requires and admits of less detail. Indeed, it is itself no mean praise of a work like this, that its faults are only such as have been specified; and when to this negative description we have added what has been already stated, that its matter has been diligently gathered and digested, that the history contained in it is by itself enough to make it highly instructive, that the author's vigour never flags, that candour and sincerity are stamped upon the book throughout, that its theology is sound, and its morality most healthful, any general terms of commendation are superfluous.

In what has now been said it will be seen, that we have not included any expression of opinion as to the peculiar views of prophecy maintained by Dr. Junkin, except so far as such an opinion is involved in the remark that he frequently pulls down without erecting anything better. The truth is that almost the only points on which we could have fastened, in attempting to define the author's position as an interpreter of prophecy, are those in which he really professes to do nothing more than reckon probabilities, or guess at what is possible, and which, therefore, could not fairly be regarded as affording data for a general judgment; while on many points intrinsically more important, Dr. Junkin is at one with the great mass of interpreters. He modestly disclaims, indeed, the praise of having done more, with respect to a large part of the subject, than select, to the best of his judgment, from among the interpretations already extant. Where we coincide with him in this selection, our suffrage would add little to the weight of his authority, and where we think him wrong, it is commonly in cases which admit of nothing but an arbitrary settlement. For this cause we abstain from all minute analysis of his

interpretation, in the hope that many of our readers will supply the want of such a statement by a diligent perusal of the work itself. But while we give this as a reason for not following him through the whole course of his expositions, we are glad to state that what is really most striking and peculiar in the book, is a part which admits of being separately analyzed without going into the minute points or the general merits of the rest. We have referred already to the view here taken of the subject and design of all the passages which he expounds, not as detached and insulated prophecies, but as a homogeneous and coherent system of prediction, setting forth the same great series of events, by means of independent but harmonious symbols. The scope of the work is, therefore, more extensive than the leading title might appear to indicate, and comprehends not only the one vision there referred to, but the parallel passages of Daniel, and a large part of the book of Revelation. In his exposition of the latter, there are several striking and ingenious novelties, to which we shall not now advert, for reasons which have been already stated, but confine ourselves to a succinct account of the interpretation given in the twentieth, twenty-first, and twenty-second lectures, of the death and resurrection of the two apocalyptic witnesses, which strikes us as the most original and characteristic portion of the volume. In executing what we now propose, we shall adopt as far as possible the author's language, even when we do not quote him with the usual formalities.

After stating and rejecting Mr. Faber's doctrine, that the witnesses first received political life in the league of Smalkald, and lost it in the battle of Mulburg, April 24, 1547; that they then lay unburied three and a half years in the literal sense, rose again at Magdeburg in 1550, and ascended into heaven by the treaty of Augsburg in 1555; our author adopts the old opinion, that the witnesses are the entire body of the true church, who during the 1260 years of papal oppression are called to bear witness to the truth. He then proceeds to say, that the instrument or agent by which the witnesses are to be slain—the scarlet-coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns and ten crowns—is the same moral monster which sprang into being with the iron sceptre of Nimrod, the same with Daniel's lion, bear, leopard, and nondescript—the iron kingdom—modern legitimacy—once

united, now divided, but again to be united, and that speedily—probably not later than the beginning of the year 1867, when the kingdoms of Europe, embraced within the ancient Roman empire, will probably concentrate their power into one, under the house of Austria or France, or at least form a Holy Alliance, and become the centre of a tremendous action which will prostrate protestantism in Europe for a time. As to the place—‘the street of the great city’—where the witnesses shall lie unburied, our author thinks that no European interpreter has struck the vein of truth, and indeed that the true views could not be published in any part of antichristian Europe, perhaps not in England nor in the fatherlands of Knox and Luther. “Certainly,” says Dr. Junkin, “they could not be published on the continent.” For this exclusion of the truth from Europe he accounts, not only by its opposition to the interests of the aristocracy, but also by supposing that a merciful providence conceals from the Christians of the old world what is coming upon them, for example, the relapse of the English church to popery, and the revival of the cruelties of Laud and the Star Chamber in England, and of the Stuarts and Claverhouse in Scotland.

The “great city” of the text is papal Rome, “where our Lord is crucified” in the sacrifice of the mass. The streets of the city are the antichristian kingdoms. That in which the witnesses are to lie unburied is the *broad way*, the great commercial thoroughfare of Europe. They are to lie unburied, not through the contempt of enemies, or the weakness of friends, but with a view to their resuscitation. The nations will not suffer the great principles of church order and doctrines to be buried and abandoned to decay and hopeless ruin. While the slayers of the witnesses are exulting in the death of the heretics, the suppression of their doctrines, and the conversion of their churches into mass-houses and idol-temples, some portions of Europe, perhaps Sweden and Denmark, with America and the missionary stations of the Protestant world, will be looking towards the *broad way* where the witnesses lie unburied, and there a great revival of the true religion will at length begin, the dispersed protestants will return, re-organize the church, and republish the doctrines of the Protestant faith, in the presence of their enemies, contemporaneously with which a tenth part of the city is to fall, i. e. one of the ten kingdoms of the Western empire, viz., the broad way or

commercial thoroughfare of Europe is to become thoroughly protestant and cease to be a part of the Roman empire, being renewed and revolutionized, and thenceforth characterized by republican simplicity and gospel sincerity ; all titles of nobility being abolished, according to the terms of the prophecy, "in the earthquake were seven thousand names of men." (Rev. ii. 13)

In the twenty-first lecture, Dr. Junkin proceeds to prove, that the street of the great city, where the bodies of the witnesses should lie unburied, is the kingdom of Great Britain. This he argues from the facts, that Britain is one of the ten kingdoms which arose from the ruins of the Western Empire : that it is now the *platea* or commercial mart of Europe ; that no other European state has so much protestantism and piety to be suppressed ; that it is and has been the great field of conflict between liberty and despotism ; that Popery is there concentrating its efforts ; that no other kingdom affords such facilities for the recuscitation of the witnesses, by its numerous colonies, presenting an asylum for the exiled protestants, and its naval ascendancy, together with the number of Independents and Presbyterians who hold commissions in the army and navy, and who will prove very unmanageable materials, when the government wishes to establish Popery. The probability of these great changes Dr. Junkin infers from the fundamental errors of the British constitution, viz the union of church and state and the extreme defects of the representation, both which arise from antichristian corruption, and require a great concussion to remove them. Another reason he derives from the condition of the Scotch Establishment, and from the prospect of that great disruption, which has actually happened since this lecture was written ; another from the state of Ireland, and the combination of Irish Catholics at home and in England, Scotland, and America, under the form of Temperance Societies and Repeal Associations, which are all described as Catholic movements, got up through Jesuitical influence. The national debt, the distress of the people, the prevalence of gross infidelity among them, the moneyed and hereditary aristocracy, the Popish connexions of Prince Albert and the consequent probability that the future sovereign will be trained nominally a Protestant but really a Catholic, the spread of Puseyism, and the frequency of actual conversions to the Romish faith, are all used to fortify the same conclusion. The closing pe-

riods of this argument will furnish a fair sample of the way in which the author sometimes runs into the style of prophecy and then recovers himself from it, and at the same time a favourable specimen of his more impassioned and excited manner.

“The Oxford Jesuits will make overtures to the O’Connell Jesuits. The former, in behalf of the high church party, will buy in the latter, acting for the Pope and Catholicism and the continental sovereigns. The court and the aristocracy, a minority of them at least, will become Catholic; the law of the Protestant succession be repealed or trampled under foot; and thus Romanism become the established religion of Britain; the Irish will rise at home and all over Britain, and tender their services to the converted court. Care will have been taken to have commanders of the fortresses and fleets at home, and as far as may be abroad, in the semi-Catholic interest. An act will be passed settling the affairs of religion, containing a section to promote uniformity; this act will be enforced at the cannon’s mouth, and thus will be lighted up the flames of another Smithfield, and the dead bodies of God’s witnesses will be piled up in the great street of the city. Such, or something like it, will *probably* be the extinction of the glorious lights of Protestant Christianity in the British Isles. Painful thought! How distressing to the heart that looks forward to the triumphs of religion under the auspices of British Christians! Yet from this thought we cannot escape. Yes! land of my fathers’ sepulchres, thou art to be again drenched with the blood of God’s holy martyrs! Yes! glorious England, thy high towers shall be prostrated;—thy defences, almost omnipotent, shall fall into the hands of thy real foes. The wild ferocity of the gigantic tornado will sweep over the cliffs of Albion,—the hills of Caledonia, the green fields of Erin; and pour down in all their maddened rage upon the wide Atlantic.”

In the twenty-second lecture, we are told that the grand confederacy of all the aristocratical interests in Europe, after crushing the Protestant cause there, will attack America. The probability of this is augured from the vast increase of Roman Catholics among us, by immigration and the influence of their hospitals and schools; from their total subjection to the priesthood; from the efforts of the Leopold Foundation; from the unwise liberality of our policy towards foreigners; from the influence of Jesuits in our national

politics; from the very freedom of our government and the separation of church and state, laying us open to the wiles of papists; from our contiguity to Canada, Mexico and the West Indies; and from the general and invincible apathy of Protestant America. The winding up we give in Dr. Junkin's own language.

“Thus far, in general, we see the steady shining of prophetic light. But when we descend to particulars, it becomes us to speak with reserve and to suggest probabilities. It is probable, that the combined forces of aristocratic Europe in their effort to establish rule in this land, by establishing the Catholic religion, will be foiled. The exotic will grow in our soil only in a forced and sickly manner. Its nourishment must be brought from Austria, Italy, or some sister country. It must be bedewed with holy water from the font at Rome, and the heat which nurtures it must be the fires of the auto-da-fé: and notwithstanding all, the plant will sicken and die. Nay, rather it will be hewn down by the two-edged sword of a free press and a free pulpit. We shall have a struggle short and transient; but fierce and most destructive to our invaders. The approach of it will unite all sects of religion and all parties in politics, and these States *United*, and fighting in defence of the religion of the Son of God and the liberty wherewith He has made us free, can never be conquered. Back from our shores they will be hurled with a tremendous overthrow. Nor is it to be believed that we will not follow them. Is it probable that having been forced by them to depart from our wonted policy, to enter into alliances with the whole Protestant world, for the common defence, we will draw off as soon as they shall have retired with the shattered remains of their invincible armada? If not, then and by that time, the grand Protestant alliance, at the head of which will stand in unassuming dignity, the *Republic*, will have matured their plans and concentrated their forces, which will pour in from the North and the East, but chiefly from the West, to intercept and pursue the retreating fleet of the enemy. Those parts of the British navy, which shall have remained faithful, and shall have taken refuge in the East, and in our seas and harbours, the American navy and a thousand privateers shall hang upon their rear. Meanwhile, the Irish, Scottish, and English Protestants shall be active, though secretly, and the moment in which the combined fleet strikes the British

strand, they will spring to their feet, and hail their deliverers. Then will follow the concussion; the court and leaders of the Catholic aristocracy will be forced to fly to the continent, and leave England in possession of the friends of the witnesses. Thus will fall the tenth part of the city, as above described. It is probable, that there will be organized in the British Isles, a government much nearer the true principles of equal rights, than they have hitherto known. The hereditary nobility, the mitred and mammon aristocracy, and the national debt, will all perish together. This terrible earthquake will not leave a wreck behind. It is probable, that henceforth the ocean will be all and forever Protestant, and the English language, be its mother tongue. This perfect supremacy of the sea, will give the recently revived witnesses full leisure to perfect their plans of government, and enable the dynasty of the people, to acquire by experience and practice, facility in the management of public affairs.

“ In view of such probabilities, or if they are barely possibilities, what ought to be our course of policy? *First.* We should cherish the pure principles of the Christian religion. These will be pre-eminently the battles of the Lord: and he is manifestly preparing American seamen to fight them. The victory that day, will not be to the strong, physically, nor to the multitude: but the Lord of hosts will fight for us. *Second.* We must keep a vigilant eye upon Popery in our precincts. And, in regard to it, let us always distinguish between Popery and the people deluded by it. We should treat the people with kindness, and endeavour to enlighten them in the knowledge of the gospel, and so break the yoke from off their neck. But the priests and nuns and their horrible impurities, particularly the Jesuits, we should watch narrowly. These are Popery. By that day this party must have put in a president, some more of our national judges and congressmen, and in our legislatures may baffle strong majorities exceedingly, even in a constitutional way, and by delay, do much to aid the enemy. *Third.* We should attend to our national defences. The true God is our defence, but he makes use of means. Let us look to our wooden walls,—rather let us make floating walls of iron, and use all due diligence for our own safety, that we may not have occasion to reproach ourselves for the high and honourable service to which our God may call us.”

This last suggestion will illustrate what we have already mentioned as a characteristic of the work, its strong patriotic and American spirit, by means of which our secular affairs are clothed with a religious interest, and brought within the confines of a subject, from which nothing has been commonly regarded as more foreign than our popular elections and national marine. If we have done injustice to that portion of the work which we proposed to analyse, or rather to abridge, it has been wholly unintentional. The rest of the volume we must leave to the perusal of our readers, simply adding in conclusion, that the doctrines of Miller, and some current forms of Millenarianism, are not only rejected but refuted by the author with a good deal of severity.

A. B. Dod

ART. V.—*Presbyterian Government, not a Hierarchy, but a Commonwealth: and, Presbyterian Ordination, not a Charm, but an act of Government. The substance of two arguments delivered before the Synod of Philadelphia met in Baltimore, October, 1843.* By Robert J. Breckinridge.

IT is truly mortifying that the Presbyterian Church, at this period of her history, instead of "leaving the first principles of the doctrine of Christ and going on unto perfection," should be employed in the juvenile task of laying again the foundation of the "doctrine of laying on of hands." We are utter disbelievers in the vaunted efficacy of a perpetual recurrence in the spirit of sceptical inquiry, to the first principles of our organization. The distinctive features of the Presbyterian form of church government have been known and settled for ages; and yet there are some who would persuade us that all who have hitherto embraced this system have used it, as common people do their watches, without comprehending at all the true principles of its construction; and who seek therefore to divert the energy of the church from reaching forward unto those things that are before, and waste it in the re-examination of foundations that were long since well and securely laid.

It is a great evil, when a church, instead of acting with the genial vigour of a well settled faith in the established principles of her organization, is agitated with a perpetual inquiry as to what her principles really are. If the Presbyterian Church of this country after a century of well-defined practice under a written constitution, needs to be instructed in such elementary matters, as who ought to perform the work of ordination to the ministry, and what constitutes a quorum of her ecclesiastical courts, we see no reason to hope for any progress in all time to come. If these matters have not been already settled beyond a reasonable doubt, we see not how they can now be settled so as to prevent them from becoming the means of future agitation.

It forms a part of the mortifying character of the present agitation of our church, that it should touch upon questions that are in themselves of such little moment. How many members shall be required to constitute a quorum of a Presbytery, and whether among the designated number there shall be one or more ruling elders are questions, that involving no principle of abstract truth or necessary order, can be determined only by general considerations of expediency. We know not what incessant and powerful appeals to some of the worst principles of human nature may effect in the end, but we are sure that no calm and considerate argument will ever succeed in convincing the sober judgment of the ministers and elders of the Presbyterian church, that our fathers in establishing the quorum clause in our constitution, or their successors in their uniform practice under it, had any intention to encroach upon the rights of the elders, or diminish in any degree their importance. The notion that the intent or the effect of the rule, or of the practice under it, is to establish a hierarchy, or to take the initial step towards so monstrous a conclusion, is simply farcical; or at least it would be so if no other means than dispassionate argument were employed in support of it. Nor do we suppose that an attempt to show that our fathers or ourselves in maintaining that ordination to the office of preaching the word, and administering the sacraments should be performed by those who have themselves been authorized to discharge these functions, did really disclose an implicit belief that ordination was a mystical charm, would be deemed worthy a serious thought were this attempt made in the simple sincerity of

honest argument. That the whole Presbyterian church of this and other lands have been for ages devoted to a superstitious belief and need now to have some one, in the plenitude of his gifts, declare unto them the true meaning of that which they have ignorantly worshipped, is too preposterous for grave argument. It will be impossible by any ingenuity of argument to persuade the church, that the belief that ruling elders ought not to impose hands in ordination is a superstition, or that it involves the injurious intents and consequences which are charged upon it. The question is in itself of trifling moment. It is a matter merely of fitness and propriety. If any Presbytery had seen fit quietly to depart from presbyterian usage in this matter, no one we presume would have thought it expedient to call their conduct into question, for no one believes that the act of ordination is rendered invalid by the supererogatory addition of the hands of the ruling elders. But when it is claimed that all Presbyteries ought to, and shall ordain in this manner, upon the ground that there is no distinction of order between the bishop and the ruling elder, the question becomes one of principle, and we are called upon to vindicate the ancient faith of the Presbyterian church when thus attacked through a proposed change in one of its ceremonial usages.

It is also worthy of consideration that the present agitation of these questions has arisen from no practical grievance under the operation of our system. No church has complained that its interests have been slighted at meetings of Presbytery held without the presence of ruling elders; no elders have complained that at such meetings advantage has been taken of their absence to encroach upon their rights and privileges; nor has any elder complained that having offered to take part in the ceremony of ordination he was hindered therein, and thus debarred from what he deemed a rightful exercise of his authority. If the germ of a hierarchical establishment is contained in the interpretation which the church has always given to the quorum clause in her constitution, it is strange that this germ should have remained so long undeveloped. If the hierarchy of this rule has continued to this day constructive only, it might have been permitted to slumber in its potential form until it had passed into actual existence. And if the confinement of the imposition of hands in the rite of ordination to preaching elders, has resulted as yet in no further

encroachments of the spirit of priestly domination from which it is said to spring, it might, we think, be safely trusted a little longer. From the days of the Reformation until now, every Presbyterian church of which we have any knowledge has ordained its preachers by the hands of preaching elders; and though Milton, in the disordered times of the English commonwealth, complained that "new Presbyter was only old Priest writ large," it certainly is not among the Presbyterians of any age or land, that we are to look for the reign of priestly usurpation. The evils complained of in the practice of our church are purely abstract. They have never yet taken on a concrete form. Instead of the voice of complaint from parties who feel themselves to be aggrieved, we have only the voices of those who are endeavouring to make the ruling elders feel that in their ignorant simplicity they have long been imposed upon without knowing it, and that this imposition is but the prelude to further strides of priestly power if it be not met with timely resistance. It is a singular feature in the championship of the cause of the ruling elders, that the most difficult part of the duty of the champion consists in persuading the body to be defended that they have been ill used, and are likely to be still further trampled upon. It remains to be seen whether the valour exhibited in such a cause will meet with its reward or not.

In the pamphlet, the title of which we have placed at the head of this article, we have the substance of two arguments upon the ordination and quorum question, delivered before the Synod of Philadelphia by Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, a conspicuous defender of what he deems the rights and privileges of Ruling Elders. It will be remembered that the General Assembly of 1842 decided by a unanimous vote that it was not within the intent of our constitutional rule upon that subject that ruling elders should join in the imposition of hands in the rite of ordination. This vote was subsequently re-considered, and the subject was referred to the next Assembly. The last Assembly after a full argument of the case decided by a vote of 138 to 9 that the constitution of our church does not authorize ruling elders to impose hands in the ordination of ministers. This was the deliberate judgment of the church expressed through its highest court, upon a question not hastily brought before it, nor hastily decided. If the church is capable of forming its mind upon the meaning of its own elementary principles

and methods of proceeding, we have that mind distinctly expressed in this decision. If the unanimous decision of one Assembly, and the nearly unanimous decision of another, after a year's reflection, ought not to be final, so as to be an end of controversy, we can discern no means by which such a question can ever be definitively settled; and for aught that we can see our church must be reduced to the humiliating attitude of ever learning what her own simplest rudiments are, and never coming to the knowledge of the truth.

By the same Assembly it was decided that any three ministers regularly convened are a quorum competent to the transaction of all business. A resolution to this effect was adopted by a vote of 83 to 35, nearly three-fourths of the body voting in the affirmative. Considering the true insignificance of the question at issue, affecting not in any sense the constitution of a presbytery, but only the definition of a competent quorum of the body, this vote was sufficiently decided to set the question at rest. We shall make ourselves a by-word among the churches, if our General Assembly is to consume its time year after year in discussing such minor points of order, and disgrace its character as a right-judging and stable court by the utterance of contradictory judgments concerning them. Should the next Assembly reverse the decision of the last, we see not why the succeeding one may not be called upon again to review and annul. The decision of our highest court upon a question of the interpretation of the constitution, when calmly and decisively pronounced, ought in all ordinary cases, to be held final and conclusive. It were far better that they who are dissatisfied should receive the interpretation as authoritative, and seek to obtain such an amendment to the constitution as would meet their wishes, than to impeach the wisdom or probity of the Assembly that rendered the decision, and attempt to move succeeding ones to set it aside. How can this venerable body retain its hold upon the confidence of the churches, how can its counsels be received with respect, or its mandates obeyed with cheerful zeal, if upon questions affecting the interpretation of the constitution, the decisions of one year are continually annulled by those of the next?

Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, dissenting from the decision of these two questions by the last Assembly, moved the Synod of Philadelphia, at their meeting in October last, to

adopt two several minutes condemning the resolutions of the Assembly, and proposing to the next Assembly to repeal these obnoxious resolutions and adopt others in their stead of a contrary tenor. The Synod refused to adopt the proposed minutes, whereupon Dr. Breckinridge gave notice of an appeal or complaint to be taken to the next General Assembly, in the trial of which appeal or complaint he should insist upon the exclusion of the Synod from the right of voting upon any question connected therewith. There can be no doubt that if the General Assembly entertain this protest against the decision of the Synod of Philadelphia under the character of an appeal or complaint, and institute the proceedings directed in such cases, the inferior judicatory must be debarred from the right to vote upon any question connected with the issue of the matter. And this of itself would be sufficient to show that this was not a case in which either an appeal or complaint could with propriety be taken, and that the proper course for the Assembly to pursue would be to dismiss it at once from consideration as irrelevant. If this appeal is to be so construed as to bring up the merits of the main questions for argument and decision, then surely the Synod of Philadelphia ought to be upon the floor. The questions at issue, not having relation to the wise and just administration of law, but to the determination of what the law itself is, can with propriety be settled only by the united voice of the whole church. The preposterous character of this appeal may be sufficiently illustrated by a very supposable case. The Synod of Kentucky has within the past year passed a resolution to the effect that in their judgment ruling elders ought to impose hands in the ordination of ministers. Let us suppose that some member of the minority had appealed from this decision to the next Assembly, and that that body issue this appeal. It is possible that the state of opinion in the next Assembly might be such that with the Synod of Kentucky off the floor, as it must be in the trial of this appeal, the decision would be adverse to the claim set up on behalf of the ruling elders, and with the Synod of Philadelphia excluded upon the issue of Dr. Breckinridge's appeal, a contrary decision might be rendered. We should thus have the church perplexed by two contradictory decisions of the same question by the same General Assembly. There can obviously be no fixed law or settled constitution in a church, if its highest court in the exercise of its prerogative as an inter-

preter of the law and the constitution may thus be broken into fractions by the conversion of abstract questions into personal wrongs.

The utter irrelevancy of Dr. Breckinridge's appeal will be further apparent, upon a moment's consideration of the nature of the decision appealed from. The Synod of Philadelphia passed no affirmative resolution. They neither affirmed or denied the doctrines put forth by the last Assembly. They simply refused to adopt certain private opinions held by Dr. Breckinridge, and by him embodied in writing and presented for their acceptance. Was this refusal a personal grievance of which Dr. Breckinridge has a right to complain? The Synod pronounced no judgment on the soundness or unsoundness of his opinions, but for reasons which they have not seen fit to assign, they declined to entertain them. Who was injured or aggrieved by this declared unwillingness of the Synod to take any action in the matter? A delay to act, may in some cases, where personal rights and interests are involved, be unjust and injurious, but in this matter we see not how any allegation of wrong can be sustained except upon the ground that Dr. Breckinridge has an inherent right to demand that any Synod to which he may be attached, shall entertain whatever opinions he may see fit to offer.

It is difficult to conceive upon what ground other than the existence of some such unqualified right, the Synod of Philadelphia could have been expected to adopt all the opinions that were on this occasion offered for their acceptance. In the minute touching the quorum question which Dr. Breckinridge, "with a profound conviction of its truth and a deep sense of its timeliness" submitted to the Synod, this body is called upon among other things, to express its belief that "the principle here involved is practically the question between an aristocratical hierarchy, and a free Christian commonwealth." That Dr. Breckinridge should believe this is not perhaps surprising, for nothing is more common than for men who find themselves out of sympathy with the community to which they belong, to manifest a certain extravagant tendency of opinion as well as of feeling. The calmness which measures the exact nature and precise relations of the question at issue is not to be expected from a man who feels himself to be in the position of Jeremiah, when Jerusalem was beleaguered by the army of aliens, and he himself imprisoned, denounced as a traitor, and threatened with

death, unless with the prophet's doom he possesses also the prophet's qualifications and supports. That Dr. Breckinridge's convictions and feelings should run out into great exaggeration, that matters in themselves of small import should be magnified into vital principles, and things that are totally dissimilar be confounded as identical, was nothing more than was to be expected from any uninspired man occupying the position in which he feels himself to stand. But if a complaint should be entertained against a deliberative body, because they refused to express their belief, that an economical rule which affirms nothing respecting the constitution of a Presbytery, which debars no one entitled to partake in its deliberations and votes from attendance upon its meetings, which restrains no right and curtails no privilege, and which moreover has been in practical operation for more than a century, without having led to any evil, involves "practically the question between an aristocratical hierarchy and a free commonwealth,"—this we confess would surprise us.

There are other methods than by appeal or complaint by which these questions may be brought before the next Assembly, under such a form as may provide for the utterance of the deliberate judgment of the entire body; and in some one of these methods we suppose they will be brought up, and discussed anew. We have therefore examined Dr. Breckinridge's arguments to ascertain what new light they have shed upon the subjects of which they treat. The many imputations of bad motives and sinister designs to those who are of a contrary opinion, which these speeches contain, as well as their confident prophecies, we shall pass without further remark. It is impossible to refute a sneer, a vituperation, or a prophecy. Honest deeds are the only fit answer to dishonest words, and time, in the absence of miracles, is the only test of the prophet. But what they offer of argument or of fact, bearing upon the proper discussion of the subject, we propose briefly to examine.

In the discussion of the question, who ought to impose hands in the ordination of ministers, we do not find that Dr. Breckinridge has added anything to the argument as delivered before the last Assembly. The whole stress of this question turns, of course, upon the interpretation to be given to the direction contained in our form of government, that "the presiding minister shall by prayer, and with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, according to the apostolic

example, solemnly ordain him to the holy office of the gospel ministry ;” and the whole force of the reasoning, upon the side of those who would change our established customs, resides in the assumption that the presbytery herein named must of necessity, mean the presbytery previously defined as consisting of ministers and ruling elders. “Presbytery imposes hands in ordination ; elders are of right members of that body ; therefore they must necessarily impose hands.” This is the whole argument. To assert that the Presbytery that imposes hands is not the entire Presbytery Dr. Breckinridge declares to be “utter folly.” “Why,” he asks, “would you stultify our fathers ? Did they first define with the utmost clearness the term Presbytery ; then invest the body so called with the power of ordaining ministers of the word ; then in a long chapter treating of this ordination in detail use the word a dozen times in its defined sense ; and then without motive or notice, use the same word in the same chapter and touching the same business, in a sense not only inconsistent with their own definition and their constant use of it, but in a sense flatly contrary to both ? The thing is supremely absurd.” Here is the whole case on the other side. And we are willing to grant that the *prima facie* meaning of the language is in favour of the interpretation here given to it. But we find sufficient evidence that this is not the true explanation, in the historical fact, altogether unexplained and inexplicable, upon the contrary hypothesis, that in the actual practice of our church with few and unimportant exceptions, ministers have been ordained by the imposition of the hands of ministers. The language of the written constitution, it is affirmed, is clear and explicit ; it can have but one meaning ; to attempt to give it any other is to stultify our fathers, is utter folly, is supremely absurd. How then came it to pass that our fathers stultified themselves, for it is undeniable that they ordained by the imposition of the hands of preaching elders ? If the language of the constitution is so unequivocal and explicit that it can bear but one meaning, how happens it that it was, as a matter of fact, understood and applied in a different meaning by our fathers and by all who have succeeded them, even until the present day ? This fact is in truth decisive of the controversy. It is perfectly futile for men to write and speak, however plausibly or ably, to prove that certain language can have but one meaning, when it is a notorious fact that they who indited that language and the whole church

after them for a period of fifty years, have actually attached to it a different meaning. No attempt has been made to explain this fact. Our fathers, whom we are urged in filial tenderness not to stultify, are left in the extraordinary predicament of having formally laid down a proposition in terms too explicit to be misunderstood, and then instantly reduced to action one that is not only inconsistent with it, but in a sense flatly contrary; that is, through incredible ignorance they were incapable of comprehending their own language, or through wilful dishonesty they perverted it. We have said that no attempt has been made to explain this fact, for we do not reckon as such Dr. Breckinridge's argument to show "the absurdity of talking about a practice that elders *should not* impose hands." If there be any other man than one of straw who has ever talked thus, we congratulate Dr. Breckinridge upon his triumphant victory over him. Nor do we consider the force of the argument drawn from the practice of the fathers of our church as impaired in any degree by Dr. Breckinridge's denial that the practice of ordaining by the imposition of the hands of preaching elders has been strictly universal. What may have been done in one or two western Presbyteries, of late years, we know not, but it is beyond all doubt, that at the establishment of our church, the practice was universal, and that from that day to this, the same practice has prevailed throughout the church. Under such circumstances it is a truly desperate attempt, to show that the framers of our constitution intended to establish a rule which was flatly contradicted by every act to which that rule was applicable. The plain palpable force of the concurrent practice of the church from its commencement until now is not to be evaded. It is conclusive as to the meaning which our fathers who established the constitution attached to the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. Whether these words can properly bear this meaning or not, it is certain that this was the meaning which they actually affixed to them when they inserted them in the Form of Government; it was in this sense that the church received them in adopting the constitution; it is in this sense that they have ever since been interpreted; and it is in this sense that we are bound by them. Of what avail is it, in disparagement of this conclusion, to tell us of other practices of this same church, such as the disuse of the office of deacon, and the establishment and tolerance of the Plan of Union, that were clearly unconstitutional? Who needs to be

taught the distinction between a corrupt practice that has crept into the church, however insidiously, at some definite period of her history, and one that is co-eval with its constitution and necessarily interpretative of it?

The conclusion to which we are thus forced by the language of the constitution, as illustrated by the practice of its founders, derives additional strength from every quarter. The terms of the constitution are not only susceptible of the interpretation for which we contend, but they do of themselves, when properly collated, compel us to adopt this as their only consistent meaning. More than one instance occurs in our Form of Government, in which the terms Presbytery, and member of the Presbytery are used, where it is apparent that ministers only are meant, the duties being such as could be properly discharged only by them. Now we maintain that in the ordination service itself, there is evidence that the whole ceremonial part of the ordination was judged to be a work which could be fitly performed only by ministers. This is sufficiently clear from the direction given that "the minister who presides shall first, and afterward all the other members of the Presbytery in their order, take him by the right hand, saying, in words to this purpose, We give you the right hand of fellowship to take part of this ministry with us." Here the language, all the other members of the Presbytery, is express and peremptory, and yet it is obviously limited to those members who have already partaken of the ministry to which the candidate is ordained. Dr. Breckinridge indeed asserts that this argument is a sophism, which chiefly rests on an error of fact; and the error of fact which he elaborately overthrows consists in an alleged misapprehension of the word ministry, which restricts it to the ministry of the word. He succeeds in proving what no one has ever denied, that the word ministry, in its etymological sense, means service, and minister a servant; but he has not succeeded in finding a single instance in our form of government where these words are employed to denote any other kind of service than that which is discharged by preaching elders. And if he had found any number of such instances, this sophism, as he is pleased to call it, would still remain a strong and impregnable argument in the judgment of all who can rightly appreciate the meaning of words. As if to forestal the very objection raised, this salutation defines with the utmost precision the kind of ministry, or service

intended. They who take the newly ordained minister by the hand, receive him not to the ministry, but to *this* ministry. What ministry? Beyond all dispute, that to which the candidate is receiving his ordination, and which they who take him by the hand share with him. And is this the ministry of rule over the church, or the higher ministry inclusive of the other, of preaching the word and administering the sacraments? When, as has not unfrequently occurred, a ruling elder has been ordained, as a preacher, to what ministry did the right hand of fellowship welcome him? The theory of Dr. Breckinridge would demand that in this case there should be no second ordination; and the contrary judgment of our constitution shows conclusively that whatever may be in other respects the merits of his system, it is not the presbyterianism of our standards. When one who is already a ruling elder is ordained to the ministry of the word, with what propriety can an elder of the Presbytery, welcome him "to take part of *this* ministry *with us*?" It is clear that these words limit the performance of this act to the preaching members of the Presbytery; and it is equally clear that it was intended that they who welcome the newly ordained minister to his office should be they who induct him into it.

In reply to the question, why the unrestricted language, laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, is employed, if it was intended that it should be limited to preaching elders, we answer that it was doubtless for the same reason that when it is said that "a member of the Presbytery" shall preach a sermon, it was not deemed necessary to qualify the designation of the person any farther than was done by the nature of the duty assigned. There never was a Christian church upon the face of the earth, excepting the Anabaptists, the Brownists, and such like, which did not ordain its preachers by the hands of those who were themselves preachers. There is no account in the New Testament of an ordination that was not performed by those who were themselves possessed of the office conferred. It was thus that all ordinations had been performed in the Presbyterian church of our own country, prior to the adoption of our present constitution. The Form of Government previously recognised as authority in the church, that drawn up by the Westminster Assembly of Divines and adopted by the Church of Scotland, expressly limits the imposition of hands to the preaching elders, and yet it speaks familiar-

ly elsewhere of ordination as performed by the Presbytery, the whole Presbytery, and by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. It was to have been expected that, in settling a Form of Government in opposition to one that had previously prevailed, the Westminster Assembly would be precise and full in their exposition of the minor details of the organization established; and on the other hand it was not to be expected that in drawing up our briefer directory, its authors would be equally careful to define words and phrases which had been settled in their meaning and usage for a hundred and fifty years. At the time that our standards were framed there was no doubt as to who ought to lay on hands in ordination. There never had been any question respecting this matter. It was altogether natural, therefore, that in compiling the rule for ordination, the authors of it should quote the scriptural phrase, "laying on of the hands of the Presbytery," without dreaming of the necessity of imposing a limit upon the general term Presbytery, which had been already affixed to it by the universal consent of the church in all ages, and by the unbroken and unquestioned practice of our own church in particular. And had the danger of misapprehension occurred to them, they doubtless would have supposed that they had sufficiently guarded against it by the direction subsequently given that "all the members of the Presbytery in their order" shall utter certain words, which words would be perfect nonsense, coming from the mouth of any other than a preaching elder. If the ministry to which the preacher is ordained is a different ministry from that exercised by the ruling elder, then it is evident that "the Presbytery," and "all the members of the Presbytery" refer exclusively to preaching elders.

This is the law of our book, consistent with itself, with the practice of the church, with right reason, with scriptural authority, and with universal custom. Not one instance has been produced, from apostolic example, or from the history of any Presbyterian church that has ever existed, in which a man was ordained to the office of a preacher, by the imposition of the hands of those who were not themselves preachers. It has always been recognised as fitting and right, that the distinction which exists between the teacher and the ruler should be made apparent in the act of ordination; and it will accordingly be found that they who have undertaken what they are pleased to call the

defence of the ruling elders, plead for their participation in the act of ordination upon principles that are utterly subversive of the true distinction between the preaching and the ruling elder.

We do not enter at present more particularly into the argument founded upon the use of the term presbyter in the New Testament; for this argument so far as it has any bearing upon the question under discussion has no force except as it tends to obliterate all distinction between the two classes of elders. The same reasoning which proves that ruling elders ought to impose hands in ordination, proves also that they ought to teach. The ruling elder, it is contended is a scriptural presbyter, a scriptural bishop, and as presbyters and bishops ordain, by the imposition of hands, therefore ruling elders must impose hands. So also the scriptural presbyter or bishop must be apt to teach; they that had the rule over the church were also they who spoke unto them the word of God. It is easy therefore, by the change of the middle term of the above syllogism, to construct one which would prove that it was one of the functions of the ruling elder to preach the word. When they who are now seeking their ends through the distortion of our standards, shall seek to change the standards themselves upon the ground that they are not consistent with scriptural teaching, we shall be ready to enter with all minuteness into this discussion. In the mean time the single question before us now is, what is the presbyterianism of our constitution? And the language of the instrument itself, interpreted by the collation of one part] with another, and illustrated by other formularies from which it was compiled, and by the undoubted practice of its founders, leaves no room for doubt in an unprejudiced mind, that it was not within the intent of the rule upon that subject, that ruling elders should unite in the imposition of hands in the ordination of ministers.

Dr. Breckinridge has attempted to invalidate the historical argument, drawn from the practice of other churches, and this, as might have been expected, is much the weakest part of his essay. He who sets out to find in history that which never existed, is very apt to lose his way. Dr. Breckinridge, "the course of whose studies," as he informs us, "has not left him ignorant of the sentiments of God's people in past times," avows his belief that the teaching of other reformed churches furnishes more in favour of his po-

sition than against it. How well he has sustained this belief, our readers may judge for themselves.

He then passes to what he terms "the most remarkable confession to which the Reformation gave birth," the second or latter Helvetic confession. It is not of much importance so far as the question at issue is concerned, but if Dr. Breckinridge will pursue his researches into the literature of this document a little further, he will find that he has mistaken its external history, as well as its internal meaning. It was not drawn up by Henry Bullinger, but by Henry Bullinger, Theodore Beza, and Rudolph Walter; it was not adopted by all the Helvetic churches—the churches of Basle and Neuchatel declined receiving it. In the eighteenth chapter of this confession, which treats of the ministry of the church, it is said, that "they who are chosen shall be ordained by elders, with public prayers and imposition of hands." But before the meaning of this can be comprehended, it must be understood who are meant by elders. In a preceding paragraph, after giving and defining the terms applied to the ministers of the church in the New Testament it adds, "*licebit ergo nunc ecclesiarum ministros nuncupare Episcopos, Presbyteros, Pastores, atque Doctores;*" *it is therefore proper now to call the ministers of the churches, Bishops, Presbyters, Pastors, and Teachers.* The term elders or presbyters is, therefore, one of several terms that may be appropriately employed to designate the ministers of the church. What then were the peculiar functions of ministers? This is made perfectly apparent. In page 510 of the same chapter, it is said: "*Data est omnibus in ecclesia ministris una et aequalis potestas sive femetio,*" *to all ministers of the church, one and the same power and function is given.* And again, "*officia ministorum sunt varia, quae tamen plurius ad duo restringunt, in quibus omnia alia comprehenduntur, ad doctrinam Christi evangelicam et ad legitimam sacramentorum administrationem:*" *the duties of ministers are various, though they are generally restricted to two, in which all the rest are comprehended, namely teaching the evangelical doctrine of Christ, and the lawful administration of the sacraments.* Through the whole chapter it is apparent that the ministers of the church, of whom it treats, are such, and such only, as are authorized to preach the word, and administer the sacraments. It says not one word, directly or indirectly, respecting any other class of ministers or rulers. The existence of ruling elders is not

once hinted at throughout the document. It affirms that ordination shall be by the imposition of the hands of the elders—that elders is one of the terms appropriately applied to ministers—and that ministers are they whose chief functions are to preach the evangelical doctrine of Christ and administer the sacraments. It must require optics peculiarly constituted, to discern in all this any evidence in favour of the participation of ruling elders in the imposition of hands. It teaches the same doctrine that is found in the standards of our own, and of all other churches, that induction into the office to preach and administer the sacraments, should be performed by those who are themselves incumbents of the same office.

We are next referred to the second book of discipline of the Scottish church, which affirms that “ordination is the separation and sanctifying of the person appointed to God, and his kirk, after he is well tried and found qualified,” and that “the ceremonies of ordination, are fasting, earnest prayer, and imposition of the hands of the eldership.” “Such,” Dr. Breckinridge adds, “is ordination according to the doctrine of that venerable church whose standards have furnished so large a portion of our own; and such it is, essentially as held by all the Reformed churches—and I may add by the primitive and apostolic church.” And this is, as we maintain, precisely the doctrine of our standards. The same language in substance is employed, and the same question arises here as in the interpretation of our own directory; what does this language mean? what is the doctrine taught? It sheds less light upon the subject, than upon the difficulties by which the reasoner feels himself to be environed, when he attempts to fortify his interpretation of an ambiguous phrase by reference to one of precisely equivalent import. “The laying on of the hands of the Presbytery,” and “the imposition of the hands of the eldership,” inasmuch as they differ from each other only in sound, undoubtedly mean the same thing: but what is this one thing which they both mean? What was intended by the “hands of the eldership,” in the second book of discipline, is clearly made known by cotemporary writers who treat expressly of the subject. Calderwood, in the *Altare Damascenum*, published in 1623 says that the imposition of hands “is confined to pastors or teaching elders only,” and expressly justifies the consistency of this usage with the language of the directory. Samuel Rutherford in his “Peace-

able Plea for Paul's Presbytery in Scotland," published in 1642, says, "everywhere, in the word, where pastors and elders are created, there they are ordained by pastors. . . .

. . . Ordination of pastors is never given to people or believers, or to ruling elders, but still to pastors." To the same effect is the testimony of Alexander Henderson, and of James Guthrie.*

There is no room left for doubt as to the doctrine of the second Book of Discipline, that venerable standard which "was drawn up by Andrew Melville, adopted by all the civil and ecclesiastical authorities of the kingdom, and made the basis of more numerous and solemn national acts than any other paper, perhaps, of merely human origin." This book teaches the exact doctrine which we maintain, that ordination is to be performed by the imposition of the hands of the eldership, meaning thereby preaching elders. We have thus, not only the example of the Scottish Church, confirming us by the conclusions to which the ablest men of the day arrived, at a period which peculiarly called for a thorough sifting of the principles of church organization; but what is still more important in its bearing upon the precise question before us, we find that in the standards which are admitted to "have furnished a large portion of our own," the phrase "imposition of the hands of the eldership" had acquired a settled meaning as early as the year 1578.

Dr. Breckinridge declares that it seems to him "the very height of absurdity and an absolute contempt of common sense, for any one to contend, that according to the principles and the very terms of this instrument, ruling elders are not permitted to impose hands in the ordination of ministers of the word." And yet, in the light of the authorities above cited, it would be so plain an affront to common sense to deny that the principles and the terms of this instrument were intended to exclude ruling elders from taking part in the act of ordination, that no one we suppose will henceforth presume to call it in question. It was universally understood by the men who framed, adopted, and used this instrument, that it confined the imposition of hands to preaching elders. If men who use language are not to be denied the privilege of explaining what sense

* See these authors cited in the appendix to Dr. Miller's Sermon on the office of the ruling elder, p. 126.

they attach to their own terms, then the "imposition of the hands of the eldership," in the Book of Discipline refers exclusively to preaching elders. It was in this sense that the church understood these words; in this sense they passed into the Westminster Directory, and into our own standards. Through a period of two hundred and sixty-five years, during which this language has been employed, in the rite of ordination, no doubt has existed as to its true meaning. And are we now to be told that during all this time the men who compiled and used the church standards which have prevailed, did not understand the meaning of their own words? Is a purely verbal argument, founded upon nothing higher or deeper than a mere jingle of words, to be considered as of weight in determining that the true intent of language is one which they who employed that language, have disavowed by all their writings and in all their acts?

Greater violence even, than in the cases already reviewed, is needed so to torture the standards of the Westminster Assembly as to make them utter the desired response. There is of course no doubt as to the judgment of the Westminster Assembly respecting the point in debate. They have expressly decided that ordination shall be "by imposition of hands, and prayer, with fasting, by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong." They have made this matter so clear that there is no room left for a play upon words. The Directory for the ordination of ministers states, in general terms, analogous to the language employed in our book, that "the Presbytery, or the ministers sent from them for ordination, shall solemnly set him apart to the office and work of the ministry, by laying their hands on him," but this is elsewhere and more than once, limited to preaching presbyters. "The preaching presbyters orderly associated, either in cities or neighbouring villages are those to whom the imposition of hands doth appertain, for those congregations within their bounds respectively." To evade the force of this example, Dr. Breckinridge contends that this Directory teaches an entirely different doctrine respecting ordination from that which we maintain. Citing the declaration that "every minister of the word is to be ordained by imposition of hands, and prayer, with fasting, by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong," he asserts that this requires us to go much further than has yet been contended for, for not only imposition of hands, but ordination itself

is here explicitly declared to belong to preaching presbyters ; and he adds the significant hint, that it will not be long before this authority will be quoted to prove that preaching elders only, have any concern with the whole process of ordination. "Is that," he asks, "the doctrine of our church." Again he quotes the declaration of the Directory, that "the power of ordering the whole work of ordination is in the whole Presbytery," with the subsequent qualification that "the preaching presbyters . . . are those to whom the imposition of hands doth appertain;" and from this he infers that the business of the whole Presbytery is *only* to order the work of ordination, and that it is the preaching presbyters who ordain. And again he demands, "is this our system?" We answer, that the system of the Westminster Directory, according to the clear and palpable meaning of the instrument itself, is undoubtedly our precise system, neither more nor less. The "ordering of the whole work of ordination" which it gives to the whole Presbytery, will not be lessened in its meaning by the disparaging "*only*" which Dr. Breckinridge has prefixed to it. The whole Presbytery are to order or to determine the entire work, to judge of the qualifications of the candidate, and decide whether he shall be ordained; but the executive acts by which their decision is actually carried into effect, the prayers, the exhortations, the imposition of hands, are to be performed by the preaching presbyters. Such is the plain doctrine of this directory, and such precisely is the doctrine of our standards. The intent of the instrument itself is so clear, that it needs no elucidation. If any confirmation were necessary, it could be found abundantly in the debates of the Assembly, attending the formation of the Directory; and in contemporary expositions and defences of the form of government which they established. In the *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici*, or the divine right of the gospel ministry, we find the whole matter of ordination, in its substantive and formal part, treated at length. This work was published in 1654, by the Provincial Assembly of London; it was subscribed, November 2, 1653, in the name and by the appointment of the Assembly, by the Moderator, Assessors and Scribes, one of the latter of whom was Matthew Pool. In the XIIIth chapter of this work, entitled, "Wherein the fourth assertion about ordination is proved, viz., that ordination of ministers ought to be by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery," we find the following question and answer:

“*Question 4.* What part hath the ruling elder in ordination.

“*Answer.* Supposing that there is such an officer in the church (for the proof of which we refer the reader to our vindication) we answer, that the power of ordering of the whole work of ordination belongs to the whole Presbytery, that is, to the teaching and ruling elders. But imposition of hands is to be always by preaching presbyters, and the rather because it is accompanied with prayer and exhortation, both before, in, and after, which is the proper work of the teaching elder.” Here is the same phraseology that is employed in the Directory, and its meaning is placed beyond the reach of cavil. The system here taught is, we repeat it, our system. The decision of every question connected with each particular case of ordination is vested in the whole Presbytery, and the formal act or acts by which the decision is declared and carried into effect, is placed in the hands of the teaching elders.

But, in the second place, Dr. Breckinridge attempts to invalidate the authority of the Westminster Directory on the ground that its provisions for ordination were extemporaneous, devised confessedly to meet the exigencies of a particular crisis and of course not adapted to a different state of things. We prefer quoting his own words upon this head, fearful that any paraphrase which we might make of them would necessarily pass with the reader for a caricature. After citing from the Directory the passages to which we have already referred, he adds: “The two heads of *Doctrine and Power* under which the foregoing statements occur, are then thrown together; and under the 11th and 12th sections of this united head we have these two important propositions, ‘*In extraordinary cases something extraordinary may be done. . . . There is at this time, an extraordinary occasion for a way of ordination for the present supply of ministers.*’ True enough, sir; but it sets the whole matter on a new foundation. Are we in a state of civil war? Have we no church courts in America as there was not one in England, when this Directory was drawn up? Do our fifteen hundred ministers, and two thousand churches furnish no present supply of ministers to constitute a single Presbytery?” This has no meaning unless it be to disparage the directions, already quoted, respecting ordination, on the ground that they were framed to meet a special exigency, there being at that time no eccle-

siastical court, regularly constituted in England. But were there no courts, with ruling elders a constituent portion of them, in Scotland, to which no less than to England, regard was had in the compilation of these directions? Do they not in their own nature, and in express terms, contemplate a Presbytery fully formed? It is true that this instrument under the *Doctrinal part of Ordination*, which precedes the *Directory*, after laying down ten principles or rules, among which is one limiting the imposition of hands to teaching elders, adds that, "in extraordinary cases, something extraordinary may be done, until a settled order may be had, yet keeping as near the rule as possible." It is evident that the rule befitting a settled order, and to which, in the mean time, as near an approximation as possible is to be made, is that contained in the ten preceding principles. The *Directory* then follows, giving minute directions as to the manner in which this rule is to be carried out in practice, under a settled order of things. At the close of this, it adds,— "Thus far of ordinary rule and course of ordination, in the ordinary way; that which concerns the extraordinary way, requisite to be now practised, followeth,"—and it then proceeds to explain what it may be allowable to do under the present exigency. Had the restriction of the imposition of hands to teaching elders been found among these extraordinary things, which were allowed on account of the present distress, we should not of course cite the authority of this venerable standard in favour of the interpretation which has always been given to our constitution. We are seeking realities, and not playing with the mere sounds and shows of things. The only two points that have any conceivable relation to the question under discussion with us, that the power of ordering the work of ordination was entrusted to the whole Presbytery, and that the authority to execute the work, when ordered, was committed exclusively to teaching elders, are not alluded to among the extraordinary allowances that were to be permitted because no Presbyteries "could be immediately formed up to their whole power and work." This, on the contrary, was the perfect theory and practice of ordination, the complete rule, which might, in certain particulars, be varied to suit the necessities of the times, "until a settled order might be had."

And yet Dr. Breckinridge, after specifying some of the allowable departures from the rule, which are all given under the distinct head of the extraordinary way which may

now be practised, asks, "Is it not equally manifest, that the whole Directory contemplates the extraordinary posture of affairs then actually existing around them?" We answer that this is about as manifest, as that the Constitution of the United States in prescribing the method now pursued in the election of President, contemplated the adopting act of the several States and other provisional measures, which were necessary to carry the constitution into operation. No man can read the Directory without seeing at once, that upon the points under discussion, and upon all other matters, excepting the few that are touched upon in the appendix upon "the extraordinary way," it contains the matured and deliberate judgment of the body respecting what is orderly and right under a perfect state of the church.

But in the third place, Dr. Breckinridge attempts a higher strain. He aims not only to deprive the positive teaching of the Assembly of its due weight, but to make them utter a contrary doctrine. To effect this, must of course require peculiar powers of ventriloquism. By a comparison of dates he finds that the Directory for Church Government was sent in to the Parliament seven months after the Directory for Ordination. Hence he infers that this work contains "the more matured decisions of the body—their advice for a permanent and not for an extraordinary church state." He then selects from this work certain general principles of church government, such as, that the government of the church is in the hand of Assemblies, that these Assemblies are composed of teaching and ruling elders, and that many congregations are under this presbyterial government; and from these he argues that the Westminster Assembly, in its matured judgment, by deciding that ruling elders are of divine right a constituent portion of the governing assemblies of the church, have decided "*ex vi termini*, that they must unite in ordinations." If by uniting in ordinations, is meant, that ruling elders must have some share in the work, then all this talk about the matured decisions of the body, after seven months study, is devoid of meaning; since the Assembly had already decreed in their immature directory for ordination, that the power of ordering the whole work was in the hands of teaching and ruling elders. If it means that ruling elders must unite in executing, as well as ordering, the whole work, then we say, that the Assembly have decided no such thing, *ex vi termini*, unless *termini* means a determination to force upon their language

a construction which it was never intended to bear, and which it does not legitimately admit. The supposed advance in knowledge made by the Westminster Assembly during the seven months which elapsed after the establishment of the directory for ordination, upon which this argument rests, is of course destitute of the shadow of a foundation. There is nothing in their later work, which contradicts or supersedes any thing in the former. They were combined together and adopted as the form of government, in England and Scotland. The decision of the Assembly that ruling elders are of right governors of the church, did not, in their own judgment of it, decide that ruling elders must therefore impose hands in ordination. Nor does it, *ex vi termini*, include this, any more than the right which every member of congress has to deliberate and vote upon any question brought before them, includes the right to join his signature to that of the speaker, in attestation of the bills passed. This matter is really too plain for argument. The doctrine which the Westminster Assembly intended to teach respecting ordination, the doctrine which they do teach, is as explicit and clear as it is within the compass of language to make it; and the alleged inconsistency between placing the whole work of ordination in the hands of all the governors of the church, and restricting certain formal parts of the execution of the work to one class of those governors, does not seem to us worth an argument.

By the process which Dr. Breckinridge employs to extract historical evidence in favour of his position, we could prove any doctrine or practice whatever. He first determines that the work of ordination in all its parts and processes, in its decision, declaration, and attestation, belongs of necessity to the governors of the church. Hence if the government of the church is vested in teaching and ruling elders, he infers that ruling elders must impose hands in ordination. In whatever standards he finds that the work of ordination in general is committed to the governing body in the church, whatever that may be, he sees the proof of his doctrine, even when those standards in other parts expressly contradict it. History thus furnishes more that is for him than against him, because he forces upon historical documents his own inconsequent reasoning, and determines what the facts of history actually were from his opinion of what they ought to have been.

The discussion into which Dr. Breckinridge enters touch-

ing the influence of the Westminster standards upon the Church of Scotland, has no relation to the question in debate. We have shown that the doctrine of the Scottish and the Westminster standards respecting ordination was precisely the same. The second Book of Discipline, and the Westminster Directory, alike place the power of ordination in the Presbytery, and reserve the imposition of hands to the preaching elders. It is of no avail therefore to depreciate the modern Scottish church as compared with the ancient, seeing that upon this point she has never varied her doctrine or her practice, since the establishment of the second Book of Discipline.

Dr. Breckinridge asserts that, "it would be easy to establish the same doctrine from other confessions—for example, those of the Bohemian churches of 1535 and 1575, and various professions of the Polish and Lithuanian churches of the following century." Of the Bohemian Confessions here referred to, the second contains not one word respecting ordination; and the first has only the following sentence: "*Praeterea vitae consuetudinem honestam, atque ut hi probentur prius, tum denuum a senioribus facta precatione, per manuum impositionem ad hoc munus in caetu confirmentur.*" There is nothing to inform us who the *seniores* were, except that throughout the article in which this occurs, entitled, *De ordine ecclesiastico, seu praefectis vel ministris ecclesiae*, there is not one word said of any other class of rulers or ministers of the church than those whose duty it was to preach the word and administer the sacraments; and the conclusion hence is irresistible, that they were the *seniores*, who were to offer up prayer and impose hands, in setting others apart to the same office.

No other confession is specially designated as lending aid to the new theory; but we find, in the October number of the Spirit of the Nineteenth Century, that Dr. Breckinridge has pressed the Belgic confession into his service. He says, "In Art. XXXI, *De Vocatione Ministrorum Ecclesiae*, of the last-named confession, it is explicitly declared that the work of holy ordination, as to manner and form, is prescribed in God's word, and appertains '*verbi ministris et senioribus ecclesiae,*' and that by it ministers, elders and deacons ought to be, '*confirmari in muneribus suis per impositionem manuum.*'" There is nothing in his article, or in the whole confession, which bears the re-

most resemblance to the affirmation which Dr. Breckinridge has extracted from it. The first sentence is as follows. *Credimus Ministros, Seniores, et Diaconos debere ad functiones illas suas vocari et promoveri legitima ecclesiae vocatione, adhibita ad eam seria Dei invocatione, atque adhibitis ecclesiae suffragiis, ac postea confirmari in muneribus suis per impositionem manuum. eo ordine et modo, qui nobis in Verbo Dei prescribitur.* The only other sentence in which the word *seniores* occurs, is that from which Dr. Breckinridge has excerpted the phrase, *verbi ministris et senioribus ecclesiae.* *Porro ne sancta haec Dei ordinatio, aut violetur aut abeat in contemptum, debent omnes de verbi ministris et senioribus ecclesiae propter opus cui incumbunt, honorifice sentire: That this holy ordination of God may not be undervalued or contemned, all men ought to esteem highly the ministers of the word and the elders of the church, on account of the work to which they apply themselves.* By what curious process this has been transformed into an explicit declaration, that ordination appertains to the ministers of the word and the elders or the church, we leave the reader to surmise. After this exposition of the manner in which Dr. Breckinridge has dealt with the historical documents which he has undertaken to expound, we need not fear to leave his assertion, that he could easily sustain his position from certain other Polish and Lithuanian confessions, to be rated at its just weight.

The attempt to extract aught from history in favour of the innovation urged upon us, is a signal failure. It remains a fact, to which nothing contrary has been shown, that through all time, in all countries, and by all Christian churches, the ordination of ministers has ever been ratified and attested by the imposition of the hands of ministers. The Presbyterian churches of England and Scotland, from whose formularies ours have been compiled, practised no other mode of ordination. Our fathers, who drew up our constitution, knew of no other; and the constitution itself, according to the only consistent interpretation which can be given to its language, admits of no other.

In maintaining what has always been believed to be the doctrine of our standards, we have not felt it necessary to interpolate any professions of our sense of the importance of the office of ruling elder, or of high regard for the intelligence and worth of the present incumbents of this

office in our church. We feel that we shall best manifest our true respect for the heads and hearts of the body of our elders by believing them to be inaccessible to the arguments and motives addressed to them, by some of those who claim to be their peculiar friends.

We have but little to say in reply to Dr. Breckinridge's argument in opposition to the decision of the last Assembly respecting the constitutional quorum of a Presbytery.* The constitution of the church declares, that "Any three ministers, and as many elders as may be present belonging to the Presbytery, being met at the time and place appointed, shall be a quorum competent to proceed to business." The decision of the last Assembly was, "That any three ministers of a Presbytery, being regularly convened, are a quorum competent to the transaction of all business;" and it is alleged that this decision is in direct conflict with the constitutional provision.

It is argued, in the first place, that the language of the book implies that at least one ruling elder must be present to constitute a quorum; since as "many elders as may be present" can never be construed to mean no elders. But the advantage of the argument from the apparent meaning of the terms in which the rule is expressed, is clearly in favour of the construction given by the last Assembly. "As many elders as may be present belonging to the Presbytery," is a contingent expression, which leaves the number of elders unlimited in either direction, except by their right to sit in that body. All belonging to it may be present, which is the limit, in one direction; and none may be present, which is the limit, in the other direction; and in either case, if three ministers are present, there is a quorum of the body. The quorum shall not be hindered by the voluntary absence of all the elders in the one case; nor by their outnumbering the ministers in the other. This is the apparent intent of the rule; it is the natural, unforced meaning of its terms. In defining the quorum, it makes it to consist of two parts, one constant and the other variable; and the variable element may evidently vary from nothing to the entire number, who may lawfully be present. This is to us, the obvious construction of the rule;

* This question has been so largely discussed through the press, that it is the less necessary to enter into at length. Dr. Maclean, in a number of essays in the *Presbyterian*, has examined in detail, and refuted every position taken by Dr. Breckinridge.

and we are confirmed in it, because with this construction we can see a reason why the language used was selected, but none at all, if it was intended to express, that at least, one elder must be present. The language, as it now stands, leaves the number of elders to vary from zero upwards; if it had been intended to fix unity as the lower limit, it would have been altogether easy and natural to have expressed this intent. The rule could have been stated so as to express this with absolute precision, in as few or fewer terms than it now contains. That the purpose of the rule was as construed by the Assembly is further apparent from the practice under it. Abundant evidence, such as cannot be called into dispute, has been furnished from the records of our Presbyteries, that meetings have been held and business transacted, without the presence of any ruling elder. But few such meetings can occur now in our old Presbyteries. The facilities for attendance upon their meetings are such that in all ordinary cases one or more ruling elders will be present. The practical interests involved in the settlement of this question, which are magnified by Dr. Breckinridge into the wide difference "between an aristocratical hierarchy and a free Christian commonwealth," are literally nothing at all; except that for our frontier settlements, and for missionaries in foreign lands, the received construction of the rule might often be convenient and sometimes necessary, to enable them to obtain a meeting of the Presbytery. If a change in the rule were sought, in the mode prescribed by the constitution, except for the cases named, we do not suppose that much, if any, practical inconvenience would result from making it. But if the change is demanded on such grounds as are urged in opposition to the Assembly's decision, and if made, is to be considered as sanctioning the principles contended for, then the question before us is nothing less than a radical revolution in our whole system. The free Christian commonwealth of Dr. Breckinridge is nothing else than parochial presbyterianism—the governor or ruling elder of the church being the chief officer, the only one requiring ordination, who may also be designated and employed as a teacher, if in addition to his gifts for ruling, he be judged to possess also the gift of teaching,—and the bench of ruling elders of each particular church being fully empowered to license, ordain, and transact all other business that a Presbytery may lawfully do. This is a distinct and intelligible system. It is that to which

all the distinctive principles advocated by Dr. Breckinridge plainly lead. But it is not our system; and the church, we trust, will pause and deliberate long before she will be ready to adopt it.

The necessary presence of ruling elders to constitute a quorum is argued, in the second place, from the definition of a Presbytery, which makes it to consist both of ministers and ruling elders. Ruling elders are, therefore, held an essential element, not only of a Presbytery, but of a legal quorum of Presbytery. The only force of the reasoning under this head, resides in the confusion of these two perfectly distinct things. If a meeting of Presbytery could be held under the compulsory exclusion of ruling elders commissioned to attend, if the received construction of the rule involved this, there could be no doubt that it would be in conflict with the principles of our constitution. And it will be found that every plausible argument upon the other side, and all the fanfaronade about hierarchy, and freedom, and priestly usurpation, are founded upon the quiet assumption that such is the effect of the interpretation given to this rule. Ruling elders, if there be any within the district covered by the Presbytery, constitute a portion of that body, and no lawful meeting can be held, no business of whatever kind transacted, without an opportunity afforded, to all who may lawfully partake in its deliberations and acts, to be present and assist; but if they choose voluntarily to absent themselves, then, that the business of the church may not suffer through their absence, it is provided that the ministers who may be assembled may proceed to business without them. It will be perceived at once that there is here no restraint imposed, no subjection established, and, of course, no power bestowed. Ruling elders, one from each congregation, have a right to be present at every meeting of the presbytery. That right is left untouched. And this is a hierarchy! These are slight materials out of which to compose the horrid picture of the church, subjected to the rule of "three ministers without charge, who, it may be, have forsaken their covenanted calling."

If it could be shown that there was anything in our book, in the nature of the case, or in reason, requiring that the quorum of a body, which, when fully formed, was composed of different classes, must of necessity embrace some members of all those classes, the question would be decided that our rule ought to have been made to mean what Dr.

Breckinridge maintains that it does mean. But this has not been shown. On the contrary, our book, in providing for the action of a church session when no minister may be present, and for a quorum of the General Assembly when no ruling elders may be present, distinctly sanctions the principle, that a quorum of a body composed of two classes may be formed entirely of one of those classes. The expediency of the case furnishes no argument against our interpretation, inasmuch as there never have been any diverse interests between the ministers and elders of our church, nor is it easy to conceive how any such can legitimately arise. They are not adverse parties, nor is there anything in the practical working of our system which could ever make them so. And if this were not so, if they were antagonistic parties, the quorum rule would still be harmless, as the elders would, in that case, take care to exercise the privilege which they possess of being always present, and thus prevent their priestly adversaries from taking advantage over them. It has also been shown, that in the common judgment of men, as manifested in the constitution and rules of other analogous bodies, it has never been deemed essential to the constitution of a quorum that it should embrace some of all the classes represented in the body; as in the English House of Lords, which can transact business in the absence of all the spiritual Lords.

In the last place, it is argued that the authority of precedent is opposed to the authorized interpretation of the quorum rule. Dr. Breckinridge quotes under this head the authority of Steuart of Pardovan, who declares that neither the constitution of the church nor the law of the land, "do authorize any other ecclesiastical judicatory but Assemblies, Synods, Presbyteries, and Kirk Sessions, or their committees, consisting of ministers and ruling elders." It will be seen at once that this does not touch the question in debate. This, and all the other authorities cited by Dr. Breckinridge refer only to the proper constitution of church courts, and we are all agreed that these must be composed of ministers and ruling elders. They affirm nothing respecting the formation of a quorum of these courts. This is apparent from the language itself; and it is placed beyond all doubt by the fact that Steuart himself quotes from the Directory, "That to perform any classical act of government or ordination, there must be present, at least, a major part of the ministers of the whole classis." So that the

quorum of a classis, or Presbytery of the Scottish church did not require the presence of any ruling elders. This fallacy of confounding the composition of a body with the quorum of that body, runs through the whole of Dr. Breckinridge's historical argument, and vitiates every one of his conclusions. A proper regard to this distinction rescues from him every instance which he has adduced, excepting that of the condemnation, by the General Assembly of 1638, of six preceding Assemblies. And every one acquainted with the rudiments of the ecclesiastical history of Scotland knows that the grounds of this condemnation were utterly wide of the question which we are discussing. It was not because there were no ruling elders present in those Assemblies that they were set aside, but because there were elders present and voting, who had no lawful commissions. This case is too irrelevant to waste words upon. If anything can be established by testimony, it is clear that the doctrine and practice of the Scottish church are in agreement with the decision of our last Assembly. In addition to other authorities which have been abundantly given to this effect, we refer to the correspondence of Robert Wodrow, the celebrated historian of the kirk, Vol. I. p. 181. In a letter, dated Nov. 29, 1710, we find the following passage. "*Thirdly*, The rule of the church, though elders have a share in it, is principally committed to pastors. The keys of the kingdom are given to them. They are such as rule over the people, and speak the word, Heb. xiii. 7, and watch for souls as they that must give account, ver. 17; none of which places to me have any relation to the ruling elder; *and therefore they can act in absence or under the want of elders*, though I cannot see how elders can act without pastors."

We have thus in favour of the Assembly's decision, the obvious meaning of the language of the rule; the sanction by our book, of the principle involved, by its provision for the action of a church session, and of the General Assembly, in the entire absence of one of the classes that compose these courts; the practice of our own church in times past; the concurrent practice of the Scottish church; and the analogies of other bodies constituted in like manner. We have opposed to it, certain abstract notions about the rights of ruling elders, which, if fairly carried out, are destructive of our whole system; and certain exaggerated fears about the establishment of a hierarchy, by means of a harmless rule

of convenience, which, restraining no right, confers no power.

We cannot doubt that the next Assembly will, if need be, affirm the decisions of the last. There are some things which the church ought to be presumed to know, and among these surely should be numbered her first principles of truth and order.

ART. VI.—*Unlawful Marriage: An answer to "The Puritan" and "Omicron," who have advocated in a Pamphlet, the Lawfulness of the Marriage of a man with his deceased wife's sister.* By J. J. Janeway, D. D. New York: Robert Carter. 1844. pp. 215.

This is a laborious and extended examination of the subject of which it treats; and is, we think, a very successful answer to the extreme and dangerous doctrines advanced by the writer in the *New England Puritan*. Dr. Janeway has convicted that writer of many errors both in quotation and argument, and has overthrown the principles on which his whole reasoning is founded. As this subject is still agitating the church, and as the tendency to unsettle long established laws and usages, relating to marriage, is clearly and fearfully on the increase in our country, and is especially manifested by some recent decisions of the civil courts, Dr. Janeway has rendered an important service by proving as we think he has done, that the law contained in *Lev. xviii.* relates to marriage, and is binding on us as the law of God.

The Christian contemplated, in a course of Lectures delivered in Argyle Chapel, Bath. By William Jay. New York: Robert Carter, 58 Canal-street. Pittsburgh: Thomas Carter. 1844.

Jay's Morning and Evening Exercises have become so generally household books in Christian families, that all our readers are probably familiar with his peculiarly felicitous style of presenting religious truth. It is clear, simple, pointed and forcible; but its greatest excellence is the appropriate and beautiful illustrations from the scriptures, with which his works everywhere abound. If any of our readers should happen not to have seen the lectures before us, they

will be able to form some conception of their plan and value, from the following schedule of the author's design, taken from the introduction to his first lecture : " It is to hold up the CHRISTIAN to your view, in some very important and comprehensive conditions and relations. To this design we dedicate twelve lectures. The first will lead you to contemplate the Christian in CHRIST. The second in the CLOSET. The third in the FAMILY. The fourth in the CHURCH. The fifth in the WORLD. The sixth in PROSPERITY. The seventh in ADVERSITY. The eighth in his SPIRITUAL SORROWS. The ninth in his SPIRITUAL JOYS. The tenth in DEATH. The eleventh in the GRAVE. The twelfth in GLORY." We need hardly say, that the spirit of the Book is richly evangelical. In mechanical execution, this volume is uniform with Mr. Carter's series of 18mo. books, and is in all respects commendable.

Droppings from the Heart : or, Occasional Poems. By Thomas Mackellar. Philadelphia : Sorin & Ball, 311 Market street. 1844. 18mo. pp. 144.

Many of the fugitive pieces in this volume have a sacred character ; some of them breathe a spirit of peculiar devotion ; and they all have a moral bearing. The style and versification are good, in some instances eminently so. But that which should give a special attraction to the work, is that it is the production of a working-printer in Philadelphia, and, if we are rightly informed, of a journeyman.

Sermons and Discourses. By Thomas Chalmers, D. D. LL. D., Professor of Theology of the Free Church of Scotland. First complete American edition, from the late Glasgow stereotype edition, revised and corrected by the author. In two volumes. New York : Robert Carter, 58 Canal-street. Pittsburgh : Thomas Carter. 1844.

These volumes complete Mr. Carter's reprint of the Glasgow edition of Dr. Chalmers's Theological works. They are uniform with his reprint of the Lectures on the Romans, in compact double columns, but in good sized and clear type, on good paper, and at a price, which a few years ago, would have been deemed incredibly low. Some idea may be formed of the mass of matter comprised in these volumes from the fact that they contain ninety-seven sermons including the Commercial and Astronomical Discourses, fifteen in number, be-

sides several addresses. We have already more than once had the opportunity of expressing, somewhat at large, our sense of the value of Dr. Chalmers' Theological works. To enumerate the mere topics embraced in the volumes before us would require more time than is allowed by the lateness of the hour at which they have been received; to characterize them farther would be unnecessary. Every page shows the well-known features of that great mind whose impress our race is destined to feel for ages to come.

Essays on Episcopacy, and the Apology for Apostolic order and its Advocates, reviewed by the late John M. Mason, D. D. Edited by the Rev. Ebenezer Mason. New York: Robert Carter. 1844. pp. 800. Price 50 cents.

The revival and progress of High-churchism has rendered the press prolific in works having reference to the original organization of the church. Bishop Ives having republished Bishop Hobart's "Apology for Apostolic order;" Mr. Mason felt called upon to republish the review of that apology and the contemporary essays by his distinguished father. If the one party is willing to rest the case on Bishop Hobart's Apology, the other, we presume, will be quite as ready to rest it on Dr. Mason's rejoinder.

The Institutes of English Grammar, methodically arranged; with examples for Parsing, Questions for Examination, False Syntax for Correction, Exercises for Writing, Observations for the advanced Student, and a Key to the Oral Exercises. To which are added Four Appendixes; &c. By Gould Brown, Principal of an English and Classical Academy, New York. New York: Samuel S. & William Wood. 12mo. pp. 311.

This is evidently the production of one who has made the structure of our language a special object of investigation. In examples and exercises it is remarkably full. In opposing innovations in our language, and giving due weight to established usage, the author has our hearty concurrence. Considered as a manual for youth, it is greatly marred by the querulous and acrimonious terms in which rival grammarians are censured. For example: Murray, Pierce, Flint, Lyon, Bacon, Russel, Fisk, Maltby, Alger,

Miller, Merchant, Kirkham, and other idle coypists :” p. 197. We find much to applaud in this work, and should probably find still more, if we had time to examine it in detail.

The Life and Character of John Calvin, the Reformer, reviewed and defended. By the Rev. Thomas Smyth, D. D. Philadelphia: Board of Publication. 1844. 18mo. pp. 120.

So prolific is the pen of Dr. Smyth, so extensive is his research, and so ardent is his zeal for his church, that a critic might be well employed in keeping pace with his productions. The contents of this little volume were originally pronounced as a public discourse. The limits of the work forbid us to consider it as a full biography: it is however interesting and valuable, and contains an able vindication of the Reformer, in several points which are usually attacked by adversaries.

The Complete Works of Rev. Daniel A. Clark, with a Biographical Sketch, and an Estimate of his powers as a Preacher. By Rev. George Shepard, A. M. Professor of Sacred Rhetoric, Bangor Theological Seminary. In two volumes. New York: Jonathan Leavitt. 1842. Svo. pp. 480, 440.

The late Mr. Clark was a native of this State, and an alumnus of our College. In looking over these volumes, we see reason enough why he should have been an acceptable and impressive preacher. And though we smile, when his biographer seems to prefer him to Samuel Davies, we can still acknowledge him to have been an eloquent divine. He belongs to a school of sermonizers, which prevails widely in America, but which we do not consider the best. We should not go to his works for great exposition of scripture passages, nor for argumentative establishment of doctrine in its theological connections. His method is not the expository, nor the textual, but the topical. A series of observations on the text, is followed by a series of practical remarks. In carrying out this method, the author is always able and sometimes truly great. The grand characteristics are perspicuity, vivacity, strength and pungency. The diction is nervous, and at the same time highly coloured with metaphor. Some of these discourses have acquired deserved celebrity. As a body of scriptural truth, we think them defective as to the space given to plain and attractive

exhibitions of the righteousness of Christ, of the free offer of complete redemption, and in general of God as the justifier of the ungodly. And we agree with his biographer, that Mr. Clark's exhibition of the divine character, at times, was not sufficiently mitigated. These discourses are awakening, alarming, humbling, and convincing, and furnish admirable specimens in this kind of preaching. The justice of God and the obligation of the sinner, are mightily and fearfully set forth. In this respect, these volumes may properly be placed by the side of Dr. Griffin's, which they resemble in some of the brightest qualities of both.

1. *The Contrast : or the Bible and Abolitionism : an Exegetical Argument.* By Rev. William Graham, Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Oxford, Ohio. 1844.
2. *The integrity of our National Union, vs. Abolitionism : An Argument from the Bible, in proof of the position, That believing Masters ought to be honoured and obeyed by their own Servants, and tolerated in, not excommunicated from, the Church of God : being part of a speech delivered before the Synod of Cincinnati, on the subject of Slavery, September 19th and 20th, 1843.* By Rev. George Junkin, D. D., President of Miami University, Cincinnati, 1843. pp. 79.

These two pamphlets, refuting the unscriptural arguments of the Abolitionists, derive a singular interest from their origin. The substance of both was pronounced in ecclesiastical bodies, to wit, the Old School and New School synods of Cincinnati; both were produced in a state which is exempt from the ills of slavery; and both were written by men who are natives of free states. We will add, that both are in a high degree interesting and cogent. Mr. Graham's examination of the scriptural passages touching slavery is cool, patient, and clear from all extraneous matter. His argument is so purely a reiteration of undeniable scripture statement, that we hold it to be unanswerable. Dr. Junkin's discourse takes a wider range, and, as founded on the same plain scriptures, is in like manner a triumphant vindication of Christian rights, in this matter. Much of the fanaticism of our age is manifested in seeking to be holier than the law of God: hence the remarkable concurrence in argument and spirit, of the extreme polemics, on Oaths, on Total Abstinence, on War and Peace, and on

Slavery. If slavery is ever to be abolished, it must be by means less desperate, than the attempt to prove that it was condemned by the inspired writers. And men of the world will always find it more easy to reject the Bible, than to take a position which upturns all rules of language and falsifies all history.

Scripture Narratives, illustrated and improved. By the Rev. Joseph Belcher, D. D. From the Second London Edition. New York: Robert Carter. 1844. 12mo. pp. 284.

A series of short essays upon more than twenty scripture narratives. This will be a welcome book to many who have not time for long treatises. It will make the Bible more precious to the reader, in its historical parts. The pious reflections are just such as we should desire; and while there are no very prominent or very brilliant points, and while a general air of repose prevails throughout the work, it is no small merit to have avoided the paraphrastical weakness and the meretricious amplification of many who have made similar attempts.

The Practical Spelling-Book, with Reading Lessons. By T. H. Gallaudet and Horace Hooker. Hartford: Belknap & Hammersley. pp. 166.

We consider this a very cheap and truly excellent spelling-book. Having used it occasionally for several years, we are prepared to commend the plan of the work, as better than that of several other popular manuals. The orthography of some words, and the pronunciation of still more, we think erroneous. Where two ways of pronouncing a word are given by the authors, one of them is commonly a vulgar provincialism. See, for example, the words None, Patriot, Beard, Creek, Antipodes, Horizon, Worsted, Pustule.

The Grace and Duty of being Spiritually Minded, declared and practically improved. By John Owen, D. D. sometime Vice Chancellor of the University of Oxford. Carefully revised from the author's edition. New York: Robert Carter. 1844. 12mo. pp. 385.

If, by chance, we should have a single reader who is ignorant that John Owen is not second to the greatest of Calvinistic writers on theology, or that this is one of the most

valuable of his experimental works, we have only to request him to make trial for himself by actual perusal. Ministers of the gospel and theological students are too ready to take it for granted that they already know all that is in such books : of this presumption we think we descry the ill effects in the meagerness of experimental preaching. It was a good rule of Doddridge, which he practised on and gave to his pupils, to read a little of some practical treatise every day. These are works which should be often perused : once a year, would not be too much for the present volume. Clergymen, who desire the spiritual proficiency of their people, would do well to keep a few copies always in circulation.

Sixteen Lectures on the Causes, Principles, and Results of the British Reformation. By John Henry Hopkins, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Vermont. Philadelphia : James M. Campbell & Co. Saxton & Miles : New York. 1844. pp. 387.

We learn from the preface to this work, that Bishop Hopkins intended to deliver these lectures in Philadelphia, but was prevented by the interference of Bishop Underdonk. This "singular act" on the part of his colleague led Bishop Hopkins to commit his lectures to the press. Instead of being heard by hundreds, they are now likely to be read by thousands. The title of the work led us to form expectations of its character which have not been realized. It is really an extended review of Dr. Wiseman's Lectures on the Reformation ; taking up the several prominent topics of the Romish controversy, such as the Rule of Faith, Infallibility of the Church, Invocation of Saints, Worship of Images, Transubstantiation, &c. It has long been the policy of Romanists to conceal the hideous features of their system, by placing a mask over them as nearly resembling the gospel as possible. No one has exhibited greater art in this way than Dr. Wiseman ; Dr. Hopkins's object is to remove the mask and to present Romanism in its true character. This he does very successfully ; and as we know that the Lectures of the Pope's Vicar apostolic, have deluded many into thinking that Romanism has been much misrepresented by Protestants, we think the work before us, will be highly serviceable in correcting that serious mistake. There are many things in these lectures to which we should demur, but as a protest against Popery we rejoice in their publication.

The Evidence of the Genuineness of the Gospel. By Andrews Norton. Vols. II. and III. Svo. Cambridge. 1844.

As we hope to be able to give, at an early date, a more extended notice of this work, we shall content ourselves, at present, with saying, that as to beauty and correctness of printing, it is rather European than American; and as a work of original research in the departments of patristic literature and the critical history of the ancient philosophy, it may rank with any work which this country has produced. We have seldom seen in so elaborate a composition, less appearance of second-hand learning or mere compilation.

Appeal from Tradition to Scripture and Common Sense; or, an Answer to the Question, what constitutes the Divine Rule of Faith and Practice. By George Peck, D. D. New York: published by G. Lane & P. P. Sandford, for the Methodist Episcopal Church. 1844. pp. 472.

Had we not so recently devoted a large portion of our pages to the discussion of the Rule of Faith, we should not feel at liberty to dismiss this valuable and seasonable work with a few lines of commendation. It is with peculiar pleasure, we hail the appearance of every new indication that our Methodist brethren are disposed to make common cause with other Protestants, in resisting the Romanizing spirit of the age. Dr. Peck has gone laboriously over the whole ground of controversy as to the primary point which he undertook to discuss; and has wisely fortified his positions by abundant citations from the genuine Protestant writers of the English Church. We consider his book a valuable and highly creditable contribution to the theological literature of the country.

The Warrant, Nature and Duties of the office of Ruling Elder in the Presbyterian Church: A Sermon preached in Philadelphia, May 22, 1843, with an Appendix. By Samuel Miller, D. D. Philadelphia: William S. Martien. 1844. pp. 166.

We notice this valuable discourse principally to call attention to the singularly well-digested and conclusive argument contained in the appendix against the novel doctrine that ruling elders should impose hands in the ordination of

ministers. We have heretofore expressed the opinion that if this matter is considered as a ceremony, or as a mode by which the elders testify their assent to the ordination of the pastor, it is a trifle not worth contending about; but if it is urged on the ground that it is an official right of the elder, then it subverts the office. Nothing is plainer from the word of God, and the practice of God's people in all ages of the church, except among the Brownists, that ordination to the ministry is the official duty of those in the ministry. To assert that any set of men have the right, in the ordinary settled state of the church, to ordain, is to assert that they are ministers; just as to say they have a right to administer the sacraments, is to say they have a right to preach. This is the only serious aspect of this controversy. There is no scriptural or logical ground, on which any man can maintain the right of the elders to ordain and yet deny them the right to preach and administer the sacraments. To press the principle which is now advocated among us, must therefore, issue either in subverting the office of ruling elder, or in bringing down the qualifications of the ministry to the standard of theological education, insisted on in the case of the ruling elder. We should think that the single fact that no instance from the time of the apostles until the present controversy, of elders not preachers joining in the ordination of pastors, in any Presbyterian church, either has been or can be produced, is enough to convince any man that the doctrine is antipresbyterial.

Natural Theology. By Thomas Chalmers, D. D., LL. D.
New York: Robert Carter. 1844.

The fact that this work has been introduced as a text book into the University of New York, and several other similar institutions, has induced Mr. Carter to publish this edition at the exceedingly low price of fifty cents a volume.

Prelacy and Parity, discussed in several Lectures; comprising a review of the Rev. Lloyd Windsor's Argument on the Ministerial Commission. By Rev. William Wisner. New York: Leavitt, Trow & Co. 1844. pp. 180.

Here is another defensive publication, emanating from the extreme west of the State of New York, showing how

extensively the church is agitated by the assertion of exclusive claims. Mr. Wisner says: "There are times when men are unavoidably placed on the defensive; when to keep silence would be weak not only, but culpable in the extreme." Such a crisis, he thinks, has been brought about by the open, constant, and pernicious advocacy of the "exclusive right" system. In this we agree with him. With Episcopalians, as such, we have no more controversy than we have with the Episcopal Methodists. Who ever heard of a book written against the bishops in the Methodist church? yet their bishops are as apostolical as any class of prelates. It is not Episcopacy, as a mere form of government, it is the assumption that Episcopacy is essential to the existence of the church; it is the union of the two doctrines, that there is no church without a bishop, and no salvation out of the church, which has called forth this widespread protest. Mr. Wisner's book appears to give a condensed view of the arguments on the points which come under review, and it has the great advantage of being suited to the present form of the controversy.

A Sermon on the Apostolical Succession. By James Purviance, a Minister of the Gospel. New Orleans: 1843. pp. 28.

Here is another voice from the extreme south-west. It would seem that the poor Presbyterians have to contend for their spiritual existence, from the shores of lake Ontario, to the gulf of Mexico. The sermon of Mr. Purviance has the benefit of the judgment of his presbytery as "lucid and unanswerable;" and he tells us that it is published in the hope of checking an absurd and dangerous error, but lately attempted to be palmed on the south-western churches. To show what that error is, he gives a short quotation from "A Doctrinal Catechism of the Church of England," published in London. In that Catechism we have, among others, the following questions and answers:

"Q. Are not dissenting teachers ministers of the gospel?"

"A. No—they have never been called after the manner of Aaron.

"Q. Is it not very wicked to assume the sacred office?"

"A. It is, as is evident from the case of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, mentioned in the 16th chapter of Numbers.

"Q. Who appointed dissenting teachers?"

"A. They either wickedly appointed each other, or are

not appointed at all—and so in either case, their assuming the office is very wicked.

“ Q. But are not dissenting teachers thought to be very good men ?

“ A. They are often thought to be such, and so were Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, till God shewed them to be very wicked.

“ Q. But may we not hear them preach ?

“ A. No, for God says, ‘ Depart from the tents of these wicked men.’ ”

This is plain, and it is consistent. According to the theory of the Romish church, there should be no piety in the Church of England ; and according to the theory of High-churchism, there should be no piety out of episcopal churches. That the facts do not accord with the theory, is simply because the theory is false.

The World Revolutionized by the true Religion and its Ministry. An Ordination Sermon. By John Niel McLeod, D. D. Philadelphia : 1843.

The two topics discussed in this sermon, are the revolution which Christianity is effecting in the world ; and the agency which it employs. Under the latter head, the ministry comes under consideration. Dr. McLeod argues to prove that God has appointed the ministry, which is not a creature even of the saints of God, but an institution of Christ, and that the ministers derive their power from Jesus Christ, and are his representatives to saints and sinners. Thus far, we suppose all Presbyterians, and even most Independents, would agree with him. The latter class of Christians, when they teach that the people have a right to judge of the qualifications of a candidate to the sacred office, and to invest him with the ministerial functions, no more necessarily teach that the minister derives his authority from the people, or is their representative, than Dr. McLeod teaches that he derives his authority from the presbytery and is the representative of the presbytery, because the presbytery claim the right of ordination. The question is not about the source of the power, but who are the constituted judges of the qualifications of the candidate, and who have the right to designate him as one of those who may execute the functions of an office instituted by Christ, and all whose powers are derived from Him. We suspect that all presbyterians would join our author in rejecting “ that scheme of

half-way presbytery which derives the office of the ministry from the body of the Christian people, and makes the minister of Christ the people's delegate and agent." On the other hand, we think he goes to the opposite extreme, when he teaches that Christ made a deposit of power, ecclesiastical and spiritual, in the hands of the primitive ministry, who ordained their successors in unbroken succession to the present time. "The chain of the succession may indeed," he says, "be buried and hidden in many of its links, but none can demonstrate that it has ever been broken and destroyed." The claim of this ministerial succession he rests not on any historical documents, but upon the promise of Christ appended to the ministerial commission. This is one form of the doctrine of apostolic succession applied to presbyters instead of prelates. If any one is satisfied with the argument, we have no objections. It is a hundred-fold better than the doctrine of an uninterrupted succession of prelates, for during the first two centuries no Diogenes has ever yet found a prelate. It is also as an argument of retort, unanswerable. But we do not believe that Christ's promise was intended to secure any such succession; nor that its actual occurrence can from any source be proved; nor that it would be of the least value if proved. We think Dr. McLeod's error lies in placing the authority to call the ministry exclusively in the ministry itself. It is primarily, according to the common doctrine of Protestants, in the whole church; to be exercised as all other executive functions, in all ordinary circumstances, by the appropriate officers in the church. Though the whole church is the depository of this power, it can be regularly exercised, under ordinary circumstances, only by the ministers, and they can exercise it at their own discretion. But on the assumption that there are no such officers, as in the case of the deserters on Pitcairn's island, and in many other cases actual and possible, then the power belongs in all its vigour to the people; and they can originate as valid a ministry as ever was made by presbytery or prelate. We admit that the proper and appointed organs for exercising the right of ordaining, is the ministry; and that there is a necessity of order, that this method should be adhered to. But to convert a necessity of order into a necessity of means; to make adherence to a rule intended for general observance, an essential condition of valid ordinances or the divine blessing, is to trammel the grace of God in a way for which we have

no authority. It is just the mistake which the ritualists make about the necessity of the sacraments. They are necessary as matters of precept; but not necessary as essential means. So also ministerial ordination is necessary, as a matter of order and precept; but not necessary as a *sine qua non* to valid ordination. Such was the doctrine of the Reformers on this subject, and if we secede from it, we shall soon get into the quagmire of semi-popery. This, at least, is our view of the matter; but if any one thinks a stricter doctrine is more scriptural or more comfortable, we shall not protest. There are three distinct grounds on which the validity of the ministerial call of the Reformers, and of their successors, can be vindicated. The one is that of their ordination in the Romish church; the second, that of the inherent right of the church to call men to the ministry, whenever the necessity for so doing occurs; the third is the extraordinary call of God. The Reformers were content with the two latter; the theologians of the following century began to bring in the first; which, it would seem, Dr. McLeod also prefers. We think any one of them is good; and altogether they make the best and clearest ministerial call, that any set of men has had, since the days of the apostles.

History of the Church of Scotland. From the Introduction of Christianity to the Disruption in 1843. By W. M. Hetherington, A. M. First American, from the third Edinburgh Edition. New York: Robert Carter. 1844. 8vo. pp. 500.

This work is compactly printed in double columns, and therefore contains a great quantity of matter. It relates to a church, which in some respects is the most interesting of the churches of the Reformation. It exhibits the effects of the truth on national and individual character, more clearly than the history of any other church. It presents especially the power of that system of doctrine and order embodied in the standards of the Presbyterian, in a way that cannot fail to win admiration. It presents the treachery, cruelty, and wickedness of the attempts to force prelacy on a people determined to serve God rather than man, in a way far more effective as a refutation of the divine claims of episcopacy, than any elaborate argument. The publication of such a work at the present time is peculiarly seasonable. The recent revival of the ancient spirit of the

church of Scotland, and the renewal of the assertion of her distinguishing principles, have attracted general attention to her history, and will we hope create an extensive demand for the work before us.

A Discourse of the Baconian Philosophy. By Samuel Tyler, of the Maryland Bar. Frederick City, Md. 1844. pp. 178.

This work is an exhibition and vindication of Bacon's system, written with singular power of analysis and perspicuity of statement. It is a masterly production, and we confidently recommend it to all, who feel any interest in the methods or results of philosophical investigation.

The Position of the Evangelical Party in the Episcopal Church. By Albert Barnes. Philadelphia: Perkins & Purves. 1844. 12mo. pp. 70.

The unusual attention excited by this tract, we attribute to its subject, and to the calmness and ability with which it is written. Though it contains some important truths, which it would be well for our Episcopal brethren to lay to heart, we cannot approve of its general character and tendency, and greatly regret its publication. Our reasons for thus thinking and feeling are briefly these. In the first place, Mr. Barnes admits that the evangelical party in the Episcopal Church, are orthodox and devoted Christians. If this is so, then it is the duty of all other Christians, as far as possible, to take their part; to aid them in their conflicts against error; and instead of aggravating whatever difficulties may belong to their position, to do all they can to relieve them. The whole tendency of Mr. Barnes's book is to throw the influence of other denominations against the interests of true religion in the Episcopal Church, and in favour of false religion.

In the second place, the assumption on which the whole book is founded, we believe to be erroneous, and because erroneous, in a high degree unjust and injurious. That assumption is that Puseyism is the true doctrine of the Episcopal Church, and consequently that the evangelical party are in conflict with their own doctrinal standards. The justification of the book rests upon the correctness of this assumption. That it is erroneous, we think perfectly plain for the following reasons. 1. Every church has a right to demand that her doctrines shall be learnt from her

Confession of Faith. The thirty-nine articles are the confession of the Church of England. They so profess to be; they were set forth as such by authority; every clergyman is obliged to subscribe them in their obvious meaning; they are printed in the collections of confessions, as the faith of the Church of England, just as the Helvetic, the Augsburg, the Westminster confessions, are set forth as the exposition of the doctrines of the several churches by which they have been adopted. Mr. Barnes will not of course pretend that the Thirty-nine articles teach Tractarianism. Those articles, as far as they are doctrinal, agree with the standards of all other Reformed churches.

2. It is a notorious fact, admitted by Mr. Barnes, that the English Reformers were evangelical men; men in correspondence and communion with Luther, Melancthon, Calvin and all the leading Protestant divines of that age. But the doctrinal formularies of the Church of England were drawn up and sanctioned by those men. They were the authors of the Homilies, in which the doctrines of the articles were explained and enforced; and those Homilies are authoritatively recognised as a faithful exposition of the doctrines of the church. The early Puritans had no controversy with the church on doctrinal points. Under Elizabeth, Calvin's Institutes was the text book in Oxford. It was not until the close of her long reign that any open opposition to the doctrines of that work was attempted. In 1595, Barret, a fellow of Caius College, Cambridge, was obliged to make a public recantation of a sermon which he had preached against predestination and the perseverance of the saints. Archbishop Whitgift, the great persecutor of the Puritans, was the author of the Lambeth articles, which were signed also by the Archbishop of York, and which are so extreme in their orthodoxy that few Calvinists of the present day would like to be called upon to subscribe them. Every one knows that the English church sided with the synod of Dort against the Arminians, and that it was only through the influence of Laud and a few others, that Arminian views got influence at court, and then among the higher clergy. Those doctrines came from Holland into England. The people did not know what Arminianism was. Bishop of Morley, when asked what the Arminians held? significantly answered: They hold the best livings in England. Speaking in general terms, the church of England was as evangelical in doctrine as any of the Re-

formed churches, until towards the middle of the reign of James I. Laud is the true father of the Tractarian system in that church; and since his day, it has always had its advocates. But they never constituted the majority of the church; they never altered its standards, and have no right to assume to be the true representatives of its doctrines. They, and not the evangelical party, are the apostates; they are a faction, the others are the Church of England. Hallam says, the first trace of the doctrine of the necessity of Episcopacy, which is but a small part of the Tractarian system, is to be found towards the close of the reign of Elizabeth;* and Laud, when a young man was censured by the University of Oxford for teaching that doctrine. It is then a historical fact, that Puseyism is not the true doctrine of the Church of England.

3. This is still more apparent, if we ask what Puseyism is? It is doctrinal Romanism. On the rule of faith, on justification, sacramental grace, the real presence, the sacrificial character of the eucharist, prayers for the dead, reverence of the Virgin Mary, the Tractarian school substantially agree with Rome. But are not these the doctrines against which the Church of England protested, and against which her divines have been contending from the Reformation to the present day? Are we to believe that all the controversies between England and Rome, have been sham fights between friends; that the Jesuit Santa Clara, and Mr. Newman in Tract No. 90, are after all right in asserting that the thirty articles and decrees of Trent agree? It might as well be said that Luther was a Romanist. The whole ground work of Mr. Barnes's book is therefore a grievous error. Puseyism is not the true doctrine of the church of England; and to assert the contrary is to give the Tractarians a most unfair advantage, and to do a corresponding injustice to the evangelical party.

A third ground of objection to this book is that its main position is a sophism. Mr. Barnes lays it down as an incontrovertible truth, that evangelical religion never has, and never can co-exist with a religion of forms. It is evident, however, that he has not taken the trouble to analyse the meaning of his own words. If by a religion of forms, he means, a religion which consists in forms, then his proposition is an identical one; it merely asserts that true religion cannot ex-

* Constitutional History of England, vol. I. p. 540.

ist where there is no religion. But if a religion of forms is a religion whose public exercises are conducted according to a prescribed form, then the proposition is contrary to scripture, to reason, and to fact. Mr. Barnes admits that the Jewish religion was eminently a religion of forms; but God was the author of that system; must we then say that God instituted a mode of worship absolutely inconsistent with true religion? Such a position is clearly anti-scriptural. It is also unreasonable. If the prescribed form contains no erroneous doctrine, if it presents nothing but the pure truth of God, is that truth neutralized, is it invested with the power of destroying religion, because it is printed and read, instead of being spoken? If Mr. Barnes had contented himself with saying that forms of prayer which include false doctrine or omit the truth, tend to destroy religion, every body would agree with him. Or if he had said that it is inexpedient, in an enlightened age of the church, to tie down the ministers to one unvarying form of conducting the public worship, Presbyterians at least would not object. But to say that a form of prayer, merely as a form, however, evangelical it may be, is destructive of piety, is to assert that the gospel is not the gospel, if read instead of being spoken. It is well for the church of England, things being as they are, that she has her liturgy, which brings out so clearly the doctrines of depravity, atonement, justification, divine influence, and a future judgment. What would have become of those doctrines in the lips of worldly ministers; or how would Tractarians if untrammelled conduct her worship?

Facts also are against this favorite position of Mr. Barnes. The Lutheran church, and many of the Reformed churches, as well as the Church of England, have had and still have their forms of prayer. Religion has flourished and declined in all these churches, influenced in its rise and declension by a multitude of causes. The mode of arguing adopted in this tract never can lead to any just conclusion. It rests on the common fallacy of *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. If religion declines in a church which uses a form of prayer, one man says it is on account of that use; if it declines in a church which rejects all stated forms, another says, the want of such forms is the cause of the declension. Many Episcopalians say: Look to Germany, and you see how truth fails in churches without prelates. Must we be equally silly and say, Look to Italy and see how certainly

episcopacy destroys religion? Wherever the truth is preserved, there true religion will be found; and the means which best secure the preservation and exhibition of the truth, and the introduction of good men into the ministry, are the means which will best secure the permanency and spread of religion. And on the other hand, whatever facilitates the introduction of worldly men into the ministry, or favours the introduction of error, must tend to destroy religion in any church. In seeking therefore for the causes of the decline of piety in any community whether Episcopal or Presbyterian, it is not so much to forms of government or modes of worship, as to the causes which determine the character of the ministry, and which affect the doctrines which are taught, that we are to direct our attention.

The only other reason for the opinion of this book which we have expressed, which it is necessary to mention, is that it changes the whole ground of our controversy with the Episcopal church. Presbyterians have hitherto acted on the defensive. They have only resisted exclusive claims and unchurching doctrines. To those Episcopalians who say that they are the only people of God; that there is no church without a bishop; that the mercy of God is promised only to Episcopalians;—Presbyterians have raised the voice of remonstrance; they have shown that the scriptures teach no such doctrine, that so far from saying that prelacy is essential, the Bible says nothing about it; that it lays down in fact a different platform of government. This is the ground which Mr. Boardman assumed in his introductory lecture on the apostolic succession. We think this the true ground. We ought to acknowledge all who acknowledge Christ; and all who teach his truth we should consider our friends.

We have already said that this little work contains many important truths strongly put. It is true that there are some things in the prayer-book which favour the Tractarian system. This fact has been freely admitted by evangelical men in England, and is historically accounted for, in a manner perfectly consistent with the original protestant character of the English church. It has been admitted also in this country. An expurgated edition of the prayer-book was printed by order of the Episcopal convention, but not meeting the approbation of the ecclesiastical authorities in England, most of the alterations had, as we understand, to be removed, before those authorities would consent to con-

secrete bishops for the American branch of their church. This unfortunate leaven has been one of the principal causes of the present difficulties ; and its removal would be a great blessing.

It is also true, as Mr. Barnes says, that the evangelical party are very inconsistent or timid in their deportment and language respecting other denominations. They recognise them as Christians, but they seldom openly acknowledge them as churches, or their ministers as invested with the sacred office. In this respect there is a marked contrast between them and the evangelical party in England. We rarely take up an English evangelical publication, without meeting some open avowal of the validity of Presbyterian ordination, or some pointed rebuke of the unchristian denial of church fellowship with non-episcopal communions. We fear that few Episcopalians in this country would publicly endorse the main principles of Archbishop Whately's recent work ; or adopt as their own, the catholic sentiments of the Rev. Mr. Goode. This is certainly wrong. It is a violation of Christian duty, if they really believe that there can be a church and a ministry without prelates ; and if they do not so believe, the want of such faith argues a serious misapprehension of the true nature of the real kingdom of Christ. Though we think these charges are just ; yet as we do not think the main assumption of Mr. Barnes's book is correct, or his main arguments valid, we feel it to be a Christian duty for Presbyterians to say so. At any rate, we do not wish to be numbered among the abettors of Tractarianism as the true doctrine of the Episcopal church.

Religion in America ; or, an Account of the Origin, Progress, Relation to the State, and present Condition of the Evangelical Churches in the United States.
By Robert Baird. New York : Harper & Brothers.
1844. Svo. pp. 343.

This work was originally prepared for the benefit of Christians on the continent of Europe. An edition was printed in Scotland ; and the author having revised his labours, has consented to its publication in this country. It goes over the whole ground which it professes to cover ; and gives a surprising amount of information collected from diverse and scattered sources. It is printed in double columns and is sold at the merely nominal price of fifty cents. The work has come into our hands at too late a period to

allow of doing more than glancing at its contents, which present a very copious array of attractive subjects.

The Unrivalled Glory of the Cross. A Sermon, delivered at the Dedication of the Church belonging to the Mount Vernon Congregational Society. By Edward N. Kirk. Boston, 1844. pp. 34.

We have looked with interest upon the measures which have been taken to secure the services of the Rev. Mr. Kirk, at Boston. The sermon before us was preached at the dedication of the Mount Vernon Church, of which he is the minister. The text is as appropriate a one as could have been selected: "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." And the discourse itself is an exhibition of the Cross, as the believer's cause of glorying. Remembering where it was preached, in the very midst of Socinians, we rejoice at the prominence which is given to the divinity of Christ; and at the distinctness with which it is affirmed, that 'the blood of Christ is substituted for our punishment.' We believe the doctrine of the proper vicarious propitiation, as understood by the Reformers and declared in the creeds of all Reformed churches, to be the only defensible position against Unitarianism. It is our earnest wish, that Mr. Kirk may be led to wage this warfare, on this ground; and that his eminently popular performances may, for many years to come, be employed for the building up of Christ's cause in Boston.

Plutarch on the Delay of the Deity in the Punishment of the Wicked. With notes; by H. B. Hackett, Professor of Biblical Literature in Newton Theological Institution. Andover. 1844. pp. 172.

Concerning this beautiful little volume, which we have just received, we can give only first impressions: these, however, are altogether favourable. Time was, even in our own recollection, when the Greek and Latin books put into our hands all bore the trans-atlantic imprint. In a second stage of classical development, we had American impressions, indeed, but only of the most common school-authors, and these on mean paper, with a signally repulsive letter, and teeming with errors. We rejoice to see the day, when works, out of the common range, are presented in critical editions, which display a slightly and even elegant page,

and the lights of auxiliary erudition. Professor Hackett's preface is both modest and graceful. He might have gone further than he has chosen to do, in commending classical studies to theological students, and in vindicating his selection of an author. Plutarch has been a favourite in all ages; and we have long held the opinion that the class of Greek writers to which he belongs is the very one from whose diction most aid is to be derived in the interpretation of the New Testament. It is moreover refreshing to take up a Greek writer, of whom the editor does not restrict himself to notes entirely critical. The observations annexed to the treatise, strike us as both learned and appropriate. A few typographical errors meet our eye, but these are not more numerous than are to be expected in first editions. And, in fine, there is everything about the book to induce the presumption, that a closer scrutiny would only draw from us a more particular commendation. In respect to the mode of referring to the text, in the notes, we take leave to say, it is awkward in the extreme.

A New and Complete French and English and English and French Dictionary, on the basis of the Royal Dictionary English and French and French and English, compiled from the Dictionaries of Johnson, Todd, Ash, Webster, and Crabbe, from the last edition of Chambers, Garner, and J. Descarrierès, the sixth edition of the Academy, the Supplement to the Academy, the Grammatical Dictionary of Laveaux, the Universal Lexicon of Boiste, and the standard technological works in either language, &c. &c. By Professor Fleming and Professor Tibbins, with complete Tables of the Verbs by Charles Picot, Esq. The whole prepared by J. Dobson, Member of the American Philosophical Society, &c. Philadelphia: Carey & Hart. 1844. Svo. pp. 1376.

The readers of French are much indebted to Mr. Dobson for this convenient, copious, and, so far as we have yet seen, accurate, complete, and satisfactory dictionary, the value of which ought not to be determined by the bad taste of the title page.

A Complete Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance to the Old Testament, comprising also a condensed Hebrew-English Lexicon, with an Introduction and Appendix.

By Dr. Isaac Nordheimer, Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of the city of New York; assisted by William Wadden Turner. First Part. New York and London. Wiley & Putnam. 4to. pp. 100.

We have already more than once invited the attention of our readers to this important undertaking, and are now induced to do so again, by information that the work, although suspended in consequence of the untimely death of its original projector, has not been abandoned either by the publisher or Mr. Turner, who is eminently qualified to continue and complete it, in a manner accordant with the views of Dr. Nordheimer. We do not think it necessary here to recapitulate the reasons for regarding such a work as an indispensable addition to our Hebrew apparatus, but shall content ourselves with stating that the further publication is dependent on the possibility of obtaining five hundred subscribers before a second part is issued. The failure of the enterprise, for want of this very moderate encouragement, would not only be a serious loss to biblical students, but a dishonour to the learning of the country.





