THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1847.

No. III.

ART. I.—1. *Collections of the New Jersey Historical Society*, Vol. I. (East Jersey under the Proprietary Governments. By William A. Whitehead.) pp. 351. 1846. Bartlett & Welford, New York.

2. *The Goodly Heritage of Jerseymen.* The first Annual Address before the New Jersey Historical Society. By the Rt. Rev. George W. Doane, D.D. LL.D. pp. 32. 1846.

3. *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society.* 1845—1846. pp. 204. Newark, 1847.

4. *Collections of the New Jersey Historical Society*, Vol. II. (The Life of William Alexander, Earl of Stirling, Major General in the Army of the United States, during the Revolution. By his Grandson, William Alexander Duer, LL.D.) pp. 292. 1847. Wiley & Putnam, New York.

SELDOM has an association of the kind advanced more rapidly in public estimation, or made its existence known in a more acceptable manner within the circle of its influence, than has the New Jersey Historical Society. Although but little more than two years has elapsed since its organization, the publications

enumerated above have appeared, giving evidence of activity and efficiency in its members, which promises well for the future usefulness of the Society. We may at some other time notice the previous volumes, but at present we propose confining ourselves to the last of the series—a welcome addition to the biographical literature of the country.

Although much has been written respecting the period in which our revolutionary drama was enacted, little is known, comparatively, of the lives of many of the most prominent actors. And yet how necessary is it that the character, habits, associations, aims and ends of individuals, should be known and understood, in order that the public events with which they were connected, may be properly appreciated? Especially important is it, when those events immediately precede and bring about such changes in empires, as that which ushered into existence our own confederacy.

Lord Stirling was for many years closely connected with the public affairs of New Jersey; but the people of the state have been in possession of little information respecting him; and his services rendered the country during the struggle for independence, have been very imperfectly commemorated. Mr. Duer has consequently conferred a favour not only upon his fellow citizens of New Jersey, but also upon the people of the whole Union, by preparing this biography of his ancestor. Having confined himself mainly to connecting the various letters and papers by a running narrative, and such explanatory notes as were thought necessary, but little opportunity was afforded for an exhibition of undue partiality. Disparaging circumstances may be less fully detailed, and some unfavourable features less freely canvassed than they might have been by one not so immediately connected with the subject of the biography; but this is not the case to an extent that impairs materially the value of the work, and so far as Lord Stirling is presented in the correspondence introduced, the deductions of the author appear to be well sustained, and his comments judicious. We must express our regret, however, that more time was not devoted to researches on some points in our colonial and revolutionary history, which, more fully illustrated, would assuredly have contributed to the interest of the work. For example: the details of the several engagements in which Lord Stirling acted a prominent part, are not

given with that precision which enables us clearly to estimate the importance of his movements; and very little information is afforded respecting them, that is not found in the general histories of the day. In the course of our examination, other instances will be noticed of what we must consider the remisness of the author in this respect,—less excusable from the fact, that a portion of the correspondence is not of general interest, and might well have given place to matter of more importance. We shall not undertake to supply these deficiencies; but to those who may not have access to the book itself, our remarks may be of service in forming an estimate of the character and services of him of whom it treats.

Among other natives of Scotland who were obliged to take refuge in America, from the consequences of their attachment to the House of Stuart, and the result of the rebellion of 1715, was James Alexander; the father of Lord Stirling. He arrived in 1716, obtained a situation in the office of the Secretary of the Province, and from his high attainments in mathematical science, he was soon entrusted with the duties of Surveyor General in both New York and New Jersey. Applying himself assiduously to the study of the law, while not engaged with his other pursuits, he qualified himself for admission to the Provincial Bar, and was not long in securing consideration and respect in his new profession. Years added to his influence and renown, and before his death he had "attained great eminence from his profound legal knowledge, sagacity, and penetration." He became a member of the Council and took an active part in all the political movements of his time, which circumstances, with his connection with the famous Zenger trial in New York, have preserved to him a measure of the fame he so well merits; but there is far too little known of Mr. Alexander. From Mr. Duer's remarking that—

"A letter, written not long before his death, is preserved in Mr. Sedgwick's Life of Governor Livingston, as one of the very few literary remains of a man highly distinguished in his day, but who has left but scanty memorials of his character and ability,"

—his readers will imbibe an impression that it is now too late to rescue from the shades of the past any farther information respecting his private and public life, but we have reason to believe that such is not the case. If rightly informed, there are yet, in

the possession of some of his descendants, ample materials for a memoir that would far more fully exhibit Mr. Alexander in his various characteristics as a lawyer, statesman, politician, and man of science, than any yet written; and we hope the time is not far distant when such a memoir will be given to the public. About ten years after his removal to this country, Mr. Alexander married the widow of David Provoost, who was engaged in mercantile business on her own account—having continued the correspondence and arrangements of her husband—and who, as Mrs. Alexander, became still more widely known and respected; a result not improbably hastened by the circumstance that the versatile talents of her husband enabled him to give to her business correspondence, a value it had not previously possessed. Mr. Alexander died in 1756, leaving an ample provision for his widow, and a large, but not productive landed estate to be divided between his son and four daughters who survived him.

"The son had received as good an education as the provincial schools afforded, with the additional advantage of private instruction from his father, in those branches of science to which the latter was particularly addicted, and for which the former had inherited an aptness and taste. He did not, however, at first pursue them practically; as he entered upon the active business of life, first as the clerk, and afterwards as the co-partner of his mother. In the course of their trade, the firm obtained contracts for the supply of the king's troops with clothing and provisions, which led to the junior partner's joining the commissariat of the army. The zeal, activity, and military spirit he displayed in the discharge of his duties, on the field, as well as in the camp, attracted the notice of the commander-in-chief, General Shirley, whose staff he was eventually invited to join as aid-de-camp and private secretary. In this capacity he served during the greater part of the war, which, although not formally declared in Europe until 1756, had actually commenced on this continent, some years before. It was thus that young Alexander had the early opportunity of acquiring a knowledge of military affairs, during three severe campaigns in which he served with General Shirley." p. 7.

This passage is all that the author has given us respecting this interesting period of colonial history, forming an important episode in the life of the future Major General. And yet, to Jerseymen —as this volume is evidently put forth as possessing claims upon their special consideration—what would have been more satisfactory than to have found detailed in its pages, the toils, privations, and achievements of the gallant Schuyler's forces—the ancestors of the men whom Lord Stirling afterwards commanded—during those three campaigns? It is not to be presumed that the intelligent and active commissary and aid-de-camp, should not have

given in his correspondence some information, respecting the army and its movements, worthy of preservation; or that the author, while narrating the personal career of his progenitor, might not have illustrated the operations of the New Jersey troops. We should judge from his brief reference to this period that it possesses not for him the interest it has for us, or he would have entered zealously into an examination of its important events, or else regretted the absence of any new matter among the Alexander manuscripts. Some colonial historian has yet to perform the grateful task of recounting in an appropriate manner, the services of the generous and chivalric Schuyler, and the trials of his unfortunate regiment.

General Shirley having been recalled, Major Alexander accompanied him to England in 1756, to aid him in the settlement of his accounts, and in the vindication of his character; and was examined with that view, at the bar of the House of Commons, in April, 1757.

"The candour and intelligence of the young American in giving his testimony received the marked approbation of the House, and contributed, with the influence of Shirley and the letters he had brought with him from other military men of rank and family, to facilitate his introduction to some of the most eminent public characters in England; while his conciliatory manners, social accomplishments, general information, and enlightened views in regard to the mutual interests of the mother country and her colonies, recommended him strongly to their esteem and confidence."—p. 9.

When Mr. James Alexander left Scotland, he was considered the presumptive heir to the title, but not to the estates, of Henry the then Earl of Stirling; but attaching little importance to the possession of a barren title, and having secured for himself station and influence in America, more highly prized probably from their being self-derived, not inherited,—he presented no claim to the Earldom, when by the death of Henry it became vacant. Whether his more ambitious son had an eye to the succession in determining to visit England, does not appear clearly, from the work before us; but soon after his arrival he was induced by the encouragement of friends and the advice of eminent counsel to prosecute the claim. This business detained him in England until July 1761, and its details occupy about fifty pages of his biography. In 1759, by a Jury convened in Edinburgh, according to the forms of law, he was declared nearest male heir to the last deceased Earl of Stirling, but whether or not entitled

to the peerage was of more difficult determination: the laws and customs of England differing from those of Scotland in relation to the descent of patents to collateral heirs. Upon the presumption however that questions respecting Scotch peerages should be settled in accordance with the laws of Scotland, Mr. Alexander's friends did not hesitate to address him thereafter as the Earl of Stirling; and so confident does he seem to have been at one time, not only of securing the peerage, but also the estates of the Earldom, including the Nova Scotia and Sagadahock grants to the first Earl, that he intended, so soon as he could arrange his affairs in America, to return to Scotland and reside on his estate there as "though a native—and to the manor born."

Eighteen months more were passed in the prosecution of the claim, but Lord Stirling was eventually obliged to return to America without having obtained a decision; and it was not until March 1762 that the House of Lords took any action upon his and other similar applications for recognition of titles and patents. An order was issued, prohibiting the various claimants from using the titles to which they aspired, until they had proved legally their right thereto; and other proceedings had, which, without determining the points at issue, appear to have induced Lord Stirling to discontinue the pursuit of the Earldom. He did not comply with the order of the House of Lords, for, says our author "there was no other claimant of the title; and he had been acknowledged and treated both in public and private for more than two years, while he remained in England, and after his return to America, as the lawful possessor of the Earldom." p. 58. The case seems satisfactorily made out, that his claim was supported by strong presumptive proof, and that it was preferred in good faith under a full conviction of its justice and validity; and we think Mr. Duer has effectually vindicated Lord Stirling, from the aspersions of those who have represented him as an usurper of honours, to which he had neither title nor pretence.

During Lord Stirling's residence in Great Britain he enjoyed the advantages, such as they are, which flow from association with the higher circles of fashionable or political life, and after his return corresponded with the Earl of Bute the Earl of Shelburne and others whose acquaintance he had thus formed. We

are induced to give one of his letters to the latter nobleman, from the nature of its contents, and from its being a fair specimen of his lordship's epistolary style.

"The Earl of Stirling to the Earl of Shelburne.

"New York, August 6th, 1763.

"My dear Lord—Nothing could have given me greater satisfaction than hearing of your Lordship's appointment to preside at the Board which must have so great a share in the government of a country in which it is my lot to reside. Your Lordship's early inquiries, and strong desire of acquiring knowledge of this new world, must now be of great use to your country; for in a proper management of the Colonies on this continent, much of Great Britain's future greatness depends. The wants of its increasing population must at all events greatly increase the manufactures of the mother country; but the suppression of such branches of trade as interfere with the importation of them from Great Britain, and the encouragement of such a cultivation of these colonies as will supply her with the raw materials, for which she is now obliged to pay millions to foreign nations, is a work that must render the value of this continent to Great Britain inestimable. These things have, no doubt, occurred to your Lordship, as well as the proper mode of carrying them into execution. But, if you can indulge me, I will, from time to time send you such hints as occur to me, of measures suitable to this part of the continent; you may perhaps find something among them that has escaped your notice.

"The making of pig and bar iron, and the cultivation of hemp, are two articles that want encouragement greatly. We are capable of supplying Great Britain with both to a great extent; but the first requiring a large stock to begin with, people of moderate fortunes cannot engage in it; and those of large ones are as yet very few, and their attention is generally given to the pursuit of other objects. Some few, indeed, in this Province and in New Jersey, have lately erected excellent works, the success of which, I hope, will encourage others to follow their example. As to hemp, our farmers have got into a beaten track of raising grain and grazing cattle, and there is no persuading them out of it, unless by examples and premiums; and these it would be well for government to try—a few thousand pounds expended in that way might have a good effect.

"The making of wine, also, is worth the attention of Government. Without its aid, the cultivation of the vine will be very slow; for of all the variety of vines in Europe, we do not yet know which of them will suit this climate; and until that is ascertained by experiment, our people will not plant vineyards; few of us are able, and a much less number willing, to make the experiment. I have lately imported about twenty different sorts, and have planted two vineyards, one in this Province and one in New Jersey; but I find the experiments tedious, expensive, and uncertain; for after eight or ten years cultivation, I shall perhaps be obliged to reject nine-tenths of them as unfit for the climate, and then begin new vineyards from the remainder. But, however tedious, I am determined to go through with it. Yet I could wish to be assisted in it. I would then try it to a greater extent, and would the sooner be able to bring the cultivation of the grape into general use.

"It is in these vineyards, my Lord, and the clearing a large body of rich swamp lands in New Jersey, and fitting it for the cultivation of hemp—settling a good farm in the wilderness, and bringing to it some of the productions and improvements of Europe, that are my present employments. They have taken place of the

pleasures of London, and I sometimes persuade myself that this is the happier life of the two. Yet there are some hours I could wish to have repeated, those in which I was honoured with your Lordship's conversation, which, I shall ever recollect with the greatest pleasure. I am, &c."

As is stated in the foregoing letter, Lord Stirling had taken up his residence in New Jersey, (at the village of Baskenridge,) soon after his return from Europe. His father's widow died about a year previous to his arrival, and he does not appear to have felt any inclination to continue the mercantile business in which he had been engaged with her before his connection with the army. Although not stated by Mr. Duer, it is presumed that one reason for his establishing himself in New Jersey, was his holding the office of Surveyor General to the Board of Proprietors of the Eastern division, to the duties of which he had been appointed on the death of his father in 1756, and which he had been allowed to delegate to another while he remained abroad.

Soon after removing to New Jersey he was appointed one of the Council of the Province. The date of his appointment is not given, but we believe it was on the arrival of the *gentleman* introduced to us in the following extract from a letter of John Penn's, dated

"Stoke, September 3d, 1762."

"It is no less amazing than true, that Mr. William Franklin, son of Benjamin Franklin, of Philadelphia, is appointed to be Governor of the Province of New Jersey! The warrant for his commission was ordered to be made out last Wednesday. The whole of this business has been transacted in so private a manner, that not a tittle of it escaped, until it was seen in the public papers; so there was no opportunity of counteracting, or indeed, doing one single thing that might put a stop to this shameful affair. I make no doubt but the people of New Jersey will make some remonstrance upon this indignity put upon them. You are full as well acquainted with the character and principles of this person as myself, and are as able to judge of the impropriety of such an appointment. What a dishonour and disgrace it must be to a country, to have such a man at the head of it, and to sit down contented! Surely that will not be the case; at least, I should hope that some effort would be made, before our Jersey friends would put up with such an insult. If any *gentleman* had been appointed, it would have been a different case; but I cannot look upon the person in question in that light, by any means. How this matter will turn out I know not, but I should be very sorry to see him first in that government, as there cannot, in my opinion, any good result from it; but, on the contrary, dishonour and disgrace to the country, and hatred of the people to himself. I may, perhaps, be too strong in my expressions, but I am so extremely astonished and enraged at it, that I am hardly able to contain myself at the thought of it." pp. 70, 71.

We have not Lord Stirling's answer to this letter, but, as *he* concluded "to sit down contented" and accept of an office which brought him into close connection with the new functionary, it is to be presumed that he did not coincide with his correspondent in thinking the appointment such "a shameful affair."

As we shall have occasion to notice particularly some occurrences in which Lord Stirling and Governor Franklin were mutually interested, we are prompted to the introduction here of some remarks respecting the latter.

William Franklin was born in 1731. He evinced in early life a fondness for literature, but as he grew older, the charms of a military life seem to have fascinated him, and, after being thwarted in an attempt to embark clandestinely on board of a privateer, he received a commission in the Pennsylvania provincial forces, and served for some time on the northern frontier. On his return to Philadelphia he became the assistant of his father in his various pursuits, both political and scientific; held several offices creditably to himself; and in June, 1757, sailed for Europe with his father who had been appointed Colonial Agent at London. A visit to the old world under such auspices could not be otherwise than advantageous, and young Franklin, as regards both personal and mental attainments, appears to have fairly profited by the opportunity.

He travelled through England, Scotland, Flanders and Holland, and at the time that the degree of Doctor of Laws was conferred upon his father by the University of Oxford, for his great proficiency in the Natural Sciences, he received the honorary degree of Master of Arts: having distinguished himself in the same branches of knowledge. It is certainly no indication of weakness of intellect or incapacity that he should have been appointed Governor of New Jersey, when little more than thirty years of age, through the influence of Lord Bute, without the interference of his father, and after a rigid examination by Lord Halifax, Minister for American Affairs.* Neither did he exhibit in his administration of the concerns of the Province, previous to the opening of the revolutionary drama, so far as his acts have come under our notice, any characteristics that warrant the application justly of the disparaging remarks of Lord Stirling's

* *Vide* Public Characters of Great Britain, Vol. IV, and Franklin's Life by his Grandson, I. 309.

correspondent. We believe that he participated, both in England and America, in the fashionable vices and follies of the day, but to no greater extent than most others; and the volume before us affords evidence (pp. 86, 87, &c.) that previous to 1775, there was a close friendship, if not intimacy, between his family and that of Lord Stirling. It is probable that much of the disparaging language applied to him by the would-be-princes of the day, was owing to the fact that some stain rested upon his birth. William Smith, writing to Gates in 1764* says, "I am a little angry at the Jersey successions. Franklin after Boone; after Morris,† Reade. Patience kind heavens!" and yet Boone was a *bon vivant*, possessing no remarkable traits of character; whose sojourn in New Jersey was not long enough to afford much ground for judging of his capabilities as a Governor, but who decidedly failed in South Carolina, whither he was subsequently sent; the Board of Trade disavowing his course in a contest he had with the Legislative Assembly of that province, and superseding him in the government.

"Lord Stirling had been among the foremost and most active of the Stamp Act opposers in America. He had encouraged a passive resistance to its execution, by promoting the agreement to dispense with stamped paper without prejudice to the contracts in which it was required to be used, and now exerted his influence in England in procuring the removal of the Parliamentary agent of the province of New Jerscy, who had supinely witnessed the enactment of the obnoxious law, and substituting in his place the eminent solicitor he had employed in his affairs before the House of Lords." p. 83

Whatever influence Lord Stirling may have exerted to obtain the removal of Joseph Sherwood, the Provincial Agent, and the appointment of his friend Henry Wilmot in his room, it was not "in England," but in New Jersey; for Mr. Duer appears to have overlooked the fact, that the appointment rested with the House of Assembly. We have seen the letter addressed by Wilmot to the Speaker of the House, on receiving notice of his appointment, in which he thanks *that* gentleman for having pro-

* *Vide* Gates' Papers in N. Y. Hist. Library.

† Chief Justice Robert Hunter Morris, was succeeded by Charles Reade, (a recommendation, by the way, of Lord Stirling's.) The sudden death of Chief Justice Morris is adverted to by Mr. Duer on page 80, but no particulars are given. They are briefly stated in the letter of Smith's quoted in the text, "Gay in the morning—dead in the evening. He came out to a rural dance, he took out the parson's wife, danced down six couple, and fell dead on the floor, without a word, a groan, or a sigh."

posed him. He did not, however, reflect much credit upon his friends in the province, whoever they were. His letters, of which many have come under our notice, indicate very little business talent; and he had not been in office a year before Governor Franklin, writing to his father says, when referring to some matter before the Board of Trade: "We have no tidings of anything's being done by our agent in this or any other American affair, and the Assembly, having some resentment for their being surprised into the appointment of him, will probably remove him at this Session."* He was removed in 1769 and Dr. Franklin appointed.

It was in 1768 that the Treasury of the Eastern Province was robbed; an event which tended greatly to alienate the good feelings of the popular party in the province from the Governor, and to facilitate the disruption of the ties that bound them to the mother country. Mr. Duer gives an interesting sketch of the circumstances attendant upon that event, but its length precludes its insertion in our pages. Lord Stirling appears to have acted in concert with the Governor, although Mr. Duer pronounces his course to have been "as usual, violent and undignified," and became involved in a personal controversy with colonel Samuel Ogden, in consequence of animadversions upon that gentleman's acts as a magistrate, in connection with some testimony relating to the counterfeiters, who were charged by the government party with having committed the robbery. The correspondence between the parties is given at length, unnecessarily we think, while one of much more public interest, to which we shall presently allude, is very briefly referred to:

"During the interval between this correspondence and the events which led immediately to the Revolution, Lord Stirling continued to reside at Baskenridge, engaged in his former occupations, to which of late years, he had added the general superintendence of several extensive iron works, which he had established principally in the county of Morris. These pursuits were interrupted only by occasional visits to New York, and the performance of his public duties as Surveyor General, and a member of the Council of New Jersey. . . . When the projects of the British Court again threatened a rupture between the mother country and her Colonies. . . . When coercion was resorted to by Great Britain, to put down the open opposition in Massachusetts, Lord Stirling was among the first in the other Provinces to take up arms, in what he deemed the common cause. From the military experience he had acquired early in life, not less than from his local influence and personal popularity, he was chosen to command the first regiment of

* Proceedings N. J. Hist. Soc., Vol. I. p. 103.

militia, raised by the authority of the Provincial Congress, in the county in which he resided." pp. 112, 113.

His acceptance of this appointment led, as our author expresses himself, to "an angry correspondence" with Governor Franklin, of which, as we think it had considerable weight in determining Lord Stirling's subsequent course, and is very little known, we will give a short synopsis from the original papers in the New York Historical Society Library. Copies of the correspondence were communicated by Lord Stirling to the President of the Provincial Congress, and by him laid before that body on the 1st October, 1775.

Lord Stirling's official intercourse, as a member of the Council, with Governor Franklin, had been of an intimate character, and they appeared to have harmonised in their views remarkably well; their personal relations also, as has been already stated, were of the most friendly and cordial kind. Such was the relative position of the parties, when, on the 7th September, 1675, Charles Pettit, as Clerk of the Council, notified Lord Stirling that, at a meeting held some days previous, it was thought advisable to have another meeting on the 15th of the month, and, as a full attendance was desired, he communicated the Governor's request that Lord S. would be present, and added:

"I have it further in command from his Excellency in Council, to acquaint your Lordship that it is a matter of public report that you have accepted a commission from the Provincial Congress of New Jersey, appointing you Colonel of a Regiment of Militia in the county of Somerset, and His Excellency requires an answer from your Lordship whether you have, or have not, accepted such a commission."

The answer to this letter, dated September 14th, is the only paper of the correspondence given in Mr. Duer's book, (p. 113.) Lord Stirling states that an attack of gout will prevent his attendance at the meeting of the Council, and then notices the inquiry made as to his acceptance of the commission. As he had "ever been used to experience from his Excellency a behaviour becoming a gentleman in his exalted station," the style and manner of the inquiry had caused a good deal of surprise, and he was not less astonished that he should think of commanding *his clerk* to correspond with him on so delicate a subject, or catechise him in so peremptory a way. He confirms the truth of the report and says:

"This mark of the confidence the people among whom I reside repose in me is

one of the most satisfactory, and I think honourable, events that I have ever experienced, at a time when their dearest rights are invaded, to call me forth to take so important a part in their defence cannot but rouse the most grateful feelings of a man, who ever has been a friend to the liberties of mankind; accepting this commission and in serving my country faithfully, I cannot doubt of having your Excellency's highest approbation, especially when I recollect your frequent public as well as private declarations that the rights of the people and the prerogatives of the crown were equally dear to you, and equally your duty as well as inclination to preserve."

This letter is certainly unnecessarily harsh although we can easily conceive that the circumstance would be provoking to such a man; and the last remark, referring to the Governor's presumed approval of his conduct, is especially objectionable. The following day Governor Franklin replied.

He regretted that Lord Stirling should think he had been treated with any indelicacy or impropriety in the request made through Mr. Secretary Pettit, as his lordship knew he was no clerk of *his*, but of the Council; and that all communications written by him, in accordance with the orders of the Governor, were "by order of Council;" that the letter in question was so intended to be written, however Mr. Pettit may have expressed himself, and that it would have been more proper for him to have sent a copy of the minutes. He had been advised unanimously to direct the Clerk to make the inquiry, as they all believed the correctness of the report. Had the Board acted upon that report only, Lord Stirling might have had some reason for complaint, and had the matter been of a private character, about which he had been catechised by a public officer at his instance, there might have been some cause for astonishment. He then adds:

"This would not have been consistent with the becoming behaviour you acknowledge I have always treated you with, nor with that friendship and regard I have constantly professed and shown for your Lordship during a long acquaintance. Your Lordship's answer to the question proposed to you I shall lay before the Council this afternoon.

"Whether or not your conduct in accepting the commission has my approbation, can, I think, appear of little consequence to your Lordship, as you intimate that it has met with the approbation of your own conscience, and as you never thought proper to consult me either directly or indirectly before you took so extraordinary a step. It is true, as you say, I have repeatedly declared both publicly and privately 'that the rights of the people and the prerogative of the crown were equally dear to me and equally my duty and inclination to preserve,' nor can any motive be sufficient to induce me to sacrifice one at the shrine of the other. Your Lordship will not, however, pretend to say that it is not the sole prerogative of the crown to grant

military commissions in the Province, or that it is not your, as well as my duty, to prevent any infringements of that prerogative as far as may be in your power, and to signify your disapprobation of such infringement whenever it may be necessary. Cases may possibly happen wherein some men may think it their duty so far to fly in the face of prerogative, as to accept of commissions from a power set up in opposition to it. But I have not as yet met with any person who makes the least pretensions to honour or honesty, but what readily allows, that a man cannot act consistently with either, unless he previously resigns any commission or trust which he holds by virtue of that prerogative he has determined to act in defiance of. This has been the conduct of not only such men as General Lee, but of many of the inferior officers of militia in this and the neighbouring colonies. It was this consideration and an unwillingness to entertain any idea the least derogatory to your Lordship's honour, which induced me to suspend my belief of the report you have now thought proper to authenticate."

We conceive that, so far, at least, Governor Franklin has the advantage in this "war of words;" for however severe his language, it is not more so than, under the circumstances, he might well have considered it his duty to use. It was assuredly inconsiderate in Lord Stirling while holding an office of trust under the king—a confidential adviser of his chief officer in the Province, to accept of rank and authority from another source, the exercise of which was aimed so directly against a continuance of the royal government. The incompatibility of two such commissions had been expressly recognised by the Provincial Congress on the 17th August, when it resolved "That before any person receive a military commission agreeable to the militia ordinance of this Congress, he shall sign the association formed and recommended by the same; and if he hold a commission under the late militia act of Assembly, that he resign such commission to the governor of this province"—a resolution which certainly applied to Lord Stirling, in its spirit if not in its letter. It would certainly have been becoming in him to have made known to the Governor, and his associates in the Council, the acceptance of the commission, and ceased to regard himself as an officer of the crown, which, from his answer to Mr. Pettit's letter, he seems still to have thought himself.

Our measure of approval accorded the Governor, is at this stage of the correspondence, materially lessened; for in a postscript to the letter noticed above, he descends to personalities which are as unworthy as they are unbecoming.

From an inspection of a copy of Mr. Pettit's letter he found he had imbibed an erroneous idea respecting it, from Lord Stir-

ling's communication, inasmuch as it was there expressly stated that he had it "farther in command from his Excellency in Council," &c., showing conclusively that it was an official act, emanating from the Council; and depriving Lord Stirling of any just grounds for believing it an individual act of his. In communicating this discovery to Lord Stirling he gives vent to the feelings which, however roused, he had previously controlled; —reminds his correspondent of his frequent public and private declarations denouncing any man "who would take up arms against his sovereign on the present occasion"—considers that he had been treated with disrespect, and that the mutilation of Mr. Pettit's letter might lead all good people to consider such conduct "an instance of contemptible meanness and dishonesty."

The answer of Lord Stirling, dated 25th September, is equally violent and undignified. He offers no palliation for the circumstances which had originated the correspondence, but retorts the personal abuse of the Governor. Any allusions to the letter of the Governor he avoids, for fear of an epistolary dispute, but he cannot so easily pass over the postscript.

"The sight of this copy of Mr. Pettit's letter," he writes "seems to have had a very sudden and strange effect—'surprise,' 'astonishment,' 'mutilation,' 'contemptible meanness and dishonesty' are all fumbled together in a most violent agitation; and for what? because as you say I have committed the heinous sin of leaving out the words *farther* and *in Council* in quoting Mr. Pettit's letter."

He states that the word "farther" was not in the letter he received,* and that whether the "command" was given in Council or not, made no difference. If improper and impolite *out* of Council, the advice of the whole Council could not sanctify it; that the Governor could not ascribe to him of his own knowledge the language he had quoted, as he had not been in his company since "the present occasion" occurred. He says,

"Since the rejection of the most humble, dutiful, and respectful petitions to the throne, have been known in America, since the battles of Lexington and Bunker's Hill; since the wanton and cruel destruction of Charlestown, and since the design of the ministry to bring indiscriminate ruin on the colonies on this continent has been publicly avowed; I have not had the honour of seeing your Excellency, and

* Could this have been a quibble of his Lordship? Mr. Pettit's *original* letter is not among the papers, but a copy, *preserved by Lord S.* is there, and on referring to it the word "further" will be found in the proper place although *farther* may not be. It is hardly probable that Lord S. would keep for himself a copy that differed from the original.

therefore I may without offence to you, sir, say that the assertion so far as it relates to the *present occasion* is false."

With this letter closes this singular and, in some respects interesting correspondence, and that it should have been spread before the Provincial Congress by Lord Stirling himself somewhat excites surprise. We are inclined to the belief that much of the zeal and devotedness which he subsequently displayed in the cause of the colonies, resulted from his desire to prove to the people of New Jersey and the country generally, that his previous associations with the crown retained no longer any influence over him, and we must also think, in some instances, was was the result of exasperated feelings; leading to retaliation for censure or presumed ill-usage. Such we are constrained to consider the circumstances under which the events detailed in the following correspondence took place.

"Colonel, the Earl of Stirling to the President of Congress."

"Elizabethtown, January 10, 1776.

"Sir. I now send you enclosed, copies of some letters which have passed between Governor Franklin, and Lieutenant Colonel Winds. As it is evident from the last letter from the Governor, that he intends no longer to remain quiet, I thought it most prudent to secure him, and remove him to this place. I accordingly sent orders to Lieutenant Colonel Winds this morning, for that purpose. I have provided good, genteel, private lodgings for the Governor, at Mr. Boudinot's, which I expect he will occupy this afternoon, and where I intend he shall remain until I have directions from Congress what to do with him. I am, &c."

"Lieutenant Colonel Winds to Governor Franklin.

"Barracks at Perth Amboy, January 8, 1776.

"Sir. I have had hints that you intend to leave the province in case the letters that were intercepted should be sent to the Continental Congress. As I have particular orders concerning the matter, I therefore desire you will give me your word and honour that you will not depart this Province until I know the will and pleasure of the continental Congress concerning the matter. I am, &c."

"Governor Franklin to Lieut. Colonel Winds.

January 8th, 1776.

"Sir,—Being conscious that my letter which was intercepted contained nothing but what it was my duty to write as a faithful servant of the Crown—being a mere narrative of such facts and reports as had come to my knowledge respecting public transactions,—I have not the least intention to quit the Province, nor shall I, unless compelled by violence. Were I to act otherwise, it would not be consistent with my declarations to the Assembly, at the last session, nor my regard to the good people of this Province. I am, &c."

"The same to the same.

"Perth Amboy, January 9th, 1776.

"Sir,—I observed this morning that armed men were placed at my gate, who,

from time to time, have been relieved by others. On inquiry, I am given to understand that they are placed there as sentinels by your orders. This, I scarcely know how to believe, not only as I am convinced that you can have no proper authority for it, but as I had before, under my hand, assured you, (who are a member of the House of Representatives,) that agreeable to my declarations to the Assembly, at the last session, and, I might have added, in compliance with their request,—I was determined not to quit the Province unless compelled by violence. Such an assurance on my part was certainly equal to any promise I could make, and ought of course to have weight with those who pretend to act on principles of honour. However, let the authority, or let the pretence be what it may, I do hereby require of you, if these men are sent by your orders, that you do immediately remove them from hence, as you will answer the contrary at your peril. I am, &c." pp. 119, 121.

The evidence which this letter contains of an intention on the part of the writer, "no longer to remain quiet," is not as manifest to us as it appears to have been to Lord Stirling, and after the assurances given by the Governor, it was hardly generous to exert—in advance of all overt acts on his part—such prompt and energetic measures for his capture. The letters which had been intercepted were, alone, of not sufficient importance to justify his arrest,* for the Provincial Congress a short time previous, had solemnly declared—in reference to charges brought against an individual of standing in the province, of having written letters to Great Britain, disapproving of the measures of the colonies—that they "would by no means violate the right of private sentiment."† The result of the orders sent to Lieut. Colonel Winds, is shown in the following letter.

"Colonel, the Earl of Stirling to the President of Congress.

"Elizabethtown, January 11th, 1776.

"Sir. In consequence of orders I sent to Liut. Colonel Winds on the 9th and 10th instant, he sent two officers, attended by a proper guard to wait upon Governor Franklin, who at first refused paying any attention to the message, which kindly invited him to dine with me at this place; but finding it in vain to act that part, he ordered up his coach in order to proceed to this place. But Chief Justice Smyth,

* One passage in a dispatch from Governor Franklin to the Earl of Dartmouth, which was among the papers, may have been thought especially objectionable; it was as follows: "I have suspended William Alexander, Esq., (claiming to be and commonly called Earl of Stirling,) from the Council, until his Majesty's pleasure shall be known; the reason will appear in the minutes of the Privy Council, now copying, and which will be transmitted by the next packet. If his Majesty shall think proper to remove him, I shall recommend such a person as I may think most suitable to serve the Crown in that capacity." In this letter Governor F. says, "My situation is indeed somewhat particular and not a little difficult, having no more than one or two among the principal officers of Government, to whom I, even now, speak confidentially on public affairs."

† Minutes Prov. Congress. October, 1775.

thinking it possible to put the matter upon an easier footing for the Governor, prevailed on him to give his *parole* not to depart from his house on any pretence whatever, not even if a rescue should be offered by Captain Parker, [Commander of a British Man-of-War,] or any other person. I have given the Lieut. Colonel orders to let the Governor remain at his house, on the conditions stipulated until I have the orders of Congress to the contrary. I am, &c."

As no orders from Congress were received, the Governor remained unmolested until June; when, a proclamation issued by him calling together the Assembly, being construed by the Provincial Congress into a defiance of the resolution of the Continental Congress, abrogating all foreign jurisdiction, he was taken prisoner and sent to Connecticut. He remained there more than two years closely watched—(not "until the end of the war," as stated by Mr. Duer,) was exchanged—became subsequently very obnoxious to the colonists from his connection with the New York Board of Loyalists—went to England—received a pension—and died in 1813.

Lord Stirling, soon after his appointment as Colonel of the Somerset Militia, received a commission as Colonel in the Continental service, and was placed in command of the first of two regiments directed to be raised in New Jersey, and engaged actively in the various duties which an organization of the new levies required at his hands. While thus employed, in January 1776, he

——"planned and executed an enterprise, which at once established his character for gallantry, activity, and zeal, and gained for him one of the earliest complimentary votes granted by Congress. With the regular troops under his command, and some volunteers from Elizabethtown, and its neighbourhood, he embarked on board a pilot boat and three smaller vessels, and, while the Asia man-of-war and her tender lay at anchor in the bay of New York, proceeded at night to sea, and, with musketry alone, attacked and carried a British armed Transport of three hundred tons burthen, mounting six guns, and laden with stores and provisions for the enemy at Boston; and the next day succeeded in conducting his prize safely into the port of Perth Amboy."* p. 124.

On the 13th March, Lord Stirling was promoted by Congress to be a Brigadier General, and was stationed at New York and in New Jersey, until, at the battle of Long Island the following August,—where he commanded the main body without the lines

* Among others who volunteered on this expedition, were *Francis Barber*, who subsequently attained the command of a regiment and distinguished himself on many occasions: *Aaron Ogden*, who served during the war, and became afterward Governor of the State: and *Brockholst Livingston*, a Judge successively of the Supreme Court of New York and of the United States.

—he was taken prisoner, and continued with the British troops until exchanged towards the end of the year; but we cannot follow his biographer in narrating the varied career of Lord Stirling during the revolution. On the 19th February, 1777, he was made a Major General, and in different skirmishes in New Jersey—at the battles of Brandywine, Germantown, and Monmouth—in the attack upon Staten Island in January, 1780, and in command of the Northern Army in 1781 and 1782, his services were so distinguished, as to merit on several occasions the special commendation of his superiors, and the thanks of Congress.* But he was unfortunately less successful than courageous and enterprising. With the exception of the battle of Monmouth and perhaps one or two other minor affairs, all the actions in which he was engaged resulted unfortunately for the American cause. There were occasions when his personal coolness and bravery in the hour of danger testified to his military capabilities and called forth the eulogiums of his fellow soldiers; but his biographer has given us little opportunity for criticising his conduct in the field; the details of the engagements in which he participated—as has been already remarked—being sketched in such a general way as to afford few points of observation. Mr. Sparks, it seems, with his usual liberality, extended to the Society the use of the plates of the battle fields, which illustrate his writings of Washington; but there is manifestly but a slight connection between them, and the contents of the pages they face.

Lord Stirling died at Albany, January 15th, 1783, while in command of the Northern department. His death

———"was lamented by his brother officers and the troops he had commanded, as well as by his personal friends. He was regretted, indeed, by all, both in military or civil life, who knew him either in his public capacity, or private relations; by many also, who, without knowing him personally, were aware of the loss the public cause had sustained, in being deprived at a critical moment, of the influence of his character and the benefit of his services. No stronger evidence could have been given of the estimation in which both were held, than is afforded by the manner in which his death was communicated to Congress by the Commander-in-chief—by the Resolution passed by that body, on receiving the intelligence—

* It was through him that the Gates and Conway intrigue became known in 1778, he having communicated to Gen. Washington the purport of remarks made by Conway in a letter to Gates, which had come to his knowledge. A circumstance which seems to have secured for him the special regard of the Commander-in-chief.

and, above all, by the following touching letter of condolence, addressed to his widow:"*

"General Washington to the Countess of Stirling.

"Newburg, 20th January, 1783.

"My Lady—Having been informed by a letter from Captain Sill, of the unspeakable loss which your ladyship has experienced, I feel the sincerest disposition to alleviate by sympathy those sorrows which I am sensible cannot be removed or effaced. For this purpose, I would also have suggested even every rational topic of consolation, were I not fully persuaded that the principles of Philosophy and Religion, of which you are possessed, had anticipated every thing I could say on the subject.

"It only remains then, as a small, but just tribute to the memory of Lord Stirling, to express how deeply I share the common affliction, on being deprived of the public and professional assistance, as well as the private friendship, of an officer of so high rank, with whom I had lived in the strictest habits of amity, and how much those military merits of his Lordship, which rendered him respected in his lifetime, are now regretted by the whole army. It will doubtless be a soothing consideration in the poignancy of your grief, to find that the general officers are going into mourning for him. . . . . .

"With sentiments of perfect esteem and respect, I am, &c."

"The man thus spoken of by Washington needs no other epitaph or monument. But it would perhaps be deemed a failure of customary duty on the part of his biographer, to close this narrative without some attempt to sketch the character of the deceased. Fortunately, in this instance, it is illustrated by his acts and their results. These bear witness that to strong native powers of mind, he added industry and perseverance, with early acquired habits of method and attention. His natural abilities were more solid than brilliant—his acquirements more useful than uncommon. His education was such only as the state of the country afforded, but he received from his father instruction in his favorite studies of Mathematics and Astronomy, which rendered him no ordinary proficient in those sciences. He was bred, as we have seen, a merchant, and was successfully pursuing his business, when he was induced to join the army under General Shirley,—first as a Commissary, afterwards as Aid-de-Camp and Private Secretary to the Commander-in chief. In these stations he served several campaigns, and the result of his military experience was especially evinced in the battles of Long Island, Brandywine, Germantown and Monmouth, in all of which he sustained a conspicuous and efficient part. In an evil hour, he accompanied General Shirley to England, . . . and when there, was persuaded . . . . to prefer a claim to what proved to be a barren title. The prosecution of this claim was attended with heavy pecuniary expenses, which together with those incident to his prolonged residence in England, of which it was the cause, laid the foundation of subsequent embarrassments. Remarkable for the cheerfulness and hilarity of his disposition, he was there confirmed in those convivial habits that increased upon him in after life, though never to such a degree as to interfere with the performance of his public duties or deprived him of the esteem and confidence of his official superiors, or private friends.

* Before he went to England, Lord Stirling married Sarah, the eldest daughter of Philip Livingston, of New York.

They contributed, nevertheless, to deepen the shade cast over his latter years by the perplexity of his affairs, and rendered more striking the contrast between the opening and close of his career."—pp. 259, 262.

We have thus allowed Lord Stirling the benefit of this summary of his character, penned by his biographer; somewhat surprised, we admit, at the tenor of the closing remarks—if we interpret them correctly. That he was an early and steadfast friend to the colonial cause no one can doubt, and his name will ever be held in grateful remembrance among those of the worthies who achieved our independence; but we have failed to perceive in Mr. Duer's book, any special indications of his possessing those traits which make a man an object of love and respect to those immediately connected with him; indeed, from what we have ourselves learned of his Lordship's temperament, from documents and tradition, we should judge that, to considerable testiness of disposition there was joined such inflexibility of purpose and self-appreciation as necessarily operated to his prejudice, notwithstanding his usual cheerfulness and conviviality. Of his qualities as a husband and father, or of those more domestic occurrences which assist so materially on making up a correct estimate of every man's character, we receive little information from the work before us.

Like many other patriots of the time, Lord Stirling died poor, leaving, says our author:—

"nothing but the certificates issued by the state of New Jersey for the depreciation of his pay, which, on his death-bed, he delivered to his wife for her future support. Even the bounty land promised by Congress to those officers who served *during the war*, was denied to his widow—although he died between the preliminary and definitive treaties of peace—on the technical ground that the war continued until peace was actually *proclaimed*."—p. 263 and note.

This was assuredly a case of peculiar hardship. We believe that of late years a claim has been pressed before Congress in behalf of the heirs of Lord Stirling for this allowance, and if no other objection can be advanced than the one stated above, it is certainly deserving their favourable consideration.

At the commencement of the Revolution Lord Stirling possessed a large landed estate in the provinces of New York and New Jersey, but it was heavily incumbered; and, at his solicitation, the New Jersey legislature before he joined the army, passed an act vesting his property in that state in commissioners, who were authorized to dispose of it and with the proceeds dis-

charge his obligations, including the debt to the provincial treasury which has been mentioned. The lands were sold and payment received in continental money, then a legal tender; but the rapid depreciation which ensued in that kind of currency, caused a repeal of the "tender law" before the debts could be paid by the commissioners, and the proceeds consequently became valueless. Nothing remained *but the debts*, and to discharge them the rest of his property was sacrificed under legal proceedings of his creditors.

Mr. Duer, says nothing of the personal appearance of Lord Stirling, but from the portrait which the work contains we should form a favourable impression of both his face and figure; his features being well proportioned—his eye penetrating—his forehead full and high—and the whole contour of his head pleasing. This portrait and the several plates of battle grounds add not a little to the appearance of the book, which in typographical execution and tasteful arrangement is creditable to the society under whose auspices it is issued.

Although, as we have remarked, less satisfactory in some respects than we could have wished, we commend the work to those interested in the men and times of which it treats as furnishing much information respecting them not before given to the public.

ART. II.—*German University Education, or the Professors and Students of Germany.* By W. C. Perry. 2d edition. London. 1846.

THE rapid multiplication of colleges and universities (so called) among us is not more remarkable than the uniformity of their organization. The literary institutions of the new states are as accurately copied as their civil institutions from the models in the older colonies. We have no more reason to be sure that every new state will have its Governor, Senate, and House of Representatives, than that every new college will be furnished with the usual apparatus of a President, a Board of Trustees, a Faculty consisting of Professors and Tutors, and if possible a

building far beyond the actual or probable necessities of the infant seminary. This last is one of the most curious features in the history of our literary institutions. In no other age or country has the idea of a public seminary been so generally understood to involve that of a building as one of its essential elements. While some of the most famous of the German universities have done their work for ages with scarcely anything that could be called a public edifice, our schools are often crippled in their infancy by a gratuitous expenditure in this way of resources which might have been otherwise applied with tenfold profit. This diversity of usage is connected with the preference of small country villages as seats of learning, where the want of public buildings cannot be so easily supplied as in large towns. As to this last question, there is not a little to be said on both sides, but we cannot enter on it here, and have only mentioned it as furnishing a partial explanation of the difference between American and European usage as to the relative importance and priority of brick and mortar in the creation of a school of learning. It is not yet fifteen years since the only academical structure belonging to the University of Halle was its Library, while all its lectures were delivered either in a large room of the old city weigh-house, or in hired apartments scattered through the town, and some of them inferior to a decent English or American kitchen. Now indeed there is a public edifice both there and in other places where they have been wanting; but the long delay in their erection has no doubt made it possible to provide for wants which could only have been made known by experience. In America, on the contrary, there are probably few cases where a false economy or want of taste in the original erection of such buildings has not prompted the wish that it had been reserved for a later generation.

We have already dwelt too long, however, on a topic which was only introduced at first, as serving to illustrate the remarkable uniformity of method in the institution of our public seminaries. The same poverty of invention is here visible as in the naming of our towns and counties, where, with few exceptions, the incessant repetition of the same familiar names presents a striking contrast with the endless variety which meets the eye on the first glance at a map of the old world. In both cases this perpetual repetition has its origin in early and exclusive associ-

ations. To the great mass even of educated men among us, the only idea of a university or college is that of their Alma Mater, or at most of one or two establishments, so much alike as to confirm rather than correct the prejudice, that what exists in these, perhaps from causes wholly accidental, could not have been otherwise without a change in the very essence of the institution. There are few graduates of our colleges who have ever looked so far into the history of academical institutions in general, as to regard our own established type as only one variety of an extensive and a highly varied genus. This may be ascertained by suggesting to any number of such men successively, the idea of a college without a Board of Trustees or Corporation distinct from the Faculty or resident instructors; or without the usual division into classes; or with any number of such classes except four; or with any names but those of Senior, Junior, Sophomore, and Freshman. We are not now objecting to these long-established and familiar regulations, which, because they are such, if for no higher reason, are entitled to take precedence of all gratuitous innovations. We are only furnishing the reader with a test, by which to satisfy himself that these conventional arrangements are regarded by the multitude of those who have been educated under them, not only as expedient and desirable, but as entering essentially into their very definition of a college or a university. We question whether there are not some of the class described, who would regard as a serious departure from established and tried usage the exchange of the title President for that of Principal as in Canonsburg, or Provost as in Philadelphia; much more the total abrogation of the office, as in Charlottesville.

This blind attachment to our own familiar usages, with all its good conservative effects, may be pernicious, by preventing changes which are really required by local circumstances, and still more extensively by perpetuating rigid uniformity in a matter where, above most others, flexibility and the power of varied adaptation are essential to the full attainment of the end designed. This is emphatically true of our own country, where variety in unessential modes of education seems as necessary as substantial uniformity. It is therefore greatly to be wished that nothing in the habits or the feelings of our educated men should throw any insurmountable difficulty in the way of such variations, where

they are really desirable. Against mere wanton innovation the prejudice of early habit and association will at all times furnish a sufficient safeguard. Believing as we do that in this, as in many other cases, the best remedy for such prepossessions is historical information, we regard with satisfaction every opportunity of gaining or diffusing knowledge with respect to other systems. We shall therefore take occasion from the work now before us, to bring before our readers the principal academical systems of the old world. What we have in view is not statistical details, but those characteristic features which distinguish the systems from each other.

The prevailing type of academical organization in America may readily be traced to the first few colleges established, and especially to Harvard University, Yale College, and the College of New Jersey. William and Mary College, though the second in the order of time, appears to have been wholly without influence in this respect, perhaps because entirely peculiar in its constitution from the very first. The other three, with some variations as to form, present essentially the same organization, which is that of an English college, on a modest scale, and modified to suit the circumstances of the country. The system thus introduced among us and so widely extended since, is therefore the English system, as distinguished from the German. To these two forms may be reduced nearly all the existing varieties of academical organization. They may therefore not improperly be made the subject of our further inquiries; the rather as their distinctive features are so strongly marked as to be easily exhibited in contrast.

It is highly important to observe, however, that these systems now so unlike, and indeed so opposite, can be traced to a common origin. The mother university of Europe was the old University of Paris, an institution altogether different from the modern University of France. In the early history of the former, may be traced the organic changes, which by being pushed to an extreme, have since resulted in the systems designated as the English and the German. By going back to this remote stage of the formative process, we can most effectually ascertain what is common to both, as well as what is characteristic of either.

The old University of Paris, and the others modelled on it at an early period, were extremely simple in their constitution.

The only two essential elements were a body of teachers and a body of learners. Degrees, classes, offices, and buildings, were accidents of later origin. In the first universities, the idea seems to have been, that all should teach who could, and all should learn who would, and as they would. Hence the vast concourse both of teachers and learners in the middle ages, at Paris, Oxford, and Bologna, and other celebrated seats of learning. As the institutions acquired permanence and authority, it became necessary to restrict the right of teaching, by prescribing certain qualifications. This was the origin of degrees, which originally had exclusive reference to the actual functions of a teacher, a design which may still be traced in the titles of Doctor and Magister. Another change which could not fail to be found necessary soon, was a more systematic reference to the training of young men for particular professions. Hence arose the division into Faculties. All these arrangements have been permanent and common to all systems, being equally the ground work of the English and German organizations. In its most mature form, then, a university may be described as necessarily including a body of teachers or professors, divided into four great faculties, with the power of admitting others to the same rank with themselves. It is from this point that we are to trace the subsequent divergence of the different methods now represented in the constitution of the English and German Universities.

The first cause that led to the modification of this system, was one which might have been supposed to threaten no material departure from the primitive simplicity. This was the natural and almost unavoidable attempt to gather the young scholars into houses, where they might be dieted and lodged together, secured from imposition and temptation, and subjected to something like domestic discipline, both of a literary and a moral nature. This arrangement was perhaps rendered peculiarly necessary by the vast numbers and the tender age of those who attended the old universities. The associations thus formed were at first entirely voluntary, differing little in their origin from ordinary boarding-houses. By degrees, however, they assumed more of a regular scholastic form, and this was sometimes rendered permanent by liberal endowments. When the change last mentioned took place, the result was a College in the English sense. Where the same advantages in kind were furnished, but without endow-

ments for the gratuitous support of scholars, the institution was a Hall, according to a distinction still in force at Oxford.

It will be observed that these establishments formed no part of the University properly so called, which would still have been complete if no such conveniences had been superadded to its simple organization. The Professors in their Faculties together with their pupils were the necessary elements of the University. The Colleges and Halls were additional expedients for the safety, comfort, and improvement of the students. But the more these secondary institutions were improved and perfected, the more they threatened to complete and interfere with that on which they were engrafted. The arrangements originally made to assist the younger pupils in their studies under the university professors soon began to aim at something higher, and to operate not in subjection but in opposition to the general system. Appearances of this effect disclosed themselves in Paris at an early date, while other universities acquired a new character, according to the preference which they gave to one or the other of the two conflicting elements. The unbounded munificence of kings and private individuals in England gave to the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, an importance which at last eclipsed that of the older organization; while in Germany the absence of such rich endowments allowed the primitive system to maintain its ground, or rather to attain its full perfection.

This brief historical sketch prepares us for a comparison of the two systems as they are. It will be convenient to begin with what is common to both. The universities of Germany and England are alike then in professing to provide for the instruction of their pupils in the whole circle of literature and science by the agency of regular professors, to whose classes all the matriculated students have access. They are also alike in the power belonging to the university as a corporation, to confer degrees in all the faculties and to prescribe the necessary qualifications and tests. Upon this common basis very different superstructures have been reared. In each of the great English Universities there are some twenty colleges and halls, every one of which may be described as a university in miniature, being more or less perfectly provided with instructors of its own, and with a system of domestic discipline, entirely independent of the rest. Each of these colleges is a distinct corporation, holding its own pro-

perty, sometimes to a vast amount, and governed by its own laws. The bond of union is the reservation to the general body of the power to confer degrees. This renders general examinations necessary, and these perpetually kindle and maintain the emulation of the colleges among themselves. The natural effect of this has been to make the rival institutions exert every effort to increase their means of improvement and attraction to new pupils. But while this has tended to exalt the reputation and the influence of the colleges, it has led to the neglect and deterioration of the general system of instruction by professors. This has indeed at times seemed to retain only a nominal existence, some of the most eminent professors merely going through the form of lecturing as seldom as they could, and often to a handful of indifferent or accidental hearers. The acknowledged cause of this extraordinary change is the gradual substitution of the college course for that once furnished by the university at large; a change recommended and facilitated by the additional advantage of strict discipline and personal supervision, which the colleges hold out, and which the old university system did not afford, either in theory or practice. Here then is one distinctive feature of the English universities, that instead of a general system of instruction for the whole, there has been gradually substituted a number of distinct systems on a smaller scale, belonging to as many different colleges or halls, and only held together by a common dependence on the general body for the honorary close of the whole course of study; while the general system of instruction which once constituted the university itself, though still maintained, is little more than a dead letter or an empty form.

But there is still another marked peculiarity to be described, as even more conspicuously characteristic of the English system. The colleges have hitherto been represented only as schools for the training of young men, in subordination or in opposition to the university properly so called. But this, though certainly the original design of these collegiate institutions, is in fact but one of their actual functions, and in the case of some entirely neglected. The munificent endowments, which have made the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge what they are, were not exclusively intended to provide for the support of young men in the early stages of their education. In strict accordance with the

monastic taste and customs of the age when most of these establishments were founded, the larger part of their endowments was appropriated to the support of men, and for the most part of clergymen, whose education was already finished, and whose lives were to be spent in learned and religious retirement. Out of this number the actual teachers of the colleges are chosen, but they are far too numerous to be all employed in this way, nor is any such necessity imposed upon them. These Fellows constitute the corporations of the several colleges, and are the rulers both of these and of the general body, except in extraordinary cases, when some question of general interest brings together the whole body of graduates to exercise their right of voting, which is usually suffered to lie dormant. So far is the business of instruction from engrossing the whole body of men thus supported at these seats of learning, that some of the most wealthy and magnificent establishments, such as King's College at Cambridge, are almost closed against undergraduates, while others, such as Trinity and St. John's, carry on the business with an intensity of emulation rendered more remarkable by their peculiar local situation, cheek by jowl. Here then is another marked peculiarity of the English system, the possession of the highest academical authority by a large body of educated residents, deriving their support from the endowments of the colleges, but only partially and voluntarily engaged in the work of actual instruction.

Both these peculiarities are absolutely wanting in the German universities. They include no colleges whatever in the English sense. The *seminaria* and other local institutions are entirely different, and in fact form no part of the university. There has been nothing therefore to compete or come in conflict with the body of Professors, which continues, as at first, to constitute the academic corporation. Instead of being thrown into the shade or superseded by any rival class or interest, they still monopolize the whole work of public and authoritative teaching. The changes which experience has introduced into the organization of these great schools, far from tending, as in England, to diminish the importance or to paralyze the action of the university Professors, have tended only to increase their efficiency and dignity by enlisting in the work the greatest possible amount of cultivated talent, and at the same time rigidly excluding not only igno-

rance but mediocrity. The means employed for this end in the German universities are eminently simple and effective. They have often been described, and yet are very frequently misapprehended by American and English readers, on account of their remoteness from our own associations. The plan may perhaps be made intelligible thus. No man, according to the proper German system, can become a regular salaried Professor, without having previously exercised his gifts as a supernumerary titular Professor, recognised as such by the university, but dependent on the patronage of pupils. From this body of Extraordinary Professors, the higher rank of Ordinary teachers is constantly replenished. But even this brevet rank, if such it may be called, can only be attained after previous trial as a private adventurer. The Professors Extraordinary are selected from the body of Privatim Docentes, who are not even titular Professors, but licentiates or aspirants to that dignity. This is not an office to which men are appointed, but an indulgence which they seek, in order to evince their fitness for the business of instruction. An important feature in this whole arrangement is that the inferior ranks of teachers are not confined to any lower function of the didactic office, but permitted to attempt the very highest subjects and to use precisely the same forms and methods with the most illustrious of their superiors. This not only stimulates their powers, but applies the only really decisive test of their capacity to teach. Another circumstance which tends to keep their powers on the stretch, is that the process of promotion, which has been described, is not confined to any single institution, but embraces the whole circle of what may in the strict sense be called German Universities. The man who has succeeded or excelled as a Privatim Docens at Leipzig may be called as a Professor Extraordinarius to Göttingen, and if there successful may become one day a Professor Ordinarius at Berlin. The field thus opened to the young aspirant is of course a very different one from that presented by the rare and slow promotions of a single institution. At the same time, this free circulation through the whole Germanic system may be viewed both as a cause and an effect of the surprising uniformity which marks these institutions, so that a man may pass without inconvenience or the necessity of any change in plan or habit from any one to almost any other of the German universities.

This uniformity of structure and of practice is not owing, like a similar phenomenon among ourselves, to the successive and repeated imitation of a few models. It is rather the result of great simplicity combined with great efficiency in the original idea, which has been so faithfully adhered to, and so fully carried out, in the German universities. These institutions theoretically recognise but one mode of instruction, that of oral inculcation by a living teacher in the presence of his assembled pupils. They are therefore free from that complexity which elsewhere springs from the variety of secondary and auxiliary exercises. All the Professors are as such mere lecturers, and they all lecture very much in the same way. This simplicity of method must have been found, in the experience of ages, highly conducive to important ends; for Germany is certainly the last place where traditional prescription would be suffered to compensate for the absence of intrinsic merit, real or supposed. In a country where opinion is in constant flux, and where mere antiquity is reckoned rather a defect than an advantage, it is not to be supposed that these hereditary methods of instruction would have been so steadfastly maintained, if they had not been proved by long experiment to be the very means required for the full attainment, not of the highest ends perhaps, but of the ends actually aimed at, in the whole scheme of German education.

Another cause which has contributed to the production of the uniformity in question is the absolute dependence of these institutions on the state. Had they been left to the exclusive irresponsible control of local boards and corporations, they would long since have exhibited diversities of form, if not of substance, which are now precluded by the uniform action of a power acting under fixed laws and a settled usage. The differences which might still be expected to exist between the institutions of the several German states, are shut out by the obvious policy and interest of all the states to keep up their intellectual as well as their commercial intercourse, and by the constant circulation which, for that end, is encouraged and maintained among their institutions. This uniform dependence of the German seminaries on the government is not to be confounded with the injudicious and disastrous intermeddling of political authorities among ourselves in the details of academical instruction and government. Nothing can well exceed the freedom guaranteed to the German

academic bodies in reference to all purely scientific or scholastic questions. The state control has reference almost exclusively to the appointment and support of the Professors, and to the general organization of the several institutions, by controlling which the governments are able to secure the uniformity in question, without encroaching upon what is regarded by all Germans as essential to the dignity, efficiency, and actual success of any academical establishment whatever.

The freedom thus possessed and highly prized is not, however, mere exemption from control and interference on the part of the political authorities. It includes a liberty enjoyed by the academic teachers and their pupils, with respect to one another, which among ourselves would rather be considered license. The two parts of this franchise are distinguished by the Germans themselves as *Lehrfreyheit* and *Lernfreyheit*, liberty of teaching and of learning. The first consists in the absolute right of every authorized teacher, even of the lowest rank, to teach what he will, within the bounds of his own Faculty. The other is the corresponding right of the student to learn what he will, and for that purpose to select his own teachers. The prescription of a certain course of study, introduced into some German universities of late, is a departure from the theory and practice of the national system, and as such not entitled to consideration here.

This cherished freedom both of teachers and of learners, which has certainly contributed to give the German universities a marked distinctive character, excludes from their academical arrangements two of the features which among ourselves are looked upon as most essential to a well-ordered school of learning. One of these is the division of the students into classes, corresponding to the periods of a determinate prescribed course of study. The other is the distribution of the sciences or subjects taught into departments or professorships, for each of which some one man is responsible, and in which he is free from interference or encroachment on the part of any other. The first of these arrangements would be inconsistent with the freedom of the learner, the second with the freedom of the teacher. The German practice which has been described, so far as it relates to the teachers, leads to two results exceedingly unlike and almost opposite. The first is the extreme division of labour, and the attention given in some cases to minute parts of a subject

the whole of which, among ourselves, would hardly be expected to engross the time and labour of one teacher. It is hardly possible to take up a programme of the lectures at a German university without being surprised at the infinitesimal character of some of the subjects. A course of lectures, not on a single author merely, but on a single book, and even on a small part of a single book, is not uncommon. And the same is true of the minute subdivisions of the sciences and individual works of art, which are often made the subject of protracted academical prelections. That the minds of certain teachers should be drawn with special interest to such themes, is not so surprising as that their instruction should find patient hearers, a phenomenon explicable only from the peculiar character of German institutions which has thus far been only partially exhibited.

The other singular effect arising from this perfect liberty of teaching, is the frequency with which the same subjects are explained by different teachers at the same place and during the same term of study. This is no fortuitous concurrence, but in many cases a deliberate rivalry, and in all the exercise of what is reckoned an invaluable right. So perfectly familiar has this practice now become, that it probably would be thought an imperfection in the organization of a German university, if any leading subject in the Encylopädie were left to the exclusive management of one Professor. Such an arrangement would be viewed as an unwelcome limitation of the student's choice, and at the same time as involving a pernicious loss of stimulus and motive to the teacher. Such a state of things is probably of rare occurrence in any but the feeblest and obscurest universities. In all the more important institutions, it is prevented, if not by the number and selection of the regular Professors, by the constant succession of aspirants and probationers, who frequently desire nothing better than the honour of competing with some eminent Professor in his chosen walk, and thus establishing their reputation in the most difficult but for that very reason the most honourable manner possible. One thing at least is certain, that the German academic teachers are accustomed, from their very entrance on the work, to look for rivalry and competition, not in other schools or other walks of learning, but their own.

This brings before us what may be perhaps regarded as the grand internal difference between the English and the German

systems, a difference more profound than that of mere external organization, though in all probability occasioned by it. Common to both is an assiduous regard to emulation, as the mainspring of intellectual activity. But with this extraordinary difference, that the emulation which the English system stimulates and feeds is that of the pupil, whereas in Germany it is that of the instructor. Between the colleges and college-tutors of Oxford and Cambridge, there is, no doubt, a perpetual and active rivalry; but the test, by which their merit is determined, is the merit of their pupils. It is only as trainers of the candidates for academic honours that they come into comparison at all, and it may therefore be alleged with truth, that the emulation of the English teachers owes its existence to the emulation of the English students. To excite the latter and direct it is the object of a large part of the academic regulations. Prizes, examinations, and degrees, have all a bearing on this same great end, and the most enthusiastic excitements at the English universities—except such as are connected with great party questions in church or state—appear to terminate upon the question who are to be Wranglers or First Class Men. In Germany this state of things has no existence, but its very opposite. Among the students emulation is unknown. Examinations and degrees have reference to special objects, and are matters of business, not of honorary competition. The emulation of the teachers on the other hand, is carried to the highest pitch of ardour and intensity. It has relation not to the attainments of their pupils but their own. The party divisions of the German students do not turn upon the standing or performances of their fellows, but upon the talents and the reputation of their teachers. Whatever influence this practice may exert upon the elementary improvement of the pupils, it can hardly fail to elevate their literary standard and present a higher aim to their ambition. But this is not all. The effects of this cause may be traced still further. The peculiarity described reacts upon the very constitution which produced it, and gives rise to one of the most marked diversities between the English and the German systems. As the centre around which all revolves in England is the proficiency of pupils, so the circle of their studies is the bound and measure of the active literature of the university. Hence it becomes a training school for general education. What is done beyond this

is the voluntary work of individual scholars, and it certainly bears no proportion to their number or the wealth of the endowments which sustain them. In Germany, on the other hand, the constant emulation of the teachers, not as teachers, but as scholars, renders it impossible to make elementary science or literature the main object of pursuit. These are thrust back into the lower or preparatory schools, and the university becomes essentially and exclusively a place of professional instruction. This is one of the most striking points of difference between the cases which we are comparing. The English and German Universities are constituted with a view to the wants of different classes altogether. The English student carries on the studies which he had begun at school, and finishes the laying of a broad foundation for his subsequent attainments. But professional accomplishments he must seek elsewhere; if a lawyer, in the Inns of Court; if a Physician, in the Hospitals of London; if a clergyman, wherever he can find them. These remarks of course have no respect to very late improvements and additions to the means of instruction in the English Universities, but only to those institutions as they have been. And the highest English authority might be cited for the allegation, that at least till very lately the two great universities afforded no means of professional instruction, in any degree suited to the wants of their own graduates. Why so? Because the wealth and strength of these establishments has been for ages lavished on the elements of general education. On the other hand, the man who should resort to a German university in search of elementary instruction would be sadly disappointed, and if not forced to abandon the object in despair, compelled to seek it in the gymnasia and grammar schools, whose course of discipline is presupposed in the arrangements of the higher institutions.

There is one point in the organization of the German universities which may require further explanation. The description which has been already given of them as professional schools may seem to be inconsistent with the fact that the largest of the four faculties is usually that of Philosophy, corresponding to the Faculty of Arts with us, and comprehending all that does not fall under Medicine, Theology, or Law. It might indeed be properly described as the Faculty of General Literature and Science. From the analogy of our academical organizations it might na-

turally be inferred that this residuary Faculty was intended to afford the means of elementary or general instruction as preparatory to professional pursuits. But this is not, to any great extent, the case. The Philosophical Faculty is not more elementary than either of the others. The studies necessarily preliminary to the three professional departments are pursued at the Gymnasia. The fourth department is intended, no less than the others, to prepare men for professional activity, especiallyas teachers. It is here that those who have selected this as their employment carry on the studies which they have begun at school. Those in particular who aim to be Professors, here continue and complete their preparation. The lectures in this Faculty are also much frequented by the students of the others, either for the sake of general improvement, or of branches more or less connected with their professional pursuits. Enough has now been said to show that the Faculty of Philosophy is not, like that of Arts in England, introductory or subordinate to the others, but collateral and equal, so that what is said in general of them applies no less to this.

It now remains to be considered what peculiar advantages are claimed or really possessed by these two systems of university education. The two boasts of the English system are, that by its college discipline it furnishes the country with the most enlightened and accomplished gentry in the world, and that by its rich endowments it enables a great number of highly educated men to devote themselves without distraction to learned and scientific labour. The first of these pretensions is well founded. After all that has been said and written to the contrary, it may be set down as a certain fact, that no class of men engaged in secular pursuits receives so manly yet so liberal a training, one so invigorating yet refining, as the gentlemen of England. This is abundantly apparent in the high degree of taste combined with common sense which they exhibit, as compared with the corresponding class in any other country. An effect so marked and uniform can only be explained by their peculiar training, a large and important part of which is furnished by the universities. We hold it to be certain, therefore, that as places of general education for the young men of the country, these establishments have honourably answered the great end of their existence. This praise, however, extends only to that general foundation

which is common to the different professions. With respect to professional pursuits themselves, the English universities, as we have seen, are signally defective. The preference thus given to general over special or professional training may perhaps be owing to the unusually large proportion of educated men in England who have no professions in the proper sense, but either engage in public affairs or live as country gentlemen. Whatever be the cause, there can be no doubt as to the effect, to wit, that the English universities have been as unimportant in their influence on professional education as they have been effective in improving the general training of the English gentry.

The other claim asserted by the English universities is far from being so well founded. The effect of their immense endowments, as means for the advancement of science and the increase of the national literature, is not to be measured by the absolute number of accomplished scholars or of valuable books which have been thus produced, but by comparing these results with the abundance of the means employed and with the corresponding fruits of other systems. Apply the former of these tests, and even the most partial observation must be struck with the immense disproportion of the means used and the ends accomplished. Even supposing all the scholars who have been sustained in learned leisure to have spent their lives in faithful and successful study, how few compared with the whole number have added anything whatever to the stock of learning; and of the contributions made, how few have really advanced the boundaries of human knowledge. Take for example the important and extensive field of biblical learning, and consider what has been achieved or even attempted since the days of Kennicott and Lowth. Or if this be considered an unfair test, we may turn to a department where the English scholars have been really distinguished, that of Greek and Latin criticism. Even here, how little has been done, beyond the admirable classical training of the grammar schools, for permanent effect, except so far as the modern English scholars have been roused by the example and assisted by the labours of the Germans. Even here, where most has been accomplished, it is little in proportion to the numbers from whom something might have been expected, and to the means provided for their sustenance. Experience

has shown that learned leisure and large incomes, with all appliances and aids to boot, tend rather to stagnation than activity, without the stimulus of emulation.

The strength of the German system coincides exactly with the weak points of the English. Its great boast is, that it furnishes the best facilities for professional study that the present state of knowledge will allow, and that it constantly tends to the advancement as well as the diffusion of learning, not by rich endowments to sustain a class of learned men distinct from the teachers of youth, but by bringing the teachers themselves under such an influence as forces them to go ahead, instead of treading the same dull routine. This effect is secured by all those arrangements which excite the emulation of the teachers rather than the students. An instructor who is constantly exposed to competition in his own department, and dependent, for a part of his support and all his official reputation, on the preference of his pupils, cannot remain contented with his first attainments, but must keep up with the scientific progress of his times, and, if he can, add something of his own to the accumulations of his predecessors. It is therefore one of the most striking features in the present literary state of Germany, that a large proportion of her authors are academical teachers, and that their labours in this last capacity have constant reference to a wider public than the population of the lecture room. There are probably few courses of successful lectures which are not eventually given to the world as books, and still fewer books on learned subjects which have not been, at least in substance, uttered *ex cathedra*. This intimate connexion between authorship and academic teaching, when combined with the incessant stimulus of emulation acting on the latter, is the surest antidote to stagnant acquiescence in established forms and actual attainments, and the most effectual security for progress, both as to the matter and the method of instruction. In this respect, the German system far transcends the English and all others, as an engine to put mind in motion and to promote investigation and discovery. Where the academic teachers of a country are its most distinguished scientific writers, all the influence of criticism and popular applause is brought to bear upon the pupil in determining his choice and engaging his attention, and at the same time on the teacher in exciting him to new exertion. The aggregate effect of all these causes is a state of

intellectual fermentation, utterly unknown where teachers are authors, if at all, by accident, and where their whole strength is expended on the bringing of successive classes to a certain point, and that not a very high one, of mental cultivation.

But we have yet to consider the peculiar disadvantages of this same powerful machinery. A system of instruction so effective and so beneficent in one direction, may still from its onesidedness do harm or do nothing in another. The objections which may be most plausibly alleged against the German universities, are three in number. On the first of these we shall not dwell, as it involves a question not yet settled by our own experience. This is the want of discipline both moral and intellectual. That the German students are too much neglected and lost sight of, in the constitution and administration of the universities, is clear enough, and a practical admission of the fact is involved in certain late attempts at reformation. But it is not equally clear that the great end of the whole system would be better answered by the substitution of a rigorous school discipline for the Lernfreyheit of the German students. The necessity of such restraints in the earlier stages of instruction is admitted every where, and nowhere more distinctly than in Germany, the grammar schools of which have carried rigorous precision to its utmost verge. But it is part of the same system to allow the student who has passed through this disciplinary process an unshackled freedom, both as to his course of study and his mode of life. The abrupt transition is no doubt pernicious, and may well be urged as one of the most serious objections to the German practice. But it does not follow that the principle of freedom, under proper regulation, is essentially a false one, or unsuited to the other parts of this peculiar system. It is a thought suggested by experience to more than one among ourselves, that if the absence of all discipline in some of our professional schools, for instance those of medicine, has led to ruinous excesses, there are evils, no less real though entirely dissimilar, produced in other seminaries, by retaining too much of those academical formalities. which could not be dispensed with safely, in the earlier periods of education. The conclusion, to which these considerations seem to point, is the familiar one, that opposite extremes may be alike pernicious, and that the course of wisdom and of safety often lies between them.

The next objection springs directly from that very emulation which has done so much for the activity and influence of German teachers. It is a necessary consequence of what has been already stated, that the method of instruction is determined, not by the necessities of the pupil, but by the ambition of the teacher. The choice of subjects and the mode of treating them, which would be most improving to a class of young men fresh from the gymnasium, might not be the best adapted to gain éclat for the lecturer, or to produce a striking and effective book, or to eclipse and vanquish a competitor. Hence the unequal distribution of the sciences already mentioned, the extreme division of labour on one hand, and the multiplicity of rival lectures in the same department on the other. Hence it is that the young theologian may sometimes hear two or three courses on Isaiah, and none at all on Genesis, or vice versâ. Hence it is that he is under the necessity of plunging into the middle of a subject and of leaving it unfinished, if his teacher chance to be at work upon the sixth or seventh volume of a book that is to last as long as he does. It is truly wonderful how small a part of a complete course of instruction can be sometimes gathered from what seems to be the richest bill of fare, and from the labours of the most accomplished cooks in the republic of letters. To this anomalous arrangement German students easily accommodate themselves, because they are prepared for it, because they are acquainted with no other, and because the practical effect of the whole system is to make them care less what they learn than where they learn it or from whom. From the right man nothing comes amiss, while nothing from the wrong one is acceptable, the strongest proof and illustration of the fact so often mentioned, that the life of the German institutions is the emulation not of the learners but the teachers. The effect of this extraordinary practice on the mental operations and acquirements of the pupils, must be one which can hardly be neutralized or made good even by the salutary stimulus and elevated standard of attainment which it affords.

But this is not the worst effect of the extraordinary stimulus to which the German teachers are subjected. If it merely led to a distortion of the course of study, and a corresponding disproportion in the efforts and attainments of the pupils, it might be regarded as comparatively innocent. But the very character of German thought and German learning has been seriously mod-

ified by this peculiar feature of their public institutions. The incessant rivalry of the professors, and the urgent need of doing something to attract and hold the attention of the public, tends of course to generate a morbid appetite for novelty, and this when once indulged becomes more craving, till the means of sating it are no longer furnished by the rational and real, but must necessarily be sought in the region of grotesque inventions and imaginations. That this diseased aversion to familiar truths and preference of what is new, however false or monstrous, should be confounded by the minds which feel it with increase of strength and intellectual advancement, is entirely natural, but just as erroneous as the opposite extreme of denying all improvement and discovery. This view of the matter may account for the coincidence, which sometimes shows itself, between the vaunted fruits of German speculation and the crude attempts of youthful minds among ourselves. However impotent the cultivated English mind may be to such achievements, it sometimes bears fruit, during the process of its cultivation, very closely resembling these exotic products. There are some among us, as we verily believe, who may be truly said to have passed through the German state before they reached maturity. At any rate, there is a strong resemblance between what is thrown aside and left behind as childish on the one hand, and what is treasured up and almost worshipped as the highest wisdom on the other. This admits of explanation without any derogation from the native strength of either party. The incessant straining after something new and strange is enough to force even the most masculine and ripened minds into puerile extravagance, if not habitually, yet at times. And such a straining, as we have already seen, is but the natural effect of the position which the leading minds of Germany are forced to occupy. How far the same end is promoted by the exclusion of those minds from many occupations which in England and America afford a kind of vent or safety-valve for mental ebullition, it may not be easy to determine. But the concentration of so many effervescent intellects on speculative subjects would not of itself account for the specific character of their operations, without the additional solution furnished by the national modes of education and their tendency to foster a perpetual and restless emulation among teachers.

We may now return to the point from which we set out, the

organization of our own public seminaries. After what has been said, it may seem absurd to represent them as belonging to either of the systems just described. The moderate scale on which they are projected, and the absence for the most part of rich endowments, may be thought to distinguish them as strongly from the English universities, as other circumstances do from those of Germany. But the points of difference are in one case accidental, in the other essential. As to those things which divide the two great systems from each other, our schools resemble those of England. Here as there, the two essential features of the German plan are wanting, liberty of teaching and liberty of learning. Even in those cases where the method of instruction and the absence of coercive discipline approach most nearly to the German model, as for instance in our medical schools, there is still a prescribed course of study, and an exact distribution of the subjects taught among a body of professors, each of whom is strictly limited to his own department, and secure from rivalry or interference in it. In one case at least, the Virginia University, an experiment has been made upon the German method of allowing liberty of choice to the students. But the limitation of the teachers, on the other hand, is more than usually rigorous. And even the *Lernfreyheit* theoretically granted has been practically restricted, no doubt for good reasons and with good results. Nothing indeed can be more clear to us than the unsuitableness of this method to the earlier periods of general education. Its only proper place is in schools of higher or professional instruction, which, as we have seen, is the true character of the German universities.

The German system being thus unlike our own, the practical inquiry is, how far we may derive advantage from it. To know that there are other methods than the one with which we have been all our lives familiar, is worth something; but we naturally look beyond this to more tangible results, and ask, in what way the good qualities of this foreign system may be made available to us. The first way which suggests itself, and which has been already tried, is that of sending our young men to study there. There is a well known and material objection to this course arising from the risk of intellectual and moral aberration. This danger is so far real as to make it highly desirable that those who go abroad with this view, should be fitted for it by peculiar attributes of head

and heart. Soundness and strength of understanding, as distinguished from mere genius or mere liveliness of parts, and a well defined religious character, are the two grand requisites. But in addition to the danger which has been described, there is a difficulty of a literary kind, which has perhaps received less attention than it merits. It arises from the fact already stated, that the German course of education and our own are incommensurable, aiming at different ends by the use of different means. Nothing can therefore be more groundless than the hope of eking out in foreign schools a course of study left unfinished here. There are only two ways in which real benefit can be derived from such a residence abroad. The first is to commence in very early life and pass completely through the course. This would no doubt produce scholars of an elevated order, where the necessary talent and desire of improvement were forthcoming. But the scholars thus produced would be Germans not Americans. They would have scarcely any advantage over an imported German, except in the use of their own language; and even that might be impaired. Their spirit, turn of mind, and prejudices, would be necessarily exotic, and unfriendly to success at home. This is not only probable a priori, but determined by experience. So far as we know, there is no case of such early and thorough German training, in which the subject has been fitted by it for commanding influence or even useful labour after his return. On this account, the preference is due to another method, that of going not as early but as late as possible, without defeating the very end in view. Let the student pass not only through what is here considered a complete course of general education, but also through a full course of professional study, especially if he be a theologian. Thus prepared, he will at least know what he wants and what is to be had, and will neither waste his time in catching flies nor bring home wheelbarrows from Constantinople. To those who are deterred by these or other reasons from frequenting German universities, it may be some consolation to know, that in no other case of the same kind is the want of personal observation so easily supplied by means of books. The transition from the lecture-room to the press in Germany is not only easy but common, we may even say constant. There is very little valuable instruction orally imparted that is not, sooner or later, and in many cases speedily, rendered

accessible to all who read the language. This, it is true, does not compensate for the want of the impression made by oral delivery, or of the information gained by private intercourse. But these are not the usual attractions to our students, and apart from these, the German schools may act almost as powerfully at a distance as at hand. A striking proof and illustration is afforded by the fact that some of those American scholars, who appear to have derived most from the German sources, have never been abroad. In one or the other of these ways, we think it highly desirable that some of our younger theologians, who possess the prerequisites, both native and acquired, should make themselves familiar with the German erudition and the German methods of instruction. This necessity arises partly from the undeniable pre-eminence of Germany in certain walks of learning, which renders it impossible to keep up with the progress of the age and yet prohibit all intellectual communion with her. It arises also from the very evils which this intercourse has generated, and which must be remedied, not by blind denunciation, but by thorough and discriminating knowledge.

It is evident, however, that this method of importing German wisdom, even if it should become far more extensive than it is, would operate rather upon individuals than on the institutions of this country. It is still a question, therefore, whether these admit of any material improvement by the introduction of the German system, as we have considered it. The sheer substitution of that system for our own is out of the question. Were it ever so easy, it would be wholly undesirable. Though some of the evils which attend its operation in its native land might be corrected by our political and social institutions, there are others which would still exist, and some which would be aggravated, if not developed for the first time, by the action of the self-same causes. It would indeed be a sufficient objection to the system, as a whole, that it is foreign, that it did not germinate and ripen here, but in another soil and under other skies. Such institutions may materially influence the state of society, but they do not produce it. They only react upon that to which they owe their own existence. And the same considerations which thus show the revolution to be inexpedient, show it also to be utterly impracticable. The German education could no more be forced

upon this country than the German language. But it does not follow that our own institutions can derive no benefit whatever from these foreign methods. There are several ways in which a salutary use of them might be made, although not perhaps at present. One which has been suggested is the institution of a university on the German principle at some central point, not with a view to supersede existing institutions or even to compete with them, but for the purpose of supplying what is really our grand desideratum, some contrivance to encourage and facilitate the further prosecution of the studies now begun at college. The proper seat of such a school would be one of our great cities, and the best plan the old German one, in its naked simplicity, and with its Jachin and Boaz, liberty of teaching and learning. It would even be desirable to try the old way of dispensing with costly buildings and unnecessary forms. The teachers might be embodied first by voluntary association, and then perpetuated in the German way, and with the usual gradations. Such an institution, if it could be brought into existence, would probably do much for the advancement as well as the diffusion of knowledge. The grand difficulty would be to find hearers. Many might be willing to resort to such a school instead of the existing colleges; but few would probably resort to it as something in addition to them. The characteristic hurry of society and life among us, and the early call to active employment, leave but few, who have completed the accustomed course of study, willing to commence a new one. At the same time, it would be extremely difficult at present to supply such an establishment with teachers, at least in sufficient numbers to maintain the real German emulation. It would indeed be scarcely possible without a weakening draught upon the other institutions of the country, unless by some arrangement which should make it possible to employ the same talent in both ways. The very statement of these difficulties may perhaps suffice to show that the country is not ripe for any such experiment, even if it should be thought desirable. And yet the day may not be distant when such an addition to our existing means of intellectual improvement will be found not only possible but indispensable.

In the mean time, there is another way, in which the least objectionable features of the German plan might be transferred to some of our existing institutions, without any change what-

ever in their form or government, by superadding to the regular prescribed course of education, some provision for subjects not included in it, or for the further prosecution of others. These, forming no part of the curriculum required for graduation, would admit of being taught with all the freedom of the German method, both with respect to learners and teachers, both being left unshackled as to subjects. Even the principle of competition among teachers, which is so essential to the German system, might be recognised, as far as would be salutary either to the individuals concerned or to the progress of learning. The lecturers on this plan might be either the regular professors only, or these with the addition of such qualified coadjutors as might offer themselves and be approved by the competent authorities. By some such arrangement at a few of our oldest institutions, a great impulse might be given to the march of science, and provision made for supplying the deplorable defect of able teachers and professors. At the same time the literary standard of our educated youth would be raised, and many induced to tread the higher walks of learning, who, for want of such inducements, now waste their time and talents in doing nothing or worse than nothing.

With these crude suggestions we conclude a notice of the foreign universities which cannot but appear unsatisfactory and meager to those who are already familiar with the subject, but may possibly afford some interesting information to a larger class of readers, whose ideas, in relation to these matters, have been vague or founded on erroneous statements.

ART. III.—*An Earnest Appeal to the Free Church of Scotland, on the subject of Economics.* By Thomas Chalmers, D.D. First American from the Second Edinburgh Edition. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1847. pp. 64.

THIS suggestive and teeming pamphlet has now been several months before the churches, and we presume in the hands of almost all our ministers. We cannot suffer ourselves to think that so much practical wisdom, enforced by the earnest eloquence of

Chalmers, can fail to influence for good a multitude of minds. We may not immediately see its effects, but the principles here suggested, the plans proposed, and the motives urged must commend themselves to the judgment and conscience of the readers, and must induce them to act, or at least prepare them to act with greater intelligence and zeal, in the prosecution of the various enterprises in which as a church we are engaged.

We propose to select from the numerous topics here discussed the support of the clergy, as a subject of a few remarks. That it is the duty of the church to sustain those who are engaged in preaching the gospel is not a disputed point. The apostle rests this obligation on the following grounds. 1. The general principle that labour is entitled to a reward, or, as our Saviour expresses it, the labourer is worthy of his hire. This principle the apostle reminds us, is recognized in all the departments of human life, and has the sanction of the law of God in its application even to brutes, for it is written: Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. 2. It is a simple matter of commutative justice. If we have sown unto spiritual things, is it a great matter that we should reap your carnal things? If we do you a great good, is it unreasonable to expect you to do us a less? 3. In all countries and under all forms of religions, true or false—those who minister at the altar are partakers with the altar. 4. It is an express ordinance of Christ that they which preach the gospel should live by the gospel.

It is not however every one who preaches the gospel, who is entitled to the benefit of this ordinance. In many cases men, who by profession are lawyers, merchants, or mechanics, are at the same time preachers. Preaching, however, is not their vocation; it is not the work to which their time and talents are devoted. It is a service in which they occasionally engage as opportunity offers without interrupting their ordinary engagements. It is evident that such men, however laudable their motives, or however useful their labours, are not entitled by the ordinance of Christ to live by the gospel. Others, who by profession are preachers, who have been educated and ordained in reference to the sacred office, are at the same time something else, teachers, farmers, or planters. They unite with their vocation as preachers some lucrative secular employment. Sometimes this is a matter of choice; more frequently, perhaps, of

necessity; sometimes, as in the case of Paul, of disinterested self-denial, that they may make the gospel of Christ without charge. No one can doubt that there may be excellent and adequate reasons why a preacher should be a teacher or a farmer. Nor can it be questioned that every one has a right to judge of those reasons for himself, and to determine whether he will support himself, or throw himself on the ordinance of Christ. But he cannot do both. He cannot support himself and claim the right to be supported by the church. He throws himself out of the scope of the ordinance in question by devoting his time and talents to the work of self support. The plain scriptural principle is that those who devote themselves to the service of the church, have a right to be supported by the church; that those who consecrate themselves to preaching the gospel are entitled to live by the gospel. As this is a truth so plainly taught in the sacred scriptures, and so generally conceded, it need not be discussed.

A much more difficult question is: What is the best method of sustaining the ministers of religion? In attempting to answer this question, we propose first to state historically and very briefly the different methods which have been adopted for that purpose, and secondly to show that the duty in question is a duty common to the whole church.

As to the former of the two points proposed for consideration, it may be remarked that under the Mosaic dispensation, the Levites being set apart for the service of the sanctuary, had thirty-five cities with a circle of land of a thousand cubits around the walls assigned to them, and a tithe of all the produce of the ground, of the flocks, and of the herds. The priests were supported by a tithe of the portion paid the Levites; by the first fruits which, according to the Talmudists, were in no case to be less than the sixtieth of the whole harvest; by a certain portion of the sacrifices offered on the altar; by the price paid for the redemption of the first-born among men, and of those animals which were not allowed to be offered in sacrifice. They were moreover exempt from taxation and military duty. Such was the abundant provision which God ordained for the support of the ministers of religion.

Under the new dispensation, our Lord while explicitly enjoining the duty, left his people free as to the mode in which it

should be discharged. From the record contained in the Acts of the Apostles, several facts bearing on this subject may be learned. First, that a lively sense of the brotherhood of believers filled the hearts of the early Christians, and was the effect of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit. Secondly, that in consequence of this feeling of brotherhood, they had all things in common. The multitude of them that believed, we are told, were of one heart and of one soul; neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common; neither was there any among them that lacked. Acts ii. 41, 47. Such was the effect of the vivid consciousness of the union of believers as one body in Christ Jesus. And such is the uniform tendency of that consciousness, manifesting itself in the same manner in proportion to its strength. Experience, however, soon taught these early Christians that they were not perfect, and that it was not wise to act in an imperfect and mixed community on a principle which is applicable only to one really pervaded and governed by the Spirit of God. As the church therefore increased, and came to include many who were Christians only in name, or who had but little of the Spirit of Christ, the operation of this feeling of brotherhood was arrested. It would have been destructive to act towards nominal as towards real Christians, towards indolent and selfish professors as though they were instinct with the Spirit of God. This is the fundamental error of all the modern systems of communism. They proceed on the false assumption that men are not depraved. They take for granted that they are disinterested, faithful, laborious. Every such system, therefore, has come to naught and must work evil and only evil, until men are really renewed and made of one heart and of one soul by the Spirit of God. In the subsequent history, therefore, of the apostolic church, we hear no more of this community of goods. The apostles never commanded it. They left the church to act on the principle that it is one only so far as it was truly one. They did not urge the outward expression a single step beyond the inward reality. The instructive fact, however, remains on record that the effusion of the Holy Spirit, did produce this lively sense of brotherhood among Christians, and a corresponding degree of liberality.

A third fact to be learned from the history given in the Acts, is that the early Christians looked upon their religious teachers

as the proper recipients and distributors of the common property of the church. They who were the possessors of houses or lands sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold and laid them down at the Apostle's feet; and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need. It is obvious that this arrangement supposes an eminently pure state of the church, and would be intolerable in any other. It is also obvious that as the church enlarged an amount of secular care, would thus be thrown on the ministers of religion utterly incompatible with due attention to their spiritual duties. A new arrangement was therefore soon adopted. The apostles said: It is not reasonable that we should leave the word of God to serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. An example was thus early set of confiding to laymen, i. e., to those who do not minister in word and doctrine, the secular concerns of the church. And no man can estimate the evil, which in subsequent ages flowed from the neglect of this example. If in human governments, it is considered essential to the liberty and welfare of the people, that the sword and purse should be in different hands; it is no less essential that in the church the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, sharper than any two edged sword, and the money power should not be united. It was this union which proved in after ages one of the most effectual causes of the secular power of the clergy and of the corruption of the church.

From what has been said, it is plain that during the lives of the apostles, the ministry was sustained by the voluntary contributions of the churches. As the church increased and became more compact as a visible society, this matter assumed a more regular shape. It seems from the beginning to have been the custom for the believers to bring certain gifts or offerings whenever they assembled for the celebration of the Lord's Supper. A custom which in one form or another is continued in most churches, our own among the number, to the present time. As in the early church the Lord's Supper appears to have been a part of the regular service of every Lord's day, those contributions were of course weekly. Besides this, there was from a very early period a regular and larger contribution made every month. It appears also that the early Christians inferred from the identity of the church under the two dispensations, that it

was no less the duty of the people of God now than formerly to devote the first fruits of the earth and a tenth of their income to his service. Long before the payment of tithes was enforced by law, it had thus become a common and voluntary usage. All these contributions were, in each church, thrown into a common stock, under the control first of the deacons, afterwards of the pastor. The amount of the sum thus raised of course varied greatly with the size and wealth of the several churches. And as the pastors of the chief towns gradually became prelates, having many associated and dependent congregations connected with the metropolitan church, this common fund was divided into three portions, one for the bishop, one for the clergy, and one for the poor. The bishop gradually acquired the control of this fund and in the Synod of Antioch, A. D. 341, his right to its management was distinctly asserted. Thus also in what are called the Apostolic Constitutions, can. 41, the right of the bishop in this matter is placed on the ground that he who is entrusted with the care of souls, may well be trusted with their money. Si animae hominum preciosae Episcopo sunt creditae, multo majus oportet eum curam pecuniarum gerere.

When the Roman emperor became a Christian and made Christianity the religion of the state, the state assumed the responsibility of supporting the ministers and institutions of religion. This has been done in various ways: 1. By the permanent grant of productive property to the church, and by authorizing the acquisition of such property by donations, bequest, or purchase. 2. By ordaining the payment of tithes and other contributions. 3. By empowering every parish to tax itself for the support of religion, and giving to such taxation the force of law. This was the method so long in use in New England. 4. By direct appropriations from the public treasury in payment of the salaries of ministers, just as other public officers are paid. This is the method adopted in France since the revolution.

In those countries in which the church and state are not united, the former is supported either by what may be called ecclesiastical law, or by voluntary contributions of its members. The Romish church in Ireland affords an example of the former of these methods. With the peculiar wisdom of silence for which that church is remarkable, it contrives to raise from that impoverished people an adequate support for its hierarchy and priest-

hood. The priests are supported by the imposition of a regular contribution upon all his parishoners payable twice in the year, at stated times; and by a regular tariff of charges for spiritual services, such as baptism, absolution, the mass, extreme unction and burial. The bishops derive their income from an annual contribution of ten pounds sterling from every priest in their diocese, and by holding as rectors some of the most important of the parishes. In this way, by the stringent coercion of spiritual power, an income more regularly paid than tax or rent, is readily secured.

Where the ministry is supported by the voluntary contributions of the people, it is done by the contributions of the particular congregation which the preacher serves, or from a common fund, or by a combination of the two methods. There are, therefore, three general methods by which the support of the clergy has been provided for. 1. Voluntary contributions. 2. Endowments and the law of the land. 3. By ecclesiastical law. In this country it is not an open question, which of these methods ought to be adopted. We are shut up to the first. And happily public sentiment both in the church and out of it, has sanctioned as the best, the only method which in our case is practicable.

Admitting that in this country the ministry must be supported by the voluntary contributions of the people, the particular question to which we wish to call the attention of our readers is; on whom does the responsibility of furnishing that support rest? Does it rest on the individual congregation, which the minister serves, or upon the church as one, and the church as a whole? Our object is to show that the obligation rests upon the church as a whole. To prevent misapprehension, however, it is proper to state; That nothing so visionary as that every minister in every part of the country should receive the same salary is contemplated. This would be at once unjust and impracticable. Much less that there should be any permanent fund from the interest of which all salaries should be paid. The principle which we wish to establish would be fully satisfied, if our Board of Missions, instead of giving a tantalizing pittance, were authorized and enabled to give an adequate support to every minister in its service, devoted to his work, i. e., not engaged in any secular employment but consecrating his whole time to the service of the church.

The first argument in support of the position here assumed, is drawn from the nature of the church. If according to the fundamental doctrine of the Independents, believers are the materials of a church, but a covenant its *form;* if a number of Christians become a church by covenanting to meet together for worship and discipline; if a church owes its existence to this mutual covenant just as a city owes its existence to its charter, so that we may as well talk of an universal city as of a church catholic, then there is no room for the discussion of this question. No one would think of contending that the obligation to support the municipal officers of any one city, rests on the inhabitants of all other cities. If, therefore, the relation which one congregation bears to all others of the same communion, is the same which one city bears to other cities, then of course every congregation is bound to take care of itself, and is under no obligation, other than that of general benevolence, to sustain the ministry in other congregations, any more than the people of Philadelphia are bound to support the mayor of New York. But such is not the scriptural, it is not the presbyterian idea of the church. It is not the idea which has been living and active in the minds of all Christians from the beginning. Every believer feels that he has a church relation to every other believer; that he is a member of the same body, partaker of the same Spirit, that he has with them a common faith, hope, and Lord, and that in virtue of this union, he is under the obligation of communion, obedience, and fellowship in all things, to believers as such, and consequently to all believers.

There are certain principles relating to the nature of the church, which though generally admitted in theory, are seldom fairly carried out in practice. Of these principles among the most important are the following: 1. That the church is one. There is one kingdom of Christ, one fold of which he is the shepherd, one body of which he is the head. 2. That union with Christ is the condition of unity in the church. We are one body in Christ Jesus, i. e. in virtue of our union with him; and consequently the church consists of all who are in Christ. 3. That the Holy Ghost, who dwells without measure in Christ, and from him is communicated to all his people, is the bond of union between them and him, and between the constituent members of his body. 4. That the indwelling of the Spirit in the

members of the church, as it is the ultimate ground of its unity, so it is the cause or source of outward union in all its legitimate forms. The church is or ought to be one in faith, in communion, in worship, in organization, and obedience, just so far and no farther than the indwelling Spirit is productive of such union. 5. There are certain duties which necessarily arise out of this relation of believers to each other as members of the same church, and which are coextensive with the relation out of which they spring. Among those duties are sympathy and mutual assistance. It is because believers are members of one body that they are expected to sympathize with one another just as the hand sympathizes with the foot, or the eye with the ear in the natural body. It is because believers are the organs and temples of the Holy Ghost that we are commanded to obey one another in the fear of the Lord, to bring our complaints to the church, and to hear the church on pain of being considered heathen men and publicans. It is because we are all brethren, οἰκειοι της πιστεως, that we are bound to bear one another's burdens, and to distribute to the necessities of the saints. These are duties we owe to believers as such, and therefore not to those only who may live in the same place with us, or worship with us in the same house. Proximity of residence or association in worship, is not the ground of these obligations. They are founded on a far higher relation, a relation which exists between all the members of Christ's body, and therefore they bind every member in reference to all his fellow members.

This being the true idea of the church, it follows that if perfectly realized, all Christians would be united in one ecclesiastical body. That consummation is now hindered by their imperfection. Though one in faith, it is only within the narrow limits of essential doctrines. Though one in affection, it is not with that full confidence and cordiality necessary for harmonious action in the same external society. So long therefore as the inward unity of the church is imperfect, its outward union must be in like manner imperfect. This admission, however, does not imply that outward disunion is itself a good; or that unity ought not to be outwardly expressed as far as it really exists. Consequently those who are one in Spirit; whose views as to doctrine, worship, and discipline, are such as to admit of

their harmonious co-operation, are bound to unite as one outward or visible church.

It is universally admitted that those who are united in the same visible church owe certain duties to each other. In other words, there are certain duties which rest upon them as a church. It is also admitted that the support of the ministry is one of those duties. If, therefore, the church is nothing and can be nothing beyond a single congregation, then that duty and all others of a like kind which rest upon the church as such, are limited to the bounds of the congregation. The obligation of obedience does not extend beyond the list of their fellow worshippers in the same house. The obligation to support the ministry is confined to their own immediate pastor. But if the church consists of all believers, then the whole body of believers stand in the relation of church-membership, and the duties of obedience and mutual aid in the discharge of all ecclesiastical obligations rest on the whole united body; that is, on all who recognise each other as members of the same church. It follows, therefore, from the scriptural doctrine of the church, that the obligation to provide the means of grace for the whole church, rests on the church as a whole, and not merely or exclusively on each separate congregation for itself.

The second argument in support of this doctrine is derived from the commission given to the church. Christ said to his disciples: Go into all the world and make disciples of all nations. The prerogative and duty here enjoined, is to teach all nations. For the discharge of this duty the ministry was appointed. Christ, in the first instance personally, and afterwards by his Spirit, calls and qualifies certain men to be organs and agents of the church in the great work of teaching the nations. To whom then was this commission given? On whom does the obligation of discharging the duty it enjoins rest? Not on the apostles alone—not on the ministry alone—but on the whole church. This is indeed a very important point, much debated between Romanists and Protestants. It must here be taken for granted, that neither prelates nor presbyters are the church, but that God's people are the church, and that to the church as such, to the church as a whole, to the church as one, was this great commission given. It was originally addressed to a promiscuous assembly of believers. The power and the promise which it conveyed,

were connected with the gift of the Holy Spirit. The presence of the Spirit was the source at once of the power here conferred, and of the qualifications necessary for the discharge of the duty here enjoined. And as the Spirit was not given to the apostles, prelates, or presbyters as a distinct class, and to the exclusion of others, so neither was the commission which was founded on the gift of the Spirit confined to them. The power, the duty and the promise of the Spirit all go together. Unless therefore we adopt the Romish doctrine that the Spirit was given to the apostles as a distinct and self perpetuating order in the church, to flow mechanically through the channel of that succession, a living stream through a dead body, we must admit that the commission in question was given to the whole church. All the prerogatives, duties, and promises which it conveys, belong to the church as a living body pervaded in all its parts by the life-giving and life-impelling Spirit of God. This however does not imply that there is no order or subordination in the church; or that there is no diversity in the gifts, graces, and offices which the Spirit divides to each one severally as he wills. All are not apostles, all are not prophets, or teachers, or workers of miracles. God is not the author of confusion, but of order and peace in all the churches of the saints. The absence of order, subordination and peace in any body is an evidence of the absence of the Spirit of God. The Protestant doctrine that the commission so often referred to, was given to the whole church, is therefore perfectly consistent with the existence and prerogatives of the ministry, not only as a work, but as an office.

The application of the Protestant doctrine just stated, to the subject before us, is obvious and direct. If to the church as such and as a whole, the duty of teaching all nations has been committed, then upon the church as a whole rests the obligation to sustain those who are divinely commissioned in her name and as her organs for the immediate discharge of that duty. On what other ground do we appeal to all our members, young and old, male and female, to send forth and sustain our missionaries foreign and domestic? We do not merely say to them that this is a duty of benevolence or of Christian charity, but we tell them it is a command of Christ, a command addressed to them, which binds their conscience, which they cannot neglect without renouncing the authority of Christ, and thereby proving that they

are destitute of his Spirit and are none of his. In doing this, we certainly do right; but we obviously take for granted that since the commission to teach all nations has been given to the whole church, the duty of supporting those sent forth as teachers rests upon the whole church as a common burden. The command therefore which binds us to support the gospel in New Jersey binds us to sustain it in Wisconsin. All the reasons of the obligation apply to the one case as well as to the other. And we miserably fail of obedience to Christ if we content ourselves with supporting our own pastor, and let others provide for themselves or perish, as they see fit.

A third consideration which leads to the conclusion for which we are now contending is, that the ministry pertains to the whole church, and not primarily and characteristically to each particular congregation. When a man is ordained, the office into which he is inducted has relation to the church as a whole. All the prerogatives and obligations of that office are conveyed though he has no separate congregation confided to his care. A call to a particular church does not convey the ministerial office, it only gives authority to exercise that office over a particular people and within a given sphere. The office itself has far wider relations. If it were true that the ministerial office has relation primarily and essentially to a particular congregation, so that a man can no more be a minister without a congregation, than a husband without a wife (the favourite illustration of those who adopt this view of the matter) then it would follow that no man is a minister except to his own congregation, nor can he perform any ministerial acts out of his own charge; that he ceases to be a minister as soon as he ceases to be a pastor; and that the church has no right to ordain men as missionaries. These are not only the logical conclusions from this doctrine, they were all admitted and contended for by the early and consistent Independents. This view is obviously unscriptural. The apostle after teaching that the church is one,—one body having one Spirit, one faith, one Lord, one baptism, adds that to this one church, the ascended Saviour gave gifts, viz. apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers for the work of the ministry and for the edifying of the body of Christ. The apostles, prophets, evangelists and teachers were not given to particular congregations, but to the church generally. Of all

the preachers of the gospel named in the New Testament it would be difficult to find one who sustained a special, much less an exclusive relation to any one congregation. Paul did not, neither did Barnabas, nor Timothy, nor Titus. That there were pastors in every church is of course admitted, but even in their case, the relation they sustained was like that of a captain of a single ship in a large fleet. While each pastor had a special relation to his own charge, he had a higher relation to the whole church.

If the doctrine of the Independents on this subject, was true, it might be plausibly argued that the obligation to support a minister rested solely on the congregation who enjoys his services. It is altogether a private affair, analogous to the relation which a man bears to his own family. But if the true doctrine is that the ministry belongs to the whole church; the whole church is bound to sustain it. The relation which the officers of the navy and army sustain to the whole country, with propriety throws the burden of their support on the country as a whole. And such is the relation which ministers sustain to the church.

A fourth argument on this subject is, that all the reasons which are given in the sacred scriptures to show that the ministry ought to be supported, bear on the church as one body. Our Saviour says the laborer is worthy of his hire. But in whose service does the minister labour? Who gave him his commission? In whose name does he act? Whose work is he doing? to whom is he responsible? Is it not the church as a whole, and not this or that particular congregation? Again, to whose benefit do the fruits of his labour redound? When souls are converted, saints edified, children educated in the fear of God, is this a local benefit? Are we not one body? Has the hand no interest in the soundness of the foot, or the ear in the well-being of the eye? It is only on the assumption therefore of a most unscriptural isolation and severance of the constituent members of Christ's body, that the whole obligation to sustain the ministry can be thrown on each separate congregation. Again, it is an ordinance of Christ that those who preach the gospel should live by the gospel. This ordinance certainly binds those to whom the gospel is given, to whose custody it is committed, who are charged with the duty of sustaining and ex-

tending it; who have felt its power and experienced its value. They are the persons whom Christ honours by receiving gifts at their hands, for the support of his servants and the promotion of his kingdom. Consequently the whole body of his people have by his ordinance this duty imposed on them as a common burden and a common privilege.

In the fifth place, this matter may be argued from the common principles of justice. Our present system is unjust, first, to the people. Here are a handful of Christians surrounded by an increasing mass of the ignorant, the erroneous and the wicked. No one will deny that it is of the last importance that the gospel should be regularly administered among them. This is demanded not only for the benefit of those few Christians, but for the instruction and conversion of the surrounding population. Now is it just, that the burden of supporting the ministry under these circumstances, should be thrown exclusively on that small and feeble company of believers? Are they alone interested in the support and extension of the kingdom of Christ among them and those around them? It is obvious that on all scriptural principles, and on all principles of justice this is a burden to be borne by the whole church, by all on whom the duty rests to uphold and propagate the gospel of Christ. Our present system is unjust, in the second place, towards our ministers. It is not just that one man should be supported in affluence, and another equally devoted to the service of the church, left to struggle for the necessaries of life. As before stated we do not contend for anything so chimerical as equal salaries to all ministers. Even if all received from the church as a whole the same sum, the people would claim and exercise the right to give in addition what they pleased to their own pastor. We can no more make salaries equal, than we can make church edifices of the same size and cost. But while this equality is neither desirable nor practicable, it is obviously unjust that the present inordinate inequality should be allowed to continue. The hardship falls precisely on the most devoted men; on those who strive to get along without resorting to any secular employment. Those who resort to teaching, farming or speculating in land, in many cases soon render themselves independent. The way to keep ministers poor, is to give them enough to live upon. Observation in all parts of the country shows that it is the men with inadequate

salaries who become rich, or at least lay up money. It is not therefore because we think that the ministry as a body would have more of this world's goods if adequately supported by the church, that we urge this plea of just compensation. It is because those who do devote themselves to their ministerial work, are left to contend with all the harassing evils of poverty, while others of their brethren have enough and to spare. This we regard as contrary to justice, contrary to the Spirit of Christ, and the express commands of his word. Let the Presbyterian church ask itself whether it has ever obeyed the ordinance of Christ, that they who preach the gospel shall live by the gospel. It is obvious that this never has been done. And if we ask, why not, we can find no other answer than that we have not adopted the right method. We have left each congregation to do the best it can; the rich giving themselves little concern how the poor succeeded in this necessary work. We do not see how the command of Christ ever can be obeyed, how anything like justice on this subject ever can be done, until the church recognises the truth that it is one body, and therefore that it is just as obligatory on us to support the gospel at a distance as around our own homes.

Sixthly, the advantages which would be secured by this plan, are a strong argument in its favour. It would secure a great increase in the amount of time and labour devoted to ministerial work. We have no means of ascertaining with accuracy what proportion of our ministers, unite with their sacred office some secular employment, nor what proportion of their time is thus diverted from their appropriate duties. It may be that one-third or one half of the time of the ministry of our church, taken as a whole, is devoted to secular business. If this estimate is any approximation to the truth, and it has been made by those who have had the best opportunity of forming a correct judgment, then the efficiency of the ministry might be well nigh doubled if this time could be redeemed from the world and devoted to study, to pastoral duties, and the education of the young.

Again, it would exert a most beneficial influence on the character of the ministry. How many men, who from necessity engage in some secular work, gradually become worldly minded, lose there interest in the spiritual concerns of the church, and come to regard their ministerial duties as of secondary impor-

tance. It is a law of the human mind that it becomes assimilated to the objects to which its attention is principally directed. It is almost impossible for a minister whose time is mainly devoted to worldly business, to avoid becoming more or less a worldly man. A very respectable clergyman, advanced in life, who had felt this difficulty, recently said, there was nothing about which he was more determined than that if he had his life to live over again, he would never settle in a congregation that did not support him. It is very hard to draw the line between gaining a support and making money. It is difficult to discriminate in practice between what is proper, because necessary, and what all admit to be derogatory to the ministerial character. How often does it happen that the desire of wealth insinuates itself into the heart, under the guise of the desire for an adequate support. Without the slightest impeachment of any class of our brethren, in comparison with others, but simply assuming that they are like other men and other ministers, it is obvious that the necessity of devoting a large part of their time to secular employment, is injurious both to their own spiritual interests and to their usefulness. Every thing indeed depends upon the motive with which this is done. If done as a matter of self-denial, in order to make the gospel of Christ without charge, its influence will be salutary; but if done from any worldly motive it must, from the nature of the case, bring leanness into the soul. It can hardly, therefore, be doubted that few things, under God, would more directly tend to exalt the standard of ministerial character and activity in our church, than a provision of an adequate support for every pastor devoted to his work. How many of our most deserving brethren would the execution of this plan relieve from anxiety and want. Many of them are now without the ordinary comforts of life; harassed by family cares, oppressed with difficulty as to the means of supporting and educating their children. It would shed an unwonted light into many a household, to hear it announced that the Presbyterian church had resolved to obey the ordinance of Christ, that they who preach the gospel should live by the gospel. Such a resolution would kindle the incense in a thousand hearts, and would be abundant through the thanksgiving of many to the glory of God.

Again, this plan would secure stability and consequent power

to the institutions of religion in a multitude of places, where every thing is now occasional, uncertain and changing. Our church would be thus enabled to present a firm and steadily advancing front. Congregations too feeble to day to support the gospel at all, would soon become, under the steady culture thus afforded to them, able to aid in sustaining others. A new spirit of alacrity and confidence would be infused into the ministry. They would not advance with a hesitating step, doubtful whether those behind will uphold their hands. When a missionary leaves our shores for heathen lands, he goes without any misgivings as to this point. He has no fear of being forgot, and allowed to struggle for his daily bread, while endeavoring to bring the heathen to the obedience of Christ. He knows that the whole church is pledged for his support, and he devotes himself to his work without distraction or anxiety. How different is the case with multitudes of our missionaries at home. They go to places where much is to be done, where constant ministerial labour is demanded, but they go with no assurance of support. The people whom they serve may greatly need the gospel; it ought to be carried to them, and urged upon them, but they care little about it, and are unwilling to sustain the messenger of God. The church does not charge itself with his support. It is true he is labouring in her service and in the service of her Lord, but he is left to provide for himself, and live or starve as the case may be. This is not the way in which a church can be vigorously advanced. It is not the way in which Antichrist advances his kingdom. No Romish priest plants a hesitating foot on any unoccupied ground. He knows he represents a church; a body which recognises its unity, and feels its life in all its members. Is it right that we should place the cause of Christ under such disadvantage; that we should adopt a plan of ministerial support, which of necessity makes the church most feeble at the extremities, where it ought to have most alacrity and strength? Truly the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light.

The great recommendation of the plan for which we contend, is that it is right. And if right it must be healthful in all its influences. If the church acts on the principle that it is one, it will become one. If from a conviction of the brotherhood of all believers, it acts towards all as brothers, brotherly love will

abound. The sense of injustice which cannot fail on our present plan to corrode the feelings of our neglected brethren, will cease to exist. The sympathies of the more prosperous portions of the church, will become more enlisted in the welfare of those less highly favoured. By acting on the principle which the Holy Spirit has prescribed for the government of the church, the church will become more and more the organ and dwelling place of that Spirit, who will pervade it in all its parts with the glow of his presence, rendering it at once pure and prosperous, instinct with the power and radiant with the beauty of holiness.

We do not anticipate much opposition to the principles which we have attempted to advocate. We do not expect to hear any one deny the unity of the church; nor that it is the duty of the whole church to sustain and propagate the gospel; nor that the ministry belongs to the church as one body; nor that every minister is engaged in the service of the whole church; nor that it is just, scriptural and expedient that they who preach the gospel should live by the gospel. Nor do we expect that any one will deny that it is a logical sequence from these principles that the obligation to support the ministry rests as a common burden on the church which that ministry serves. The objections which we anticipate are principally these. First, that there are many inefficient men in the ministry who ought not to be supported by the church, and who need the stimulus of dependence on their congregations to make them work. In answer to this objection we would say, that we believe the difficulty is greatly over estimated, and that the inefficiency complained of arises in a great measure from the necessity which so many of our ministers labour under of providing for their own support. There is indeed no plan which is not liable to abuse. But we have in this case all the security which other churches have who act on the principle for which we contend. We have the security arising from the fidelity of sessions in guarding admissions to the church; in the judgment of presbyteries in selecting and training men for the ministry, in ordaining them to the sacred office, and in superintending them when they come to discharge its duties. We have the security which the Board of Missions now have for the fidelity and efficiency of those who are engaged in its service. It will be observed that the plan contemplated does not propose to render the minister indepen-

dent of his congregation. The principal part of his support, if a pastor, must, in most cases at least, come from them. It is only proposed that the Board of Missions should be authorized and enabled so to enlarge their appropriations as to secure an adequate support to every minister devoted to his work.

A more serious objection is the expense. In answer to this, we would ask whether it would require as large a portion of the income of believers as by divine command was devoted to this object under the old dispensation? Is the gospel of the grace of God less valuable, or less dear to our hearts than the religion of Moses to the hearts of the Israelites? Would it require a tithe of the sum which the heathen pay for the support of their priests and temples? Would it cost Presbyterians in America more than it costs Presbyterians in Scotland, or more than it costs our Methodist brethren? What ought to be done can be done. What others do, we can do. What the cause needs are, with the blessing of God, two things, an intelligent comprehension of the grounds of the duty, on the part of the church, and some man or men to take the thing in hand and urge it forward.

ART. IV.—1. *History of the Israelites, from the time of the Maccabees to our days.* In six parts. By J. M. Jost. 1820—1826.
2. *General History of the Israelitish People.* By J. M. Jost. 2 vols. 8vo. Berlin. 1832.*

THE modern history of the Jews reaches far back into the antiquity of other races. The dividing line between the old and new of their existence is the advent of Christ, or rather the destruction of Jerusalem. The later portion of their history, as thus distributed, has several distinct claims to attention. It is highly interesting in itself, including all the usual elements of historical effect, and some of them in a very high degree. It is also important as a conclusion to the earlier annals of the race,

* Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Maccabäer bis auf unsere Tage.
Allgemeine Geschichte des Israelitischen Volkes, sowohl seines zweimaligen Staatslebens als auch der zerstreuten Gemeinden und Secten, bis in die neueste Zeit, in gedrängter Uebersicht, u. s. w.

without which they remain unfinished and abruptly broken off. In the third place, it demands attention on account of its intimate connexion with other parts, both of general and ecclesiastical history, so that neither can be thoroughly understood without correct views on this subject. Nothing has struck us more, in examining particular periods of history, especially as reproduced by French and German writers of our own day, than the constancy and prominence with which the Jews present themselves, in every quarter and almost at every juncture, until quite a recent date. It may also be observed that this relation of their history to that of other races is, for reasons which will be considered afterwards, so very peculiar that the latter scarcely serves to explain the former, but must derive elucidation from it.

Beyond this general statement of our views as to the value of such studies, we can here attempt no more than the suggestion of some general considerations, which may afford a key to the historical enigmas just alluded to, and correct certain popular misapprehensions. The form of these misapprehensions varies with the degree of general cultivation and of historical knowledge in particular. Those which arise from gross ignorance and stupid indifference may pass unnoticed. But there are others which may coexist with a lively interest in the subject and an exact acquaintance with it to a limited extent. The source of these misapprehensions is the habit of transferring to remote and unknown periods of history impressions drawn from that in which we live, or with which we are in any way familiar. This mistake, which has done mischief in abundance elsewhere, is peculiarly injurious in the case before us. The Jews, as a race, are at this moment objects of a deeper and more enthusiastic interest than any other people in the world. Although this feeling is not universal, even in the religious world, nor even in that part of it distinguished by a zeal for missions, it is still extensive, and yet less remarkable for its extent than its intensity. Connected, as it is in many cases, with peculiar views of prophecy, and with exciting anticipations of the future, it gives to this department of the missionary work, a poetical or visionary tinge, unknown, at least in the same degree, to any other. One effect of this, if we are not mistaken, has been to exaggerate the relative importance of this object, in the view of some who are devoted to it; and even in the view of others whom they influence, it clothes

the modern Jews with an ideal charm, by no means suited to correct their national conceit, and as little warranted by their scriptural pretensions, as by their history since they ceased to be the chosen people. A most serious error, growing out of this exaggerated feeling, is the error of supposing, that the place which they once occupied is empty, standing open till they are ready to resume it; whereas nothing can be clearer than the teaching of both testaments, that the Israel of God has never ceased to exist or hold communion with him, in strict accordance with his original design, and that the Jews, when restored, will be restored, not AS the church, but TO the church, from which their unbelief has long excluded them, and of which they will form a part no more essential, and perhaps no more conspicuous, than other nations.

But besides this error in relation to the future, there is another in relation to the past, growing out of the same state of feeling and opinion. This is the error of assuming, that the relative position of the Jews at this day to the Christian world is that of their whole history, and interpreting by this rule all that we read of them within the last eighteen hundred years. This error is so palpable, however, that it cannot be supposed to exist in any form but that of vague and negative misapprehensions, which must be dispelled as soon as the inquirer takes a single step backwards in the history of Europe. That step will bring him to a full conviction, that the actual position of the Jews is altogether recent, and that few years have elapsed since they were universally regarded with a morbid antipathy such as is sometimes felt towards certain animals, and only a few generations since they were the objects of outrageous persecution.

This corrects one error, but may generate another, by leading to the hasty conclusion, that this previous stage of odium and maltreatmeat was itself the uniform condition of the Jews throughout their later history. This, although not so gross an error as the first, is no less real. Nothing could in fact be more unfounded than the notion that the Jews have always been a persecuted race, except the notion that they have always been caressed and idolized. The truth is, that their modern history, in the sense before explained, has been one of extraordinary changes, at once the causes and effects of their anomalous position in the history of Christendom, or rather of the world.

A clear view of these causes and effects is not to be obtained from any foreign point of observation, but can only be afforded by the aid of Jews themselves. For this end it is happily the case that the Jewish mind, in every age distinguished for vivacity and clearness, has in no age, even the most barbarous, been wholly without cultivation, and as a necessary consequence of this, that their national literature embodies an immense mass of historical materials, out of which some of their ablest men in modern times have undertaken with success the history of their people. The best of these works, or at least the best known and the most esteemed by learned Christians, are the two by Jost, of which we have placed the titles at the head of this article. The earlier and more extensive work is a learned and minute account of the Jews since the period of the Maccabees, and seems to be now very commonly regarded as the standard authority after the time of Josephus. The smaller work, published several years after the completion of the first, is not a mere abridgment of the other, with which it does not coincide in plan, for it includes ancient as well as modern times, and even in relation to the latter, was re-written, as the author assures us, from the same original authorities, but in a condensed form.

These works of Jost, and more especially the second, which we have examined with attention, are, in our opinion, justly entitled to the praise of general ability and learning, soundness of judgment, strict impartiality, and freedom from antichristian virulence. To this last excellence we are indebted, it may well be feared, to the author's want of cordial faith in revelation. This of course vitiates his exhibition of the sacred history, whereas it seems to add to the authority of that part of the work, in which he treats of later times, by placing him on ground which could not well be occupied by either a zealous Christian or a zealous Jew. Be this as it may, every reader must be struck with the entire absence of that extravagant self-admiration, whether personal or national, so often found in Jews of the most humble pretensions, and as strongly marked in real life as in the poetry of Disraeli's novels. The unhappy traits which mark the modern Jewish character, so far from being either palliated or disguised by Jost, are fully disclosed and traced to their true causes, with a mixture of severity and tenderness, which serves at once to show how well he loves his race, and yet how incapa-

ble he is of letting even that love vitiate his truth as a historian.

These remarks upon books which can no longer be considered new, may be excused upon the ground that an American translation of the large work is announced by one of our most enterprising publishers. The version, as we understand, is to be furnished by Mr. John Henry Hopkins, jr., of Vermont, a name which seems to indicate a son of the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of that diocese. If worthily executed, such a publication will form an addition to our works on Jewish history, scarcely inferior in value to the new Josephus begun by Dr. Traill, and to be completed by the famous Isaac Taylor. Referring the reader to the work of Jost himself for more minute details, we shall embrace the opportunity of making the suggestions which we have already promised, with a view to the correct appreciation of modern Jewish History in its several characteristic features.

The first point, to which we ask attention, is the perfectly anomalous position, into which the Jews were thrown by the destruction of Jerusalem and their own expulsion from the country. Their condition at this juncture is without a parallel except in their own history, and even there the parallel is distant and imperfect. It is not the downfal of their government, nor the dispersion of their people, nor the hardships incident to such a revolution, that imparts to their condition this extraordinary character. Such changes have occurred and such sufferings been experienced in a hundred other cases, without any such effect upon the sufferers or the world at large. The extraordinary feature of the case is this, that they were left to keep up a peculiar national organization, when deprived of the very thing that seemed most indispensable to its existence. To other systems of religion and of polity, a particular local habitation might be highly important; but in this case it was recognised as absolutely necessary. Christians and Pagans could set up their altars any where; but Judaism was restricted, by the law of its existence, to one country. The place of its rites was, by divine appointment, as essential as the rites themselves. The Jews themselves will hardly deny, that if it had been the divine purpose to announce providentially the termination of the old theocracy, it could not have been done in a more significant and striking manner. Their condition was now worse than that of Israel in Egypt. To maintain a system eminently local, when

expelled from the prescribed localities, was indeed to make brick without straw, or rather to make it with nothing but straw. All that was now left was the cohesive spirit of the race, while every thing substantial, upon which it had once acted, was now gone forever.

That the surviving Jews did not take this view of the matter, when they first recovered from the stunning blow, is easily explained by their national remembrance of the Babylonish exile, when the same state of things had existed during less than three-fourths of a century, so that some, who had worshipped in the first temple, wept at the dedication of the second. But in that case, the whole nation, as one organized body, had been carried and deposited together, so as to be ready for a simultaneous restoration; while in this case it had sprung into a multitude of fragments, scattered no one could tell where, like the breaking of a potter's vessel with a rod of iron, or, to use a modern illustration, like the sudden instantaneous havoc of some great explosion. Still the recollection of the old captivity and of its joyful termination could not fail to cheer the Jews with sanguine hopes, during the first half century, and till the mystic term of three score and ten years was passed. But then as the former generation passed away, the hopes of the survivors and successors must have lost their elasticity. This would have been the case, even if external circumstances had improved or remained unaltered. How much more when they were growing worse and worse; when the miserable remnant left in Palestine was again and again thinned by new proscriptions, and the land at last hermetically sealed against the race to whom it had been promised; when the old Jerusalem was razed, Moriah turned into a grove, heathen temples, amphitheatres, and circuses erected all around it, and the ancient landmarks so confused, that it is still a question where the walls ran, and alleged by some, though no doubt incorrectly, that the present area is not that of the old town, but only marks the site of the one built by Hadrian, and called, after one of his own names, Ælia. Nor was it merely the hostility of emperors and senates that thus tended to destroy their hopes. When Julian the apostate, in the fourth century after the catastrophe, attempted to rebuild the temple, his design was thwarted, and Jews and Christians seem to join with Pagans in believing that it was by a miraculous interposition.

If, in the face of these discouragements, the Jews had given

up all hopes of restoration to their own land, they would thereby have abandoned their religion, and with it their national existence, scattered as they were among the nations. The choice presented was between this national annihilation and an obstinate persistency in waiting for what never was to come, at least in the way desired and expected by themselves. That they should have shrunk from the total loss of their historical and national existence, is entirely natural. The only wonder is that they should have been able to escape it, by maintaining their original attitude of expectation for a space of near two thousand years. This is the wonder, the unparalleled enigma, in the condition of the Jews, that they are waiting, just as their fathers waited so many hundred years ago. As a race, they may be said to keep perpetual passover, their loins girded, shoes on their feet, and staves in their hands, prepared for a journey, for which fifty generations have prepared before them, without ever taking it. If we could imagine a family, in which the inmates have, from time immemorial, been sitting in their travelling dress, surrounded by their luggage, as if in expectation of a vessel or a stage-coach, it would be a fantastic but not an unjust image of the posture of the Jews throughout the world for ages. The religious service which they now use is avowedly a temporary substitute for that which is to be restored in Palestine hereafter. Hence it abounds in allusions to the sacrificial system, which was essential to the Jew's religion, but of which they have practically known nothing since the fall of Jerusalem. The American edition of their Liturgy contains this note on p. 10 of the Daily Service. "Whereas sacrifices and incense were an integral part in the temple-worship, we look upon the order of sacrifices as a part of our daily service in our prayers. To this same reason it is owing, that in many parts of the Prayer Book, the ordinance relating to sacrifices is to be found, as appointed to be read on the respective holidays and festivals. For we should, according to the opinion of our teachers, keep alive the recollection of that holy service, of which our sins have deprived us, and which will, we trust, be ultimately again restored in the temple to be rebuilt at Jerusalem." That is to say, the non-performance of rites absolutely necessary to the system is made good by remembering them and talking of them, in a service altogether different, both in form and substance. This is the

true position of the Jews, as defined by themselves and attested by their history. The temporary state of expectation, which at first seemed likely to last only for a few years, has continued until this day, like the fabled metamorphosis of men into stone, by which their momentary attitudes and gestures have been fixed forever, or the real petrifaction of a drop arrested in the very article of distillation.

We have dwelt upon this circumstance, not only on account of its intrinsic singularity and interest, but also and especially because it furnishes a key to the whole subject. Out of this anomalous position of the Jews, occasioned by the downfal of their state and perpetuated by their own choice, has arisen, more or less directly, all that is peculiar in their national relations or the figure which they make in history. This may be rendered clear by an enumeration of its consequences, some of which might have been foreseen, and all of which are easily demonstrable from history.

The first of these effects is the continued separate existence of the Jews among the nations where they have been scattered. This would never have arisen from a spirit of nationality alone, as we know from other cases where that spirit has been thoroughly subdued by coercive or persuasive measures. This result could have been secured by nothing short of a religious conviction of their own superiority to other nations, or at least of their separation from them by express divine appointment, with an accompanying hope of restoration to the external marks of their pre-eminence.

Out of this first effect has naturally sprung a second, the peculiar mode of life and method of subsistence, which have prevailed among the Jews for ages. Had they merely considered themselves bound to live apart from others, they might have done so, like the Quakers, while engaged in the same occupations. But it was necessary also that they should sit loose to the community, and live in constant preparation for removal. Even where this motive has not been consciously present to the minds of individuals, its action on the whole community is still perceptible. To this cause we may confidently trace the early disposition of the Jews to deal in money and portable goods, rather than gain a higher social standing, but at the same time hamper and commit themselves, by engaging in agricultural or mechanical employments on a large scale.

A further consequence of all this was the frequent transmigration of the Jews, even where it was not necessary, and their extensive knowledge of each other, as well as of the nations among whom they were domesticated. There are certain periods of history, in which the Jews were substitutes at once for the modern bank and the modern post-office.

But one of the most singular and interesting facts connected with this subject is the long continued and extensive employment of the Jews in the European slave-trade. As the practice of enslaving prisoners of war was maintained during some of the most martial periods of medieval history, we find the Jews still following the scent of war, and perhaps, fomenting it. At any rate, wherever the carcass was, there were these eagles gathered together. It is curious to observe, in some of the oldest legislative records of the European States, the compromise between their interest which required them to employ the Jews, and their pride as Christians which forbade it. Hence we find in the same ordinance the most absolute prohibition of a Jew's enslaving Christians on his own account, and the most explicit recognition of his agency as a slave-trader. This extraordinary practice had its origin, no doubt, in the facilities of locomotion and commercial intercourse arising from the social relations of the Jews. In process of time it contributed, of course, to form that deep-seated aversion in the popular mind which showed itself in later times.

Another effect of the anomalous position of the Jews was the peculiar cultivation, or at least the sharpening of their faculties, a natural result of extensive and exclusive commercial occupations, but unless properly controlled, too apt to degenerate into a low cunning and to be accompanied by a general moral deterioration, far outweighing the mere intellectual advantage. It nevertheless deserves to be recorded as a fact attested by the history of ages, that the Jews, since their expulsion and dispersion, have maintained a high place in the estimation both of friends and foes, for intellectual acuteness, and if not for actual cultivation, for a rare susceptibility of it.

Still another effect of these same causes is the wonderful success, with which the Jews have maintained their doctrine, polity, and worship, almost perfectly uniform, for such a length of time, and over such an extent of surface. Independent as the Jewish

congregations seem to be of one another, and dependent as their spiritual rulers are upon the people, it is nevertheless true, that Jews from one end of the world can join in the discipline and worship of those living at the other, with as little difficulty as the different branches of the Presbyterian body. This substantial uniformity would not have been attainable without the constant action of a powerful inducement to abstain from all assimilation to the Gentiles, by remaining similar to one another. Mere conviction of the excellence and truth of their own system would no more have preserved them from corruption than the Christian church. The secret charm is in the temporary nature of their present polity and worship. If they had thought it permanent, they could not have been prevented from attempting to improve and perfect it. But as it is, they no more think of this than a man would think of beautifying the shed in which he lives until his fine house is completed. This is only one example of the paradoxical but certain fact, that what is less esteemed may escape corruption more than that which is most highly valued.

We have now enumerated some of the most marked effects of the anomalous position, into which the Jews were thrown by their expulsion from their own land—their continued separation from the other races, even while they lived among them—their predominant devotion to particular employments—their free communication, even from remote points, and their agency as means of intercommunication among others—their comparative intelligence, at least on certain subjects—and their continued uniformity of discipline and worship. We shall now speak briefly of the relation which the Jews have sustained, from the time of their dispersion, to the different branches of the human family.

The general dispersion of the Jews included two great movements, one to the east and south, the other to the west and north. Long before the great catastrophe, a body of Jews had been prosperously established in the region of Babylon, first under Parthian protection, then under that of the resuscitated Persian monarchy. These settlements received a large increase upon the final dissolution of the commonwealth. Those who escaped took, for the most part, this direction; those who were carried captive took the other. In these oriental Jewish settlements, some of

their most celebrated schools of learning long subsisted. Hence the Babylonish Talmud, as distinguished from the Jerusalem Talmud, a more ancient but less copious and authoritative commentary on the same text (the Mishna.)

From the Babylonian Jews, at different times, and under different auspices, colonies went forth to the remote east, so that Jewish communities, essentially identical with those of the west, were founded, many centuries ago, not only in Arabia, but in India and China. As a general fact, modified by some exceptions, it may be stated, that the oriental dispersion of the Jews enjoyed comparative prosperity and quiet, but that in the same proportion, they were less conspicuous in history. Jews, in great numbers, had already found their way into many of the Roman provinces, including Germany, Gaul, and the Spanish Peninsula. In Greece, Italy, and Egypt, they had been at home for ages.

While the Mosaic system and the old Hebrew commonwealth subsisted, it was still the common centre of the Jews, however far and widely scattered. The communication with the Holy Land was kept up, and an influence continually emanated from it. But when this great centre was destroyed, and this communication interrupted, the expatriated Jews were not only greatly multiplied, but forced to assume and sustain a new relation to the power under which they lived, and which they civilly acknowledged. It is the numerous successive changes in this political relation that gives character and colour to their history for ages.

In the earlier portion of this period, the main fact is the uniformity with which the Jews took sides against the ruling powers and identified themselves with the party or the sect in opposition. As long as heathenism was established, they were confounded with the Christians, shared their persecutions, and partook of their relief. It was in vain that both protested against this identification of the most inimical extremes. Their pagan rulers either could not or would not understand such nice distinctions, and continued to confound two bodies, not only really distinct, but constantly at war among themselves.

When Christianity became the recognised religion of the empire, the Jews assumed a new position, that of friendship with the heretics in opposition to the Catholics or orthodox. They attached themselves particularly to the Arians, in consequence of which they were highly favoured by the Goths, who had

embraced that form of error, and by whom they were introduced and settled in the regions which they conquered. The decline of this heresy, and the general establishment of catholic doctrines, would have left the Jews without support, but for the rise of the Mohammedan religion, to which they now attached themselves, not by relinquishing their own, but by joining in the opposition of the Moslems to the Christians. Much as the Jews, in later times, have suffered from Mohammedan oppression, nothing is clearer or more certain in their history than the zeal with which they once espoused its cause against the Christians. This however could of course take place only in those countries where the Moslem power prevailed in whole or in part, and the only part of Europe to which that description applied before the fifteenth century, was the Peninsula including Spain and Portugal. In Barbary and Egypt, after these had become subject to the Arabs, there were many flourishing settlements of Jews. But in the greater part of Europe, having neither Arians nor Moslems to rely upon, they were compelled to take a new position.

This they were unable to do, without a sacrifice of what they held most dear, by their increasing wealth and importance to the Christian powers as financial agents. Under the feudal system, properly so called, the Jews held a place peculiar to themselves, being reckoned as belonging, in the feudal sense, not to any of the inferior lords, but to the sovereign, who might parcel them out as he did the lands, and often in connexion with them, so that in the chronicles of the middle ages we find the Jews represented as a kind of property, and nothing is more common in the records of some periods than complaints, upon the part of certain barons, that their enemies had carred off their Jews, and royal mandates for their restoration. This statement may, however, without further explanation, lead to misconception of the true design and nature of this whole arrangement. There seems to be little doubt, at present, that it was intended for the benefit and profit of the Jews, by exempting them from various oppressive impositions and exactions, and placing them beyond the reach of petty tyranny, not for their own sake, it is true, but for the sake of the advantage which the state was to derive from their wealth or their fiscal operations.

Under the immediate successors of Charlemagne, the privileges granted to the Jews were so exorbitant that the Church

rose in arms against the measure, and denounced it as an anti-christian apostasy. This excess of favour soon produced reaction, and indeed it is easy to perceive that such a system, though originally meant for protection, might be easily transformed into an engine of oppression. We accordingly find, as we descend to later times, the persecution of the Jews becoming more and more frequent, till at last it appears as the settled policy of all the great European powers.

There are, however, three kinds of persecution, which must not be confounded, although often co-existent, because springing from entirely different causes. The first is the persecution practised by the governments themselves. As the Jews were, at least negatively, quiet subjects and good citizens, the motive for this kind of oppression was almost invariably thirst of gold. When the Jews became, or were supposed to have become, so rich that their plunder was more tempting than their loans, they were fleeced without mercy. The story of the English king, who drew the teeth of wealthy Jews to extort money, is perhaps an exaggerated type of this new spirit in the European Sovereigns.

The second form of persecution was that practised by the Church, for the conversion of the Jews to Christianity. Besides the unreasonable nature of the means employed to work this important change, it is easy to observe, that the ecclesiastical authorities were able and accustomed to contemplate the contingency of obstinate refusal and impenitence without much horror, on account of the substantial compensation furnished by the forfeited possessions of the infidels. It is indeed no breach of charity to utter the suspicion, that in process of time the hopes of a corrupt church and clergy were directed rather to the failure than to the success of their proselyting efforts, and that they often needed to be comforted as much for the salvation of the Jews as their perdition, at least when the reprobates were very rich.

The third form was that of popular persecution, sometimes existing in connection with the others, sometimes arising in rebellious opposition to the ruling powers both of church and state. The occasions of these popular outbreaks were both various and capricious, and the state of mind in which they had their origin resulted from a combination of exciting causes. Not the least

powerful of these were the external differences continually presented to the senses. From a very early period the Jews were required to wear a distinctive dress. Perhaps equally ancient was their compulsory confinement to particular quarters of the great towns, traces of which have long survived the usage itself in the names of streets, such as the Old Jewry of London, and many kindred designations on the continent. This palpable external separation, like the difference of colour among us, though it did not of itself excite to persecution, made it easier and more severe when once excited. To all this we must add the popular prejudice against the Jews as hereditary money-lenders, and their growing ill repute as usurers. Something was also due, no doubt, as we have hinted, to the tradition of their participation in the slave-trade. But the chief appeal was to religious prepossessions. Besides the general stigma of the race as the murderers of Christ, there were particular enormities imputed to them, in the middle ages, and exaggerated by the fancy of the people into various forms of superstitious horror. Of these imaginations there were two particularly frequent, both connected with the memory of the great national offence against our Lord himself. One of these was the alleged violation of the host or consecrated wafer, which, according to the prevalent theology of Christendom, was a renewal of the outrages offered to the Son of God in person. The other was the alleged crucifixion of Christian children by the Jews in their secret haunts, a charge which has led to sanguinary persecution, even in our own day. Another favourite charge was that of creating or promoting epidemical disorders. The different forms which this accusation was made to assume is a strong proof of the *animus* by which the populace was actuated in its treatment of the Jews. When a disease prevailed throughout the north of Europe, bearing strong resemblance to the leprosy, it was instantly ascribed to the Jews, as being their national or hereditary malady. But when it was discovered that the Jews, to a great extent, were free from its ravages, the people, with their usual versatility, ascribed it to the poisoning of the wells by Jewish agency. The strength of such popular impressions was exemplified by the existence of a similar panic, when the cholera prevailed in Paris, fifteen years ago.

All these varietes of persecution became more and more fre-

quent by tradition and long habit, till at last they led to the expulsion of the Jews *en masse* from certain leading states of Europe. Among these were France, England, Portugal, and Spain. These banishments led to extensive emigrations and new settlements, in consequence of which the different races of the Jews became so extensively mixed among the nations.

This brings us to another very interesting feature in the modern history of the Jews, to wit, their national or rather geographical distinctions. Although wholly separate for ages from the nations among which they lived, the Jews of each nation nevertheless gained, in the course of time, a distinctive character, with certain unessential variations of opinion, discipline, and worship. These varieties are strictly just as numerous as the countries, in which Jews have been settled, in large numbers, for a series of successive generations. But their own authorities, as well as Christian writers, are accustomed to reduce them to three families—the Spanish and Portuguese, the German and Slavonic, the Italian and French. Of these the first is, and always has been, confessedly the highest, both in mental cultivation and in social position. Highly favoured for ages, both by the Gothic and the Moorish kings, the Jews of the Peninsula acquired an elevation of character, which some think discernible even in their countenance and manner, and which never was attained by the German and Slavonic Jews, including those of Russia, Poland, and Bohemia. As a general fact, stated by their own most authoritative writers, these have ever been a more contracted and less polished race. Their learning has been more confined to the minutiae of the Talmud and the trifling mysteries of the Cabbala. Their very pronunciation of the sacred tongue has been confessedly corrupted, while the old tradition has been best maintained among the Jews of Spain and Portugal. Between these two extremes the Italian type of Judaism is intermediate, and this appears to have extended to the old Jewish settlements in the south of France. Those of the northern provinces, and of England, do not appear in history so strongly marked with a distinctive character.

In order to understand the language of the books, in relation to this subject, it is important to observe that, although local in their origin, these various distinctions are no longer limited to their original localities, but diffused and scattered by repeated

transmigrations throughout all regions where the Jews are known. By a Spanish or a German Jew is not necessarily meant a resident or even a native of Spain or Germany. The terms denote Jews of a certain school, or of a certain race, wherever born or settled. In the great cities, even of America, whole synagogues of Portuguese and German Jews are found, many, perhaps most of them Americans by birth, and yet distinguishable even to the eye. These same distinctions are found also in the remote east, and even in the Holy Land itself. After the Turks had overthrown the Eastern Empire in the fifteenth century, the Jews began once more to settle in those regions, chiefly from the different European countries, for the Jews of the remote East scarcely reappear in history. These emigrants brought with them all their national peculiarities, from which arises the otherwise perplexing fact, that the distinctions, of which we read most frequently, among the oriental Jews, are founded on European national diversities. Hence the constant reference to Spanish, German, and Polish Jews, in missionary journals and reports. Hence too the necessity of printing Hebrew-Spanish books for Jews, not in Spain, but in Constantinople and the Turkish provinces. The same thing is true of Palestine itself, where the Jews, however, are less numerous than many are accustomed to imagine. As most of our associations with that country are derived from scripture, it is often hard, even for the best informed, to bear in mind the repeated and entire change of its inhabitants, and especially to remember that its permanent native population is at present very small, and not of Hebrew but Arabian origin. The Jewish residents in Palestine are still described by travellers as consisting chiefly of poor and aged devotees, who have come, in many cases from afar, to die and be buried in the Land of Promise.

A remarkable fact in the modern history of the Jews is the unfrequency of false Messiahs. Delusions of this kind appear to have been most frequent in the times immediately before and after the destruction of Jerusalem. The famous Bar Cochba, or Son of a Star, in the reign of Hadrian, (so called in allusion to Num. xxiv. 17) was afterwards consigned to infamy among the Jews themselves, under the title of Bar Coziba, or Son of a Lie. In later times the most remarkable case is that of an impostor at Smyrna, in the seventeenth century, who created an

extraordinary movement, first in the east, and then throughout the Jewish population of all Europe, but strangely ended his career by becoming a Mohammedan himself. The detailed account of this delusion, given by Jost, is highly interesting and affords a glimpse into a world little known to general readers. In our own day, fanatical delusions seem to have given way, in Jewry as in Christendom, to sceptical doubts and a very extensive defection from the faith and hope of the preceding generations. The general course of modern Jewish history may, to aid the memory, be summarily stated thus. From the fall of Jerusalem to the establishment of Christianity under Constantine the Great, the Jews, with all their hatred of the Christians, shared their persecutions. This may be laid down as the first great period. After Christianity was established, they enjoyed the patronage of heretics, and especially of the Arians. A critical event in the history of the Jews was the rise of the Mohammedan religion. Another was the introduction of the feudal system. Under the first of these in Egypt, Barbary, and Spain—under the second in the rest of Europe—they were highly prosperous and became the money-dealers of the world. As the feudal system gradually passed away, and the existing organization was developed, the Jews lost their advantages and passed through a period of persecution—regal, ecclesiastical, and popular—sometimes resulting in their general expulsion from extensive countries. This spirit of intolerance was still alive and active at the commencement of the Reformation, and the principles of the Reformers were not generally such as to repress it. From the Reformation to the French Revolution, while the Jews suffered actual oppression in some countries, the predominant feeling towards them was one of contemptuous fear—an exaggerated notion of their wealth and cunning, mixed with aversion for their falsehood and duplicity, even among those who cared but little for their unbelief. The French Revolution began the work of their emancipation, which has kept pace with the general progress of liberty. One effect of this has been to withdraw from view those outward social differences which used to strike the eye and the imagination, and to leave them distinguished only by religious peculiarities. The consequence is that, while they have ceased to interest statesmen and men of the world, they have acquired, in the eyes of many Christian philanthropists, a great and even disproportionate importance.

Although the subject has been here presented only as a part of general history, it is not wholly barren of suggestions in relation to the great cause of Christian philanthropy. Some of these we shall barely indicate, without attempting either proof or illustration. The first thought that occurs to us, in this connexion, is that even the hasty glimpse which we have taken of the later Jewish history confirms the claim of that extraordinary people to a place in the benevolent remembrance and exertion of the Christian world. Besides the interest attaching to them as the subjects of prophecy and sacred history, they are too conspicuous in that of later times, to be overlooked or treated with indifference. Another inference from this historical review is, that the relative position which it represents the Jews as holding to the Christian world for ages, when taken in connexion with the actual condition of the Holy Land, is by far the most plausible foundation for the doctrine, that the Jews are to be restored *en masse* to Palestine. A people providentially kept separate from every other, yet without a country of their own, while that of their fathers is almost unoccupied, presents a combination and concurrence of events, which may well suggest the thought of some great providential purpose to be yet accomplished by the re-union of the two, without supposing any express promise or prediction in the scripture. It is indeed much to be desired, that this opinion, which is daily gaining ground, may be allowed to rest upon its true foundation, without any wresting of the scriptures in support of it, like that occasioned by the zealous efforts to promote the cause of temperance and anti-slavery by positive authorities from scripture. Although the cases are, in other respects, totally dissimilar, they both present a strong temptation to the fanciful or partisan interpreter, against which even the defenders of this doctrine should be on their guard. Another danger, in relation to benevolent exertion for the Jews, is that of fostering their national conceit, and the spiritual pride even of true converts, by too marked a separation of their case from that of other objects of Christian benevolence. Whatever advantages may be connected with distinct organizations for this special purpose, and however great the good accomplished by them, which we would not question or extenuate, we think that the most wholesome fruits may be expected from the subjection of this cause to the same general management with others, so that

the Jews may be caught in the same net with the Gentiles, and no longer constitute a "several fishery." With these views, we heartily approve of the beginning, which has been already made in this direction, by our own Church, through her Board of Missions.

ART. V.—*General Assembly.*

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America met, agreeably to appointment, in the First Presbyterian Church in the city of Richmond, Virginia, on Thursday, the 20th of May, 1847, at 11 o'clock, A. M., and was opened with a sermon by the Rev. Charles Hodge, D. D., the moderator of last year, from 1 Cor. ix. 14; "Even so hath God ordained, that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel."

After sermon the Assembly was constituted with prayer. The roll of the Assembly was then made up in the usual way, embracing commissioners from two new Presbyteries formed during the year; that of Rock River, in the Synod of Illinois, and that of Knoxville in the Synod of West Tennessee.

The Rev. James H. Thornwell, D. D., was elected Moderator, and the Rev. P. J. Sparrow, D. D., Temporary Clerk.

Devotional Exercises.—St. James' Episcopal Church.

A communication was read from the Rector and Vestry of St. James' Church, Richmond, offering the use of said church for religious services, at the pleasure of the Assembly. On motion it was *Resolved*, That the Christian courtesy of the tender be acknowledged, and the matter be referred to the Committee on Devotional Exercises. This gratifying exhibition of Christian feeling and confidence, shared equally by the Baptist, Methodist, and New School Presbyterian Churches, led to the appointment of a daily devotional service, for the benefit of the people, which alternated between St. James' Church and the United Presbyterian Church, in addition to the supply of all the pulpits on the Sabbath by members of the Assembly.

We have received the impression that this Assembly was characterized by an unusual amount of devotional and benevolent feeling. In addition to the usual services connected with the anniversaries of the several Boards, there were special sermons in the evening before the Assembly, by the Rev. Dr. Thornwell on Popery, by the Rev. Thomas P. Hunt on Temperance, by the Rev. Dr. Hodge on Parochial Schools, and by the Rev. Dr. Jones on the religious instruction of the Negroes. If our impressions on this point are correct, we hail it as a happy omen. The true prosperity of the church is much more vitally connected with these exercises which cherish her inward life, than with the usual business of settling appeals and complaints, and enacting laws touching her outward forms. This constitutes a very pleasing feature of the proceedings of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland.

Reduction of Representation.

The propriety of altering the ratio of representation, so as to reduce the number of delegates forming the General Assembly has been agitated for some time, and during the last year it has been freely discussed in our periodicals. The subject was brought before the Assembly by memorials from the Presbyteries of Greenbrier and Western District, asking the Assembly to overture to the Presbyteries the expediency of reducing the ratio of representation; and also from the Presbytery of Zanesville, proposing to adopt the plan of Synodical instead of Presbyterial delegations. The Committee of Bills and Overtures returned these memorials to the house recommending the following resolution which was adopted, viz:

"*Resolved*, That it is not expedient to refer to the Presbyteries any measure, having for its object the alteration of the existing ratio of representation."

From the small degree of interest excited by this subject in the Assembly, and from the strength of the vote in its rejection, we are led to infer, that only a few individuals in our church sympathize with the agitation kept up in the papers during the last year. There appear to be three principal reasons for desiring the proposed change. 1. It is urged that our General Assembly as now constituted, is too large for the transaction of business in a way at once deliberate and expeditious. In an

Assembly composed of so many individuals trained to public speaking, there will always be a large number anxious to deliver their views on every leading question. If all who wish to speak are fully heard it consumes an inordinate amount of time; and if the liberty of speech is restricted, it leads to confusion and dissatisfaction. And besides, the time of the house is often taken up by speeches on unimportant questions while the real business is left to be hurried through, in the closing hours of the session, with a precipitancy which forbids deliberation, and endangers the wisdom of the decisions.

These are doubtless real evils; but it is urged in reply, that the proposed measure would have no tendency to obviate or abate them. All the experience of deliberative bodies goes to show that no reduction in the number of members would have the effect of diminishing the amount of speaking, unless it were carried to a point that would entirely defeat the whole principle of representation in the Assembly. Upon every question about which there is a diversity of views at all, there will be found in every such body, however small it might be made, persons representing every shade of opinion, and therefore anxious to express their opinions. Debates are terminated, not by the exhaustion of speakers, but the exhaustion of opinions and arguments on the one side, and the exhaustion of patience on the other. Now experience proves that this exhaustion takes place sooner in a very large body, than in a moderately small one. The speaking in the former case, being mostly confined to a few of the ablest members of the body, is soon done up, and the majority refuse to hear any more. Hence there is less speaking in the British House of Commons, made up of more than six hundred members, upon great public questions, than there would be in the House of Representatives of any State in this Union, composed of one-sixth of the number.

The evils arising from the undue consumption of time by speeches seem to be inherent and incurable; at least they are incurable by any reduction of representation compatible with the character of the Assembly.

2. A second and more plausible argument for the proposed measure, is drawn from *the expense* of assembling so large a body from every part of the United States. The direct and unavoidable travelling expenses of the delegates, cannot amount to less

than five thousand dollars annually. This argument derives greater weight from the fact that a considerable part of that sum comes out of the pocket of the members, in consequence of the inadequate contributions to the Commissioners' Fund. And it happens, farther, from the necessities of the case, that this tax falls heaviest upon the remote and less wealthy parts of the church.

That this is felt to be a severe grievance is manifest, from the warmth of the debate which sprang up incidentally, about the distribution of the monies collected and reported for the Commissioners' Fund. It appears that some of the richer Presbyteries first pay the expenses of their delegates, and merely transfer any balance that may remain to the general fund. The effect of this, of course, is to diminish the dividend available for the other members. Cases of difficulty and hardship, and even injustice are liable to arise out of this arrangement. But the obvious answer to all this, as an argument for reducing the delegation is, that in the first place, these evils may easily be cured by more ample and equal provision on the part of the church at large, to meet the expenses of those whom she delegates to transact her business; and in the second place, that they would not be met by a reduction of the delegation. The most natural result of this measure would be, a corresponding reduction in the amount of the contributions to the fund. If any one will cast his eye over the statistical table, he will see at once, that the contributions to this fund are graduated not at all by the means of the churches, but simply by their estimate of its necessities. The present inadequacy of this fund ought to be held up before the churches until it is seen and felt; and no one can doubt that there is abundant means to supply the deficiency. The way to remedy the evil, is not by discussions and resolutions in the Assembly, but by spreading information, and calling to it the attention of the churches.

If the question be whether the necessary expenses of the present delegation to the Assembly are wisely laid out, or in other words, whether it is worth to the church what it costs, we take for granted, no one would hesitate to give an affirmative answer. For in the first place it is clear that the contributions for this purpose, do not, in the least, diminish those made for benevolent purposes, or other ecclesiastical objects. This has been set-

tled long ago in the experience of the church. And in the second place, the obvious advantages arising from the association of the members of the Assembly, and the impressions received from the various exercises and doings of the body, immeasurably outweigh the comparatively trifling expense of its annual assemblage.

3. The third argument for the reduction of the Assembly is that it vacates unnecessarily for several weeks, so many pulpits. To this it may be answered, 1. That most of the pulpits are not necessarily, or in fact, vacant at least for the whole time. In almost every place some supplies can be procured in the absence of the pastor, either by licentiates, or unemployed or transient ministers. 2. It is often a great relief to the minister to escape for a little while from the steady pressure of pastoral care and labour, to recruit his health, unbend his mind, and refresh his spirits by pleasant intercourse with his brethren. And, of course, the people also get the full benefit of this invigorating process, on the part of their pastor. 3. Even if there were no incidental considerations of this sort, the temporary vacancy of a few churches would be nothing, in comparison with the advantages arising from the greater wisdom and weight of the assembly as now constituted. Any material reduction in its numbers, (and to be effective it must be material,) would not only endanger the principle of adequate representation, but essentially diminish that moral power, both conservative and efficient, which is now one of its principal functions.

"Commissions" of Presbyteries and Synods.

The constitutionality and expediency of Presbyteries and Synods appointing "Commissions" of their body to try judicial cases, was brought before the last General Assembly, and referred with very little discussion to a committee to report to the present Assembly. Dr. Hodge, on behalf of the committee, presented the following report:

"In the minutes of the General Assembly for 1846, p. 210, is found the following resolution, viz: '*Resolved*, That the records of the Synod of Virginia be approved, while in so doing the Assembly would be understood as expressing no opinion on the question decided by the Synod, in reference to the authority of the presbyteries of Winchester and Lexington to appoint commissions in the case alluded to in the record of the synod.'

"It appears from the minutes, p. 216, that the following resolution was subsequently offered and referred to a committee consisting of Drs. Hodge, Lindsley, Musgrave, McFarland, and McDowell, to report thereon at the next Assembly, viz: '*Resolved*, That in the judgment of this Assembly, it is contrary to the constitution and uniform practice of the Presbyterian Church in the United States for any ecclesiastical judicatory to appoint a commission to determine judicially any case whatever.'

"This resolution presents two questions for consideration, one of principle, the other of fact. First, Is it contrary to the constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States for its judicatories to appoint commissions to decide judicially cases which may be brought before them? Secondly, Are such appointments contrary to the uniform practice of our church? Your committee are constrained to answer both these questions in the negative.

"That such appointments are not contrary to the constitution, the committee argue, 1st. Because the power in question is one of the inherent original powers of all primary church courts. 2d. Because there is nothing in our constitution which forbids the exercise of that right.

"It is important in considering this subject, to bear in mind that the constitution is not a grant of powers to our primary church courts, but a limitation, by treaty and stipulations of the exercise of those powers. For example, a presbytery does not derive from the constitution (i. e. from the consent of other presbyteries) its right to ordain; but by adopting the constitution it has bound itself to exercise its inherent right of ordination only under certain conditions. Were it not for its voluntary contract with other presbyteries, it might ordain any man who, in its judgment, had the requisite qualifications for the ministry. It has however, agreed not to ordain any candidate for that office, who has not studied theology for at least two years; who cannot read Greek and Hebrew; and who has not had a liberal education. The same remark might be made with regard to other cases, showing that the constitution does not confer power on our primary bodies, but is of the nature of a treaty binding and guiding them in the exercise of the powers which they derive from the great Head of the Church. This being the case, all that is necessary to determine whether the power to act by com-

mission belongs to our primary courts, is to ascertain whether such power naturally belongs to them; and whether, if it does originally pertain to them, they have by adopting the constitution removed its exercise.

"That the power in question does inhere in our primary church courts, may be inferred first, from their nature. It is a generally recognised principle that inherent, as opposed to delegated powers, may be exercised either by those in whom they inhere, or by their representatives. The powers inherent in the people, they may exercise themselves, or delegate to those whom they choose to act in their stead. We can see nothing in the Word of God, nor in the principles on which such bodies are constituted, which would forbid any presbytery or synod, if independant or untrammelled by treaty stipulations with other similar bodies, delegating their powers to a committee of their own number to act in their name, and subject to their review and control. Secondly. We infer that the power in question does belong originally to primary church courts from universal consent. It is an undeniable fact that presbyteries and synods, when not constrained by special enactments, have in all countries where Presbyterianism has existed, acted on the assumption that they possessed the right of acting by commissions. It is on the principle that a presbytery may delegate its powers, our presbyteries are still in the habit of commissioning one or more ministers to organize churches, ordain elders and perform other similar acts.

"If then it be admitted that the right to act by commissions did belong to presbyteries and synods, were it not for the provisions of the constitution, the question arises, whether the constitution does forbid the exercise of this right.

"In answer to this question it may be remarked, that to deprive our judicatories of an original and important right, something more than mere implication is, in all ordinary cases, necessary. No one however pretends that there is any express prohibition of the exercise of the power in question, contained in the constitution. 2. No fair inference in favour of such prohibition can be drawn from the mere silence of the constitution. As the power is not derived from the constitution it is not necessary that it should be there recorded. As far as we recollect, the Westminster Directory is equally silent on this subject, yet it is

admitted that under that instrument church courts freely exercised this power.

"3. Nor can it be inferred that the constitution tacitly prohibits the exercise of this right, from the fact that it always treats of certain acts as being the acts of a presbytery or synod. An act does not cease to be a presbyterial act when performed by a committee in the name and by the authority of the presbytery. Even the ordinary process of reviewing records, is performed not by the whole presbytery or synod, but by a committee in their name and under their sanction. And the executive acts of ordination and installation, when performed by a committee are still presbyterial acts. Nothing was more common in the early portions of our history, than for our presbyteries to ordain by a committee. And yet our fathers did not deny that ordination was a presbyterial act. It cannot therefore be inferred from the fact that the constitution recognizes certain acts as the acts of presbyteries and synods, that those acts may not be legitimately performed by a commission appointed for that purpose. Such commission is by delegation, and *pro hac vice*, the presbytery or synod. The body virtually resolves itself into a committee to meet at a certain time and place for a specific purpose.

"On these grounds your committee rest the conclusion that it is not contrary to the constitution of our church that our primary church courts should appoint a commission to determine judicially any case that may come before them.

"As to the second point embraced in the resolution under consideration, viz: whether such appointments are contrary to the uniform practice of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, it may be remarked, 1. That it is well known that the original Synod of Philadelphia, the Synod of New York, and the united Synod of New York and Philadelphia, from the original institution of the first mentioned body in 1716, to the formation of the General Assembly in 1788, did each, during their several periods of existence, annually appoint a commission with full synodical powers. This commission sometimes consisted of a definite number of members named for that purpose, and at others any member of the synod who chose to attend was recognized as a member.

"There is therefore no principle better sanctioned by long

continued usage in our church, than the right of a synod to act by a commission in adjudicating any case that may come before them.

"2. This however is a small part of the evidence which bears on this subject. Not only did the judicatories above mentioned annually appoint a commission with full powers for general purposes, but the original Presbytery of Philadelphia, the Synod of Philadelphia, the Synod of New York, and the united Synod of New York and Philadelphia, were uniformly in the habit of appointing special committees with full powers (i. e. commissions,) to act in their name and with their authority, in any matter, executive or judicial. The Assembly would be fatigued by the citation of all the cases on record bearing on this subject. The following may be deemed sufficient.

"In 1713 a committee was appointed by the Presbytery of Philadelphia for the examination of Mr. Witherspoon, and if satisfied as to his qualifications, they were authorized to proceed to his ordination and settlement. Records, p. 32. In 1714 a similar committee was appointed by the presbytery for the examination and ordination of Mr. H. Evans. In 1715, two other candidates were ordained in the same manner. pp. 36 37. In 1716, two more. p. 43. In all these and in many similar cases subsequently recorded, the committees appointed for the purpose were invested with full presbyterial powers to judge of the qualifications of the candidate, to determine whether he should be ordained or not, and if they saw fit, actually to ordain. In most cases the reports made by them show that they did ordain, in others they say, that they declined to proceed on account of the incompetency of the candidate, or for some other sufficient reason.

"In 1717, a committee was sent to New Castle, Delaware, 'to receive and audit the reasons of the people of New Castle against the removal of Mr. Anderson, (their pastor,) to New York, or to any other place.' And 'it was farther ordered, that the said committee do fully determine in that affair.' p. 47. The following year they reported that 'they had transported Mr. Anderson to New York, having had power lodged in them by the Synod to determine that affair.' p. 49.

"In 1723 a committee was appointed to act in the name and with the full power of the synod, in a conference with the Con-

necticut ministers in relation to certain difficulties in the congregation of New York, arising out of the interference of the two bodies. p. 75.

"In 1720 it was 'overtured that a committee be sent to Rehoboth with full power from the synod to act in their name and by their authority in the affair between Mr. Clement and the people, and that Mr. C. be suspended from the exercise of his ministry, until the determination of the committee. The overture was carried in the affirmative, *nemine contradicente*." p. 60. At that time therefore, there was not one member of the body who questioned the right of the synod to act by committee in judicial cases. Again, it is said in the Record, 'The synod having received letters from Snowhill, by way of complaint against Mr. D. Davis, have appointed Mr. McNish (and six others,) or any three of them, to be a committee to go to Snowhill, with full power to hear, examine, and determine about the complaints made or to be made against said Mr. Davis.'

"In 1722, a committee was appointed to attend at Fairfield, N. J., with full power to restore a suspended minister, unless they saw a sufficient reason to the contrary. p. 71.

"In 1724, a committee reported that they had not removed the suspension from Mr. Walton. p. 76. In 1726, difficulties having occurred in the church at Newark, N. J., a committee was appointed to visit that place with full power of the synod in all matters that may come before them in respect to that congregation, and to bring an account of what they do to the next synod. p, 83.

"In 1727, a committee was sent to New York to accommodate differences in the church there, 'and to receive Mr. Pemberton as a member of the synod, or not as they should see cause.' p. 85. In 1731, a committee was sent to Goshen, to hear and determine matters of dispute in that congregation, 'with full powers.'

"In 1734, an appeal from the Presbytery of Donegal was presented to synod, and by them referred to a committee to meet at Nottingham, 'with full power to hear said appeal, and to determine it by authority of synod, they bringing an account of their proceedings therein to the next synod. And the synod do also empower the said committee to hear any matter . . . . that shall be brought before them by the said John Kirkpatrick and John Moor, (the appellants,) with relation to the affair afore-

said, and authoritatively to determine the same; appointing also that if either party do appeal from the determination of the committee, they shall enter their appeal immediately, that it may be finally determined by the next synod.' p. 107.

"In 1735, another appeal from the same presbytery was referred to a committee to meet at ———— 'and determine the business.' p. 119. In the same year the two presbyteries of Philadelphia and East Jersey were appointed a committee to try the case of Rev. Mr. Morgan. p. 130. In 1735, a committee with full powers was sent to New York. p. 254. In 1751, a committee was sent to Jamaica, L. I., with authority to decide whether the pastor, Mr. Bostwick, should be removed to New York. p. 206. In 1759, an appeal from the Presbytery of New York was referred to a committee at Princeton, any seven of whom to be a quorum to try the matter. p. 312. A similar committee was sent to Chesnut Level in 1762. In 1764, the synod decided that the censure inflicted by a committee was inadequate to the crimes contained in their charge. p. 338. In 1764, the synod say, in reference to an appeal from New Castle presbytery, 'As this matter cannot be issued here, we appoint (thirteen members) a committee to hear and try the merits of the case, and to issue the whole affair, and to take what methods they may think proper in relation thereto.' p. 340. In 1765, two appeals from the Presbytery of Donegal were presented, 'and the synod,' it is said, 'considering the impossibility of determining the said affairs at present, have appointed a committee to issue and determine both matters.' p. 360.

"In 1766, a similar case occurred; an appeal from the Presbytery of Suffolk was referred to a committee 'to try and issue the whole affair.' p. 360.

"From all these cases it is apparent that from the beginning, the right has been claimed and exercised by our primary courts of appointing committees with full powers, (i. e. commissions) to act in their name and authority, in all kinds of cases, executive and judicial.

"Though from the altered circumstances of the church, and the great increase in the number of presbyteries, this mode of action has been less necessary and therefore less common, since the adoption of the present constitution it has never been renounced, and, as far as known to your committee, never con-

demned by the Assembly. On the contrary, in the remarkable case in the Synod of Kentucky, it received the sanction of the Assembly, in 1809. It is well known that the Cumberland Presbytery had, for some time, persisted in licensing and ordaining men who had not received a liberal education, and who refused to adopt the Confession of Faith. These proceedings were brought before the Synod of Kentucky, in 1805, by a review of the records of that presbytery. But as the synod had not sufficient data on which to act; as the case did not admit of delay, they appointed a commission consisting of ten ministers and six elders, 'vested with full synodical powers, to confer with the members of the Cumberland Presbytery, and to adjudicate on their presbyterial proceedings.' Much doubt was expressed in the Assembly of 1807, of the regularity of the proceedings of this commission; but as far as can be learned from the letter from the Assembly to the synod, the former body did not deny the right of the synod to appoint a commission. The Assembly requested the synod to review their acts in question, and demand that the licentiates of the presbytery should be re-examined, and in approving the action of the commission in suspending ministers without trial, who had been irregularly ordained. The synod having reviewed all proceedings in this whole matter, and re-affirmed their decisions in relation to it, sent up their explanation and vindication, to the Assembly; which did not reach that body, however, till 1809. The action of the synod was in that year sustained without a dissenting voice, and the Assembly declared the synod entitled to the thanks of the whole church for the firmness and zeal with which they had acted. See chap. ix. of Dr. Davidson's instructive and interesting History of the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky.

"In view therefore of the original rights of our judicatories, of the long continued practice of the church, and of the great value of the right, on due occasions, of acting by commissions, the hope is respectfully expressed that the Assembly may do nothing which may have the effeet of calling that right into question."

A motion was, in the first instance, made to adopt this report. But that motion was subsequently withdrawn, with a view to introduce a resolution for the indefinite postponement of the resolution referred by the last Assembly to the consideration of the committee. This was the disposition of the subject proposed

and advocated by those who were in favour of the doctrine presented in the report. The resolution referred by the Assembly of 1846, declared it to be contrary to the constitution and uniform practice of the Presbyterian church in the United States, to decide judicially by commission any case whatever. The rejection of that resolution, or its indefinite postponement, was a refusal on the part of the Assembly to deny this right to our primary courts. This was all the friends of the report wished, and the motion for indefinite postponement was accordingly made by the chairman of the committee. And this was the disposition ultimately made by common consent. The debate was interrupted by a motion for the indefinite postponement of the whole subject.

There was no opportunity afforded for testing the real sense of the house, but we have little doubt that a decided majority was in favour of the doctrine that our primary courts have the right to act by commission in any case that may come before them. The objections urged against this doctrine resolve themselves into two. First, that the constitution makes no mention of such a power. Secondly, that its exercise is liable to abuse.

The first of these objections rests on the radically false principle, combated in the report, that our courts get their powers from the constitution, a principle inconsistent with the essential doctrines of presbyterianism. We hold that our courts get their powers from the head of the church. He has instituted a government. He has determined the nature and limits of the powers to be exercised by church courts. A constitution is and can be nothing but a written agreement between certain judicatories consenting to act together, as to the conditions on which they will exercise the powers given them from above. Now according to our confession of faith, "It belongeth to synods and councils, ministerially, to determine controversies of faith, and cases of conscience; to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of public worship of God, and the government of his church; to receive complaints in cases of mal-administration, and authoritatively to determine the same." That is, by the word of God, church courts have inherently certain legislative, judicial, executive powers. These powers inhere in them, just as by the gift of God, similar powers inhere in the community. And if they belong to our courts, it follows they can exercise them, in

any way not inconsistent with their nature and design, and the limitations of the word of God, or their own voluntary agreement. Whether a presbytery shall ordain or instal in full session, or by a commission, is a matter left entirely to its discretion. It is responsible to God for the exercise of this power, and also to its associate presbyteries. But that it has no right, in itself considered, to exercise its powers except in full session, seems to us a most extraordinary assumption. All analogy is certainly against it. The people delegate the powers which inhere in them, to be exercised by representatives acting in their name, and by their authority. So do kings, so do parents. Why then may not primary church courts? All usage is against it, the usage of the continental presbyterian church; the usage of the church of Scotland; the usage of our own church from its very foundation, before and since the adoption of the present constitution. The presbytery of Hanover, in Virginia, sent a commission to ordain men in Kentucky, and one venerable father on the floor of the Assembly, was understood to say that he himself was ordained in that way; and another member said that it was not two years since the presbytery of Susquehanna, acted in an important case, by a commission. We have therefore, scripture, analogy, and usage in favour of the doctrine that certain powers inhere in our primary church courts, which powers they may exercise either directly, or by commission, subject to the limitations laid down in the constitution.

It was the neglect or oversight of this last qualifying cause that gave rise to most of the objections to the report urged under the second head mentioned above. The power was deemed liable to great abuse, because it was supposed that it was unlimited; that if a presbytery or synod had the right to act by a commission, it would have the right to delegate its whole power to a single member. But no such doctrine was contended for. As the constitution requires that a presbytery should consist of at least three ministers, and a synod of at least seven, it would be a direct violation of that agreement for a presbytery or synod to give presbyterial or synodical powers to any commission consisting of less than a quorum of their own bodies. What would be the use of the provision that not less than three ministers can constitute a presbytery, if those three could meet and devolve their whole power upon a single minister or elder? It is obvious

therefore that no commission of a presbytery, if clothed with presbyterial powers can consist of less than a quorum of presbytery; and no commission of Synod can constitutionally consist of less than a quorum of that body. This single consideration is an answer to the great majority of the arguments drawn from the supposed liability of the right in question to be abused. Another answer, however, is drawn from experience. The right to act by commission has been exercised by all presbyterian churches, and by our own for a long series of years. There is not a single case upon our records of the abuse of this power. There is not a single instance of complaint of injustice, unfairness, or injury arising from this source. The prediction, therefore, of such evils, in the face of an opposing experience so diversified and so long continued, cannot be entitled to much consideration. If the principles of presbyterianism can be learned from the practice of all presbyterian churches, it is most unreasonable to denounce the right in question as anti-presbyterian. The innovation is all on the other side. The encroachment is on the part of the Assembly, and against the lower courts; if the ground should be assumed by the former that the latter have not a right which from time immemorial they have claimed and exercised.

The strict construction of the constitution for which some of the opponents of the report contended, would if consistently carried out, effectually tie up the hands of all our church courts. Where do we find in the constitution the explicit recognition of the right to appoint stated clerks, committees of review, boards of education, of domestic and foreign missions; directors of seminaries, &c., &c.? If our church courts have no powers but those laid down in the constitution, we shall have to give up all the general institutions of the church, and many of our most familiar modes of action.

If the right in question were not one clearly recognised in the past history of our church, and one of real value, it would not be worth contending for. But the single instance of the Synod of Kentucky, in the case of the Cumberland Presbytery, shows that there may be cases, in which it is of the highest importance that this right should be called into exercise. And cases are constantly occurring, in which it is impossible to get a large presbytery, or a whole synod, to devote the time and attention requisite for their due consideration and decision. In such cases

a commission of a third or a fourth of the whole body, might be sent to investigate, deliberate and decide, with obvious advantage to all the parties concerned. If the parties are satisfied, the matter ends there. If not, an appeal is open to the appointing body, before whom the matter comes with all the advantage of a previous protracted and careful examination. In this way the ends of justice are better answered, and the time of our church courts is saved. We are, therefore, glad that the Assembly refused, by indefinitely postponing the whole subject, to sanction the resolution denying to our primary courts the rights in question.

It is proper to mention that the committee, consisting of Drs. Hodge, McFarland, Lindsly, McDowell, and Musgrave, were, with the exception of Dr. Lindsly, unanimous in sanctioning the report submitted to the Assembly.

The McQueen Case.

The Rev. Archibald McQueen having married the sister of his deceased wife, was for that offence suspended by the Fayetteville presbytery from the communion of the church, and from the exercise of the office of the ministry. In 1842 this sentence was confirmed by the decision of the General Assembly. Having submitted to the sentence of suspension for about three years, he applied to be restored to the privileges of the church and to the exercise of his ministry. The presbytery decided not to restore him. Of this decision he complained to the Assembly of 1845, and at the same time memorialized that body praying them to decree his restoration. In the minutes of that Assembly, p. 32, is found the following record in relation to this subject. "The second order of the day was taken up, viz., the complaint and memorial of Archibald McQueen against the Presbytery of Fayetteville; and on motion, the Rev. Mr. Goldsmith was appointed to manage the case of Mr. McQueen in his absence, and agreeably to his request.

The moderator having reminded the members that they were about to sit in a judicial capacity, the papers in the case were read in due order, and the original parties were fully heard. After which the following resolution was on motion adopted, viz: *Resolved*, That the prayer of the memorialist be granted, so far as that the General Assembly recommend the presbytery of

Fayetteville to reconsider their decision in the case of Rev. Archibald McQueen; and, if in their judgment it should appear conducive to the peace of the church, and the promotion of religion in the region around them, to restore Mr. McQueen to the communion of the church, and to the exercise of the functions of the gospel ministry, on the ground that in his case, the ends of discipline are attained, by the operation of the sentence under which Mr. McQueen has been lying for a period of three years."

The presbytery of Fayetteville referred the matter to the Assembly of 1846, but the reference was dismissed, by a vote for its indefinite postponement. The presbytery then proceeded to take action in the case, and restored Mr. McQueen to the communion of the church and to the exercise of his ministry. Against this decision Rev. Colin McIver and others complained and appealed to the Synod of North Carolina. The synod sustained the action of the presbytery. Mr. McIver and others complained of this decision of the synod to the General Assembly.

The judicial committee having reported the case to be ready for hearing, it was made the order of the day for Tuesday afternoon. When that hour arrived the case was called up, and the moderator, in a very impressive address, reminded the Assembly that they were about to sit in a judicial capacity. The papers in the case were then read, in part. When the decision of the synod against which the complaint was entered had been read, a motion was made to dismiss the case, on the ground that no complaint could lie; the matter having been decided by a former Assembly. This motion was after considerable debate, laid aside in order that the complaint itself and the reasons on which it was grounded, should be read.

The motion was then made to dismiss the case, by the introduction of the following preamble and resolution, viz:

"*Whereas*, The Rev. Archibald McQueen prosecuted a complaint before the Assembly of 1845, against the Presbytery of Fayetteville for refusing to restore him to the exercise of the gospel ministry, and did at the same time memorialize that Assembly to decree his restoration; and whereas that Assembly did take up and judicially entertain the said complaint, and pronounced judgment in the case by authorizing and recommending the presbytery to restore the said Archibald McQueen to the gospel ministry, provided that in the judgment of the presbytery

it was wise so to do, and whereas the presbytery in the exercise of the discretion thus confided to them did restore Mr. McQueen, Therefore,

"*Resolved*, That the complaint of the Rev. Colin McIver and others against the Synod of North Carolina for having sustained the action of the Presbytery of Fayetteville in restoring the said Archibald McQueen, in accordance with the judicial decision of the Assembly of 1845, cannot be entertained by this house, and is hereby dismissed.

"In making this disposition of the above mentioned complaint, this General Assembly wishes it to be distinctly understood, that they do not mean to retract or modify any judgment hitherto expressed by any Assembly respecting the offence for which Mr. McQueen was suspended from the exercise of the gospel ministry. They simply declare that his case cannot be regularly brought before them, by this complaint."

The above resolution was adopted, ayes 95, noes 53. This vote was not arrived at until Saturday morning at 12 o'clock, the question having been in the meantime debated at great length. The resolution was opposed by Messrs. Gazley, Woodrow, Kerr, Berry, Pryor, Junkin, Mitchell, Johnston. It was advocated by Messrs. Cunningham, Hoge, Janeway, Hamil, Hunt, Hodge.

Those who sustained the resolution, argued substantially thus: In the first place the question which this Assembly is called upon to decide, is the precise question decided by the Assembly of 1845. That question is, the propriety of restoring Mr. McQueen to the ministry. The Assembly of 1845 decided he ought to be restored; this Assembly is called upon to say he ought not to be restored. The former said, the ends of discipline in his case were answered; we are called upon to say, they have not been attained. It was strongly argued on the other side, that if the Assembly of 1845 could reverse the decision of the Assembly of 1842, this Assembly can reverse that of 1845. The Assembly of '45 did not reverse the decision of that of '42. The one Assembly said Mr. McQueen ought to be suspended from the ministry; the other, that having suffered that suspension for more than three years, he should be restored. To reverse a decision is to declare it erroneous and to render it inoperative. The Assembly of '45 did not sit in judgment on the decision of the

Assembly of '42, and reverse it; the sentence of suspension was not pronounced erroneous, or invalid; the punishment was declared to be sufficient. It was never, we suspect before argued, that to restore a suspended minister or church member, is to sit in judgment on the sentence of suspension. The questions, therefore decided by the Assemblies of 1842 and 1845, were entirely different. In the present case the question is precisely the same. The thing complained of is the restoration of Mr. McQueen; the very thing which the Assembly of 1845 decided should be done. It is that decision which we are called upon to pronounce unconstitutional and wrong.

In the second place, the decision of this case in 1845 was a judicial decision, and being the decision of the court of last resort, is of necessity final. It requires no argument to show that the decision of one Assembly cannot be reviewed by a subsequent Assembly. There cannot be a remedy after the last, a court higher than the highest. One Assembly may indeed decide one case one way, and a following Assembly decide a similar case in another way. One may act on the principle that the marriage of a man with his wife's sister is null and void, and that therefore separation must precede restoration, and on this ground refuse to restore A. B. suffering under a sentence of suspension for such a marriage. Another Assembly may act on the principle that the separation of the parties to such a marriage is not an indispensable condition to a restoration to church privileges, and on this ground decide to restore C. D. to church fellowship. In this way one Assembly may go counter to the decision of another Assembly; but it never can be contended that one Assembly can review the judicial decision of a previous Assembly.

All therefore that can be required in the present case, is to show that the decision of 1845 in reference to the restoration of Mr. McQueen was really a judicial decision. It is readily conceded that if Mr. McQueen had merely memorialized the General Assembly to take action in his case, and the Assembly had proceeded to recommend to the presbytery to restore him, such a recommendation would be no bar to our entertaining the present complaint. One Assembly is not bound by the opinions or recommendations of another. Neither is any judicial decision binding as a precedent, as has already been remarked. But a case being once judicially decided by one Assembly, the decision

is final. The only question, therefore, is whether the Assembly did decide judicially in favour of the restoration of McQueen.

A judicial decision, in the sense here intended, is the judgment of a court in the decision of a trial. McQueen complained of the presbytery of Fayetteville for refusing to restore him to the ministry. The Assembly of 1845 entertained that complaint. They resolved themselves into a court for that purpose. The papers were read in order. The parties were fully heard. The court then proceeded to pronounce its judgment; which was that the ends of discipline had in his case been answered, and that the presbytery ought to restore him provided, in their judgment it was right to do so. This was in form and effect a judicial decision. It was the judgment of a court in a case regularly tried. Our book teaches us that a complaint may be sustained in whole or in part; absolutely and conditionally; on a condition to be performed by the complainant or by some other party. The Assembly might have restored Mr. McQueen on some conditions to be performed by himself—as for example, that he put away his wife, or that he make a public confession before the presbytery. No one can question that on the performance of such condition, the judgment of the Assembly, would have been final. The Assembly, however, wisely made the restoration dependent on the judgment of the presbytery, as to its propriety. The point really decided by the Assembly was that temporary suspension is an adequate punishment for the offence for which Mr. McQueen had been condemned. But whether that suspension had been, in his case, sufficiently protracted; whether it had wrought its proper effect upon him, or satisfied the demands of the Christian community of which he was a member, were points on which the presbytery was the only competent judge. The restoration, therefore, was made conditional on the judgment of the presbytery as to these points. As soon as the presbytery declared that, in their judgment, the interests of religion and the peace of the church would be promoted by his restoration, the only condition attached to his restoration was fulfilled, and the decision became final.

The objections urged on the other side, were principally these two: first, that the act of the Assembly of 1845, was a mere recommendation, and not a judicial decision. And secondly, that even if a judicial decision it was null and void, because contrary to the

constitution of the church. The answer to the former of these objections is contained in the records of the Assembly, which show that the case was strictly a judicial one; that it was so regarded by the Assembly, and so treated and decided.

The answer to the second objection is two-fold. First, admitting the allegation that the decision was unconstitutional, it is still final, and cannot be reviewed because the decision of our highest court. It is not denied that there are numerous decisions of a like kind, upon our records; and yet no one pretends that these decisions can be brought up and re-examined by this or any subsequent General Assembly. It often happens that the decisions of a supreme court are erroneous or unconstitutional. And when so considered they ought to have no weight in the determination of similar cases, but they are not the less final and irreversible for all that.

But in the second place, it is denied that the decision in question was unconstitutional. The allegation is, that the constitution clearly declares that the marriage of a man with his deceased wife's sister, is incestuous, and therefore null and void in the sight of God and the church, and consequently that the parties to such a marriage cannot be admitted or restored to the privileges of the church, unless the marriage relation between them be dissolved.

The answer to this is, in the first place, that the word incest, as the word man-slaughter, and others of a similar kind, is a term of wide import, embracing under it acts of very different degrees of moral turpitude. Man-slaughter may vary from justifiable homicide to murder in the first degree. And incest may vary from the lowest to the highest degree, according to the degree of relationship between the parties. It is to confound all our ideas of right and wrong, to shock the moral convictions of all sane men, to maintain that there is no difference between marriage within the prohibited degrees, when those degrees extend from a niece to a parent. No man believes this; and our Confession of Faith cannot be understood to teach any such doctrine. Admitting, therefore, that the Confession does pronounce the marriage in question incestuous, in the sense of being within the degrees of consanguinity and affinity prohibited in the word of God, it does not follow that no distinction is to be made between such a marriage and one between brother and sister, or parent and

child. Such a distinction is made in scripture, and in the nature of man. It is made by every human being, and should be made by the church, unless the church means to bring herself into conflict with the Bible and with the instinctive moral sentiments of men.

In the second place, the interpretation of the Confession insisted upon on the other side, is contrary to the uniform action of our highest judicatory for more than a hundred years. While the old synod and the General Assembly have repeatedly censured the marriage in question, they have never to the best of our knowledge, required the parties to separate as a condition of their restoration to church membership. They have, however, repeatedly decided just the reverse. See Minutes of the Assembly for 1810, &c.* It cannot be just to enforce an interpretation of the constitution contrary to the established action of the church, from a period long anterior to the date of the admission of our oldest living members. The church has in this respect always recognised the obvious distinction between what is unlawful and what is invalid, any thing contrary to the rule of duty laid down in the scriptures, is unlawful; but many engagements and contracts which men ought not to form, are, when formed, nevertheless binding. It is unlawful, i. e. contrary to the rule contained in scripture, for a Christian to marry a pagan, but such a marriage would be valid. In the same sense, it is unlawful for a man to marry a member of his own household, i. e. any one so connected with him, as to render it proper, on the ground of that relationship, that they should live together as members of the same

* We cite this case as showing that the ground now taken was not only that maintained by our highest judicatory as far back as 1810; but was the ground uniformly taken by the church in all such cases.

"A reference from Bethel Church, South Carolina, was overtured, requesting the decision of the Assembly in relation to a case in which a person had married the sister of his deceased wife. On motion,

"*Resolved*, That this reference be answered by the following decision of the Assembly of 1804. 'The Assembly having given repeated decisions on similar cases, cannot advise to annul such marriages, or pronounce them in such a degree unlawful as that the parties, if otherwise worthy, should be debarred from the privileges of the church. But as great diversity of opinion appears to exist on such questions in different parts of the church, so that no absolute rule can be enjoined with regard to them, that shall be universally binding and consistent with the peace of the church; and as the cases in question are esteemed to be doubtful, the Assembly is constrained to leave it to the discretion of the inferior judicatories under their care, to act according to their own best light, and the circumstances in which they find themselves placed. *See Volume of Minutes of the General Assembly, published by the Board of Publication*, pp, 456, 457.

family. This is the obvious rule laid down in scripture; but such a marriage *may* nevertheless be valid; and is valid, unless the relationship be one of those in reference to which separation of the parties is decreed in the word of God.

In the third place, the interpretation of the constitution, now contended for on the other side, is contrary to the practice of its very advocates. As members either of presbyteries, synods, or of the General Assembly, they are in constant communion with parties living in the relation in which McQueen and his wife stand to each other. It is not for one moment to be believed that these brethren would or could sit quietly, if within the bounds of their own presbyteries, church members were allowed to enjoy their privileges undisturbed, who were notorious drunkards, or thieves, or who, being brothers and sisters, had intermarried. And yet, if we are correctly informed, within the bounds of this very presbytery of Fayetteville, there is more than one such case. And sure we are that such cases are numerous in all parts of our church, where such marriages are not forbidden by the law of the land. The only consistent course, therefore, is the one on which our Assembly has so long acted. That is, to censure such marriages, whenever brought before them judicially, but not to insist on the separation of the parties. It was, therefore, very proper in the Assembly of 1842, to sanction the action of the presbytery of Fayetteville, in suspending Mr. McQueen; but it would be contrary to our long established usage for this Assembly to insist that he must repudiate his wife.

In the fourth place, the interpretation in question, is contrary to the Word of God. It supposes that all violations of the general law, "none of you shall marry any who is near of kin to him," are to be treated just alike; whereas the Bible makes a great distinction between the cases. For one offence against that law, the parties were to be burnt to death; for another, they were to be stoned; for another, excommunicated; for another, they were to die childless. These penalties being part of the judicial system of the Hebrews, are no longer binding. But the offences to which they are attached, being offences against a law having its foundation in the permanent relations of men, are offences still. And the fact that they were visited by divine appointment, with such diifferent degrees of punishment, shows that they are not to be confounded.

The decision of the Assembly of 1845, that a man who had married his deceased wife's sister might be restored to the privileges of the church, without repudiating his wife, is not contrary to the constitution, as that instrument has been interpreted for more than a hundred years, and as understood in the light of God's own word. All this, however, is really foreign to the present question, which is simply this, whether a man restored to the ministry by one Assembly, can be again suspended on the ground that such restoration was unwise, injurious, or unconstitutional? Mr. McQueen was conditionally restored by the Assembly of 1845, and the condition having been fulfilled by the action of his presbytery, the decision became final.

It is due to the complete history of the marriage question before this Assembly, to add, that the following resolution was offered by the Rev. Dr. Patterson, viz: *Resolved*, That the General Assembly overture to the presbyteries the following question, viz: Shall that part of the fourth section of the twenty-fourth chapter of the Confession of Faith from 1 to 2, which says, "Nor can any such incestuous marriages ever be made lawful by any law of man, or consent of parties, so as those persons may live together as man and wife," be stricken out? This resolution was urged by the mover and Dr. Hoyt, solely on the ground that the law as it now stands in the book is inconsistent with the practice of the church. The previous question was moved by Mr. Hunt, after very little discussion, and the resolution was rejected by a vote of 57 ayes to 89 noes.

A resolution offered by Mr. Berry, reproving, and bearing testimony against, those presbyteries and church sessions which allow the formation of this marriage relation, was also rejected without a division, and by a very large vote.

Case of the Rev. Dr. Scott.

This case came before the Assembly, in the form of a complaint, by the Rev. James Smylie, against a decision of the Presbytery of Louisiana, acquitting the Rev. Dr. Scott of certain charges affecting his moral and ministerial character, and growing, we believe, out of some political controversy, the merits of which did not appear. The complaint was first laid before the Synod of Mississippi, who requested the complainant, if he could not conscientiously withdraw the complaint, to carry it up to the

General Assembly. The Judicial Committee reported the case as regular, but finding it exceedingly voluminous and perplexed, and after carefully deliberating on the subject, they were unanimously of the opinion that if the case could be disposed of, consistently with the rights of Mr. Smylie, without either remanding or adjudicating on it, all the ends of justice would be gained and the peace of the church promoted. Accordingly, after an interview with Mr. Smylie, who agreed to submit to this course if the Committee and Assembly would assume the responsibility of adopting it, they recommended to the Assembly the following resolution which was adopted, viz:

"*Resolved*, That in view of the representation of the case given in the statement by the Judicial Committee, of the voluminous nature of the testimony, and of the difficulties attending the case, and believing that the interests of the church will be best promoted by adopting the course recommended by the committee, and being willing to assume the responsibility of acting accordingly, this General Assembly, do hereby terminate this unhappy case without any further judicial trial."

We sincerely rejoice in this termination on every account, and not least, because it restores, without reproach, to his laborious and important work, in that great and needy field, a man whom we regard as an eminently able and faithful minister of the gospel.

Board of Foreign Missions.

The annual report was laid before the Assembly by the Rev. J. C. Lowrie. It mentions the death of Rev. Joshua L. Wilson, D. D., a member of the Board, and the Rev. Thomas Wilson, a missionary in Africa. The receipts of the Board during the year, including a balance of $1,949 35, were $95,628 69, and the expenditures were $95,458 36. Many boxes of valuable clothing have been received from female members of different churches. More than 8,000 copies of the Missionary Chronicle, and 12,580 copies of the Foreign Missionary have been published during the year, besides 15,000 copies of various missionary papers.

During the year, twelve ordained missionaries, of whom seven were married, were sent to the several stations of the Board, besides a teacher, steward, and carpenter to the Choctaw Indians.

The Choctaw Mission consists of seven male and five female members. The Spencer Academy, supported by the Choctaw Nation and the Indian Department of our Government, is now under the care of the Board; and notwithstanding a severe visitation of sickness, is now in a condition highly satisfactory and promising. The number of pupils at the beginning of the session was eighty. The Creek and Seminole Mission is composed of four labourers, a church of fourteen native members, and a school of forty-two pupils, male and female. This mission is prosperous both as regards attention to the preaching of the gospel and progress on the part of the pupils. Two large manual labour boarding schools are to be founded by the Indian Department of Government, one of which will be under the care of the Board.

The Iowa and Sac Mission has five labourers with a school of thirty scholars. Intemperance fostered by their proximity to the white settlements has been a dreadful scourge to these Indians. Among the Omahaw and Otoe Indians there are three missionaries. These Indians are in a sadly depressed condition; but on that very account should interest our Christian sympathies. The Chippewa and Ottawa Mission, with only two labourers is making steady progress. The church numbers twenty native members, and the school fifty-eight children. The mission on Western Africa numbers eight labourers, divided into two stations, with their churches and schools.

In Northern India there are stations at Lodiana, Saharunpur, Sabathu, Futtehgurh, Mynpory, Agra, and Allahabad. At these stations there are thirty-five missionaries from our own church and two from Germany, together with seventeen native labourers, of whom two are ordained ministers, and two licentiates. The whole number of pupils reported is near 900, at various stages of advancement. There were printed at the Lodiana Mission Press, during the year, 6,756,000 pages and at the Allahabad press 6,318,400 pages.

In Siam there are three missionaries, a wide door of entrance, and fields white unto the harvest. The China Mission has stations at Canton, Amoy and Ningpo, with seventeen missionaries of whom five are females. These missions have made remarkable progress, for the period of their establishment, especially the two last. The printing with metallic types has

been successfully conducted at Ningpo, and 1,210,000 pages have been issued during the year. The schools are prosperous and promising. Preaching is done to the extent of their ability. At the northern stations the missionaries are in high favour with the highest Mandarins, which gives them great advantages in their intercourse with the lower classes.

To the Evangelical Missionary Societies in Papal Europe, the Board have sent upwards of $3,000 during the year. They have also a Missionary to the Jews in the city of New York. The committee to whom this report was referred presented the following resolutions to the Assembly which were unanimously adopted, viz:

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

"2. *Resolved*, That the General Assembly have abundant ground of encouragement and devout thanksgiving to the Great Head of the Church, in the evidence of success which has attended the operations of the Board during the ecclesiastical year.

"3. *Resolved*, That as God in his providence is opening many effectual doors and spreading out before our Board of Foreign Missions many interesting and extensive fields, and inviting them to enter and take possession, it is the imperative duty of the Church, with combined and more vigorous efforts to prosecute the work in which we have embarked.

"4. *Resolved*, That as there are adequate pecuniary resources in the churches under the care of the General Assembly, if called forth, to meet all the engagements of the Board, it be recommended to them to extend the sphere of their operations as far as practicable in strengthening existing stations and in establishing new ones.

"5. *Resolved*, That whilst it is our duty to labour and pray with increased energy and zeal for the conversion of the heathen, the Assembly recognizes its obligation to increase its efforts in behalf of Papal Europe, as well as the seed of Abraham, remembering that all the 'kingdoms of this world are to become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ.'

"6. *Resolved*, That whilst the Assembly learn with pleasure that there has been a considerable increase in the amount of contributions from the churches to the Board the last year, it is with painful regret they learn that a large proportion of our churches have contributed nothing to this important object, and that some of our churches, instead of sustaining their own board, direct their contributions through other and foreign channels.

"7. *Resolved*, That all the churches under the care of this General Assembly are expected, as a matter of duty and consistency, to contribute, systematically and annually, to the funds of this Board.

"8. *Resolved*, That it be recommended to the Board to adopt measures to secure the object referred to in the preceding resolution, by a wise system of agency or otherwise, and that it be recommended to the Presbyterics efficiently to co-operate in this matter.

"9. *Resolved*, That recognizing our dependence upon the blessing of God and the Holy Spirit for the success of this great enterprise, for the conversion of the world, it be earnestly recommended to all the churches under our care to cultivate the spirit of prayer, and more earnestly and unitedly to seek the divine blessing upon the efforts of this Board, as well as of other institutions, especially in the Monthly Concert."

Board of Domestic Missions.

The report of this Board was read by the corresponding Secretary, Dr. W. A. McDowell. The whole number of Missionaries in commission during the year has been 431. The number of feeble congregations and missionary stations supplied has exceeded 1200. Not less than seventy new churches have been organized, and nearly one hundred houses of worship have been erected. The amount of funds reported including the balances at the beginning and end of the year, is $63,522.59. In *Church extension*, the Board have aided in building forty-one houses of worship and made appropriations to thirteen congregations to relieve them from pressing debts. The condition of all these grants has been such that in every case the houses have *been finished* and the congregations left free from debt. The whole sum contributed for this department was $4,596.85.

The committee to whom this Report was referred brought in the following Resolutions which were unanimously adopted, viz:

"1. That the Report be approved, and published under the direction of the Board; also that the Board furnish the Stated Clerk of the Assembly with an abstract to be published in the Appendix to the Minutes.

"2. That the increase during the past year, in the amount of pecuniary contributions, in the number of missionaries commissioned, and in the good results of their labour in various respects, has been such as the Assembly may well recognize with gratitude, and receive as an encouragement to the renewed and more vigorous prosecution of the interests of this important cause.

"3. That, in the judgment of this Assembly the enterprise of Domestic Missions has never stood sufficiently high in the estimation and affection of the American churches. In its relations to the wide extent of our territory, the rapid increase of our population, the efforts that are made to scatter the seeds of error in our new settlements, and the influence which our country is to exert upon the character and destiny of the world, it is the great enterprise which should enlist the sympathies and the active co-operation of the patriot, the philanthropist, and the Christian.

"4. That this Assembly reiterate the testimony of former Assemblies to the vast importance of this object, and calls upon the Synods and Presbyteries to take such measures as may seem to them best calculated to secure the largest possible contributions to the funds of the Board which has this interest in charge.

"5. That in view of the increasing importance and magnitude of this branch of

our benevolent operations, a sermon be delivered on this subject at some convenient time during the sessions of the Assembly.

"6. That the Assembly has heard with pleasure of what has been done by this Board, in its capacity as a Church Extension Committee, and express the hope that the funds placed at their disposal for this object for the coming year will be greatly increased."

At a subsequent period, the following Resolutions were also adopted, viz:

"*Resolved*, 1. That this Assembly has heard with satisfaction, the sermon preached by the Rev. C. C. Jones, D.D., of Georgia, according to their appointment, on the subject of the religious instruction of the colored population.

"*Resolved*, 2. That the Assembly regard this subject as one of very great interest and importance, and recognize the goodness of God in opening this field to our ministers and missionaries to so large an extent, and with such cordial approbation from the community.

"*Resolved*, 3. That the Board of Missions be directed, if it appears to them advisable, to appoint a secretary or general agent from and for the south and southwest, who shall superintend the collection of funds and the location of missionaries, and attend to the other duties of this department, in co-operation with the presbyteries and churches in that section of country."

Board of Education.

The Annual Report was read by the Rev. C. Van Rensselaer, D.D., the corresponding Secretary. It stated that the number of candidates on the roll during the year was 403, making the whole number from the beginning 1663. Of these thirty-nine had finished their studies, and gone into the field.

The Committee on the Report of the Board of Education recommended the following Resolutions, which were adopted, viz:

"1. *Resolved*, That this Assembly reiterate their conviction of the importance of ministerial education in its relations to all the enterprises of the church and the conversion of the world.

"2. *Resolved*, That this Assembly solemnly recognize the Sovereign grace of God, in calling the sons of the Church into the ministry, and also acknowledge the obligations of his church to use all scriptural and proper means to increase the number of candidates, especially by prayer to the Lord of the harvest, ministerial instruction, parental consecration, Christian education, and pecuniary assistance to those who may need it.

"3. *Resolved*, That it be specially recommended to our ministers and churches, not only to pray for an increase of labourers, but also to remember in their prayers the youth of the church, who have already commenced their preparatory studies, and who are naturally exposed to many temptations which the Spirit of God alone can enable them to resist.

"4. *Resolved*, That the Presbyteries be enjoined to use unceasing vigilance in the examination of candidates, and to retain a strict pastoral supervision over them,

throughout their entire preparatory course; and that the Board of Education be enjoined to continue the plan of personal visitation and correspondence and to use their best endeavours to promote a high standard of ministerial qualification.

"5. *Resolved*, That the Board of Education exercise the same pastoral care over the candidates for the ministry, who are sustained by the permanent funds of the General Assembly, as over those who are sustained by the annual collections of the churches.

"6. *Resolved*, That the Annual Report be committed to the Board for publication."

Parochial Schools.

It is a subject of gratulation that we are at last fairly embarked in this great work, and in a way that promises the best attainable efficiency. It is this, more than any thing else, that we have long regarded as the complement of our ecclesiastical organization. We venture to say that the next generation will wonder how the Presbyterian Church could have consented so long, to the unnatural divorce between teaching and preaching, we might say, between teaching our youth in the school-room, and our adult population in the church. We rejoice that the work is now in the vigorous hands of the Board of Education. The able report of the Board, presented by its Corresponding Secretary, Dr. Van Rensselaer, met a hearty approval. From the deep interest excited by the subject and from what we have learned of the doings of the Board since the Assembly, we expect to be able to commence the history of actual operations in this vital work, with our notice of the next General Assembly.

As we have already expressed our views on this subject in giving an account of the discussions of last year, and as our space is in requisition for other purposes, we deem it unnecessary to do more at present than give the report of the Committee to which was referred the report of the Board of Education, on this subject, which was adopted by the Assembly, and is as follows, viz:

"1. *Resolved*, That the report be committed to the Board of Education, in order that it may be printed, and circulated among the churches.

"2 *Resolved*, That this Assembly do hereby express their firm conviction, that the interest of the church and the glory of our Redeemer demand that immediate and strenuous exertions should be made, so far as practicable, by every congregation, to establish within its bounds one or more primary schools, under the care of the session of the church, in which, together with the usual branches of secular learning, the truths and duties of our holy religion shall be assiduously inculcated.

"3. *Resolved*, That this Assembly do hereby earnestly call upon all the Syn-

ods and Presbyteries under their care, to take the subject of Christian education under consideration, and to devise and execute whatever measures they may deem most appropriate for securing the establishment of parochial and Presbyterial schools in our bounds.

"4. *Resolved*, That a committee, consisting of one minister and one ruling elder, be appointed by each Presbytery to collect information as to the number and condition of schools within the bounds of the Presbytery, the number of children under fifteen years of age belonging to their congregations, the state of public opinion in respect to education, the ability of the churches to sustain teachers and build school houses and whatever other statistical information relating to education they may deem important; and that these committees forward their reports to the Board of Education, on or before the first of January, 1848.

"5. *Resolved*, That this whole subject be referred to the Board of Education, and that the Board is hereby authorized to expend whatever moneys are committed to them for that purpose, in aid of the establishment of parochial and Presbyterial schools.

"6. *Resolved*, That it be recommended to the Board of Publication, to make inquiries on the subject of elementary school books, with a view of adapting them, as far as practicable, to a system of religious instruction, and that the Board report on this subject to the next General Assembly."

Board of Publication.

The Rev. Dr. Jones, Secretary, submitted the annual report from which it appeared that 21 new volumes had been published during the year, embracing 23,500 copies. The sales of books from the beginning of the Board amount to $145,477, and many donations have been made through private liberality to destitute churches.

The following resolutions were subsequently adopted by the Assembly, viz:

"1. *Resolved*, That the Report be approved, and published under the direction of the officers of the Board.

"2. *Resolved*, That in the opinion of the Assembly the affairs of this Board have been conducted with judgment, energy, and success—calling for the continued and increased confidence of the churches in its operations, as a means of usefulness.

"3. *Resolved*, That the Assembly cordially approves the plan proposed by the Board for circulating its books, and earnestly recommends it to the immediate attention of the churches.

"4. *Resolved*, That the Assembly is highly gratified that the Board has entered upon a system of Colportage, as an agency for the circulation of its books; and while repeating the recommendation of former Assemblies, that funds be raised by Synods and Presbyteries for the establishment of Depositories, owned and managed by themselves, the Assembly would further recommend that they employ, in connexion with these Depositories, the Colporteurs appointed by the Board.

"5. *Resolved*, That the Assembly approves of the charter obtained by the

Board, and orders that in accordance with the terms of the charter, it shall hereafter be known by the name of 'The Presbyterian Board of Publication.'

"6. *Resolved*, That the Assembly also provides in accordance with the requirements of the aforesaid charter, that at the annual meeting of the Board of Publication in the year 1848, on the day when the Board meets to re-organize and elect officers, it shall proceed to elect by ballot, three persons in the room of the three first named of the Trustees of the Presbyterian Board of Publication, incorporated by the aforesaid charter; on the day of the annual meeting in 1849, it shall proceed in like manner to elect three persons in the room of the second three Trustees named in the charter aforesaid; and on the day of the annual meeting in 1850, it shall elect in the same manner three persons in the room of the three remaining Trustees of the aforesaid Board; and thenceforward annually electing three persons in the room of that class which has served three years; provided always, that the same persons shall be re-eligible.

"7. *Resolved*, That the Presbyterian Board of Publication may also, at any of its regular meetings, elect persons to fill vacancies occasioned by death, resignation, or otherwise."

Foreign Correspondence.—Slavery.

It is a remarkable and gratifying fact that amidst all the agitation on the subject of slavery, which prevails around us, our church has arrived at such harmony of views, that the question would not have come before the Assembly, if it had not been incidentally introduced in connexion with the letters from the Irish and Scotch churches. These letters, when presented to the house, were referred, unread, to the committee on foreign correspondence. That committee, in due time, reported answers to be adopted by the Assembly. The reading of the foreign letters was then called for. The Moderator, however, decided that the letters having been referred to the committee could not be brought before the house except by a motion to reconsider. That motion was accordingly made, for the purpose of hearing the letters. The house adjourned before any vote was taken. When the subject was resumed, the letters were read by common consent.

The only point which gave rise to any further debate, was that clause in the answers reported by the committee, which expressed the wish that correspondence on the subject of slavery between us and the Irish and Scotch Assemblies, might cease. After discussion, the answer to the letter from Ireland was adopted as reported. The answer to the church of Scotland was modified so as to express the idea that no further communication on our part on this subject was necessary.

The letter from Scotland was dignified and kind, and in most of its sentiments, the great mass of our members, we doubt not. heartily concurred. The Irish letter was of a somewhat different character. The inconsistency between the terms used in different parts of it, was so glaring, that we wonder how it could escape the notice of its authors. To us it would be ludicrous were it not for our respect for the source whence it emanated. It is surprising that a body of grave men should say to another Assembly: "Beloved brethren, we esteem and confide in you as good soldiers of Jesus Christ, we rejoice in your prosperity and usefulness; we should be glad to sit at your feet; but we are constrained to say you are 'man stealers,' and are classed in the scriptures with murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers." This substantially is said by simply bringing together the different parts of this letter.

Even if the moral incongruity of such a character failed to strike them, they must see that it is very strange logic. Both these representations cannot be true. Either we are not Christians, or we are not man stealers and murderers. If they recognize us as Christian brethren, as we hope they do, then for their own sake as well as ours, we hope they will not again call us such hard names.

The reasons which induced the Assembly to express the opinion in respectful terms, that the subject of slavery should be dropt from the future correspondence between us and our foreign brethren, were principally the following. In the first place, we have heard repeatedly what they have to say on the subject, and we have replied fully and explicitly. The points of agreement and disagreement between us have been clearly brought out. They have told us wherein they think us wrong; and what they think is our duty. We have stated to them the principles on which we feel bound to act, and beg to be allowed to be governed in our own difficult circumstances by our own sense of duty. The principal point of difference between us and our Scotch brethren is, that they think we are bound as a church to avow the abolition of slavery to be our immediate object, and to insist on immediate emancipation as an imperative duty. Whereas we conceive that we have no right, as a church, to insist on emancipation as an immediate duty, while we are bound to require of all our members to make suitable provision for the religious education of their slaves; to respect

their parental and marital rights; to render to them that which is just and equal; to recognize their right of property, i. e. to their own lawful acquisitions. We fully believe that this is the gospel method of emancipation; that the immediate and indiscriminate liberation of millions of slaves of a different and inferior race would be unjust, cruel, and disastrous to the whole community. We insist upon it, that there is no middle ground between that which we occupy, and that of the fanatical abolitionists, of whose tender mercies, of whose truthfulness and justice, the Free Church of Scotland has had some slight experience. Our Scotch brethren vainly seek for such middle ground. But they simply pass first to one side and then to the other. They find no intermediate resting place. They say all slaveholding is sinful and immediate emancipation a duty. This is the Garrison and Wright ground. Then they say it is not requisite to exclude slaveholders as such, from the communion of the church. This is our ground. This is the ground of the Bible. Then, of course, slaveholding is not man stealing; it is not necessarily sinful; it is not a thing to be immediately and in all cases renounced. It may be right, or it may be wrong, according to circumstances; and of those circumstances, those concerned must judge, on their responsibility to God. This inconsistency and confusion of ideas, we notice not only in the letter of the General Assembly of the Free Church, but in the speeches of the most eminent members of that body. It is as clear as day to us that they have not turned their minds fairly to this subject, nor studied it out, so as to satisfy even their own minds. They see that the abolitionists are wrong in making slave holding a bar to Christian communion, for that is in direct opposition to scripture; but they do not discriminate between slavery and its separable adjuncts. They seem never to ask themselves, what slavery is, or what it is they denounce as sinful. That one man should have the right to the services of another, is the essence of slavery; and yet the master may recognize his obligation to reward his servant, to educate him, to treat him as a fellow man and a fellow Christian. What is really declared by these brethren to be sinful, is the oppression, injustice, cruelty, &c., which in so many cases, attend the possession of despotic power. The possession of such power, however, is no sin; though to use it as a despot, that is, unjustly, is a great sin.

In the second place, the Assembly thought that our correspondence on this subject, ought to cease, because we are fully satisfied that we understand the matter a great deal better than they do. This indeed they dispute. They think that our very familiarity with it has blunted our sensibilities and perverted our judgments, and rendered us unfit to view the subject in its true light. We do not claim any exemption from the general laws of our nature. We admit that it is the tendency of familiarity with evil in any form, to render the mind insensible to its enormity. But on the other side, it is to be remembered, that the great majority of our church have nothing to do with slavery; multitudes of our members never saw a slave; a still larger portion never witnessed any act of injustice or oppression exercised towards any one belonging to that class of our population. We are not in such contact with it as to be under its deadening influence. Many of us are further from it geographically, than they are from Italy or Russia. We do not see slavery, as our Scotch and Irish brethren see the misery and degradation of their manufacturing and mining population. If it surprises them that the Christians of the Northern States of this Union, can even hear of the cruelties, sometimes practised towards slaves, without loud protestations and outcries, let them be assured that the existence of such a state of things as was revealed, by the committee of Parliament in the mining districts of England and Scotland under the very eyes of British Christians, filled their American brethren with wonder. Our only solution of the fact that such things could be tolerated in a Christian land, was that the good people of Great Britain had grown up in familiarity with such scenes. We admit, therefore, that such familiarity, where it exists does benumb and blind the mind. But we deny that the majority of our church have any such familiarity with slavery or its attendant evils. On the other hand, while we claim to have more sensibility to the evils of the pauperism of the British Isles than our British brethren are likely to feel; we do not claim to understand it better, in its causes and cure. We acknowledge that as it is the product of their peculiar form of civilization, and of their peculiar institutions, those on the ground or near at hand are more likely than we are, if once roused to the subject, to deal with it wisely and effectively. We do not presume to insist on their adopting our panacea of free

institutions, equal distribution of property among the members of the same family; universal education; &c., &c. We concede that the subject has bearings and relations, which we are not likely to understand. And, therefore, while we say that the existence of such a mass of pauperism, of ignorance, degradation, and misery, as is to be found among them, is evidence of great guilt somewhere—of great defects in the social system—we do not presume to sit in judgment on our brethren, nor to dictate to them their duty in the premises. In like manner, though we should concede to our brethren abroad livelier emotions when the subject of slavery is mentioned, than American Christians are likely to experience, we do not concede to them greater advantages for an enlightened judgment of the proper method of dealing with it. We think the advantage is all on our side. This conviction is strengthened when we see the crudities, the inconsistencies, the misapprehension of facts, the ignorance of the real state of the case, the common-place declamation, which too often constitute the staple of the most solemn "deliverances" of our foreign brethren on this subject. We notice too, that precisely those of their number who have had the least opportunity of knowing the situation of our churches, are the most liable to the above imputations. There is more solid sense in a single speech of Dr. Cunningham on this subject, than is to be found in all the harangues of the excitable brethren who have never seen America. This is no doubt to be referred, in part, to his superior intellect, partly to his moral courage, but partly also, as we doubt not he would be glad to acknowledge, to his having been on the ground, looked at the subject with his own eyes, seen what abolitionism is, and what is the real position of our church and nation in reference to slavery. To his influence, to the manly stand which he took in the Assembly of the Free Church, is to be attributed the dignified and Christian bearing of that body, in the face of the fanatical influence by which it was assailed. We do full credit to our brethren of the Free Church for their resistance to the ignorant and misguided zeal which would have goaded them to unscriptural and unbrotherly measures. And we feel that gratitude is due to them on our part, for having subjected themselves to obloquy for our sakes, and for the cause of truth. We claim, however, their superior wisdom and moderation as proof, that the more and bet-

ter British Christians are acquainted with America, the more nearly will they agree with us, as to the proper method of dealing with this great subject. We wish, however, to have it understood, that it is for our principles, and and not for our conduct that we claim this superiority. We do not assert that we have either as openly announced, as urgently enforced, or as faithfully carried out our principles, as we ought to have done. This would be to claim that we have done our whole duty to the slave population of our country. We confess that in this, as in all other respects, we come lamentably short, and we are willing to receive the rebukes and suffer the exhortations of our brethren in view of our short-comings. But then these rebukes must be enlightened, and not strokes given at random. Our Irish brethren speak to us as though we were all slaveholders, all guilty of separating parents and children, husbands and wives; all chargeable with the neglect of the religious education of the slave; all guilty of the atrocities which the papers sometimes bring to light. Or if not personally guilty of these crimes, they ask whether we do not admit to our churches those who are. Now this is both insulting and ridiculous. Does it follow because there are thieves, drunkards, and murderers in Ireland, they are members of the Irish church? Besides, suppose they were, would it follow that the Irish church sanctioned these crimes? Does any man infer from the fact that the hands of the Church of England are tied by her circumstances or her principles, so that she is powerless in the exercise of discipline, and admits indiscriminately all classes of men to her communion table, that she makes no distinction between virtue and vice? Do our Irish brethren ever talk of withdrawing from all Christian intercourse with the Established Church, on the ground of this lack of discipline? Is it not notorious that the principles which determine admission to church privileges, are far more strict in this country, than either in Scotland or Ireland? Is it not admitted by every one, who has ever visited America, that there are fewer persons of irreligious or immoral character in our churches, than in any of the churches of Europe? When, therefore, questions are put to us, which imply that we admit to our churches men guilty of the greatest crimes, and that too by those who are far less strict on this point than ourselves, we are surprised at the ignorance and self-delusion thereby manifested.

Again, our Irish brethren, ask how we can be so zealous for the conversion of the heathen and yet keep so many in a state of deplorable heathenism at home. Now, though we have not the statistics at hand, we have little doubt that there are more ministers preaching the gospel to our three millions of slaves, than all protestant Christendom has sent to the six hundred millions of heathens elsewhere. There are, we doubt not, more of our slaves in Sunday schools and under other means of religious training, than all evangelical churches have gathered from among the heathen; there are more church members in full communion among the slaves of our Southern States, than converts from among the heathen. Nay more, we have no doubt that among our three millions of slaves, there is not only far more physical comfort and decency, but more intelligence and religious knowledge, morality, and real piety, than among the lower three millions of Great Britain or Ireland.

One of the worst consequences of such letters as those we received from our foreign brethren on this subject is, that in repelling unjust and even absurd accusations, we are driven into self-justification and self-commendation. Paul complained of this. And it is a great evil. It is an evil to us, it makes us compare ourselves with others, and judge ourselves by them rather than by the word of God. It tends to satisfy our conscience unduly, and make us feel that as we are doing more than those who blame us, we are not deserving of blame. It is an evil also to those who ignorantly make such charges. It places them in a false position, and brings the sin of censoriousness upon them. As therefore it is perfectly apparent, that our foreign brethren do not know what they are writing about; as they manifest the greatest ignorance of the facts of the case, we think the Assembly was perfectly right in saying to them—brethren, we have heard your repeated exhortations and counsels; we thank you for your kind intention; we sincerely respect and sympathize with you; but on the subject of slavery, we think enough has been said on both sides, and therefore the matter had better now be dropped.

A third reason for this request is that experience has taught us that these communications do harm rather than good. We are willing to allow there is in many of our brethren, what we regard as undue sensitiveness on this subject. But then their

peculiar circumstances must be taken into account. Our Assembly is in the main composed of members from the non-slaveholding states; it is looked upon at the South, as more or less a Northern body; its declarations are received as coming from abroad; things which Southern men can say and do at the South, if said or done at the North, give offence and excite opposition. It is not the feelings of the church, but the spirit of the community at large, that is thus unduly excited. Men of the world are led to throw obstacles in the way of the efforts of the church. On these grounds our Southern brethren say, you are only weakening our hands, and impeding our progress, by this continual agitation. These denunciations and unfounded accusations, though we can bear them with patience, only irritate the people, and indispose them to co-operate with us in doing good to the slaves. More or less excitement is therefore produced every year when these letters are read. Injustice on the one hand is too apt to produce resentment on the other. And there is great reason to fear that unless this subject, which has been so abundantly discussed, is now laid aside, the friendly intercourse between our Assemblies, will be interrupted. This we should all deeply regret. We feel the sincerest affection and respect for our brethren abroad; we know that we have much to learn from them; we earnestly desire their counsels, on points on which they are competent to instruct us. Let them write to us about parochial schools, and the support of the clergy. Let them tell us how to proceed in bringing all our children, whom the State offers to educate without religion, under the care of church schools; let them urge us on in the discharge of this great duty; and show how we can, in our scattered population, and immense country stretching thousands of miles in every direction, carry out the principles which are found so effective in the compact and homogeneous population of Scotland. We are not indisposed to look up to them for instruction and example, but we think we know our own wants better than they do, and we therefore beg them to give their exhortations another direction.

Since the adjournment of our Assembly we learn that this subject was brought before the Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland. It seems certain petitions were laid before them calling for a more explicit and solemn testimony against American

slave-holding. The prayer of these petitions was rejected, on the ground that the Free Church had already said all they had scriptural warrant for saying; and on the ground, that having written us, the way was not open for further action on their part, until they had received our answer. In the Edinburgh Witness for June 1st, we find a report of the debate on this subject. We are sure our readers will thank us for the following extract from the speech of Dr. Cunningham on that occasion.

"The precise point to which our attention is now called is this,—we are called upon in these petitions to issue, as an Assembly, a more full and stringent declaration than we formerly did on this subject; and we are also called upon now to come to a resolution that we can hold no more intercourse with these American Churches,—thereby adopting a different ground from that on which we have hitherto stood with respect to this subject. Now, as to a more stringent declaration with regard to the subject of slavery, the answer we have to give to these petitioners is just this,—that the Assembly has again and again set forth, in the fullest and plainest terms, every thing which we think the Word of God requires, or warrants us to say against the system of slavery; and the only point where we have stuck,—the only tangible ground of difference betwixt the petitioners and us is, that we have not said, because the Word of God does not warrant us to say, that it is a law universally binding on the Church of Christ, that every slaveholder, simply as such, is on that ground alone, at once and immediately to be excluded from Christian privileges. We stop there. We have said as much, and we have spoken as strongly, against slavery,—against the sinful nature, the degrading character, the injurious tendency of slavery,—as they could wish us to say but we stop there, because we do not believe that it is a principle which the Word of God sanctions, that we are bound to deprive slaveholders, simply as such, of Christian ordinances. That is the sum and substance of what we have said as a Free Church, and we abide by it. (Hear, hear.) If there is any practical step to be taken now on the ground of that position, it must just be resolved into a discussion of the truth and soundness of that position. We do not hold that we differ with them on any very clear and tangible ground. Much obscurity has been cast on the whole question by these persons indulging in mere vague declamation on the character and tendency, the nature, bearing, and effects of slavery,—its injurious influence on the slaveholders and the slave; and when they have thus stirred up the popular feeling against slavery, they assume that they have carried the whole matter; and all ulterior questions are supposed to be at once disposed of, merely on the ground that slavery is an atrocious system, and that it is the duty of every Christian and philanthropic man to do what he can to have it brought to a termination as speedily as possible. Now, it is of importance to remind the house, in the present stage of the question, that the real ground of difference betwixt us and the objectors is that to which I have adverted. (Hear, hear.) I would like very much if any man of competent ability and knowledge of the subject would just begin here, and in an honest and manly way face this question and discuss it fully and at once. I expect that any man who really intends to act an honest and manly part in the discussion of this question as it now stands, and who is in the main favourable to the views of some of these petitioners, and of other

petitioners whose petitions have been rejected, will just feel called upon, in common honesty and fairness to lay down this position, and assert and maintain it from the Word of God,—that it is a law universally binding on the Church of Christ in all countries and in all circumstances, at once and immediately to exclude slaveholders, simply as such, from the enjoyment of Christian privileges. That is the basis of the question to be asserted and maintained. Now, in common fairness they ought to have laid down that position, and attempted to give us the evidence on which it rests. If any man will lay down and affirm that position, I will have no hesitation in taking the negative—(cheers)—on that question,—in asserting and maintaining that it is not a true position, and in producing strong grounds upon which to rest the negation. (Hear, hear.) No man, after all that has been said in this matter up to this point,—after the full and stringent declarations which this church has again and again given against slavery,—I say that no man can now expect to be regarded as dealing with the question in a fair and manly way, unless he lays down this position and undertakes to prove it. Now, notwithstanding all the declamation we have heard on this subject, I have not seen any thing like an honest and manly attempt to establish this position. I have seen a good deal of discussion on various points, which seem to have been intended as a discussion of this position—(a laugh)—but which manifestly is not; a good deal of discussion, for example, of the meaning of the word *doulos;* and I am told that this discussion has found its way among some of the ladies of our congregations. (Laughter.) I am told that they have now got quite learned on *doulos;* and that some of them who don't pretend to know any Greek themselves are accustomed to assert, with considerable decision—(laughter)—that the authority of a son who is at the High School—(continued laughter) or of a brother who is at the College, is in favour of their meaning of the word *doulos*. (Much laughter.) Things of this kind, I understand, are going on, and many have laboured to prove that *doulos* does not always mean a slave,—a statement which no man ever disputed. (Hear.) And they wish their proof of the fact, that the meaning of the word *doulos* does not always mean a slave, to be received by the community as an attempt to establish the proposition that the Word of God imposes, as a law on all the Churches of Christ, the immediate and absolute exclusion of slaveholders from all religious ordinances. I certainly will be very willing to discuss that question if any man—(a laugh)—as I said before, competent to discuss it, would come forward and just lay down this proposition, and undertake the proof of it; although, of course, the idea of proving it is ridiculous. (Hear, hear.) The ground of that opinion is just this, that although we find, in Commentaries on the New Testament, all sorts of absurdities, I don't know that there exists a single commentator who ever disputed that the apostles admitted slaveholders to all the privileges of the Christian Church. I don't, at this moment, know a single individual with the slightest pretensions to scholarship or theology, who has ever ventured to come forward in a fair and manly way to dispute it. People talk of it in various ways, as if they wished to convey the impression that it was not true, or doubtful, although they do not expressly deny it; but that it clearly is the fact, is shown by the common consent of all commentators who have discussed it; and this seems to me an insuperable barrier in the way of laying it down as universally true, that Christian Churches are bound under all circumstances to exclude slaveholders from religious ordinances. I should be exceedingly glad,—I should be most willing to look at it with a decided leaning towards the reception of it,—if any man will maintain, and undertake to

prove that the apostles did not admit slaveholders to, but excluded them from, religious privileges; and that this being a universal law of the church, we must now exclude them. I should be glad that any man would undertake the proof of that proposition; but I am satisfied it could not be proved. We have here, then, a clear and distinct line of demarcation, beyond which, in condemning slavery, we cannot go, without going beyond what the Word of God requires or allows of us. I can easily conceive of a community being placed in such circumstances that a slaveholder, merely on the ground of his being a slaveholder, might be fairly and justly regarded as by the mere fact of his holding slaves, manifesting a sinful state of mind,—as manifesting a sinful love of power,—a sinful desire of oppression,—a sinful willingness to put himself in circumstances of grievous temptation.—I can conceive of a community that might be so placed, as that slaveholding might be regarded as plainly and palpably open to the proof of all this; and I think this would be an adequate ground of exercise of ecclesiastical discipline; but I do not believe that we have the authority of scripture or of apostolic example for laying it down as a law universally binding on the Church of Christ, that every slaveholder, simply as such, is to be excluded from the enjoyment of Christian privileges; or that we are to be forced into the position, by the admission of that rule, and the application of it in practice, that this is to be the term or condition of our friendly intercourse with other churches. (Hear) But even conceding for the sake of argument that it can be made out to be the law of the Christian Church to exclude all slaveholders from ordinances, in order to make out their case they must farther maintain this position, that when a Christian Church takes a different view on that point, she is thereby guilty, either of so much heresy, or of so much sin, as to afford an adequate ground for our abandoning all friendly intercourse with her. This is a position which they must also maintain. Now, that position they never look at. They make some sort of attempt to appear to be discussing the former, when they are not discussing it—(laughter)—but in reference to this second position, they have not yet got the length of even trying to appear to be discussing it. (Laughter.) Even conceding, for the sake of argument, that there are sufficient materials in scripture for maintaining the position that every Christian Church ought to exclude all slaveholders from ordinances, it certainly would not, by any means follow at once, that a church which did not act on this, was therefore by such an act guilty of heresy or sin, so as to afford a valid ground for our abandoning Christian intercourse with her. And that is the sum and substance, so far as distinct matters of doctrine and practice are concerned, of the charge which lies against the American Churches. These people are accustomed to speak of these churches as slaveholding churches. They talk in a vague way of their sanctioning slavery, and so on. But the sum and substance of the matter is just this, that they do not hold that law to be universally binding as a rule of discipline. They do admit to Christian ordinances, men, who although slaveholders, seem to be duly qualified in all other respects for admission to Christian ordinances. This is the charge which ought to be really brought against them, and I cannot admit, on scriptural grounds that it is an adequate charge at all against the American Churches. These people speak of them as if, because they do not exclude all slaveholders, they make themselves responsible for the atrocities of the system But the truth is, that slaveholding, in the sense which we commonly attach to it, as connected with all the atrocities of the system, with its slave-stealing, slave-driving, and slave-breeding has no more connection with the American Churches than the

worst and most infamous characters who infest the worst and most infamous parts of our large towns have to do with the Christian Churches of this country. (Hear, hear.) Supposing then that after a careful examination of God's Word, we find that the apostles admitted man-stealers, as these people call them, to the Lord's table, we cannot see how it can be laid down as a universal rule, that all slaveholders are to be excluded from ordinances, in so far as their connection with slaveholding is concerned. They hold that opinion; they do not exclude slaveholders, who are otherwise well qualified from the enjoyment of Christian privileges; and in holding that opinion we maintain that they are right, and incur no guilt and no blame. Notwithstanding all the vague declamation that we often hear about the atrocities of slavery, I have no hesitation in affirming, what I believe in my conscience to be true, that the communion roll of these American Presbyterian Churches is purer than the communion roll of the Presbyterian Churches of this country. By which I just mean, that the communion roll of the American Presbyterian Church contains a larger portion of converted men, than the communion roll of the Presbyterian Churches of this country. That I mention, simply in the way of illustrating how unreasonable it is to assume that all the worst class of slaveholders have really any connection with the American Churches. Some men assume that, because the churches in America do not take up the grounds which they think they ought to take, that they therefore become directly responsible for all the evils of slavery;—that because they do not exclude all slaveholders from the communion of the church, therefore it is the worst class of slaveholders that are received and recognised as good churchmen. Now this is perfectly ridiculous. Men ought to inquire into these things before they make such assumptions. However, we shall in all likelihood have farther opportunities of discussing this matter; and I would just, in the meantime, remind those who betray so great an anxiety to discuss this question, that we have again and again spoken of slavery in the only way that scripture allows us to speak of it; and any man holding views, such as I have referred to, is bound to come and lay down these two positions, and endeavour to prove them, namely, that the Word of God imposes a law on the Church of Christ to exclude all slaveholders from its communion; and then, secondly, conceding this position, for the sake of argument, that every church which holds erroneous views on that point, is thereby guilty of so much heresy, and so much sin, as to exclude it from Christian intercourse. Even if I thought that to be the law of the church, which assuredly I do not, I would shrink very much from saying that they should be excluded from our Christian regards. The reverend Doctor here compared the second proposition to the unwarrantable conduct of the High Church Prelatists, in unchurching all other denominations who do not recognize the order of Bishops, even although it were proved that Presbyterians and others are in error in rejecting that order as unscriptural. On the same ground (he proceeded) we are not entitled to assert, even although it were proved that the American Churches have fallen into error in not believing that it is the law of scripture, that slaveholders should be excluded from Christian ordinances,—I say, even although it were proved that this is an error which they have fallen into, that would not be a sufficient ground for at once excluding these churches from Christian intercourse. I have no wish to diminish the guilt of slavery,—I abominate and abhor the infidel principle of what is called the innocency of error,—I believe all error to be sinful; but still we must regard it in its own proper light, and see, in judging of these American Churches, that we do really apply to them the principles of common sense and

ordinary Christian charity. To a certain extent they may be guilty of sin, in not doing all they ought to have done in reference to slavery; and upon another occasion, when we have received an answer to our letter from the American Churches, we may be called upon publicly to discuss this point; but I just wish to explain why it is that we cannot do those things which the petitioners call upon us to do. They call upon us to declare in substance, that it is a universal law, binding on the Church of Christ that all slaveholders should be excluded from Christian ordinances. We cannot make that declaration, because we do not believe it to be true; and we cannot persuade ourselves that it is true, until these men have proved that the apostles did not admit slaveholders to Christian ordinances. They call upon us to declare that the churches which do not exclude slaveholders, ought not to be regarded as worthy of Christian, friendly intercourse. Now, we cannot declare that, because we don't believe the truth of the previous proposition, and because we are persuaded that, even although the first proposition were established, the mere circumstance of a church's taking a different view of this question from us, is not of itself a sufficient reason for our excluding them from friendly intercourse. I would fain hope that the members of the Free Church who have felt difficulties on this question, will be brought to see, that upon distinct and definite grounds they are bound to stop short, in their course of procedure, and that the real course of Christian duty, in following out the principle of God's Word, and with a view to the best interests of the American Churches, is just to follow out the friendly intercourse which we have commenced with these churches. I would fain hope that they will soon come to see more clearly, that the agitation which has been got up upon this subject, is, to a large extent, with the desire of injuring the Free Church. (Hear, hear.) The agitation bears that on the face of it too plainly to be misunderstood. (Cheers.) Of course there are men who have suffered themselves to be involved in it, who have no such feeling against the Free Church; but as a whole, this agitation bears that far too plainly stamped on the face of it, to admit of its being disputed. There are men who are glad to hear the Free Church railed at, who rather enjoy it,—who rejoice to hear her abused; and there are also a considerable number of persons in the community who have no sympathy with any church—(hear, hear,)—and who like to hear all ministers abused; and these two classes formed the main bulk of the late meetings of which we have heard so much. (Hear, hear.) In a letter which I lately received from Dr. Duff, he adverted to American slavery, and the opinon he formed of this agitation upon the question was, that it 'was an ingenious device of Satan to injure the church.' (Hear.) I have no doubt it was an ingenious device of Satan,—a device of Satan, not however so ingenious at its first concoction; because in the form in which it came first before the community of this country,—with the Garrisons, the Wrights, the Buffums, the George Thompsons, and the Douglasses,—(laughter)—with that class of persons, in the character which they exhibited, and the spirit which they manifested, I think Satan entirely outwitted himself. (Laughter and cheers.) These men disgusted the Christian people of this land,—they made perfectly manifest their character, their spirit, and their principles, and thereby Satan's device, to a large extent failed of success. I confess I have some fear and apprehension that the establishment of the Free Church Anti-Slavery Society, and the labours which they have been carrying on,—although I have no doubt there are some pious persons concerned in it,—is just a device of Satan to repair his former blunder, and to get this agitation carried on under a more respec-

table countenance. (Laughter.) It is rather a remarkable thing that there has been on the part of some of those employed by the Free Church Anti-Slavery Society, to make speeches and deliver lectures, very plain and palpable indications that these men are treading as fast as they can in the footsteps of the reckless misrepresentations and spiteful malignity of the Garrisons, the Wrights, the Buffums, the George Thompsons, and the Douglasses. (Laughter, cheers, and hissing from the audience.) This is now becoming every day more and more plain. And I believe that the really good and well principled men among them will very soon find that they are constrained to leave that society. It is a society which cannot last long; and I believe every man of good principle, good sense, and good feeling, who has any professed regard for Christian liberty, will soon abandon altogether all connection with it." (Great applause.)

This is a long extract but we rejoice to give it place, were it only to let our readers know Dr. Cunningham. If they put themselves in his position, surrounded by a strong, though perverted, yet in the main, generous public sentiment, clamorous for further and different action; himself and his church subjected to all manner of abuse for the course which he has taken; if they contrast the clearness and precision of his principles with the vague declamation of his opponents, they will be able to form some idea of the great superiority of the man, and we are sure will be disposed to cling to any bond of union between us and the noble church which he so nobly represents.

Demission of the Pastoral Office.

This subject came up on reference from the Assembly of last year, and was referred to a committee consisting of Messrs. Junkin, Pryor, Hoyt, Bullock, and Snowden, to whom Dr. Hoge was subsequently added. This committee presented the following Report, which was adopted, viz:

The Committee to which was referred the matter concerning the demission of the pastoral office, respectfully report for the consideration of the Assembly the following statement and resolution, viz. 1. With all the care which the Presbyteries can exercise in the examination of candidates, and with all the inquiry which candidates may sincerely make after the path of duty, it has happened and will again occur, that men may mistake their calling, and be introduced to the office of the ministry without those qualifications which will enable them, with profit to the church, and comfort to themselves, to continue to exercise its functions. 2. It is a fact that many persons do practically demit the exercise of the office, engaging entirely in secular pursuits; and yet, 3. Their names remain upon our rolls, they are accounted as ministers, and are counted in estimating the ratio of representation of the Presbyteries to which they belong, thus giving to some presbyteries a preponderance in the General Assembly to which they are not justly entitled under the fair operation of our system. There is no reason for deposing or suspending them, they have no authority to demit the exercise of their office, nor have Pres-

byteries a right to permit such demission; and these worthy brethren are constrained to live on with vows resting upon them which they have neither the ability nor opportunity to perform.

Therefore, *Resolved*, That it be referred to the Presbyteries whether the following sections shall be added to the 15th chapter of our Form of Government, viz.

XVI. The office of a minister of the gospel is perpetual and cannot be laid aside at pleasure. No person can be divested of it but by deposition. Yet from various causes a minister may become incapable of performing the duties of the office; or he may, though chargeable with neither heresy nor immorality, become unacceptable in his official character. In such cases he may cease to be an acting minister.

XVII. Whenever a minister from any cause, not inferring heresy, or crime, shall be incapable of serving the church to edification, the Presbytery shall take order on the subject, and state the fact, together with the reasons of it, on their records. And when any person has thus ceased to be an acting minister, he shall not be a member of any Presbytery or Synod, but shall be subject to discipline as other ministers. *Provided always*, that nothing of this kind shall be done without the consent of the individual in question, except by advice of the Synod.

This subject has been repeatedly before the Assembly at least as far back as 1802. The strong conservative principle in our Church, which resists all change whatever, together with a vague and indefinable feeling, that the investment of the ministerial office imparts a certain official virtue, and involves the assumption of certain unalterable vows of which the individual cannot be divested, except by formal deposition, has always prevented the adoption of any constitutional provision, for allowing the voluntary demission of the office. And yet cases have been so constantly occurring, in which men have manifestly mistaken their calling, or been placed in circumstances compelling them to engage in occupations so glaringly incongruous with the ministerial character and work, and that too without any fault of theirs, or any deficiency of religious character which would justify the serious penalty and stigma of deposition, that although dismissed again and again, the subject still continues to return upon the Assembly. We have long been perfectly persuaded, that it can never be put to rest, until some provision is adopted, which will allow us to get over the obvious and serious evils of our present system, in a way that will infer no censure where we think none is deserved. It would certainly be an unspeakable relief both to the Church at large, and to those brethren who find themselves driven into this unfortunate position by the clear indications of duty, to allow them without forfeiting their moral character or ecclesiastical reputation, quietly to demit an

office, whose functions both they and their brethren feel that they cannot with propriety perform. And we can see nothing either in the nature of the ministerial office as understood by Evangelical Protestants, or in the unavoidable tendencies of such a provision, which should render it either improper, or inexpedient. The unusual length to which our remarks on other subjects have grown, prevents us from entering into any discussion of the subject; but we cannot forbear expressing the strong hope, that the overture now sent down by the Assembly to the Presbyteries, with a view of providing for these cases, will not be voted down by those of our brethren who are not in a position to see the evils existing in certain parts of our Church, or—which we fear still more—that it will not be allowed to go by default, through the failure of so many of our Presbyteries, to take action on the subject, as in the case of the last overture sent down for the same purpose.

Christian Union.

A strong feeling on this subject seems to be awakened throughout the whole Evangelical Church in all its branches. The recent puttings forth of this feeling in various ways, resemble the promptings of unreasoning instinct, revealing a conscious feeling of a real want, and yet manifesting no settled views of the true method of gratifying it. In the present state of interest which pervades almost the entire Christian world, we know of no subject more inviting to the sanctified master minds in the Church, than to investigate in the light of the scriptures and of Christian experience, the true nature of that union which should pervade the whole Church of Christ in all its separate branches and members, and to indicate the principles and methods by which that union may manifest itself in outward expressions and in concerted action, without interfering with those distinctive views which must always spring from the free actings of the human mind on subjects of such vast range, and such engrossing individual interest.

The subject was brought before the Assembly by memorials from the synods of Pittsburg, Wheeling and Virginia. The committee to whom these memorials were referred made the following report, viz:

"It is well known that the manifestation of unity among evangelical churches,

occupies a distinguished place in the public mind at the present time. Nor can it be alleged that it does not deserve the consideration which it has received.

"The Convention held last year in London, has greatly increased the attention given to the subject among Protestants, and it is hoped the results of that meeting may be extensively and permanently beneficial. If real Christians, who hold fast the form of sound words, and feel the purifying and elevating power of truth, shall perceive more clearly their substantial agreement, love one another more fervently, and co-operate in the work of faith, and labour of love more extensively and zealously, the advantage to the common cause of Christianity would be real and great.

"We would by no means call in question the organization or operation of that branch of the Christian Alliance which has been constituted in our country, but would rather bid those brethren God speed in their legitimate efforts, and pray that the blessing of the God of peace may abide with them always. Still it may be inquired whether some plan of intercourse and combined effort may not be adopted, which may specifically include those denominations who hold the same faith, and the same ecclesiastical form of government and discipline, substantially and truly, which we hold, that may greatly contribute to more intimate and complete unity, in sentiment, affection, and practice. If this can be accomplished in a considerable degree, in a way which will be safe, and will not interfere at all with denominational peculiarities and interests, it will be much gain to the cause of truth ond charity. And thus not only entire apostacy from true Christianity in its various forms, but errors of dangerous tendency may be more effectually resisted, and the system of salvation by free and sovreign grace, may be more favourably exhibited before the Christian public.

"It is to be particularly observed, however, that such a plan should bear no relation whatever to the amalgamation of those denominations who may be willing to enter into such an arrangement. This must be left to each in its own ecclesiastical capacity. Only that unity which is consistent with denominational distinction should be embraced in the plan.

"It is therefore respectfully recommended that the General Assembly offer for consideration to the supreme judicatories of those denominations in the United States, who are of the description above mentioned, the following propositions:

"1. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, the Synods of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, the Reformed Dutch Protestant Church and the German Reformed Church, will appoint both ministerial and lay delegates, in such numbers as they shall deem proper, to meet in conference at such time and place as shall be hereafter designated, and consult and decide respecting a suitable plan of intercourse, as may be deemed profitable and safe.

"2. The results of this conference shall be reported to the several bodies, and shall be regarded as adopted only so far as they shall be approved by each body.

"3. This Assembly will appoint a committee who shall have the charge of previous arrangements, so far as we are concerned, and shall be authorized to communicate with the bodies above named, and confer with any committee by them appointed."

This report was unanimously adopted: and the following committee were subsequently appointed in accordance with the Proposition viz: Dr. Phillips, Dr. Potts, Mr. Lenox, Mr. Oliphant and Mr. Steel.

Peace Resolutions.

We conclude our account of the Assembly by giving the following Resolutions, which we are sure will commend themselves to the humane and Christian feelings of all our readers, and we trust will meet a hearty response on the part of all our ministers and churches.

"On motion, *Resolved*, That in view of the continuance of the war in which we are engaged, and of the great and dreadful evils of war, it be earnestly recommended to all our churches to humble themselves before Almighty God, with confession of their own sins and of the people, and to engage in fervent and continued prayer that as individuals, and as a nation, we may be forgiven; that there may be a speedy, righteous, and amicable adjustment of all existing difficulties with other nations; and that we may be permitted to enjoy without interruption the blessings of peace.

"*Resolved*, That all pastors, and all others preaching statedly, be requested to bring this subject before the several churches in which they minister on the second Sabbath of July, or as soon after as it may be convenient, and to urge upon our people the duty pointed out in the foregoing resolution."

SHORT NOTICES.

ART. VI.—*Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, from its Organization, A. D.* 1789 *to A. D.* 1820 *inclusive.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 8vo pp. 756.

WE sincerely thank the Board of Publication for placing within our reach this collection of valuable and hitherto inaccessible documents. In the publication of works which are invaluable to the Presbyterian Church, and which from their character no common publisher could be induced to issue, our Board is fulfilling one of the main objects of its establishment; and rendering a most important service to our Church. We take for granted that most of our ministers and elders will desire to

possess this volume of the early minutes of our highest judicatory; and we are sure that if they will make themselves in some degree familiar with its contents, it will save much time in all our judicatories, and often help to settle wisely and harmoniously, difficult and perplexing questions. And besides, it is to be hoped that the spirited demand for such books will justify the Board in presenting us with many others which we should rejoice to possess, and to see circulated among our ministers and people. If one individual in each Presbytery, would interest himself in the sale of this and similar publications, we might hope to see a Library of Presbyterian Books issued by our Board containing documents of a rare and valuable sort, which otherwise it will be impossible to procure.

Zion's Pilgrim: or the Way to the Heavenly Canaan, familiarly illustrated. By Robert Hawker, D. D. Vicar of Charles, Plymouth. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 24 mo. pp. 153.

The design and plan of this little book are ingenious and happy. The author gives us a series of sketches, most of which are of the nature of incidents which may have actually befallen him, a course of simple and scriptural instruction adapted to the various states of mind incident to men interested in the pursuit of religious things. The interest of these sketches is perfectly kept up by their variety, their brevity, and their graphic character; and the instruction imparted appears to us to be perfectly sound, judicious and appropriate.

Interesting Narratives; or Religion the Great Concern. Compiled for the Presbyterian Board of Publication. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 24mo. pp. 230.

We may as well say, once for all, that our object in noticing the Books of the Board of Publication, is, not to endorse their general excellence, (for the *imprimatur* of the Board itself would go as far as our endorsement for such a purpose,) but to describe in a few words the particular character of each work. Our readers will then be able to judge, not only as to the excellence of the book, but whether it may happen to meet a particular want of their own.

The little volume before us, is made up of a collection of at-

tractive narratives, designed to illustrate the importance and enforce the necessity of practical religion. There are nineteen separate pieces embraced in the collection: the great majority of which are taken from the excellent publications of the London Religious Tract Society. The following are the titles of the several narratives.—The German Cripple: The Dying Teacher: The Weaver's Daughter: Dame Cross: A Happy Release: Power of Religion: The Two Brothers: Visit to the Union House: Effects of Grace: The Aged Sailor: The Best Light: Old Andrew: The Two Patients: What shall I do?: Time enough yet: Sins going before to Judgment: The Aged Roman Catholic Widow: No one ever told me this before: The Swedish Nurse Maid.

Recollections of Marion Lyle Hurd, in a Letter from her Father, the Rev. Carlton Hurd. With an Introduction by the Rev. Asa Cummings. Second Edition. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 24mo. pp. 108.

WE have read this memoir with mingled feelings of wonder and pain. The subject of it died at a little over four years of age; and yet the activity of her mind and the exercises of her heart, would be deemed precocious, at thrice her years. It is impossible to read the history of such mysterious cases without deep interest and emotion. The parents of precocious children —those precarious blessings—may learn important and salutary lessons from such a record; while to the reflecting, and philosophical mind it opens suggestions of intense interest, as to the possible developements and capabilities of the mind, under physical circumstances the most favorable to this purpose.

Elizabeth Bales: A Pattern for Sunday School Teachers and Tract Distributors. By J. A. James. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 24mo. pp. 77.

THIS little Memoir written in the polished style, and breathing the delightful spirit, of Mr. James of Birmingham, presents us with one of those remarkable examples of female piety, in which the modesty and sweetness of a very humble Christian, inspired with the moral heroism of the gospel, overcame the most appalling difficulties in the form of physical infirmity resulting in great bodily deformity, superadded to the disabilities

of extreme and helpless poverty, yet rendered herself respected and beloved, and useful, to a degree that almost any Christian in any circumstances might emulate. The principles of her wonderful success are unfolded briefly, and in the peculiarly happy style of the respected author. Those desiring to be useful among the thoughtless and neglected, especially of the lower classes who throng our great cities, will find much in this unpretending little book to guide and encourage them.

Letters to the Rt. Rev. John Hughes, Roman Catholic Bishop of New York. By Kirwan. New York: Leavitt, Trow & Co. 1847. pp. 103. 12mo.

The writer of this little book professes to be an Irishman, born and educated within the pale of the Romish church. His design is to give a narrative of his own experience, showing how he was led to become a Protestant; what doctrines, usages, superstitions and manifest impositions of Popery one after another awakened misgivings, then dissatisfaction and finally the intelligent and conscientious rejection of the errors and authority of the church of Rome. All this is done with a truthfulness, with a moderation and courtesy, which commend the book to all classes of readers. Few, if any publications of the day, have met with such prompt and signal success. These letters originally printed in the New York Observer, were copied into almost all our religious newspapers, and disseminated by thousands over the whole land. And yet when collected into a volume, the demand appeared to be as great as ever. We do not marvel at this. Any thing which is a genuine product of the heart, will commend itself to the convictions of other men. And as these letters are such an effusion, we are persuaded they will reach and rouse many a conscience hitherto slumbering in the lethargy of Romanism, and work like leaven in the diffusion of a spirit of calm but determined opposition to the soul-destroying despotism and corruptions of popery.

The unpopular doctrines of the Bible: a Discourse in defence of the doctrine of Divine Sovereignty. By Ashbel G. Fairchild. Fourth edition, enlarged and improved. Pittsburgh: 1847. pp. 114. 12mo.

The doctrines here discussed are those of divine appointment,

election of grace, election of infants, and definite atonement. By the election of infants the author means that all infants dying in infancy are elect, and he shows that Calvinism, in opposition to ritualism which confines salvation to baptized infants, gives the broadest and most scriptural foundation of hope in regard to those who die before they are able to discern good from evil. This little work is a clear, popular and forcible statement and defence of the several doctrines to which it refers. It strikes us as remarkably adapted to meet the common objections arising from misconception and prejudice against these articles of our faith.

The Rule and Measure of Christian Charity. By Rev. Thomas Smyth, D.D. Charleston, S. C. 1847.

THE first point urged in this discourse is that "covetousness is the great iniquity of our times." The second is that Christian charity, so far as giving is concerned, must, to deserve the name, be willing, conscientious, and prompted by the love of Christ. The rule and measure are found in the proposition, "all must give, and all must give in exact accordance with the means which God has entrusted to their stewardship." Dr. Smyth is indefatigable in his efforts to do good through the press, and this sermon is another proof both of his zeal and ability in the work of benevolence.

An Address on the Reflex Influence of Foreign Missions. / Delivered before the Society of Inquiry of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church. New Brunswick, New Jersey, May 13, 1847. By the Rev. Henry Mandeville, Professor of Moral Science and Belles Lettres, in Hamilton College, N. Y. 8vo. pp. 35. New York: Robert Carter. 1847.

THIS is a pious, well reasoned, instructive address. We do not wonder that the society to which it was delivered deemed it worthy of being committed to the press. The author has demonstrated conclusively, and with no small amount of eloquence, that the reflex influence of foreign missions is powerful and most happy on the individual who engages in the work on the Church, and on the world. It will be a precious pledge of the enlargement of the Redeemer's kingdom, when the spirit of this Address shall be widely diffused and cordially received.

Sacrifice and Atonement. By Samuel W. Lynd, D. D. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society.

We are pleased to find our brethren of the Baptist Church, paying more attention to the Old Testament, than formerly. We are of opinion, that a diligent study of the scriptures of the Old Testament, especially of the Pentateuch, is necessary to the acquisition of correct and consistent views of Bible Theology, and of the principles on which the Christian Church is founded. And it is believed, that what we deem errors in the Baptist system, have arisen from too great a neglect of the Old Dispensation, and the exact relation which it bears to the New. Dr. Lynd, the author of the book now noticed, appears to be an evangelical man, who has studied the ritual laws of Moses with care, and has with no small success entered into the explanation of the typical import of the ceremonies of the Mosaic dispensation. It is difficult to determine accurately, in many cases, what institutions or rites, are of a typical character, and more difficult to know how far we should go in tracing the analogy between the type and the anti-type. Doubtless, the Fathers generally erred on the side of excess, and *spiritualized* many passages, which ought to be understood in a simple literal sense. The same has been the error, though in an inferior degree, of many excellent writers since the Reformation. The celebrated Witsius, a favourite of ours, has a dissertation on the Tabernacle and the Jewish rites connected with its worship, which we have often read with much pleasure, and we trust, profit; but this learned and excellent theologian pushes his analogies, in some cases, far beyond our capacity to follow him. And McEwen, a Scotch writer on the types, has, with much that is good, offended against the rules of sound interpretation, in the same way. And in our own country, the fashion of allegorizing plain, historical passages, and running out all the minute circumstances of parables to a disgusting extent, has not been uncommon with many ministers of the Baptist Church; especially the uneducated in the south and west. Such discourses we have often heard, and in some cases, the allegory was carried so far as to furnish striking examples of the ludicrous; but which would be unsuitable to be here exhibited. The same tendency to excess on the same side, has also been manifest in the more rigid class of Scotch Presbyterians.

But there is another extreme, and of this we entertain stronger fears than of this; for we think there is less danger from the practice of giving a pious meaning to a text, which it was not intended to signify, than reducing it to a meaning which is of no consequence. The rule adopted by some learned critics, derived from the German school of hermeneutics, is, that we have no authority for considering any thing to be typical, which is not so represented in scripture. This rule seems to be adopted not only by Neologists, but by such distinguished Biblical scholars as Bishop Marsh, and Professor Moses Stuart. If this indeed be correct, our system of typology is reduced within very narrow bounds. But, we are persuaded, that as types are a species of prophecy, the same principles of interpetation are applicable to them as to other prophecies. Now, no interpreter of prophecy, has ever proposed that no predictions should be considered as fulfilled, except those whose fulfilment is recorded in the inspired scriptures. But, how do we know that a prophecy has been fulfilled, but by the coincidence between the meaning of the words and symbols, with certain events which are known by authentic history? as in the case of the fulfilment of our Lord's prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem. Our author pursues the middle way between these two extremes, and, in the main, is felicitous in his interpretations.

It seems to have been the principal end of the work before us, to exhibit the author's views on the necessity, value, and extent of the atonement. And an impartial consideration of the sacrifices of the Old Dispensation will lead the honest inquirer to the doctrine of vicarious satisfaction. Accordingly, some of our ablest writers on the atonement have pursued this course. Among these may be reckoned Doct. John Pye Smith, Archbishop Magee, Jerram, Outram, and John Owen. Our author, after establishing by very conclusive arguments, the vicarious nature of Christ's sufferings, undertakes to answer some stale Socinian objections, where he appears to us to have fallen into some confusion and inconsistency, and to have made concessions not necessary. The part to which we more particularly refer, is found on pp. 128, 129, where the writer considers the objection, "that the atonement is incompatible with the gracious nature of pardon." Here, in our opinion, Dr. Lynd, in his answer, concedes the main principle on which vicarious atonement rests. And

he seems to us to abandon the true scriptural doctrine of atonement, and to adopt the *new divinity* scheme, which we hold to be utterly inconsistent with that very view of vicarious atonement, before so ably established. But our space does not admit of our entering further into the subject.

On the extent of the atonement also, the author has attempted what many ingenious men have before him, to reconcile two incompatible theories. He adopts what has sometimes been called the *Baxterian*, or perhaps, more properly, the *Hopkinsian* theory of a general atonement. But upon thorough investigation it will appear, that the doctrine of sovereign election is utterly inconsistent with the doctrine of universal atonement. The only thing which a Calvinist can consistently hold is, the universal sufficiency of the atonement for all men, and although this is true; yet it only serves to justify the universal gospel call; which, by the way, however, Dr. Gill, and many others deny. On this point, our author assumes a self-complacent, dictatorial air, and treats the sentiments of such theologians as Turretin and Symington, with very little respect. He seems to think that the argument derived from the universal terms of certain texts is altogether unanswerable; whereas, some of the most learned of the advocates of universal atonement have conceded, that nothing can be inferred from these terms in favour of this doctrine. And most of them cannot be interpreted without limitation, unless you will play into the hands of the Universalists.

With the exceptions stated, we are pleased with the work of Dr. Lynd.

A Manual of Devotion for Soldiers and Sailors. Comprising, 1. *Forms of Prayer, Public and Private.* 2. *A Compend of Bible Truth.* 3. *The Assembly's Shorter Catechism.* 4. *A selection of Psalms and Hymns.* Philadelphia. Presbyterian Board of Publication.

This is a seasonable publication. Great complaint has been made by many serious persons, that no suitable provision was made for the instruction and edification of such soldiers and sailors as had been educated in the Presbyterian and other evangelical denominations, who are not accustomed to use the Book of Common Prayer.

The only part of this Manual which is original, is a portion of the prayers; but most of these, we find on examination, are taken from Jenks and others. The composition of devotional prayers has always been esteemed very difficult; few who have made the attempt have succeeded.

It may seem to some an inconsistent thing, for those who are opposed to the use of *forms* of prayer in the worship of God, to publish a book of forms. To which it may be answered, that though there may be a few persons who are conscientiously opposed to all forms of prayer—we have known such—yet their number is small. Presbyterians do not neglect all use of forms as sinful, or reject them as useless; but they object to the imposition of such forms on the church as necessary, and confining ministers and people to the use of prayers composed by uninspired men, who lived huudreds of years ago, and who could not be acquainted with our circumstances. Why should not the pious and learned ministers now compose prayers, as well as those who lived in former years? Good prayers may be useful to many, who have not yet learned to make prayers for themselves.

We are glad to see this Manual, and hope it will be widely circulated among the defenders of our country, for whom it was compiled.

The Holy War, made by Shaddai upon Diabolus, for regaining the Metropolis of the World, or the losing and taking again the town of Mansoul. By John Bunyan, author of the Pilgrim's Progress. Illustrated by engravings. Revised by the Committee of Publication of the American Baptist Publication Society. Philadelphia.

IT is not our usual custom to notice books, which have been long before the Christian community; but as we believe this is the first American edition of a work of one of the best men and greatest geniuses of the 17th century, we will merely remark, that the work has been brought out by the Baptist Publication Society, in a very attractive style. We recollect to have heard a great reader, and a great admirer of the *old tinker*, as he called Bunyan, say, that there was much more genius displayed in the "Holy War, than in the Pilgrim's Progress;" but certainly the majority have not been of this opinion; for while the latter is read by

every body; the former is in few hands. We are, however, gratified to see any production from the pen of this extraordinary man, put into wide circulation. Piety and Orthodoxy as well as ingenuity, characterize all his writings.

NOTE.

We regret to state that the manuscript of a large portion of the Short Notices prepared for this number having been mislaid, we are obliged to neglect, for the present, calling the attention of our readers to various works we designed to notice.