THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1854.

No. III.

Art. 1.—*Present state of Oxford University.*

Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners, appointed to inquire into the state, discipline, studies, and revenues of the University and Colleges of Oxford; together with the Evidence, and an Appendix. London: 1852. 760 pages, folio.

It required no small degree of courage in Lord John Russell to move his Sovereign to command such an investigation as this; but he seems to have found seven men courageous and indefatigable enough to accomplish the work. We can only regret that a place in the board of investigation could not have been offered to Sir William Hamilton, the eminent professor of logic and metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh, whose papers in the Edinburgh Review, twenty years ago, were so influential in summoning attention to the abuses existing in the English Universities. Those articles, lately embodied in his wonderfully diversified volume of learning, entitled "Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform," show that much of the laborious research of the seven commissioners had been already accomplished by the single-handed Scotch professor, and the greater part of their conclusions anticipated. That no trifling toil is demanded for such an

undertaking, will be sufficiently evident to an American and Protestant, when he considers that the rubbish is an accumulation that began some centuries before the existence of his continent was known, or the Reformation attempted.

The actual commission, including in their number a bishop, a dean, two masters of colleges, and a professor, began their inquiry in October, 1850, and closed it in April, 1852. The Report which they then presented to the Queen, and which was at once communicated to Parliament, was founded on a large mass of evidence, furnished in answer to interrogatories addressed to as many of the officers and members of the University, and such others, as were likely to give useful information and judicious opinions. To these applications they received some very short and crusty returns. Not the royal sign-manual was potent enough to draw from several of the college dons so much as a polite answer to simple questions, even (as some did render their replies) under protest as to the authority for demanding it. They took the ground that the statutes of the respective colleges were made inviolable and unalterable by the most solemn conditions imposed by their founders—sometimes under awful anathemas against those who should propose or in any way consent to the slightest change—and these statutes these officers had sworn to obey to the uttermost. So it would be treachery and perjury for them to open their lips, even to make known the state of their revenues or the number of their students. But on this point there arises one of the most astounding disclosures of the inquiry. For while these functionaries are so scrupulous about imparting the slightest information that would open the way for the reform of abuses, or introduce improvements, they are daily living in the violation of many statutes, as express and stringent as those which they interpret to justify their contumacy to the royal commission. According to their own principles, their holding any office in the University or Colleges is *ipso facto* a breach of trust: for of the nineteen colleges, only four have been founded since the Reformation—beginning with Jesus College, in 1571. The chief object of the founder of Lincoln (1427) was to extirpate the Wycliffe heresy, by training up theologians. The first fifteen were not only built upon the Romish creed, but their

statutes, unalterable and *unaltered*, include in the oaths still taken by every official, from the chancellor to the bell-ringer, the observance of daily masses, prayers for founders' souls, the ejection of any Fellow who shows the Protestant taint—to say nothing of those laws which require that dinner shall be eaten in silence whilst the Bible is read, and that after dinner it shall be expounded, and that nothing but Greek or Latin shall be spoken within college walls; that chapel shall be attended five times a day, that Fellows shall never reside out of university, &c., &c. If those laws of the founder which forbid innovation may now be pleaded by tender consciences, surely one law is as irrevocable as another, and the Reformation cannot give absolution to the one more than to the other. Yet the pretence is, that the change of the national religion changed every thing in the statutes that was inconsistent with it; or that it is to be presumed that if the founders had lived to see the light of the Reformation, they would surely have ranked with the Protestants, and modified their academical organizations accordingly. Some confidence is placed in the power of the legal visitor to give a dispensation from inconvenient oaths. This is sometimes managed in a way worthy of St. Omer's. The Principal of Jesus College swears, in the latter part of his oath, that he will obtain no dispensation against his foregoing oaths, and against the ordinances of the college, and then he swears that he has never been married and never will marry while Principal. "It is the position of this oath," says one of the witnesses, "that gave colour to the idea that it was intended to be left open to future dispensation; and accordingly, upon the election of Dr. Hoare to the headship, the visitor, Lord Pembroke, decreed that it might be omitted at his admission, and that of all future Principals." At Corpus Christi, they get over it quite as ingeniously. "It is only implied that the president will be unmarried by his being required to be a priest (*sacerdos*)." At the Reformation, a "sacerdos became marriageable, so that there is now no legal impediment." Some of the oaths, now imposed on fellows, fill five closely printed octavo pages, and if there shall be an obstinate resistance of the recommendation of the commission to abolish all that are vain and impious, we may expect to see the days of 1511 return, when it was a common

thing for a Chancellor to give license to the Regents to choose for themselves suitable confessors to absolve them from all offences, the chief of which, at that period, was perjury.

If the Oxford tract doctrine of retracing the mediæval paths should be applied to the University, the Regius Professor of Hebrew himself would shrink from the practical experience of the life of those days. For though little is done now for the education of the poor, the Colleges were once in fact, as they yet are in law, eleemosynary institutions. As late as 1572, distressed students were licensed to beg. Sir Thomas More writes of the "poor scholars of Oxford a-begging, with bags and wallets, and singing *salve Regina* at rich men's doors." The candidates for fellowships are often defined as "pauperes," "indigentes," "pauperes ex elëemosyna viventes." A visitor in 1284 rebukes his college, "Ye ought only to have received the indigent, as is shown in the eleventh chapter of the regulations, whence it appears that ye have no liberty to receive such as have sufficient to provide for their own necessities." In two colleges, the fellows are forbidden to keep dogs, for the reason that to give to dogs the bread of the children of men is not fitting for the poor, especially for those who live on alms. In those times the fellows were allowed for their commons one penny on week days and two-pence on Sundays, an annual suit of cloth, with six shillings and eight-pence to pay for making it. Fellows in priest's orders might receive, at the utmost, forty shillings a year. William of Wykeham, or Walter de Merton, not to say stewards of refectories nearer our own day and home, would look with astonishment at the "battels" of undergraduates as now made out in such savory items as those furnished incidentally in the evidence before us. The expense of reaching the first degree at Oxford is from four thousand to five thousand dollars. That is, assuming the academic year to be twenty-six weeks, and eighty-four weeks as the whole necessary time of residence during the (so called) four years which pass between matriculation and the bachelor's degree, the total expense will exceed a thousand dollars annually. This estimate refers to the commoners. The more aristocratic class of gentlemen-commoners, who keep their horses and hounds, go far beyond the highest of the sums

above-named, while the most careful economy, on the part of such as would maintain a respectable social position, requires not less than six hundred dollars for the little more than six months of the year of study. The system of living is nothing like our ways of boarding in or out of college, where the student pays a fixed sum by the week or term. He is charged daily for what is furnished at the college table, according to a price annexed to each article used, and on the sale of which the college menials are allowed to make a large profit. Thus the account, or "battels" for a week, is made out for each day separately, under such standing heads as these: 1. Bread, butter, cheese, toast, muffins, and coffee; 2. Beer, porter, &c.; 3. Meat, poultry, fish, soup, sauce and vegetables; 4. Pastry, jellies, pickles, and eggs; 5. Milk, cream, gruel, and whey; 6. Hire of sheets, table-cloths, towels, and oyster-cloths; 7. Coquus (*sic*) for plates, dishes, &c. for extra dinners and breakfasts; 8. Ditto for fast-night suppers, brawn, &c.; 9. Knives; 10. Candles; 11. Letters; 12. Janitors; 13. Butler, servitors, bedmaker, water plates and silver forks; 14. Famulantibus. Then we find in other battels such separate items as shoe-cleaning, decrements or charges for table-cloths, chapel-candles, candles for the staircase, coal-carrier, chimney-sweep, use of cruets, gate bill, tonsor, laundress, sconces, "knocking in," cleaning windows, and grates and carpets. The bill of fare issued from some of the kitchens of these recluses who are sent to college "ad orandum et studendum," is hardly exceeded in the cloisters of St. Nicholas and the Metropolitan in Broadway. Fifteen varieties of soups are set down at prices varying from three to seven pence the half-pint; twelve kinds of meat-sauce; all kinds of pastry; teas, coffee, and chocolate, by the pint; winding up with ale, porter, stogumber, (!) swig, bishop, sherry, punch, brandy, gin, rum, whiskey, per measure or bottle. The varieties of bread are sometimes charged under the name of *farina*, and the vulgar condiments of mustard, pepper, and salt, go under the fragrant title of *aroma*.

We find sometimes among the charges a stipend to the Bible-clerks (poor youth who have rooms and tuition free) for keeping a record of attendance at chapel, repeating the responses and reading the lessons. The furniture of the rooms is owned

by the occupants, and resold when they leave. Breakfast, lunch, and tea are taken by the students in their rooms; the dinner is in common. The rooms are rented according to situation, and they are allowed to be used by the students for wine parties, suppers, and dinners, which are supplied from the college kitchen, and at which the tutors, and probably higher officers, may often be found as guests.

With their knowledge of these facts, as examiners, it was hardly worth while for the Commissioners to address interrogatories in every direction to know the cause of the extravagance and dissipation of the students, and how it could be reformed. One apology for providing within the very walls of the University, the means of indulgence to such an extent as we have indicated, is that many of the young men have been accustomed to this style of living at home, and that they ought to have every luxury at command in their own apartments, if they can afford to pay for it. We do not know how the Professor of Moral Philosophy, or the lecturer on Aristotle can reconcile this argument to the common-sense judgment of the silliest undergraduate. Yet, one of the most judicious of the witnesses allows this standard:—"The least that a gentleman could give in his own house should be sufficient for a gentleman's son *in statu pupillari* to give." This *giving* means "where the usages of University life demand entertainments," a demand which, in American eyes, is one of the greatest curiosities of English college life. To establish such a scale in the opinion of that witness, "would strike at those expensive wines and desserts which are sometimes given by men who at home only dream of such things." Yet it seems to be almost unanimously admitted by the gentlemen who have given the results of their experience in their testimony under this commission, that the carrying into educational life the distinctions of wealth and rank is an evil which ought to be eradicated from the University system. We must make great allowances for habit, but it is hard to conceive, how, even in an aristocratic country, one class of students should be allowed—not for their money's sake, but in deference to their social rank—privileges both academical and sumptuary denied to the rest. Young noblemen wear a distinctive dress, take precedence of their superiors in scho-

lastic standing, are allowed to take their degrees on a probation shorter by four terms than commoners. And why, says Archbishop Whately, "should a man not be allowed a valet or a horse, who has always been used to such luxuries, and to whom they are not more extravagant luxuries than shoes and stockings are to his fellow-students?" The Commissioners reject this plea, and endorse the opinion of a Professor, that the gentlemen-commoners, taken collectively, are the worst educated portion of the undergraduates, and the one least inclined for study, and add, that there is a growing disapproval of the favoritism, even among the "best of families," who frequently enter their sons as commoners that they may fare as plebeians. There is the same general concurrence among the best counsellors, in advising the abolition of the distinction of compounders, grand and petty, from ordinary graduates—the compounders being such as having an income of their own of a certain amount, are required to pay extraordinary fees, and thus, the possessor of 300*l.* a year is often more heavily taxed than the heir of an entailed estate of many thousands.

Indeed, there is throughout these opinions of the experienced scholars, a tone of liberality in favour of relaxing old conventional and conventual customs which we did not expect. The right reverend and well-endowed members of the Commission admit with respect into their report, such phrases as "the temper of our times," and "the tendencies of the age;" and some of the witnesses go to an extent in suggesting modifications both social and ecclesiastical, which must stigmatize them in many high places as enormous latitudinarians. Some, even of these sons of Oxford, venture to speak of "the scandal of requiring youths of eighteen to sign the XXXIX Articles," and to whisper that it may be allowable in a great seminary of learning to overlook the fact, that one capable of serving as a professor, or studying as a pupil, is not able conscientiously to embrace all the Articles of the Church of England, or to take oaths and vows inconsistent with the principles of other Churches, in which they have been baptized.—"Remove restrictions from the Universities," says a reverend subrector and tutor of Lincoln, "and they will contribute their share towards popular education. America has been instanced only as the

most patent example of the defect of the higher cultivation to meet by a tangible fact the objections always brought to considerations of the class now insisted on, that they are fanciful and far-fetched. But in fact, the more popular notion of education has been making rapid encroachments among ourselves since the great alteration in our examination system, in Cambridge at the end of the last, here in the beginning of the present century." The alteration alluded to, consists in the opening of the Universities to more practical branches of study than were formerly provided for—as the natural sciences. Sir Charles Lyell is very open and strong in his repudiation of all restraints on the freedom of study and on the social equality of students. He complains of the virtual exclusion of the middle classes of the community, and affirms from his own knowledge, that parents possessing ample means are deterred from sending their sons to Oxford, by an apprehension that they will contract from the social atmosphere of the place, notions incompatible with the line of life to which they are destined, although it may be one peculiarly demanding a liberal education. An Oxford graduate discovers at the end of a few terms, that such occupations as attorneys, surgeons, publishers, engineers, or merchants, are vulgar, and beneath the dignity of a Bachelor of Arts. Nearly all the answers on these heads of inquiry sustain the wholesome view expressed by a fellow and lecturer of Trinity, that mere artificial distinctions of every kind are relics of a period when the several ranks of society were not left to be discovered by tact, feeling and silent conventionalities, but were marked off by formal and tangible badges. "These are left off elsewhere, as inconsistent with the spirit of the present age; and it does seem strange that the last to retain them should be an institution dedicated to religion and learning, in which one would have thought they ought never to have been introduced in any age."

The particulars of the extravagance and indulgence openly practised in Oxford, are given by a member of Christ Church, under the head of dining-clubs, running in debt to tradesmen, houses of ill fame, intoxication, tandem-driving, hunting, steeple-chases, and horse-racing. The dinner excesses are connected with clubs for the practice of archery, cricket, boating, &c.

The scenes which take place, and the songs which are sung at some of these dinners, held once a week, are pronounced by an official censor "a curse and a disgrace to a place of Christian education." Novices are carried to these parties, made drunk, and at once initiated into a curriculum of vice. As in all other schools, the parents have a share of the blame for these occurrences. Some fathers insist upon their sons keeping up their practice as sportsmen and horsemen. Others are pleased with the idea of their boys mixing in what is called good society. Many make extravagant allowances of money, and require no account of its expenditure; and often when "a tutor ventures to communicate to a parent any suspicion of his son's society, expenses, or habits, he is pretty sure to receive the snubbing reply, that the parent has questioned his son, and feels perfect confidence in his explanation." We wish we could place *this* trait among the strange anecdotes for the amusement of American readers.

And yet Oxford is to this day eminently a church fixture. "The great bulk of those who actually resort to Oxford," says the report, "are destined for the ministry of the Church." Few physicians are now educated there; many are called to the bar who have not been members of either University; but the large proportion of those who have been so educated are from Cambridge. There are five hundred and forty fellowships; nine-tenths of these can be held permanently only by clergymen. The income of the fellowship is worth, on an average, £200; and this prize, often a perfect sinecure, requiring nothing but celibacy, is sure, in a state hierarchy, to keep up the clerical or monastic appearances. This is one of the characteristics of the modern Oxford, entailed upon it by the reluctance to make changes upon what was established of old, however long and entirely the original circumstances have been outgrown. At the foundation of the old Colleges in papal times, ecclesiastics were not only the celebrants of masses for the living and the dead, but were the civilians, the politicians, the men of all accomplishments. The College and the chantry were sometimes endowed together. These shadows of the middle ages darken many an observance in Oxford at this day, and give absurdity to many of its rules. There must be a large party there now,

who would rather revive than bury these relics of monkery. The statutes of Queen's College provide for certain tableaux which must commend themselves irresistibly to the mediævists. According to the unalterable laws of the foundation, the number of provost and fellows must be thirteen, to represent the Lord and his apostles; the seventy Evangelists are to be commemorated by as many poor boys, maintained by the provost and fellows, and to be employed, with shorn heads, as choristers; the doctors must wear crimson robes at dinner and supper, "for the sake of conformity to the Lord's blood;" thirteen beggars, deaf, dumb, lame, and blind, must be fed daily in the hall, as remembrancers of the benevolence of Christ; the provost and fellows are directed to sit on one side only of the table at meals, as in the pictures of the last Supper, and they must be summoned to table by the sound of a trumpet.

The students are forced (we use the terms of the report) to partake of the communion. The members of Halls, (five unchartered Colleges,) are required to communicate three times every year. Attendance on divine service is sometimes imposed as a penalty for offences. While the forms of the liturgy are daily gone through, the commission are surprised at the neglect of "the obvious mode of appealing to the moral and religious feelings of the students, by short practical addresses in the College chapels." Sermons in Latin are part of the ceremonial of opening the terms; and according to a late annual "University Calendar," now before us, "in the prayer preceding the Latin sermon, at the beginning of each term, and likewise in that preceding the sermons on Act Sunday, the Queen's inauguration, and at both the Assizes, are introduced *the names* of the public benefactors of the University," and then follows a list of forty-six names, from "Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester," to "Francis Douce, Esq.," which are pronounced in this Protestant "*orate pro nobis.*"

But while there is so much ecclesiology in these venerable schools, there is a barren account of their theological instruction, and of their efficiency in supplying ministers to the Church. The report digests the evidence on this point as follows:

"Oxford still educates a large proportion of the clergy; but learned theologians are very rare in the University, and, in consequence, they are still rarer elsewhere. No efficient means at present exist in the University for training candidates for holy orders in those studies which belong peculiarly to their profession. A University training cannot, indeed, be expected to make men accomplished divines before they become clergymen; but the University must be to blame if theological studies languish. Few of the clergy apply themselves in earnest to the study of Hebrew. Ecclesiastical history, some detached portions excepted, is unknown to the great majority. The history of doctrines has scarcely been treated in this country. It may be safely stated that the Epistles of St. Paul have not been studied critically by the great bulk of those in orders. It is true, that the English Church has produced great divines, and may boast at this moment of a body of clergymen perhaps more intelligent and accomplished than it ever before possessed. But they might well acquire more learning. We hope that the theological school of Oxford may yet be frequented by earnest students, as of old; so that many among her sons may gain a profound acquaintance with the history and criticism of the sacred books, and with the external and internal history of the Church."

It does not appear to what hand—if but one—was assigned the drafting of the report; but the Secretary of the Commission was the Rev. A. P. Stanley, the able biographer of Dr. Arnold, and in the tone of what is said on the religious and theological character of Oxford, as well as in the general spirit of enlightened and liberal reform throughout the report, there is much to remind us of the aspirations and projects of that noble heart. His own spirit was so much beyond that which was prevalent in his day at Oxford, that it is well said by some one in the evidence, that if the appointment had been in the hands of the University, instead of the Sovereign's, Arnold would never have been a Professor there.

The theological chairs are the best endowed in the whole institution. The annual incomes of the Regius Professorships of Divinity, Ecclesiastical History, Pastoral Theology and Hebrew, the Margaret Professorship of Divinity, and the Boden Professorship of Sanscrit, range in value from near £850 to £1800; but it is roundly asserted that they "produce

no results commensurate with their emoluments." Some of the graduates repair for their theological course to the Episcopal schools of Durham and Wells. A degree is required as a qualification for orders, but there is no special training for that degree. A Vice-Principal of one of the Halls, in his earnestness on this abuse, says that nothing but the acquiescence in anomalies that is characteristic of Englishmen could have suffered such an evil to remain. "It is not too much to say," in his opinion, "that there is no country of Europe, Protestant or Romanist, in which so anomalous a state of things exists; every Church, Lutheran, Reformed, or Romish, but our own, provides that her ministers shall undergo two or three years of theological study and preparation before they enter upon their office."

The present Regius Professor of Divinity is Dr. Jacobson. His official income is equal to nine thousand dollars, (£1,800.) We have his own report of his labours, and it will not take long to make our readers acquainted with them. In the first place, he gives twelve public lectures. Their subjects are: 1, introduction to the study and some points of clerical duty; 2, 3, on some of the aids to arriving at the sense of Holy Scripture; 4, 5, on Creeds, particularly on the three in the Liturgy; 6, 7, on the study of Church History; 8, on the Continental Reformation; 9, on the English Reformation; 10, 11, on the Prayer Book; 12, on parish duties. This is the royal course of theology, and it is repeated three times a year. The burden of the incumbent was increased by statutes, in 1842 and 1847, requiring private lectures. These are given at least three times in the week, throughout the term, and therefore furnish abundant opportunity for eking out any deficiency in the public course. Accordingly, the Professor testifies, "my subjects hitherto have been the *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Opuscula*, edited by Dr. Routh, and the Book of Common Prayer." On the public course, about two hundred and thirty have attended annually, during the two years before the date of his testimony; the classes for the same space of time, at the private course, numbered, from term to term, 13, 3, 6, 26, 16, 14. The Professor of Sanscrit receives a salary of $4,250, (£850,) lectures less than a hundred times in the year, and has an average class of

ten students. The other theological Professors declined to furnish any statements. Of the success of the teaching, such as it is, we can form no accurate opinion, for of the only two public examiners who answer the general interrogatory, "In what subjects is failure most common?" one says, "Failures are perhaps most common in divinity;" and the other, "Failures occur seldom in divinity." Hints are more than once interjected, that a more thorough and systematic attention, on the part of the Faculty of Divinity, to the studies committed to them, would have saved the University from the controversy and reproach which certain events have of late years associated with the very name of Oxford. Much of the mischief may be ascribed to the fact that, whilst the 1700 clergy of the Establishment are more than enough for all its livings, a vast number are left with idle hands and heads. "To wait for a country living, and to obtain it when he is unfit for it, is the most common fate of the college fellow." So says a "Fellow and Tutor," and in this long waiting there must be some amusement to pass the time; and what more diverting than to excavate and restore the ecclesiastical Pompeiis and Herculaneums? The Tractarian controversy has introduced conflict into every department of the University's proceedings; so that it is charged in the evidence that even the Professorships of Political Economy and Poetry have been contended for, on the party grounds of that schism.

There is a diversity of opinion as to the expediency of making the University the place for graduating theological candidates. On the one hand it is maintained, that the exclusive study of Divinity—as in a theological school—is a great evil; that the mind should be liberalized and accomplished by pursuing other branches of learning at the same time; that the facilities of libraries, excitements of study, and opportunities of social refinement are greater at the seat of a large University, than in more retired places, among a few companions; and that an establishment bearing the name of University, and especially one so richly endowed for the purposes of theological teaching as Oxford, ought to make unnecessary any supplement to the course of a clergyman. On the other side it is argued, that it is better that the candidate for the church

should be removed from old scenes of idleness and dissipation; that if he has been yielding to their influence, he should find in a new spot a *locus pœnitentiæ;* that he should have a space of breathing-time in a more retired air before he enters on his new and solemn calling; that the real preparation for clerical duties is found in the life of a country parish, and that want of knowledge of the poor, rather than of books, is the more common defect to be supplied. The ground taken by the Commission is in favour of so improving the course at Oxford, as to make it unnecessary for candidates for the ministry to go elsewhere. Let us hear their reasons, and judge whether they have any force in favour of combining the strictly theological studies with some of the higher branches of College lectures—say on Natural Science, Civil History, and Law.

"The greatness of the institution acts, even as things are now, as a safeguard against the permanent occupation of its whole atmosphere by the opinions of particular schools and parties; and if the energies of the University should be further developed, the admixture of other professions and other studies will tend to prevent the formation of that exclusively ecclesiastical character in the clergy, which, by dividing their views and interests for those of the laity, exercises a mischievous influence over the relations of the Church and the nation. The habit of investigating God's works, and the operation of his laws, whether in the mental or physical world, or the study of the actual history of mankind would, we believe, do much towards correcting the narrow spirit in which theology is too often studied."

As things now stand, it is as if each member of the senior class of an American College who had the ministry in view, were going forward to the "commencement" to graduate at once in the arts and theology. Instead of expecting them to enter a theological school for three or four years, he will have already heard the dozen lectures of the Regius Professor, studied and sworn to the Thirty-nine Articles, attended what is equivalent to a College Bible-class, and is ready for deacon's orders. Even in the case of individuals who have no diploma to present, it seems as if there were nothing like a theological course required in the Church of England before ordination.

On turning to the life of the late Rev. Mr. Biekersteth, we find that though he left grammar-school for a place in the post-office at the age of fourteen, and never returned to his studies, but was occupied in business till his thirtieth year, yet, when at that period he determines to enter the ministry, he simply proposes to get a letter to the Bishop of Norwich from J. J. Gurney, or another person—"both of whom have considerable influence with him"—and to go to him "in about a fortnight, state my plans, and ask him if he can ordain me." Accordingly, on the introduction of the good Quaker, he had an interview with the Bishop, who, after dwelling on the importance of a University education, and that it could only be dispensed with in particular cases, prescribed to him a year and a half's study with a clergyman. To this Mr. Biekersteth (then in legal business) pleaded that he "had been accustomed to read a chapter frequently in the Greek Testament," and had given attention to other suitable studies, upon which the Bishop at once struck off more than six months of the probation; and finally ordained him in less than half of the term that remained. His examination consisted in stating "some of the great doctrines of the Bible, translating the Greek Testament, Grotius, and a Latin article, and writing a Latin and also an English theme."

To meet the existing deficiencies, the report proposes a distinct school of theology in the University, through which candidates for the ministry, after two examinations in the other departments, should be required to pass.

One of the diversities between the English institutions of education and our own, which often confuses our ideas of the former, is that the University by itself, and each of the nineteen Colleges by itself, is a separate corporation. There is not one, but twenty societies, faculties, (in our sense), charters, codes of laws. It is Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Dickinson, Charlottesville, and fifteen others in one city, besides the five Halls, the only common bond being that which unites them to the State and to the established religion. The University may be said to be composed of, or manifested by a corps of Professors, whose duty is to give public lectures on their respective subjects to as many members of the Colleges as may choose to

attend. There is no matriculation at the University by examination; this is required only at the Colleges. Each student enters some one College, and there his studies are conducted, not so much as with us, directly by Professors and in classes, as by College tutors, for whose examinations the great proportion of the students are daily prepared by *private* tutors. This monopoly of tutorial instruction is not according to the original scheme, but has grown upon the system in consequence of the absence of compulsion to attend the professional courses, so that tutors almost supersede Professors, as the Colleges in this respect absorb, or "swamp" the University. On the merits of the questions arising out of these designs and their accidents, which enter largely into the report before us, we will not enter, as our main object is the gleaning of facts. Let us look for a moment at the evidence scattered through this vast folio, as to what is actually accomplished by all the power concentrated in the whole institution.

As to the Professoriate, it is set down in the report as an unquestionable fact that the Professors are not now the teachers of the University; and that of all the functions of the academic body, that which was once, and which in the statutes is still presumed to be, the most important, might cease to exist altogether, with hardly any perceptible shock to the general system of the place. Part of this default is ascribed to the inadequate salaries. There are thirty Professors; and omitting the theological staff already mentioned, their revenues average only 150*l.* to each. Almost all of them complain that they have not separate lecture-rooms, nor adequate libraries, apparatus, &c., for their special departments. Their report of services and attendance is a melancholy record. Nothing but the literary luxury of a life in Oxford, and the leisure for study, can keep men of any enthusiasm from escaping from their chairs, when they have to tell such tales as most of them have laid before us. The Savilian Professor of Geometry, finding the attendance very small, "and often none," confines himself to one comprehensive course of from twelve to fifteen lectures. From 1830 to 1849 the class was never over *seven*—for three years it consisted of *one*—for four years of *none*—and in five other years no course was announced. The Professor of Moral

Philosophy, out of the 1300 students, had less than 50 on an average of four years. The Professor of Ancient History has 40 at his popular, 10 at his more elaborate lectures. Modern History in the first year of the new Professor, had 160—the second year 57. Botany draws 12. Astronomy 3. Geology 7. Mineralogy 5. "Nothing can at first sight be more disheartening to the student of natural science," says one of those who speak from experience, "than to look around him in the University and find all in it apparently so dead to the value of such study."

It is notorious that mathematics has been generally more regarded at Cambridge than at the sister University, but we were not prepared to find it in so low a place in the more classical institution. There are scarcely any prizes of scholarships or fellowships held out for competition; the mathematical chairs are inadequately endowed, and it is affirmed that there are, or were very lately, colleges in Oxford where no mathematical instruction whatever was supplied to the students. Students who have been eighteen months matriculated, are admonished that at an examination which takes place at that period, they must come up with a knowledge of arithmetic to—decimal and vulgar fractions, the rule of three and its application! In 1850, there were only twenty-one candidates for mathematical honours; of these, thirteen stood for a first class and but seven gained it. University College reports the Mathematical Lecturer as honoured with a class of three in Mechanics, two in the Integral Calculus, one in Optics, and one in Conic Sections.

The incumbent of the chair of Moral Philosophy does not withhold the expression of his conviction, that that branch of study is in a very unsatisfactory condition; and that the time given to it is, in most cases, thrown away.

There is not much to retrieve these discouraging statements, at least as to fruit, when we turn to the pride of Oxford—its classical scholarship. The present century has seen a great contraction of the circle of studies in this department. So late as 1827, a list of twenty authors for the test at examination was not uncommon; at present twelve are sometimes sufficient for the highest honours. Among those set down as

having almost disappeared from the University course, are Homer, Demosthenes, Cicero, and Quintilian. The favourites of the highest students at present are Aristotle, Plato, Herodotus, Thucydides, Livy, Tacitus, Æschylus, Sophocles, Aristophanes, Virgil, Horace, Juvenal. This is still a great list, and is often well-studied, both philologically and in connection with the histories of Niebuhr and Grote. But Whately says "three or four easy Greek or Latin books" are all that is required in this branch, for a degree; and the Rev. Mr. Wall intimates poor work in the classical line, when he says of the requisition of an examination in the *literæ humaniores*—"If this prerogative given to Latin and Greek resulted in the majority of men in any useful knowledge of those languages—if it enabled them to write a commonly respectable piece of Latin—there would be something to say for it; but I am sure, that compared with the time and labour spent in 'cramming up' parts of a few Greek and Latin authors by the aid of translations, the labour of a man who breaks stones in the road is as profitable to himself, and much more profitable to others." The intimate acquaintance with the Latin poets, so perceptible in the writings and biographies of the Oxonians of the beginning of the century, is confessed to be rare—and there are few who tread in the steps of Porson and Elmsley. It is a rule of the House of Convocation that the debate shall be in Latin. So few of this generation are competent for doing this fluently, that discussion is seldom ventured; some resort to written speeches. "If decent Latin writing should be insisted on," remarks our examiner in reference to all studies, the number of failures would be more than quadrupled." "Language, (as such)" says the Report, "can hardly be said to have formed a distinct subject of academical study." Dr. Phillmore, the worthy Professor of Civil Law, complains that his stipend is a poor compensation for the function that devolves on him, of presenting the honorary degree of D. C. L., and of addressing the audience on other occasions of the kind, all which must be done in Latin. It is true the doctor's income, exclusive of diploma fees, is under 100*l.*; but this seems to be fair wages, even for speaking Latin occasionally, when we take into consideration his assertion, that no public lectures on his branch have been heard for

more than a century; and that though he has "several times had it in contemplation" to break the ice, he has as yet found no encouragement to do it. He tells us that when the Duke of Portland signified to him that he was to receive the office, he told him that if he could have found any person as competent as himself, within the University, he would have preferred it; "but that not being the case," says the Professor with much naïveté, "he could not expect or require me to abandon my profession in London;" where he accordingly remains, and only runs down to Oxford once or twice in the year, to make his Latin speeches.

Among the suggestions which surprise an American student, as implying the absence of what he has been accustomed to identify with the commonest routine of college-duty, is that it would be a good thing to have examinations on what is heard in lectures. For thus, says Professor Vaughan—"I have no doubt that if it were thought advisable to convey information through Professors' lectures generally to the students, most of the supposed advantages of the catechetical system might be secured by examinations, at intervals, conducted on paper. It would be advisable, of course, that the Professor so conducting them should comment in some way upon the answers." Equally strangely does the intimation sound in our ears, that possibly the very proposal of this extra pains to a class might deter some from appearing at the lectures at all!

We may here throw into our gossipping paper some of the levities which this grave blue-book presents, to illustrate the manner in which classical and other examinations are sometimes disposed of in other bodies than Presbyteries and Yankee schools. The anecdote is quoted from the life of Lord Eldon, that Mr. John Scott, who took his B. A. at Oxford in 1770, used to say, "I was examined in Hebrew and in History. 'What is the Hebrew for the place of a skull?' I replied, 'Golgotha.' 'Who founded University College?' I stated that King Alfred founded it. 'Very well, sir,' said the examiner, 'you are competent for your degree.'" Ten years later Vicesimus Knox writes —

"Every candidate is obliged to be examined in the whole

circle of the sciences by three Masters of Arts, of his own choice. The examination is to be holden in one of the public schools, and to continue from nine o'clock till eleven. The Masters take a most solemn oath that they will examine properly and impartially. Dreadful as all this appears, there is always found to be more of appearance in it than reality, for the greatest dunce usually gets his *testimonium* signed with as much ease and credit as the finest genius. The manner of proceeding is as follows: The poor young man to be examined in the sciences often knows no more of them than his bed-maker, and the Masters who examine are sometimes equally unacquainted with such mysteries. But *schemes*, as they are called, or little books, containing forty or fifty questions in each science, are handed down from age to age, from one to another. The candidate employs three or four days in learning these by heart, and the Examiners having done the same before him when they were examined, know what questions to ask, and so all goes on smoothly. When the candidate has displayed his universal knowledge of the sciences, he is to display his skill in philology. One of the Masters, therefore, desires him to construe a passage in some Greek or Latin classic, which he does with no interruption, just as he pleases, and as well as he can. The statutes next require that he should translate familiar English phrases into Latin. And now is the time when the Masters show their wit and jocularity. Droll questions are put on any subject, and the puzzled candidate furnishes diversion in his awkward embarrassment. I have known the questions on this occasion to consist of an inquiry into the pedigree of a race-horse."

Archbishop Whately, whose academical memory goes back more than forty-five years, is very sprightly in his remarks on the Higher Degrees. He declares he knew not what an Oxford man could answer, if he were asked whether the degree of M. A., and those in Law and Divinity, "do not convey, at least to *some* of our countrymen, some notion of merit or proficiency, more or less, of some kind? and whether any such belief is not *wholly* groundless? And whether, therefore, a University so conferring those degrees as to create, or keep up a false impression, is not guilty of a kind of fraud on the public? He goes on to testify as follows:

"When first I went to Oxford, and for some years after,

there was a regular public examination for the degree of M. A. But, in fact, it was not public, all the Undergraduates and Bachelors making it a point of delicacy never to attend, because several of those examined were men of middle age, and many clergymen. And it was soon found that no examiners could be induced ever to reject a candidate, however ill prepared. Hence, the whole degenerated into an empty form, and was discontinued. Then, a good many years after, a scheme was proposed for making the *Divinity* exercises something real. It looked well on paper; but I inquired 'Suppose a candidate for the degree of B. D. or D. D. fails to exhibit the requisite proficiency; will the examiner reject him?' I was answered, 'We hope none *will* fail.' 'Well, but suppose some man *does;* what then?' They were compelled to admit that rejection was a thing not to be thought of, considering that several of the candidates would be elderly men, and clergymen, and perhaps dignitaries. 'Then you will see,' said I, 'that after a few terms the whole will become an empty form. As soon as it has happened—as, of course, it will—that a deficient candidate is allowed to pass, and then one a little more deficient, and another a little worse still, and so on, the exercises will be understood to be a mere form.' I alluded to the story in the Spectator, of the Indian, Maraton, who went to the Land of Shadows—the Indian Elysium—to visit his deceased wife Garatilda. He found it surrounded by a seemingly impenetrable thicket of thorn-bushes, and for a time was at a loss; but he soon found that it was only the ghost of a departed thicket, the shadows of thorn-bushes; and he walked through without any difficulty. 'Even so,' I said, 'this examination will have some effect till it is discovered—as it soon will be—that it is only a shadow.' And thus it proved, on the experiment being tried. So it must always be with any examination which *all* are sure to pass."

A Reverend Fellow of Balliol (which, though one of the smallest Colleges as regards its foundation, the Report pronounces to be certainly at present the most distinguished) takes a different view of these honours, and holds them very cheap, considering that after all they signify nothing. "I can see nothing but unnecessary indignity in examining senior men for higher degrees. If they were made Bishops or Deans, or in any other way exalted, because they were doctors, an examination for this degree would be desirable. 'Doctor,' applied

to a clergyman or a lawyer, is a very harmless dignity, and to confer it, if paid for, is a very fair way of raising money."

We hear the echo of many of our home complaints about the state of education. English boys do not enter and leave college at as early an age as ours. They matriculate at about nineteen, and a large proportion do not take their B. A. at Oxford before the age of twenty-two or twenty-three. Yet we read of disgraceful want of preparation both for admission and graduation; of superficial and hasty attempts to acquire too much in a short time, and of the disposition to hurry a young man through his studies that he may be making money. "Why are the great majority of young men sent to the Universities?" asks a Prælector. We can all join in the answer he gives to his own question—"Precisely for the same reason that, at certain periods of their life, they were breeched, then put into a jacket, then into a coat, and that when they leave the University they will go abroad. It is part of a *routine*. They are sent to the University, not because they are fit for it; not because they want to benefit by its libraries, and its lectures, but because it is a part of a young gentleman's course—it is the usual thing to do—it is respectable." Add to this the faults of what a Principal of one of the Halls terms the indirect discipline of the place:—"The giving of the lectures in comfortable parlours, without any convenient means of taking notes; giving of fellowships to almost any qualifications rather than academical merit; the precedence allowed to gentlemen-commoners on the ground of wealth; that given to noblemen on the ground of birth—all this tends to convey the impression that the chief object of the place is anything rather than study; and young men are ready enough to treat the studies accordingly, as secondary to many other pursuits."

Besides the great libraries of Sir Thomas Bodley and Dr. Radcliffe, Oxford has nine smaller collections, which, with those attached to each College, make more than thirty in all. Here is a department of the educational and learned apparatus which, on this side of the water, we can as yet only envy. Those, however, may be grateful for their position, who can by two hours railway-travel have access to the collections of the Philadelphia (including the Loganian) Library Company, the

American Philosophical Society, the Academy of Natural Sciences, and the Astor Library. The Report quotes the complaint of one of the witnesses that "the literature of the United States is almost wholly unrepresented in the Bodleian, except by English reprints of some of the more popular authors," and notes among the valuable foreign periodicals which should be found in that or the Radcliffe, Silliman's "American Journal of Science." The general verdict is highly favourable to the manner in which the great libraries are conducted, the accommodations to readers, and the prompt and polite attendance of librarians. Dr. Greenhill gratefully enumerates sixteen particulars of the special advantages of the management of Bodley's.

Some complain of the rule forbidding the removal of books from the rooms, and one murmurer exaggerates in this style about the Bodleian:

"It is impossible," he says, "to conceive a thing of which the actual use is more disproportionate to its possible benefits. If one is proof against cold, and against the distraction of visitors and others passing to and fro before his eyes, he may study there. When I became a B. A., I was romantic enough to think of working in the Bodleian. Although I protected myself, even to incumbrance, with clothing against the cold, I could not work there more than two hours at a time. I soon found that the time spent in going there, and returning, and in getting warm after I came home, and the unsteadiness of my work there, owing to the discomforts of the place, was all a loss to me. Books are meant to be read and not to be looked at, and even if by going out of the library they were occasionally damaged or lost, the Bodleian is rich enough to pay this small price for its increased utility."

This radicalism comes from the same source as the following argument against a matriculative examination. "If it is meant to find out what he *can* do, will anybody be excluded by it? Is there anybody who cannot do *something?* If a man by admission to the University acquired a license to *teach*, an examination would be most important; but as he only acquires a license to *learn*, I do not see the value of it."

Positive as the interdiction of removal of books may be, it

does not appear to be enforced at the Bodleian with as extreme a penalty as in Maynooth, where Sir Francis Head, during his "Fortnight in Ireland," saw the inscription—"Whoever takes a book out of this library incurs excommunication *ipso facto*."

It is as places for learned men as well as for pupils—for voluntary and recondite research—for quiet, studious retirement—we must look upon the great English Universities. They are called the two eyes of the nation, in reference to their permanent position in the body politic, and should, therefore, be the eyes of experience and proficiency. The Vice-Chancellor reminds the Commissioners that the Colleges have not been usually founded directly for the education of youth, "but for higher purposes." Among these are the promotion of religion and the support of the Church. Colleges have changed, (says the testimony) from learning to teaching bodies. In All Souls there are no undergraduate members; nor have there been, since its foundation in 1437. There is not room in the buildings for all the Fellows—though they number but forty; it having to be remembered on this side the Atlantic, that a Fellow does not room in a little closet, with a bed in one corner, and a ventilator over the door, but has a set or suite of apartments, and sometimes a double set. To the Fellows, Professors, Tutors, Graduates, besides scholars of all kinds and from all countries, who resort to the seats of learning—to these, the libraries, museums, and collections, the opportunities of converse with men wholly given to literary and scientific pursuits, must always constitute a part of their value to the nation and the world, independent of all that is done in teaching undergraduates.

The University Press, which divides with Cambridge the monopoly of Bibles and Prayer-books, produces a revenue of £8000. It sold its exclusive right to publish Almanacs for an annuity of £500. The other department of its publication business is called "the Learned Press," and has issued many costly works which would not otherwise have appeared; but Dr. Greenhill is disposed to believe that there is no establishment in Europe which, upon the whole, does so little for the promotion of literature, in comparison with the vast means at its command.

Notwithstanding the original statutes of some of the Colleges

prohibit music and musical instruments, as those of some others ostracise dogs, long hair, and cloaks, there is a Professorship of Music in the University. The prohibition must have referred to instruments or to music as a mere pastime, for in the days of chantries and "plain song," and intoned litanies, some practice must have been necessary. That a ban should have been imposed on young gentlemen who might be so uncivilized as to scrape their miserable violins, and blow their gamuts and scales on flutes at all hours, regardless of the ears and nerves of their neighbours, must commend the example of the middle ages to any later academical era where such plagues may prevail. Sir Henry Bishop, the present incumbent, informs us that the foundation calls for a *Choragus*, or Music-master, as well as Professor. The late Dr. Crotch held both offices for fifty years. Sir Henry is not likely to break down under the burden of either salary or work, since Dr. Elvey has the Choragic branch, and the knight, with a stipend of fifty pounds, gives no lectures or lessons, and has only to examine the compositions of aspirants to the degree of Music Doctor, conduct the rehearsal of such as pass the trial, preside at the organ at the annual commemoration, and set installation odes, and similar nonsense, to music. The lot of the Choragus is harder, for out of a salary of £13 6*s*. 8*d*. he is bound to repair the instruments and find strings. The degree of Bachelor in Music is not taken till after seven years' study, and the presentation of an approved piece in five vocal parts, with instrumental accompaniments. Five years' additional study, and a score in six or eight parts, are required for the Doctor's degree.

A few miscellaneous memoranda of statistics that will be naturally inquired for by many of our readers, must close our notice.

At the date of the Report, (April, 1852,) the number of students actually resident in Oxford was put down at 1300—a greater number than was to be found there at any other time in the last two centuries. The number of undergraduates, both resident and non-resident was 1400. The average matriculations from 1800 to 1813 were 267; from 1814 to 1840 the annual average was 364; from 1841 to 1850 it was 400. The number who have passed the final examination for B. A. has

during the last ten years, averaged annually 287—showing that not quite three-fourths of those who enter the University proceed to a degree. On the last day of 1850 the total number of "members of the University" was 6060; "members of Convocation" 3294; resident graduates of all ranks 300. These are low figures compared with 30,000, which tradition declares to have been the number of students in the reign of Henry III.

The ordinary income of the University (aside from the Press, the gain of which is only appropriated when the surplus becomes large) is about £7,500, and its expenses £7,000. The aggregate income of the Colleges from endowments alone is said to be not much less than £150,000. Yet in making this statement the Report adds the bold opinion, "the architectural magnificence of Oxford would be diminished, and many excellent men would suffer, and great opportunities of future good will be lost, if several of its richest Colleges were swept away; but little present loss would be suffered by the University, the Church, or the country."

The matriculation fees of the University are on a gradually diminishing scale, according to the rank of parents, beginning with Prince, Duke or Marquis, and ending with Gentlemen—Clergymen, Plebeians—from 13*l.* 15*s.* to 1*l.* 19*s.* 6*d.* Each undergraduate pays before each of the three examinations a fee, amounting in all to 2*l.* 18*s.* There are other annual taxes for libraries, police, &c., graduated according to academical rank, from 1*l.* 8*s.* 4*d.* downwards. At graduation, the wealthy B. A. pays 30*l.*; ordinary persons 8*l.* 8*s.* M. A. costs them respectively 40*l.* and 15*l.* B. D. 20*l.* D. D. 45*l.* The highest fee is paid by a "Non-Resident, Accumulating, Grand-Compounding Doctor of Divinity; and this fee amounts to 104*l.*" It strikes us that for this price he ought to be entitled to write all those seven capitals at the end of his name. The British Government takes not less than 2400*l.* annually from this University alone, in the shape of stamp duty on matriculations and degrees.

Besides the University charges cited above, the College entrance-fee is between three and four pounds, and a charge at the first degree of between five and seven pounds, and various

annual charges. For tuition about 64*l.* is the amount paid during the sixteen terms of the course. To give opportunity for a wider extension of the system, the friends of the University suggest the establishment of more Halls, either as independent boarding-houses under the care of Wardens, or in connection with the present Colleges—or a more general permission to undergraduates to lodge in private houses—or an allowance of persons to attend instruction without formal or expensive connection with College or Hall. The last plan is favoured by the Commission—being, in substance, just the one on which any worthy young man in our country may have all the advantages of our best Colleges for one half of the lowest sum suggested in the Report as practicable at Oxford. It anticipates the best kind of students by throwing open the doors to the poorer classes. "We have already had occasion to observe how greatly the extravagance and vice of the students depend on their idleness and means of indulgence. There is every reason to hope, on the other hand, that poverty, and the guarantee implied in poverty that such students would come to the University only for the sake of study, would act as a direct hinderance to vice, and as an inducement to good conduct."

The usual salary of a College tutor is 300*l.* The number of those officers is eighty. The cost of private tutorship at Oxford, which is, of course, paid by the students, is not estimated. At Cambridge, where the practice is somewhat more general, the annual payments for this purpose we believe to amount to 50,000*l.* Some of the College tutors must earn their wages, for they lecture on seven, eight, or nine different subjects, and are employed seven hours a day in College work. In the great hive of learning they come nearest to the double honour, awarded by the founder of Corpus Christi, who desired that "in order that the honey-bees may work within, and not be called away to mean duties, there may be certain persons free from honey-making, and devoted to other services. But if any of them shall please to imitate the honey-bees, he shall deserve a double crown." The poor servitors, immediately referred to in this allegory, have almost disappeared. In 1616, there were in sixteen Colleges, between four and five hundred students. Long since that date there was a class of students who per-

formed menial offices, in consideration of the opportunities of study. Heber, in his life of Jeremy Taylor, (who was in Cambridge a sizar, till appointed by Laud to a fellowship in Oxford in 1636,) remarks, that instead of that custom being chargeable with the illiberality of depressing the poorer students into servants, it would be more just to say that servants were elevated to the rank of students. But now the few Bible-clerkships and exhibitions which are bestowed in consideration of the poverty of the candidates, are said to be often given to secure talents to the College, rather than from real charity.

Having lately devoted an article to the University of Cambridge, (*Repertory*, April, 1852,) and now embodied facts enough from this voluminous report on Oxford to enable our readers to judge of its condition, and the estimation in which it is held by its best friends, we can readily leave to American parents to decide whether the English Universities present much to make them dissatisfied with their own institutions, or furnish much as a model for their improvement. Let our Colleges be abundantly endowed, so that the highest ability, and the largest necessary number of instructors, and the fullest apparatus can be commanded, and we shall have occasion to rejoice in the untrammeled vigour of our younger and fresher institutions.

Edw. J. Hooker

ART. II.—*The Life and Labours of St. Augustine.* By Philip Schaff, D.D. Translated from the German. By the Rev. T. C. Porter.

ATTAINMENTS in patristical learning are justly expected of those who enter the sacred ministry. No man who would be furnished for that responsible work, in a just acquaintance with ministerial character, as it has been exhibited in different periods of the Church, will be satisfied with himself, unless, in ecclesiastical history and Christian biography, he has studied the men, and their labours, denominated "the Fathers."

Knowledge of these men ought not, however, to be confined

to the men of the ministry. Christians in the ranks of the Churches should have the privilege of knowing who were "the Fathers," and what were the elements of character which occasioned this honourable designation. It gives deep interest to their lives, that some of them were instructed by the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ; others taught by these pupils of the apostles; and that still others, though at later periods of the Church, drank into the spirit of their patristic predecessors, and followed their steps, through the histories of whose labours, sufferings, sanctity of character, and example, and through whose writings, have come down to us rich instructions, and influences for great good.

For these reasons we welcome the appearance of the volume whose title is above noted. It is a book not only for the library of the Christian student and minister, but for that of the private Christian also. And for the general reading of our Churches we should welcome a series of the Lives of the Ancient Fathers. To the eye of the intelligent private Christian, it would show, more clearly than is at present known, the connection between the ministry that now is, and that of the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ. It would enable him to see, and prepare him to admire, the grace of God which has been displayed in the choicest examples of ministerial character, from the day of the Redeemer's ascension to heaven down to this hour.

The attentive and discriminating reader of the book before us, will find much to awaken his admiration of the rich and sovereign grace of God, which led Augustine "out of darkness into his marvellous light;" "turned him from the power of Satan unto God;" and which not only made him "a vessel of mercy," but an eminent instrument of good in his own, and to following ages. To study the history and character of Paul; first in the period of his life when he was a student of Jewish law, "at the feet of Gamaliel;" and in his character as a Pharisee of the "straitest sect," and as by profession and office for a time, a haughty and blood-thirsty persecutor; this prepares the Christian to study, with intense interest, the history of his conversion, as it displayed the unspeakable mercy and the triumphant grace of God in Christ Jesus. With an interest some-

what like this will the Christian reader of the volume before us contemplate Augustine; first, as he was in his youth; next, as he moved forward in the pride of talent and learning through the various stages of philosophical study, and in his intimacies with the men of his time; then as he appeared embracing and advocating specious errors; and, more than all, to see him uniting with these, things which we can call by no milder name than the profligacies of "a man of pleasure," and living for pleasure as much as for distinction and honour; till, at the age of thirty-three, "the Spirit of the Lord God," merciful and almighty to renew the heart and sanctify the life of the vilest, visited his breast and made him "a new creature," an humble and devoted follower of Christ Jesus.

Let it not be overlooked, through whose instrumentality, under the blessing of God, Augustine became a monument of divine mercy and grace, a "preacher of the unsearchable riches of Christ;" and a skilful teacher and valiant defender of "the faith of the gospel." Blessed be God for those rich gifts to the Church, in all ages, *godly mothers*. The heavenly minded and devout Monica, the mother of Augustine, who seems to have lived at the footstool of the throne of grace, and always to have been there, as much that she might pray for her son, as for her own soul, was deeply concerned in laying the foundation of his final character as a servant of God. She lived in supplication and tears for him, long before he knew how to pray for himself or to weep for his sins. Blessed woman! eminent mother of such a finally eminent son! Her name will accompany his down to the latest ages of time; as "she who bore him," and in answer to whose prayers, and by the blessing of the Holy Spirit upon whose instructions, he was "born again," and this after he had become old in sin, and strong in that pride of heart and wickedness of life which had swept him away from the foot of the cross of Christ.

As in the case of Paul, so in this of Augustine, conversion to God was followed by immediate consecration to that great work for which the highest talents and most various learning are always desirable, under the control of divine grace. Of Paul it is written, "and straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God." Augustine, after his

conversion, began to mourn over the Manicheans, a class of errorists with whom he had been for nine years—up to the twenty-eighth of his life, associated; and to wish most ardently for their recovery from their delusions. He also gave immediate attention, as an instructor, to young men in theology; and to controverting the errors of a school of sceptics who, after the fashion of some in our time, "denied the possibility of knowing the truth;" and to other labours through which he could act upon the minds of that day. In short, he began at once to live for the high purposes of a new man in Christ Jesus; and to shine in excellencies of character and example, which never appear in the graceless, however wise, talented, or learned. He taught men who were to become preachers of the gospel of Christ; preached, wrote for the purpose of setting forth the truths of the word of God, and, also for the defence of the doctrines of the gospel as controverted and attacked by errorists.

The history of the theological writings of Augustine, as briefly given in the book before us, presents him to our minds as a man of great industry. They appear in the several classifications of the Exegetical; the Apologetical, the Dogmatical, and Polemical; the Ascetic and Edifying; and the Autobiographical. A sub-classification of his works, Dogmatical and Polemical, presents them under the several designations of Anti-Manichean writings; Anti-Donatistic, and Anti-Pelagian. The latter named especially possess, to the ministry and the Church of the present day, a great amount of interest and value; inasmuch as they, relate to great first truths of the gospel of Christ, more widely, industriously, and violently disputed than many others.

It is in the class of his writings denominated dogmatical and polemical, that Augustine is before the Christian world in one of the most interesting positions and points of character, in which any apostle, father, or modern minister can be viewed—that of a man living in the holy resolve of fidelity to "the truth of Christ." Paul, as he stood on "the verge of life," and looking at the hour of his departure as at hand, among his humble, yet triumphant declarations of his "course of life," made this impressive declaration, "*I have kept the faith.*"

Who that lives and labours in the ministry of the gospel, and desires to die in peace with his Lord, and with his own conscience, can fail to make it his daily prayer, that when his dying day shall come, he may be able to take up this same declaration respecting himself; and with the eye of the Lord and Master whom he has served, resting upon him, to be able to say, "*I* have kept the faith?" And can deeper horror and darkness settle down upon the departing hour of any man, than upon that of one bearing the name of a minister of religion, who has lived for the subversion of "the faith of Jesus;" himself a "blind leader of the blind," and teaching others to be such; and having acquired the "bad eminence" of an author and procurer of the unbelief and final destruction of multitudes, which can be fully known only in the great day of the revelation of secret things.

While it would be easy, and withal pleasant and profitable, to go into the examination of various points of excellence in the character of Augustine, the limits of this article require us to confine our attention more especially to one which, unhappily, in its reproving contrast, is but too appropriate to the condition of some minds, and the position of some men bearing the titles of Christian ministers, in our own country, at this time. This characteristic is ministerial fidelity to "the faith." Who, in the office of the Christian ministry in these days, and having the wakefulness of conscience and tenderness of solicitude for the honour of Christ belonging in the breast of a minister, does not feel constrained, by many "things which have come to pass in these days," to live in jealousy of himself, and fraternal solicitude for his brethren in the ministry, that both he and they may keep themselves, and by the grace of God be kept faithful to the great doctrines of the gospel of "God our Saviour," and preserved and assisted to guard others from "falling after the same example of unbelief?"

In what consists ministerial fidelity to "the faith?" And how will it be indicated? Both these inquiries will be in the process of answer in the following observations.

This trait and excellency in ministerial character will first of all appear in habitual prayerfulness for the teachings of the Holy Spirit, respecting the truth. The man lifts up his voice

before the throne of heavenly grace, saying, "in thy light shall we see light;" "that which I see not, teach thou me." And that voice will be as music to his ear, which says to him, "the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things;" "he will guide you into all truth." And the voice which thus replies to his request, he recognizes as the voice of "the Master" whom he loves, and whose truth it is his privilege to preach. Such a minister will find "light arising in darkness;" and his fidelity in committing his way to the Lord will be rewarded in the divine fulfilment of those precious promises, "and ye shall know the truth;" "if any man will do God's will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God."

Fidelity to the faith will be indicated in the diligent study of the Bible, as God's revelation of all the elements of "the faith." This will be done in clear distinction from those discursive studies, with their Bible shut, in which some put philosophizing in the place of prayer, and put reasoning about what the truth *ought* to be, instead of asking at the open pages of the Bible what the truth *is*. The minister who intends to be faithful to the truth, as a student, will begin with "the word of God" as the great field for his researches. "What hath the Lord said?" "what is written in the law?" are his first inquiries—and his second—his constant askings. And relative to doctrines, discoverable in the Bible by a fair and legitimate interpretation, he takes his stand, never to be "moved away." True, he will not neglect to examine the writings of good men, who have loved "the truth of Christ," have stated it scripturally; reasoned for it in the exercise of a sound Christian philosophy; defended it fearlessly; applied it to the conscience earnestly and powerfully; and who have lived upon it as their spiritual bread. But even such writings, with all their excellence, he will hold secondary and subservient to the sacred word of God. He could live without the books of men; without the book of God—never. Give him the Bible, and the retirement of his study, and access to the throne of "the Father of lights" in prayer, and he will be satisfied without any other help; will ask for no richer satisfactions than thus he will find in his researches for the truth.

The formation and settlement of discriminating and positive views of "the faith," will be in the minister of Christ another manifestation of fidelity. Christian doctrines, as revealed in the Scriptures, and as constituting that great and glorious system, called by Paul "Christ crucified," will never be regarded by the faithful minister as intangible, indefinable, uncertain matters of opinion, for ever evading search, and eluding intellectual grasp. If other men please to spend life in philosophically "groping for the wall like the blind," and "as if they had no eyes;" and in "stumbling at noon-day as in the night," while this lamp of heavenly truth is offered them, this is not after his spiritual taste. Divine truth is a divine certainty to his mind; palpable, perceptible, and comprehensible, sufficiently so for all the purposes to be answered by it, involving any man's renewal and sanctification. His settled conviction is, that "the faith of Jesus," in all its articles, can be clearly and definitely set apart from all the errors which men endeavour to substitute for them, however specious and deceptive: that it can be distinguished from all modifications, counterfeits, and corruptions, which "the spirit of error," pressing into its service false philosophy, can ever invent and propound. He will hold himself ready at any and all times, to state any doctrine of the Bible which he has studied in its essential elements, and to do it so that his professional brethren and his hearers can see it as a desirable and certain article of the Christian faith; and likewise, as occasion may require, to pour its light upon error, for the purpose of its complete and helpless unmasking.

Fidelity to the truth of Christ will be indicated by the minister in his full and firm belief of it. He gives it a credence in which his heart and his understanding are cordially united. He is not afraid to put into his creed every article of it; and, on fitting occasions, to sign his name to it, and in the presence of God, angels, and men, solemnly to declare, "*thus and thus I believe.*" Nor is such a minister at all disturbed at hearing that other men give their assent to, and sign creeds, comprehensive of the elements of "the faith of Jesus."

Take particular notice, however, that the minister who is, and intends to be, faithful to the truth of Christ, cannot—will not—give his assent and subscription to any and every creed

which may be laid before him. There is a strong and lively repellency between that honest belief of the doctrines of Christ, which, in a faithful minister, asks whether the articles to be believed and subscribed are "THE *faith*," and that strange lubricity of conscience which makes some men indifferent as to what they subscribe, if it be only *a* faith. To a minister intending to be faithful to the truth, it is a matter of vital consequence whether the creed in question be unmingled truth, or unmingled error; or an incongruous compound of both. Faith in the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, keeps close companionship in such a minister's breast with a just, healthy, and tender conscience; a conscience which would be keenly wounded, exasperated, and awakened to the work of remonstrance, of loud and startling rebuke, at any violence thus offered to it.

Fidelity to the truth, in the minister of Christ, will be indicated in his unwavering love to it. His religious affections, as well as his reason and judgment, are concerned in his reception of it. There may be—and often is, (and it is a point for solicitude and self-scrutiny)—a merely speculative knowledge and persuasion of the truth, in which a minister may give merely his intellectual assent to its articles, as he does to proved problems in Geometry, or the demonstrated theorems of Algebra; or as the lawyer assents to the principles set forth in the books of his profession, or the physician to those taught in his. Such a man's assent is given to a Bible truth simply because it cannot be rationaly denied or overthrown. Meanwhile there may be no love to it as God's holy truth; and the man perhaps would deny it if he could, or, if he dared. Sometimes such an one arrives at a state of feeling in which he both dares, and does it. Between a mind in this condition and that of a faithful minister, there is a difference wide as between day and midnight, and high as between heaven and hell. It is the same kind of difference as that which exists between Gabriel, who believes in one God, and adores and loves him; and Lucifer, who also "believes that there is one God," and "trembles" too. The faithful minister's heart is fixed upon what he believes; he loves the truths of Christ ardently, as well as believes them firmly. No truths have such beauty to his spiritual eye, such music to his spiritual ear, such sweetness to his spiritual taste, as those of

the gospel of "God our Saviour." "Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of my heart," is language well describing his holy relish for the doctrines of the incorruptible word; and indicating his consciousness that they are to be the nutriment of his own soul in the divine life, while he dispenses them to others.

Unreserved preaching of the truth is another manifestation of fidelity. "To declare the whole counsel of God," is esteemed by the faithful minister as important as that he should hold it in his creed, and love it in his heart. Such a man is unable to conceive of any good reason why that which is believed and loved as divine truth, should not also be spoken publicly. Errorists generally make no secret of their errors. Why then should the truth-loving minister be reserved and cautious about the declaration of the truths which he "most surely believes." He says with Paul, and all faithful ministers, "we also *believe* and *therefore* speak." That maxim, sometimes having its application in affairs of this life—"the truth is not always to be spoken"—is not the faithful minister's maxim, as a justification of silence respecting "the faith of Jesus." His pulpit, therefore, will be a place whence "sounds out the word of life." He blows a trumpet which gives no "uncertain sound." He utters the doctrines of God our Saviour in unmistakable terms; in language having specific meaning. Such a man does not know why he has been "put into the ministry," if it be not to be the preacher as well as believer of "the unsearchable riches of Christ." His love to them prepares him to find some of his highest satisfactions in setting them forth. Those Sabbaths are days of truest, richest enjoyment, in which he comes to his people with sermons best filled with the truths of Christ; and in the dispensation of which he prays and hopes to succeed, in helping those who sit before him, to behold the glory of the gospel of Christ, in some or other of its great articles of doctrine.

The minister in whom is fidelity to the faith will defend it whenever it is attacked. Such a minister is not controversial in his pulpit habits; is no theological pugilist; no "heresy-hunter;" does not inform his people of errors of which they never heard, that he may show his theological prowess in demol-

ishing them. He does not love controversy for itself; on the contrary, he regards it as the minister's least desirable work. If those who "teach for doctrine the commandments of men" will not come into his field, and that of his brethren, he will never go in pursuit, for the sake of doing battle against them. But when such teachers come within the district where lie his and his brethren's responsibilities for the maintenance of "sound doctrine," he is on his feet at once; with Paul's words and doings for his rule and example of action, "to whom we gave place by subjection, *no, not for an hour*, that the truth of the gospel might continue with you." When "false brethren unawares brought in" do "privily bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them;" when he perceives that the time is come to set forth questioned, disputed, denied, and reproached articles of the Christian faith, in their proper distinction and careful separation from ingenious perversions, or specious substitutions for the truth; or from, perhaps, bold and barefaced errors of doctrine; then he is ready for the duties of one "set for the defence of the gospel." Meanwhile, certainly, he will look to his spirit. That which has been well said of the immortal Calvin will be true of him; "his zeal is not rage; his vigilance is not captiousness; his reasoning is not rancour; his candour is not obstinacy."* But another thing also will be true—that he feels himself to be a soldier of Immanuel. And he proves himself to be one who can never be bribed to silence; nor decoyed or frightened away from his post of watchmanship, or his place in the ranks. And in the hour of conflict he will be seen firm, fearless, unconquerable.

A very important adjunct to this, is that the minister intending to be faithful to the truth of Christ, will regard it as sometimes necessary to be the *assailant* of error. Those who look to the ministry for instruction in "the faith," and for its defence when it is attacked, should also have reason to know, that the heavenly arsenals of Immanuel contain the material, in ample store, for attack upon error itself, and which can be for the effectual overthrow of false doctrine, and the discomfiture of those who assail the truth. True, "the weapons of our war-

* Dr. John M. Mason.

fare are not carnal," but they are "mighty, through God, to the *pulling down* of strong-holds." Paul said this, and it was proved true in his day. He helped in the proof; and was himself a valiant demolisher of the positions of the enemies of the gospel, as well as a mighty defender of truth against their assaults. This has been true, in all the days of the Church; is now, and ever will be, till the "sword of the Spirit" shall have cut down the last assailant of "the faith which is in Christ Jesus." Fidelity to the truth will constrain him in whom it is, to understand this use of these weapons of the Christian warfare, and to put them to their appointed use wherever the exigencies of the contest for the faith shall require.

Ministerial fidelity to the faith will lead to timely acts of public and solemn protest against doctrines of men, which are subversive of faith. It guards against that misjudgment which our Saviour reproved, when he said, "How is it that ye do not discern this time?" It is the weakness and the fault of "some in the Church," that they are never sufficiently watchful against the first approaches of evil; and, therefore, they do not recognize it till arrived on the spot, and when it appears in undisguised forms. Men whom we respect and love, and call "good ministers," are sometimes too much blinded and embarrassed by a mistaken charity, to act with that promptitude for the honour of the truth which belongs with fidelity to its interests. Such ministers timidly delay taking up positions for its protection, till error has "come in like a flood." They wait till the battlements of the citadel of truth have been scaled by its enemies, and entrance effected before they are ready to act. A minister of this class seems unable to bring himself to believe it possible that "one that is called a brother" can become a man, respecting whom he must act on Paul's direction to Timothy—"from such withdraw thyself." One of the most difficult and trying of all the acts ever to be done, in the fulfilment of the Christian ministry, is, to do the duty of separation, public and solemn, from those who "subvert the faith." There is probably no profession or association of men, in which the ties of friendship and fraternity are stronger than among ministers. And thus it sometimes comes to pass, that the truth of Christ is left unvindicated in the ranks of the ministry itself, till both

the Church and the world have begun to see that the truth is under reproach and dishonour; and perhaps have felt impelled to raise the note of alarm to the sleeping watchmen.

The steps of Christian discipline with a minister for heresy, make a line of duty along which the faithful minister will pursue his way with an aching heart; with many sighs and tears; with reluctances which none can understand, who knows not "the heart" of a minister. And yet, fidelity to the truth requires, that when it is subverted by whomsoever it may be, the minister should "know no man after the flesh;" that he should be like Levi, in the day when Israel was to be purged from idolatry; and of whom it is written that he "said unto his father and to his mother, I have not seen him, neither did he acknowledge his brethren nor know his own children," that he might "observe God's word and keep his covenant." That fraternal affection is eminently commendable, which leads to forbearance, to the utmost which can be consistent with the safety and honour of the truth; and should prompt to every reasonable and hopeful endeavour to win back a brother from the path of defection. But love to Christ demands tenderness also for the honour of Christ. Fidelity in great matters of faith forbids the ministers to balance for one moment, on the question, which shall suffer, the crucified Saviour again in the dishonour of his gospel, or they who deny him, and despise "the Rock of our salvation?"

What are some of the relations in which ministerial fidelity to the truth stands, as now described? It would be relevant to consider this characteristic, as it relates to the Church itself; particularly as securing the intelligence of private Christians in the truths of the gospel; their soundness in the faith; their experimental religion; their progress in holiness; their religious enjoyment; their protection against the perplexities and temptations of specious and entangling errors; their ability to defend the truth in the walks of life where they find it assailed; its concern also in securing their attachment to the ministry, as God's appointment for their edification and consolation, under the various vicissitudes of the Christian pilgrimage. It would also be appropriate to show how such fidelity to the truth stands in relation to the good of the unconverted, who sit under the

ministry of the gospel; their instruction "unto salvation;" their being shown the distinetion between soul-destroying errors and soul-saving truths; and as sccuring their respeet for the gospel as a system of truths; harmonious, eonsistent, eommanding in its influenee on the judgment and the intellect; and as that in whieh a faithful ministry "commends itself to every man's conseienee in the sight of God." We pass these topies, however, with the simple mention of them, as belonging to this subjeet; and in order to eonsider fidelity to the truth as it eoncerns the minister himself.

The minister's own safety against apostaey from the truth is coneerned in this. Who that has entered the saered office with the eonseienee of a man of common honesty even, must not recoil from the idea of betraying the truths he has professed to believe, and pledged himself to preaeh? While he looks upon examples of sueh "sins against Christ," he perhaps says, like Peter to "the Master," "though all men deny thee, yet will not I." It is well. But let him live in godly jealousy of himself, and in the spirit of humble and implicit dependenee on divine teaehing, and divine keeping; and remember that admonition—"Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." Names there have been enrolled in the catalogues of the Christian ministry, in our own and in other countries, of men who have professed to believe and to preach the truths of Christ; but who finally began their silent, slow, and searee pereeptible divergences from the doctrines of Christ; and after some misgivings of eonscienee, and perhaps "great reasonings in themselves," have quiekened their steps along the path of error, and acquired a solemn and frightful momentum, till they had gone down to the dark precincts of utter sceptieism and infidelity.

How eame those men to take such a course, and to run sueh a race to ruin? The beginnings were probably somewhat on this wise. They had never "reeeived the love of the truth." They never had anything more than an intellectual knowledge and persuasion of the truth. They were averse to trouble themselves to diseriminate conscientiously and aecurately, and for their own safety, to draw the definite and strait lines of demareation between truth and error. They were jealous, sensitive and

afraid of the obligations of creeds and confessions of faith. They never loved to preach the holy, searching, humbling, sanctifying doctrines of "the cross of Christ." Meanwhile they learned to look on without concern, and see Christ's truth subtly, ingeniously, radically perverted by other and leading men, and at length denied, reproached, and the very names of its articles "cast out as evil." They found it in their hearts to sympathize with the rejecters of the truth, and to apologize for their defections, rather than with its anxious, watchful, and faithful defenders; more even to sympathize with the enemies of truth, than with the dishonoured Saviour, who "came into the world that he might bear witness unto the truth." What wonder then, that at length such ministers began themselves to swerve from the truth as it is in Christ Jesus; and to resign, one after another, its great articles, and become of the number of those who deny the faith, which they once professed to believe, and promised to preach; and of those who have "trodden under foot the Son of God, and counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and done despite unto the Spirit of grace." What fearful defections from the truth were those of Priestly, Robert Robinson and Belsham, in the ranks of the British ministry; and in more recent times and in our own country, those of Chauncey, Freeman, Joseph Huntington, Sherman, Abbott, Holley, and Channing; all once professedly believers and preachers of the truths of Christ! And what names next will be added? Yes, what names might at this moment be added to the melancholy catalogue of those who "have made shipwreck of the faith?" Who, with such examples before him, and warning him as a minister, can help lifting anxiously the prayer, "Oh! keep my soul and deliver me:" "Hold thou *me* up, and I shall be safe?" That man in the office of the Christian ministry, is not to be envied for his quietness of spirit, who, with his eyes on such cases of defection from the Christian faith, feels no stirrings of godly jealousy of himself; no solicitude lest he also "fall after the same example of unbelief;" nor is constrained to set a double guard over the movements of his own mind, and the deceitfulness of his own heart, lest he also become entangled, and "led away with the error of the wicked."

The minister's own moral character is concerned in his fidelity to the truth. The standard of morality, in ministers, not unfrequently declines with their decline from "the faith." That condition of conscience in which a minister becomes prepared to reject any of the truths of the gospel, is one in which he is likely also to undervalue its precepts, and gradually to lose even the resemblances he may have had to Christian character. Suppose, however, the common virtues of this life to continue to flourish in such a man, and that people who never discriminate carefully between these and the holiness founded on regeneration, look upon amiable and virtuous teachers of false doctrines, and call them men of Christian sanctity, and challenge us with the question, "Can there be vital and fatal error in connection with so much that is estimable in personal character?" But the great question is, "How come on in such an one the virtues of 'Christianity as a distinct religion?'" a religion, spiritual, elevated, heavenly; embracing love to the doctrines of Christ, and exhibiting likeness to Christ? We go further, and raise the question, is there nothing immoral in unbelief of divine truth? The apostle John, under divine inspiration has declared it; "He that believeth not God hath made him a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son." And by what principle in sound ethics is he a virtuous man who gives the lie to the holy Sovereign of the universe? Sober, temperate, chaste, just in his transactions with men, he may be amiable and estimable in domestic and social life; but is this all of Christian morals? Is it an act of virtue—of Christian virtue—when a man deliberately writes in his study, pronounces in his pulpit, and, perhaps, sends forth to the world on the printed page, in words deliberately chosen, and in rhetoric finished, things touching revealed truth and truth's holy God, which, on the minds of serious Christians and lovers of sound Scripture doctrine, make the impressions of ungodly irony, or solemn, sacerdotal blasphemy? As, on the one hand, there are no men on earth under more advantageous circumstances than ministers, to "grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," so on the other hand, if they do not in their hearts love the truth; if they are disposed to employ their talents and learning in perverting the

gospel, and disrobing its divine Author of the glories of his person and character, then none can outstrip ministers in the mighty and frightful strides they are capable of making along the path of error; nor can any surpass them in the bitterness of their contempt of "the truth as it is in Christ Jesus." What must be the scene presented to the eyes of witnessing angels, jealous for the glory of that "name which is above every name," when, hovering over a sanctuary dedicated to the worship of the "Three who bear record in heaven," and around a pulpit consecrated to the dispensation of the "unsearchable riches of Christ," they witness prayers which recognize no Intercessor for man before the throne in heaven; and the preaching of doctrines which subvert "the faith of Jesus;" deny to the Son of God his glory, and crucify afresh, Him who bled and died on Calvary for our sins?

Let the certainty, then, be deeply impressed upon every mind, that the holiness—yea, the morality of the ministry—depends upon the fidelity of the ministry to "the truth as it is in Christ Jesus." That state of conscience, in which the doctrines of the Lord Jesus Christ are held from love to him and to his word, is that in which the practices of the life, the virtues of the Christian character, will thrive, and make the minister to "shine as a light in the world, holding forth the word of life."

The minister's peace of conscience in the approach of the close of life, and in prospect of standing with his people "before the judgment-seat of Christ," is concerned in his fidelity to the truth, as already described. A delightful frame of spirit was that of Paul, when, arrived near the close of life, looking back on his ministry for the Lord Jesus, reviewing all he had taught, "publicly and from house to house," and all he had written to the churches, and had maintained in his conflicts with the enemies of the truth, he deliberately and solemnly declared, and under divine inspiration records it, for coming generations to the end of time—"I HAVE KEPT THE FAITH." Like to this, though in humbler degree, is the joy of every minister, who, receiving, believing, loving the truth, and preaching it, defending it, watching for its honour, and weeping for its reproach, lives in the feeling of Martyn, when he said, "*I cannot endure existence if Christ Jesus is not honoured.*" Differ-

ent from this is the scene when a minister is "at the point to die," in whom the truth of Christ has had a preacher in profession only; a timid and inefficient defender: or, worse than this, a secret enemy, betraying one fortress of the truth after another; and at last, having become an open assailant, joining, helping, cheering, perhaps leading on the ranks of those who insultingly say, "raze it, raze it, even to the foundations thereof." The condition of mind of such a minister, in the day of death, may be that of portentous calmness, such as sometimes attends upon "strong delusion" and the "belief of a lie." Or, it may be that state of gloomy reserve, in which the man, like the false prophet of Ahab, "goes into an inner chamber to hide himself;" a reserve in which the man's soul is, of choice, curtained in and shut up, so that its gloomy workings, under the rebukes of a violated and incensed conscience, may not get disclosure. Or, he comes into that condition of anguish, and horror of conscience, and "fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation," which unnerves the soul, and fills his dying hour with foretastes of the bitterness of an undone eternity.

It is a delightful scene, when a minister who has been faithful to the truth comes to the day and the hour when, and the place where—his last service and conflict, as a soldier of Immanuel, "for the truth's sake," being rendered—he is permitted to put off his armour and anticipate his speedy reception of the "crown of life." On the other hand the scene is *awful*, when a minister who has been unfaithful to the truth of Christ, has filled up his measure of guilt, done his last act of treachery to the faith, and is about to die and go to the judgment-seat of the injured Saviour. Do angels witness gloomier and more fearful death-scenes in our world than those of unfaithful ministers? Time, talents, attainments, influence, pens, pulpits, all devoted to the devisings of men "loving not the truth;" hating, despising, perverting, and exposing to contempt, the doctrines of "the cross;" rejecting the Son of God; misleading souls for which they had promised and bound themselves to watch. Respecting a minister who has spent his life thus, that is a most fitting utterance by the divine Saviour, "good had it been for that man if he had never been born."

One other scene, and one only, can surpass this. It is that where both the faithful and the unfaithful minister will stand before the "great white throne," and under the eye of "Him who sitteth thereon." Paul will stand there, and so will every minister who has lived faithful to the truth on the earth. Who can describe the joy which will fill the heart of the minister, who on the side of the grave shall have been able to declare it, and before the throne of judgment to repeat it, "*I have kept the faith?*" Standing even at God's awful throne, prepared to give account of a ministry, which, though imperfect, yet is sprinkled with trusted blood of atonement; a ministry in which he has loved, believed, taught, defended, and honoured "the faith which is in Christ Jesus;" what holy joy will be that of such a minister! what rapture his, when from the lips of "Him who sitteth upon the throne," it shall be said to him, "Well done, good and faithful servant," "enter thou into the joy of thy Lord!" On the other hand, behold the lot of the minister who has lived unfaithful to the truth, trembling under the glance of Him "whose eyes are as a flame of fire," and surrounded with a crowd of beings, whom on earth, and in the days of grace he led blindfold to destruction, and against whom with "the key of knowledge in his hand," "he had shut up the kingdom of heaven:" who will be able to look on such a minister but with horror? It was cruelty enough in him to have destroyed his own soul. But to have spent life in working out the ruin of others, from hatred to the truth: to have industriously laboured that he might not "perish alone in his iniquity;" to have come to "the judgment-seat of Christ," having to give account for the souls whom he deceived while he lived, and for others who, by his posthumous influence were led astray from God and the truth, long after he had gone out of life: to witness their anguish and horror of spirit, and their imprecations on him for his treachery to their souls: and to contemplate the eternity of an unfaithful minister, under "the indignation of the Almighty:" Oh! if there could be weeping on that day "among the angels of God," and among the saints on the right hand of the Judge, would it not be over the final doom of that minister who has been unfaithful to the truth of Christ?

Jas. W. Alexander.

ART. III.—*Sketches of the Pulpit, in Ancient and in Modern Times.*

IT admits of little question that preaching took its rise from the public reading of the Scriptures. No one needs to be informed how regularly this formed a part of the synagogue service. The case of our Lord's expositions in this way is too familiar to bear recital. The apostles, and Paul in particular, seem to have followed the same method. Indeed, this may be taken as the rule, while free utterances, like that at Mars' Hill, are considered as the exceptions. Little has come down to us, in regard to the precise form taken by the discourses of Christian teachers in the early and less rhetorical period. The celebrated passage of Justin Martyr points towards the familiar harangue or exhortation, rather than the elaborate comment on Scripture. This we apprehend arose in part from the fact—now very much neglected, though significant—that inculcation of doctrine was carried on chiefly in the classes of catechumens, while the public assembly was more employed for lively addresses to the Christian people. Justin expressly declares that the writings of the prophets and apostles were read to the assembly. The Apostolical Constitutions doubtless report a well-known usage, when they say that the congregation reverently stood, while the reading took place; of which some churches retain a vestige, in the custom of rising, when the little fragment by synecdoche, called the *Gospel*, is recited. Liberty was given to the aged and infirm to remain seated. In our times, when people refuse to stand even in prayer, such a usage would prove burdensome in the extreme.

There is good reason to believe, that the portions of Scripture for public reading were at first left to the free choice of the presiding minister. After a while, when festivals and fasts became numerous, ingenuity was exercised to affix certain passages to the subject of commemoration. From this it was an easy step to a programme of regular lessons, for all Sundays and great days. But these were far from being uniform or immutable. Thus we find that the Churches in Syria read at Pen-

tecost from the Acts of the Apostles, while those of Spain and Gaul read the Revelation. In Syria they read Genesis in Lent, but at Milan, Job and Jonah. In Northern Africa the history of our Lord's passion was appropriately read on Good Friday; at Easter, the account of the resurrection; in both cases from Matthew. When we come down to the days of Augustine, we find the lessons somewhat fixed; and it would be easy to make numerous citations from his works to this point. Antiquaries refer the first collection of lessons, called Lectionaries, in Gaul, to about the middle of the fifth century; the oldest known being the celebrated *Lectionarium Gallicanum.* In the eighth century it was still necessary for the imperial authority of Charlemagne to enforce uniformity in the portions read.

When matters had gradually assumed their rubrical settlement, the Church customs became fixed. The reading was by a reader, or lector, who stood in the elevation known as the *ambo.* He began with the words, "Peace unto you," to which there was a response by the people, such as is familiar to us in modern service-books. The gospels had the precedence, as they still have in the Missal, and were frequently read by the deacon. This we suppose to have been a very ancient custom, and one which might well have a place in modern liturgies, where the voice of the minister is often overtasked, in oppressive seasons and times of ill-health. The sermon was pronounced sometimes from the bishop's cathedra, before bishops had ceased to preach, or from the steps of the altar, when this had taken the place of the communion table; in some instances, however, from the *ambo,* which reveals a connection of the discourse with the lesson of Scripture.

In attempting to gather some notices of early preaching, we have to grope amidst darkness, most of our authorities belonging to a corrupt and ritualistic period. The preacher began with the *Pax omnibus,* to which the audience responded. We find Augustine asking them sometimes to help him with their prayers. "The lesson out of the Apostles," he says, in one place, "is dark and difficult;" and he craves their intercession. And elsewhere: *Quemadmodum nos, ut ista percipiatis, oramus, sic et vos orate, ut ea vobis explicare valeamus.* The preacher sat, while the people stood; as no seats were fur-

nished for the worshippers. Augustine speaks of this, in apologizing for a sermon longer than usual, and contrasts his easy posture with theirs.

Every one must be persuaded that early preaching was without the use of manuscript. It was in regard to expression extemporaneous. Here we might again quote Justin. Socrates tells us indeed, concerning Atticus, Bishop of Constantinople, that he committed to memory at home such things as he was about to deliver in the church; but afterwards, he says that he spoke from the impulse of the moment. Sidonius, addressing himself to Faustus Rejensis, writes thus: "Prædicationes tuas nunc repentinas, nunc cum ratio præscripsit elucubratas, *raucus plosor audivi.*" The allusion is to the audible applause given to popular orators. Pamphilus relates of Origen, that the discourses which he delivered almost daily in church were *extempore*, and that they were taken down by reporters, and so preserved for posterity. We find Chrysostom changing his subject, in consequence of tumults in the street on his way to the public assembly. His discourses as now extant contain many observations which plainly arose from the circumstances in which he stood during the delivery; such as the clapping of hands, the shouts heard from the neighbouring hippodrome, and the entrance of attendants to light the lamps. In one instance we find Augustine suddenly taking up a passage which the lector, who it seems was a boy, had read by mistake, instead of the one which the preacher had premeditated. The whole air of his *Sermones* is that of the extemporaneous preacher. Again and again he descants on the psalm which has just been sung. He throws in such remarks as this: "You see, beloved, that my sermon to-day differs from what is usual; I have not time for all," etc. And we may here observe that the four hundred sermons of this father afford the richest treasure for any one who wishes to study the peculiarities of Ancient Latin preaching. Gregory the Great says in one place: "I understand some hard passages now, *coram fratribus*, which I could not master *solus*." "In the earliest times," says Thiersch, "it is certain the free outpouring more prevailed, the nearer we get to primitive simplicity, and the liberal manifestation of the *charismata*." According to Guericke, the reading of sermons

occurred only as exceptional. For example, Gregory says in one of his Homilies on the Evangelists: "It has been my wont to dictate many things for you; but since my chest is too weak for me to read what I have dictated, I perceive some of you are hearing with less pleasure. Hence, varying from my usual practice. . . . I now discourse *non dictando, sed colloquendo.*" It should seem, perhaps from the same infirmity, that he sometimes wrote sermons which were read to the people by the Lector.

If any should inquire how we come to have so many extant sermons of the Christian fathers, the reply must be, that they were taken down by reporters; the revision and emendation of the author being added in some instances, then as now. Great preachers in every age have been accustomed also to write out at their leisure, the discourses which they had delivered extempore. It would be a great historical error to suppose that short-hand reporting was unknown to the ancients. There were many causes which operated to bring it into general use. The enthusiastic admiration of eloquence, which prevailed among the Greeks and Romans, furnished a motive for seeking to preserve what had electrified the populace. The extraordinary amount of manuscript, in ages before the invention of printing, led to a facility in the penman's art, which we probably undervalue. The use of uncial or separate characters, in place of a cursive or running-hand, in rapid writing, would naturally prompt, first to such ligatures and contractions as we observe in many manuscripts, and then to still greater abridgments, condensations, and symbols, by means of which a whole word or even a whole sentence was denoted by a single mark. Specimens of these, from ancient remains, may be seen appended to some editions of Cicero. But as to the details of the methods, we are altogether uninformed. The results show that full reporting was as much relied upon by them as by us. Those orations of Greek and Roman orators, which were produced on the spot, were thus taken down; and as soon as Christian eloquence began to be regarded from its worldly and literary side, the same mode was applied. Eusebius assures us that the discourses of Origen were thus written by stenographers. Reference has already been made to the case

of Gregory the Great. Almost all the sermons of Augustine which remain to us, are due to this method. Many, doubtless, received their fitness for this work from acting as amanuenses. Thus, Augustine writes feelingly of the death of a boy who was his notary.* In the Ecclesiastical Acts, concerning the designation of Eraclius as his successor, we find Augustine thus addressing the assembly: "A *notariis ecclesiæ*, sicut cernitis, excipiuntur quæ dicimus, excipiuntur quæ dicitis; et meus sermo, et vestræ acclamationes in terram non cadunt."† But the authorities on this head are innumerable; indeed, some of our most valuable patristical treasures were thus preserved. Modern times and our own days have seen the same means employed. The expositions of Calvin on the Old Testament are from reports of this sort, which contain the very prayers which he offered. The Commentary on the Ephesians, by McGhee, one of the most admirable evangelical works of the age, was delivered by the author at a little weekly lecture in Ireland, and reported in stenography. Some of the greatest sermons of Robert Hall were never written till after the delivery; and some of these were "extended" from the notes of Wilson, Grinfield, and Green. But we need look no further than to the orations of Webster, Clay, Russell, Palmerston, Cobden, Thiers, and Montalembert, to escape all doubts as to the practicability of what has been supposed.

With the secular advancement of Christianity, the augmentation of assemblies, and the accession of learned men and orators, the simple and ardent addresses of apostolic times gave place to all the forms of Grecian rhetoric. The house of worship, no longer a cavern or an upper chamber, became a theatre for display. This is apparent more among the Greeks than the Latins, and was not inconsistent with much ardour of piety and edification of the faithful; yet the change was very marked, and in the same proportion we observe the art of homiletics assuming a regular shape. It is impossible to condemn what we here discern, without at the same time censuring the pulpit of our own day in the most refined portions of Christendom; but we are not sure that a universal advancement in the

* Ep. clviii. † Ep. ccxiii.

spiritual life of the Church would not instantly put to flight many adventitious glories of the sermon, and restore a more natural and impassioned species of sacred oratory. The ancient preacher was frequently interrupted by bursts of applause, clapping of hands, and acclamations of assent. Chrysostom says:—"We need not your applause or tumultuous approbation," and asks for silence. These tokens of admiration are to be compared, not with the devout exclamations of the Methodists, in their more illiterate assemblies, but with the cheers of our anniversary meetings, if not with the turbulent praise of the House of Commons. The great preacher last named, found it necessary, therefore, to remind the Christians of Antioch that they were not in the theatre. Yet such signs of sympathy in the people, when moderate and decorous, were expected and approved. For example, Augustine thus closes a sermon: "*Audistis, laudastis; Deo gratias.*"

In early times, public preaching was by no means confined to the Lord's day; and its frequency indicates a great interest in divine things on the part of the public. It is necessary only to look through a number of consecutive sermons of Augustine, particularly at the beginning and end of each, to learn that he was accustomed to preach very often, and during sacred seasons for several days in succession, and at times more than once in the same day. Seasons of extraordinary religious emotion are always signalized by this avidity for the word. So it was at the Reformation; Luther preached almost daily at Wittenberg, and Calvin at Geneva, as did Knox and Welsh in Scotland. And so it will be again when religion is greatly revived in our own land.

As a matter of course, the great body of ancient sermons has passed into oblivion; but enough remains to give us a very complete notion of the way in which the fathers treated divine subjects before the people. Of the Greeks, we possess discourses of Origen, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Athanasius, Basil, the Gregories of Nyssa and Nazianzum, Cyril, Macarius, Amphilochius and Chrysostom. In all these the traces of Gentile rhetoric are visible. Of the Latins, none are so remarkable as Ambrose, Augustine, and Leo the Great. To gain some fair conception of the manner adopted, it would

be well for every student acquainted with the ancient languages, to peruse a few discourses of Basil, Chrysostom, and Augustine. He will discover amidst all the elegance of the golden-tongued Greek, an admirable simplicity in the exposition of Scripture in regular course, as for example, in the numerous sermons on the Romans; and a fidelity of direct reproof, worthy of imitation in all ages. What are called the *Sermones* of Augustine are not only shorter—perhaps from abridgment by the notary—but in every respect more scattering, planless, and extemporaneous, but at the same time full of genius, full of eloquence, full of piety, all clothed in a latinity, which, though not Augustan, and sometimes even provincial and Punic, carries with it a glow and a stateliness of march, which oftener reminds us of the Roman orator than the elaborate exactness of Lactantius, the "Christian Cicero." If, sometimes he indulges in a solecism, for the sake of the *plebs Christiana* of Carthage, it is not unconsciously; and we seem to see him smile when he says in apology, "Dum omnes instruantur, grammatici non timeantur." He even begs pardon for the form *fenerat;* though this is used by Martial and occurs continually in the Digests. And of a blessed neologism he thus speaks: "Christ Jesus, that is *Christus* SALVATOR. For this is the Latin of JESUS. The grammarians need not inquire how Latin it is, but the Christians how true. For *salus* is a Latin noun. *Salvare* and *salvator*, indeed, were not Latin, before the Saviour (*Salvator*) came; when he came to the Latins he made this word Latin."* But we check our hand, on a subject, which from its tempting copiousness, is better fitted for a monograph. On this period of patristical eloquence much remains to be written. There are good things in Fénélon, Maury, Gisbert, Theremin, and above all in Villemain; but we have reason to long for a work of research and taste, which shall present the modern and English reader with adequate specimens and a complete history and criticism of the great pulpit orators of the Greek and Latin Churches.

Pursuing our ramble among old Churches, we leap without further apology into the middle age, in order to say that in this period, about which there is so much dispute and so little knowledge, preaching could not but suffer a great decadence,

* Serm. ccxcix.

when sound letters and taste fell as low as religion. When every other description of oratory became corrupt, it is not to be expected that sacred eloquence should abide in strength. Among the Greeks, it sank under the influence of superstition, frigid rhetoric, tinsel, and bombast. In the Latin Church, plagiarists and abridgers took the place of genuine preachers. The method of postillating came in; that is, of uttering a short and jejune discourse after the lesson; *post illa* (sc. *verba Domini*) hence the name *postill*. The diction and style of Latin preaching decayed with the general language. Preaching in the vernacular was not unknown in the West, but grew less and less impressive. At times of great popular excitement, when crowds were flocking after crusading captains, or trembling before the invading Turk, there were vehemently passionate harangues, and we have instances of street and field-preaching. What great revivals are with us, were those simultaneous awakenings of religious emotion which sometimes stirred the entire population of large districts. These engendered a sort of eloquence which in degree was high enough, but of which few records appear in our books of history. Among the most extraordinary actors in these moving dramas were the *Flagellantes*, *Geisseler*, or Whippers, of the fourteenth century. We find an account of the entrance of these penitentiary fanatics into Strasburg, in the year 1349. The universal panic in expectation of invasion, and even of the judgment-day, prepared the people for singular impressions. About two hundred entered the city, in solemn procession, singing those ghastly hymns which were chief instruments of their work. Their flaunting banners were of the costliest silk and satin. They carried lighted tapers, and all the bells of the country sounded at their approach. Their mantles and cowls bore red crosses, and as they chanted together, they would sometimes kneel and sometimes prostrate themselves. Multitudes joined themselves to their number, for purposes of penance, and subjected themselves to the fearful lacerations of self-flagellation, from which the order took its name. The discourses delivered by these sombre itinerants were in every way fitted to harrow up the consciences, and beget the religious fears in which middle-age popery had delighted.

Every reader of Church history is familiar with the preaching friars, as they were called. The same enthusiasm, and the same successes, attended their progress from land to land. That branch of the Franciscan Minorites, called the Capuchins, is well known, even in our day, to every traveller in Europe. The bare head, filthy robe, and tangled beard, occur in many a picture. The cant of these holy beggars has received the distinctive title of *capucinade*, a vulgar but impressive sort of preaching, which was found very serviceable to the Church of Rome. In the *Lager* of Wallenstein, the most comic and at the same time the most Shakspearian of Schiller's production, the camp-sermon of the Capuchin is one of the most felicitous parts. It was, evidently, in the mind of Scott, when he depicted, in exaggerated burlesque, the fanatic preacher of the Covenant in Old Mortality. As to preaching before the Reformation, it needs scarcely be repeated here, that as a part of regular religious worship in churches, it had fallen very much into desuetude. The great preachers of Popery were raised up as the result of a re-action against Protestant reform.

The modern pulpit really dates from the Reformation. With few exceptions the Reformers were mighty preachers, and some of them wielded an influence in this way which far surpassed all their efforts with the pen, and was felt over half Europe. In the British isles the power of the Word was particularly felt. Cranmer, Latimer, and Jewell, in their several varieties of eloquence, awakened an interest in the new doctrines which nothing was able to allay. The fearless tongue of John Knox, even against princes, has been noted as fully by foes as friends. In the recorded specimens of his sermons, if we translate them out of the atrocious Scotch spelling, and the fetters of the uncouthest dialect ever pronounced, there are apparent both power and elegance. From that day to this, the Presbyterians of Scotland have been, above all people, lovers of the preached Word.

Some of the more prominent characteristics of the Scottish pulpit are familiarly known. It was at once expository, doctrinal, methodical, and impassioned. For ages it was without book, as it still is in a great degree; for the country parishes retain all their ancient contempt for the "paper-minister;"

notwithstanding the eloquent examples of reading by such men as Chalmers, Irving, Candlish, and Hamilton. The citation of Scripture passages, and the custom of "turning up" the same in the little Bible of the hearer, have given a peculiarly textual character to Scottish sermons. The great stress laid upon strong and tender emotion at the Lord's table, the meeting of several ministers and multitudes of people on sacramental occasions, and the continuance of these services during several days, have contributed to an unction and pathos which have been extended to our own churches, among the purer settlements of strict Presbyterians. The power of the pulpit has, therefore, been nowhere more manifest. No public authority has ever availed to silence this mode of popular agitation and rebuke.

In the sermons of the Scottish Church two very unlike tendencies are clearly distinguishable; one is the fondness for scholastic method and minute subdivision, derived from the dialectical turn of the people, and the familiarity of the preachers with the severe manuals of Calvinistic theology; the other is the disposition to give outlet to high religious feeling. In some portions of the Kirk both have been active throughout the entire period; there have been manifest the acumen and ratiocinative precision, as well as what Buchanan calls the *ingenium perfervidum Scotorum*. This has been diversified by the constant practice of lecturing in the forenoon service, which has maintained expository preaching for three hundred years, and done much to mould the religious temper of the nation. There was indeed a period in the eighteenth century, when the chill of Moderatism fell upon public discourses, in a part of the Church, producing the tame literary elegance of Robertson and Blair. But the same age produced the Erskines of the Secession, in one school of homiletics, and Walker and Witherspoon in another. The Ecclesiastical Characteristics and the Corporation of Servants, did much to stigmatize the unfaithfulness of the frigid preachers, and even to open the way for those triumphs of principle which have since resulted in the strength and fervour of the Free Church. It would carry us beyond all due limits to enlarge on the new modes of pulpit discourse which have owed their origin to the brilliant but some-

times misleading example of Chalmers and his imitators. This great preacher, admirable as he appears in his printed works, can never be fully comprehended by those who never heard him. The cool reader has time to pause over solecisms of language and excesses of amplification, which were put utterly beyond the hearer's sense by the thunder of his delivery. When Dr. John M. Mason, on his return from Scotland, was asked wherein lay Chalmers's great strength, he replied, "It is his blood-earnestness."

The free course of our remarks has led us somewhat further than we intended, and we must go back to gather up a few observations respecting the English pulpit, more, however, in the way of desultory observation than of historical detail. From the very beginning of Reformation times, the pulpit has been a potent engine of popular impression in England. Indeed, we suppose that at no time has preaching been more powerful in its influence on the people, than before the rise of those corruptions which rent the Anglican Church, and drew off some of its greatest minds to the side of Puritanism. When this rupture took place, it is just to say, that in many of the greatest qualities of preaching, the true succession was in the line of non-conformity. But it is impossible to ignore the fact, that in some important attributes, the Anglican pulpit is the greatest of which the press has given any record. As the movement-party was characterized by great warmth, extemporaneous flow, and assault on the religious passions, it became at once a necessity and a fashion for churchmen to cultivate a species of discourse which was more learned, more accurate, and more sedate. We do not mean to admit the force of the vulgar taunt, that the Puritans, as a body, were deficient in learning. The first generations of Dissenters numbered among them some of the most profound scholars in the Christian world. Yet, as the lines diverged, and the Nonconformists were excluded from the great seats of learning and all the emoluments of the Church, the difference in this particular became more marked; and, notwithstanding some brilliant exceptions, it must be acknowledged, that in point of erudition and elegant letters, the dissenting ministers of England, as a body, are inferior to the established clergy. The latter, indeed, vaunted

of this difference much beyond any substantial ground, and sometimes made the pulpit a place for dogmatic discussion and patristic lore, to a degree which was unseasonable and offensive. In its more favourable manifestations, the learning of the Anglican Church has been nobly brought out in defence of the truth; especially against the freethinkers, the Unitarians and the Papists. A body of divinity might be compiled solely from the sermons of great English divines; a library might be filled with the elaborate dissertations which they have preached.

No one could reasonably expect us, in an article of such limits and character as this, to recite the splendid roll of English preachers; but there are a few whom we would earnestly commend to the notice of every theological student. Omitting entirely the great names which occur in an earlier period, it is important to mention the four bright luminaries, Barrow, Taylor, South, and Tillotson, each so unrivalled in his way, and all so unlike. Barrow was an extraordinary man, as a traveller, a philologist, a mathematician, and a divine. He read Chrysostom at Constantinople before he was made Greek professor at Cambridge. He was predecessor of Sir Isaac Newton in the mathematical chair. Both pursuits tended to make him the eloquent reasoner. It was the age of long periodic sentences, such as appal modern lungs, and Barrow knew how to give a sonorous swell and climacteric advance to his Demosthenic passages. Many is the period in his pages, which for matter might fit out the whole fifteen minutes' sermon of a dapper Oxonian of our times. He abounds in high argument, which is more inflamed by passion than coloured by decoration. His noblest passages leave us thrilling with his passion, rather than captivated by his imagination. He is sometimes too abundant, and sometimes unwieldy; but not dull, not weak, not quaint. A ponderous earnestness and a various wealth strike you in every page. With Barrow, multitude of words is never verbosity, and length of discussion is never diffuseness; it is massive strength without brevity. Hence, we do not wonder that the great Chatham should have taken him as a model, reading over some of his sermons as much as twenty times. "In his sermons," says Mr. Granger, "he knew not how to leave off writing, till he had exhausted his subject; and his ad-

mirable discourse on the duty and reward of bounty to the poor took him up three hours and a half in preaching." His bust in Westminster Abbey will be fresh in the recollection of all clerical travellers.

How abrupt is the transition to the "Shakspeare of the pulpit!" Bishop Taylor, in his own manner, has had a few imitators, but never a competitor. If we except the great dramatist, no man can be named in any department of literature, who stands more clearly alone. Never were there sermons, we suppose, which purely for intellectual pleasure have been read with such satisfaction. In everything but the outward guise, they are often the highest poetry. Imagination has no flights more lofty and adventurous, than many which have been quoted again and again. He soars in a grand similitude, with a boldness of preparation and a sustaining power of wing, and then descends to the earth with a graceful undulation and gentle subsidence, which are absolutely without a parallel. The voluptuous melody of the rythm gives a charm to his diction. Interwoven with these brilliant strands of fancy, there is often a subtle thread of argumentation which wins your assent before you are aware; often, unfortunately, to worse than semi-pelagian laxity; for Taylor was very remote from the orthodoxy of his day. Along with all this, there is poured out upon us a profusion of learning as from a golden horn of plenty. No preacher of our day would venture to quote as much Greek, during his whole life, as Jeremy Taylor sometimes brings out in a single sermon. But the reminiscences and allusions of classic learning spin from him spontaneously in every paragraph. While his invective is sometimes of a scalding heat, he is often tender and pathetic; and there is a scholarly negligence in the style which charms while it baffles all attempts at imitation. It must now be admitted that with all these claims to our wonder, Taylor seldom makes prominent the peculiarly gracious doctrines of the evangelical system. There is a saintly calm about his ethics, which reminds us of the purer class of Romish preachers, but the ascetic directions and the exaltation of human merit belong to the blemishes of the same school. The amplitude of his comparisons, sometimes conducted with a sameness of display which runs into mannerism, did not escape

the censure even of his contemporaries, and was plainly struck at by the following sentences of the austere and caustic South: "Nothing here [namely in Paul's preaching] of the 'fringes of the north-star;' nothing of 'Nature's becoming unnatural;' nothing of the 'down of angel's wings,' or the 'beautiful locks of cherubims:' no starched similitudes, introduced with a '*Thus have I* seen a cloud rolling in its airy mansion, and the like.' "*

But a single perusal of any one of those beautiful passages, of which the above is so clever, and so cruel a travesty, will instantly obliterate the criticism from the mind of any tasteful reader. Though it would end in ludicrous disaster for any one now to try to preach like Jeremy Taylor, we are persuaded that the study of his works would be an excellent regimen for young clergymen, especially for such as labour under the diseases of coldness and lethargy. It would at least stimulate them to warmer effusions, and would show them that logic and immensely fertile learning are compatible with a flow of elegance and an exuberant illustration, such as we commonly seek only in verse.

We speak of the "witty South," as familiarly as of the "judicious Hooker," and with less fear of any exception. But we despise the man, while we admire the genius. South was a veritable Vicar of Bray, trimming his sails to every gust of

* Compare the famous passage from Taylor: "For so have I seen a lark rising from his bed of grass, and soaring upwards, singing as he rises, and hopes to get to heaven, and climb above the clouds; but the poor bird was beaten back with the loud sighings of an eastern wind, and his motion made irregular and inconstant, descending more at every breath of the tempest, than it could recover by the libration and frequent weighing of his wings; till the little creature was forced to sit down and pant, and stay till the storm was over; and then it made a prosperous flight, and did rise and sing, as if it had learned music and motion from an angel, as he passed sometimes through the air, about his ministeries here below: so is the prayer of a good man; when his affairs have required business, and his business was matter of discipline, and his discipline was to pass upon a sinning person, or had a design of charity, his duty met with infirmities of a man, and anger was its instrument, and the instrument became stronger than the prime agent, and raised a tempest, and overruled the man; and then his prayer was broken, and his thoughts were troubled, and his words went up towards a cloud, and his thoughts pulled them back again, and made them without intention; and the good man sighs for his infirmity, but must be content to lose the prayer, and he must recover it when his anger is removed, and his spirit is becalmed, made even as the brow of Jesus, and smooth like the heart of God; and then it ascends to heaven upon the wings of the holy dove, and dwells with God, till it returns, like the useful bee, loaded with a blessing and the dew of heaven."

popular or royal favour. It is amusing to find this scourge of dissent beginning his career at Oxford, with a paper of Latin verse in eulogy of Cromwell. He afterwards had rich livings and stalls and high diplomatic places. When it was no longer profitable to truckle to the Stuarts, he took the oath of allegiance to William and Mary.

We are now fairly beyond the region of fancy, pathos, or eloquence, in its ordinary sense. South is clear, strong, saturnine, and truculent. He is a cogent reasoner, always observing an exact method, and establishing his point by the most effective reasoning. He seldom quotes, never displays his reading, and always advances with directness, brevity, and a sort of bull-dog fierceness to his purposed end. Where his terrible prejudices do not come into play, he commands our highest respect, as in some of his masterly arguments for divine predestination; but in other places he bends his tremendous powers against the other doctrines of grace. It would be difficult to find in any language such insufferable rebukes of worldly indulgence, as in certain sermons of South. But his dark and bitter sarcasm is chiefly expended on the Puritans; and he leaves any subject to deal a blow at these enemies, when no longer in power. It is difficult to speak of his style without danger of exaggeration. It combines some of the highest excellencies of human language. Being always sourly in earnest, he never makes ornament or elegance an object of study, though he often attains them. Rotundity and periodicity in sentences are not sought. But he is perpetually clear, energetic, vivacious, and memorable. He strikes us as far before his age in English writing, as having by the prerogative of genius seized upon the imperishable part of the language, and as having attained the excellencies of such prose as that of Pope and Warburton. The antithetic character prevails throughout, and this always ensures brevity, and gives opportunity for that tremendous sting which makes the end of many a paragraph like the tail of a scorpion. This venom is for the most part distilled on the Non-conformists. A few quotations will not only exemplify his manner, but illustrate the homiletics of that day, by showing what were the charges brought against the Puritan pulpit. Speaking of falsehood, he says: "But to pass from that to fanatic treachery,

that is, from one twin to the other: how came such multitudes of our own nation, at the beginning of that monstrous rebellion, to be spunged of their plate and money, their rings and jewels, for the carrying on of the schismatical, dissenting, king-killing cause? Why, next to their own love of being cheated, it was the public, or rather prostitute faith of a company of faithless miscreants that drew them in and deceived them. And how came so many thousands to fight and die in the same rebellion? Why, they were deceived into it by those spiritual trumpeters who followed them with continual alarms of damnation, if they did not venture life, fortune, and all, in that which wickedly and devilishly those impostors called the *cause of God.*" In his two sermons "against long extemporary prayer," he thus distils his gall: "Two whole hours for one prayer, at a fast, used to be reckoned but a moderate dose; and that for the most part fraught with such irreverent, blasphemous expressions, that to repeat them would profane the place I am speaking in; and indeed they seldom 'carried on the work of such a day,' as their phrase was, but they left the church in need of a new consecration. Add to this, the incoherence and confusion, the endless repetitions, and the insufferable nonsense that never failed to hold out, even with their utmost prolixity; so that in all their long fasts, from first to last, from seven in the morning to seven in the evening, which was their measure, the pulpit was ever the emptiest thing in the church; and I never knew such a fast kept by them, but their hearers had cause to begin a thanksgiving as soon as they were done." "The consciences of men," he says again, "have been filled with wind and noise, empty notions and pulpit-tattle. So that amongst the most seraphical *illuminati*, and the highest Puritan perfectionists, you shall find people of fifty, three-score and four-score years old, not able to give that account of their faith, which you might have had heretofore of a boy of nine or ten. Thus far had the pulpit (by accident) disordered the church, and the desk must restore it. For you know the main business of the pulpit, in the late times, was to please and pamper a proud, senseless humour, or rather a kind of spiritual itch, which had then seized the greatest part of the nation, and worked chiefly about their ears; and none were so overrun

with it, as the holy sisterhood, the daughters of Zion, and the matrons of the New Jerusalem, as they called themselves. These brought with them ignorance and itching ears in abundance; and Holderforth equalled them in one, and gratified them in the other. So that whatsoever the doctrine was, the application still ran on the surest side; for to give those doctrine and use-men, those pulpit-engineers, their due, they understood how to plant their batteries, and to make their attacks perfectly well; and knew that by pleasing the wife, they should not fail to preach the husband in their pocket." Our own day might learn a lesson from the fling at the prophetic preachers, who interpreted Scripture, "as if, forsooth, there could not be so much as a few houses fired, a few ships taken, or any other calamity befall this little corner of the world, but that some apocalyptic ignoramus or other must presently find and pick it out of some abused martyred prophecy of Ezekiel, Daniel, or the Revelation." It was South, who, in a sermon, said of Milton, "as the Latin advocate, who, *like a blind adder*, has spit so much poison upon the king's person;" and who says of the opposition to liturgies: "I question not, but that fanatic fury was then at that height, that they would have even laughed at Christ himself in his devotions, *had he but used his own prayer.*" But one grows weary of malice, however, epigrammatic. When the same edge is turned against prevailing sins, especially among courtiers, it does great execution. We would send no man to South, for gentle, persuasive, melting, spiritual instruction; but the scholar may gain from him many lessons of dialectic force, of directness and pungency, of earnest, indignant invective, and of pithy, apothegmatic declamation. The vice of his method is indicated by one of his own sayings: "That is not wit, which comporteth not with wisdom."

It is refreshing to turn from such a malignant, to the sweet and gentle Tillotson. The good archbishop's father was a Yorkshire clothier, a stern Calvinist; perhaps this may account for the son's mildness towards dissent. But in Kneller's great portrait at Lambeth, we discern the unmistakable lineaments of holy peace, joined with everything that a wise churchman might wish in the personal presence of a primate. In this,

though for other reasons we might compare the picture with that of Bossuet, which ennobles the gallery of his native Dijon. Burnet testifies of Tillotson, after long acquaintance, that "he had a clear head, with a most tender and compassionate heart; he was a faithful and zealous friend, but a gentle and soon conquered enemy; his notions of morality were fine and sublime, his thread of reasoning was easy, clear, and solid; he was not only the best preacher of the age, but seemed to have brought preaching to perfection; his sermons were so well liked, that all the nation proposed him as a pattern, and studied to copy after him." Such was the judgment of contemporaries. After his death, there was found a bundle of bitter libels, which had been published against him, preserved and endorsed with his own hand as follows: "I forgive the authors of these books, and pray God that he may also forgive them." When the Huguenot Refugees sought the prayers of the Church, Beveridge, with genuine Episcopalian etiquette, scrupled to read a brief to this effect, in Canterbury Cathedral, because it was against some rubric. "Doctor, doctor," replied the wiser, greater Tillotson, "Charity is above rubrics." We are not to suppose, however, because the archbishop was good and gentle, that he was either feeble in argument or tame in controversy. Against both infidels and papists, his sermons afford some of the most powerful apologetic treatises which have ever been composed. His argument on Transubstantiation would singly be sufficient to make the fortune of a common disputant. Vulgar minds so commonly think that what is very clear must be very shallow, that reasoners of great simplicity and perspicuity are in danger of losing credit; and such we believe has been the case with Tillotson, in our day. He was so little offensive to Dissenters, being indeed the friend of John Howe, that his works would have been widely read and long preserved in our churches, if the stature of his theology had not fallen far below the mark which Evangelical Calvinism fixes as a standard. But there is a boundless store of wealth, in all those discourses which treat of Natural Religion, the difficulties of infidelity, the absurdities of Popery, and the neglected circle of Christian duties. The style of Tillotson is graceefully negligent, sometimes even flat, but generally agreeable, invariably

perspicuous, and at times eminently happy from his idiomatic English; it is well known that Addison took him as a model. For studied ornament, and the glow of oratorical passion, he will never be quoted; but a better model of didactic or practical discourse, could scarcely be chosen.

If our object had been to go fully into the history of the Anglican pulpit, we should have inserted many other names; but then we should have written a volume. Among these we should have found a place for Atterbury, a man of worldly character but great force, and often superior to Tillotson in the elaborate graces and warmth of oratory. We could not have omitted Bull, and Waterland, whose learned and profound vindication of Athanasian truth will abide as a venerable and unequalled monument, as long as our language shall be the vehicle of sound theology; Samuel Clarke, the friend and interpreter of Newton; Secker and Ogden, smooth, judicious and instructive sermonizers; Bentley, Butler, Warburton, and Horsley, giants in theological conflict. But these and many others must be left unrecorded. The perusal of all will only serve to evince more fully the justice of our statement, that the predominant quality of the Anglican pulpit, has been learned and extensive instruction. A manner corresponding to this has prevailed even till our day. Sermons have been read from the manuscript, with little elevation of voice, little action of body, and no fervour of delivery. As the liturgy has become the crowning part of public services, the sermon has become more attenuated in matter and curtailed in length; until in many a fashionable church and chapel, there is a cold essay of fifteen minutes. The mode just now is to cultivate what is called a "quiet manner;" by which is meant a *nonchalant* utterance, such as may persuade the hearer that preaching after all is almost a work of supererogation. There have indeed been Simeons, Melvilles, and McNeiles; but these are *raræ aves* in the Anglican flock. Though a Scotchman, Blair was in all respects a sermonizer after the English heart, and his discourses had immense currency south of the Tweed. No manly critic can read without contempt his pretended survey of the British pulpit, in his Lectures. Amply has the truth been avenged by John Foster's strictures on the once famous sermons of

Blair himself. "After reading five or six sermons," says Foster, "we become assured that we must perfectly see the whole compass of his powers, and that, if there were twenty volumes, we might read on through the whole, without once coming to a broad conception, or a profound investigation, or a burst of genuine enthusiasm. A reflective reader will perceive his mind fixed in a wonderful sameness of feeling throughout a whole volume; it is hardly relieved a moment, by surprise, delight, or labour, and at length becomes very tiresome; perhaps a little analogous to the sensations of a Hindoo while fulfilling his vow, to remain in one certain posture for a month. A sedate formality of manner is invariably kept up through a thousand pages, without the smallest danger of once luxuriating into a beautiful irregularity. A great many people of gayety, rank, and fashion, have occasionally a feeling that a little easy quantity of religion would be a good thing; because it is too true, after all, that we cannot be staying in this world always, and when one gets out of it, why, there may be some hardish matters to settle in the other place. The Prayer-book of a Sunday is a good deal to be sure toward making all safe, but then it is really so tiresome; for penance, it is very well, but to say one likes it, one cannot for the life of one. If there were some tolerable religious things that one could read now and then without trouble, and think it about half as pleasant as a game of cards, it would be comfortable. One should not be so frightened about what we must all come to some time. Now nothing could have been more to the purpose than these sermons; they were welcomed as the very thing. They were unquestionably about religion, and grave enough in all conscience, yet they were elegant; they were so easy to comprehend throughout, that the mind was never detained a moment to think; they were undefiled by Methodism; they but little obtruded peculiar doctrinal notions; they applied very much to high life, and the author was evidently a gentleman; the book could be discussed as a matter of taste, and its being seen in the parlour excited no surmise that any one in the house had lately been converted. Above all, it was most perfectly free from that disagreeable and mischievous property attributed to the eloquence of Pericles, that it 'left stings behind.'"

If we retrace our steps to the last point of departure, in order to consider the preaching of the Nonconformists, we shall find abundant cause to believe, that even after being politically defeated and overthrown at the Restoration, they continued to possess learning, eloquence, and piety, such as were worthy of that great Church of England, of which they were really though not nominally a part. It is somewhat remarkable, that notwithstanding the extraordinary theological interest which characterized the Puritans, and the voluminous works which proceeded from their great men, these less frequently took the precise form of sermons, than was the case with their churchly oppressors. Most of them, it is true, left numerous sermons, but the great mass of their religious writings were given to the public in the shape of treatises and protracted works. This did not certainly arise from any undervaluing of the pulpit; indeed, an over-estimate of this instrument was universally laid to their charge; they preached more frequently, more fervently, and at greater length, than the beneficed divines, and these exercises were attended by greater throngs of animated hearers. But the sermon, as a species of literary creation, was less an object of separate regard. They were more accustomed to the effusion of thought and feeling in language suggested at the moment of delivery; and even when they studied for successive months and years on particular books of Scripture, or heads of theology, and preached constantly on the same, the utterances of the church were not identical with the labours of the study, and the latter continued to retain that form which we now observe in their published works. Of some great treatises we know assuredly, and of others we have the strongest presumption, that they contain the substance of a series of pulpit discourses. This we suppose may be affirmed concerning the greatest works of the most eminent Puritan divines. We need scarcely add, that they had among them some of the mightiest preachers whom the Church has ever seen. Whether we judge by extant remains, or by the testimony of coevals, Richard Baxter was one of these. In our judgment, the English language was never more dexterously wielded by any writer. The thing most observable is, that it is the language of the common people, that which does not

grow obsolete, that which is racy with idiomatic anomaly, that which obeys every impulse of the heaving mind, that which goes direct to the heart. His perspicuity is absolutely cloudless. When he chooses to inveigh against sin, or to thunder from the legal mount, or to depict the doom of sinners, or to awaken the slumbering sinner, he is terrific and irresistible. In graceful description he paints without a superior. And for melting pathos, such as soothes the soul and opens the hidden spring of tears, what can be compared to some passages of the Saint's Rest? Baxter was often betrayed by his native subtlety and his familiarity with the schoolmen, into an intricacy of excessive distinctions which mars all the beauties of his style; and though this occurs more in his controversies than his pulpit labours, we should never think of setting up his sermons as the greatest of his works. The eminent piety which breathes through his practical writings makes him a model for the preacher and pastor of every subsequent age.

The number of distinguished Puritan preachers is so great that we should not dare to attempt enumeration; and if we used selection, we should name those who are familiar to our readers. Of Owen and his works, we have lately written, at some length, in a separate article. In connection with the argumentative force and profound experience of this greatest of the Puritans, the student of theology will remember the silver current and figured diction of Bates; the sweet and simple eloquence of Flavel; the sententious brilliancy of Charnock, like the iridescence of crystals on the surface of a massive rock; and perhaps, above them all, the majestic strength of Howe, a grave and stately bearing of mind, which looks down on the quaint antitheses and foreign images of his contemporaries. In John Howe we meet a writer who seems entirely free from the vicious passions of his day, in thought and language. He even shuns the conventional phrases of the Calvinistic schools, while he teaches their theology. But he was a great Christian philosopher, imbued with the choicest literature of the ancients, and trained by long meditation to expatiate in tracts of spiritual truth, where superficial minds will never follow him. His manner is said to have been in a high degree engaging and impressive. If any one will collate his sermon on the "Vanity of

Man as mortal," with the famous discourse on the same topic by Robert Hall, who profoundly admired him, he will find the germs of the latter in the former; yet, in everything but the exquisite finish of Hall's style, we think the palm must be given to the older divine.

The succeeding generations certainly manifest a decline in regard to the annals of the dissenting pulpit. Even before we come down to the latter half of the eighteenth century, and leaving entirely out of view the lamentable defection from the faith of many Independents, and of most called Presbyterians, it must be admitted that the age of great English preachers was past. That title we unhesitatingly give to Watts and Doddridge. Both, in our opinion, have undeservedly fallen into the shade. For fertility, facility, graceful fluency of thought, charms of illustration, and delightful variety, we know none who excels Watts, in any period. His theological whimsies are well known, and he is not what we denominate a great doctrinal preacher; but the warmth of love, and the play of sanctified imagination, give a stamp to most of his sermons which we would gladly recall to the notice of the younger ministry. Doddridge was a safer and a graver mind, and, according to all canons, a better builder of sermons. Some of his discourses come near being master-pieces; they instruct the mind and elevate the heart; those addressed to youth, and those on Regeneration, have been reprinted again and again, and have won the admiration even of severe judges. They labour sometimes under a fault of style belonging to a particular school of Dissenters at that period, and which, for lack of a better phrase, we may call a sort of genteel affectionateness, or a tenderness of endearing blandishment; but this is forgotten amidst the great amount of saving truth, expressed in language which is always clear and pleasing. It does not fall within our plan to enumerate the celebrated dissenting preachers of a later day and of our own times.

To those who have a facility in the language, we commend the careful study of the French pulpit; for to speak of preaching, and not to name the times of Louis the Fourteenth, would be like discoursing of sculpture without allusion to the age of Pericles. Considered as a product of literary art, the sermon

never attained such completeness, beauty, and honour, as at this period. Our remark must not be taken apart from our limitations. We do not say it was most apostolic, most scriptural, or most fitted to reach the great spiritual end of preaching; the results show that such was not the fact. But viewed in relation to letters, logic, and eloquence, as a structure of genius and taste, the French sermon, in the hands of its great orators, had a rhetorical perfection as distinctly marked as the Greek drama. We are constrained to look upon it in much the same light. The plays of Corneille and the victories of Turenne were not more powerful in penetrating the public mind, than the oratory of Notre Dame. Rank and fashion, including royalty itself, thronged the church, as if it were a theatre, wondering and weeping. Madame de Sevigné, the best painter of her age, speaks of a *belle passion*, as the Good Friday sermon was called, just as she speaks of the Cid. The greatest scholars and critics of the Augustan era of France, saw their ideal of faultless composition realized in the pulpit. The culmination of the art was rapid, and the decline soon followed. No one will claim more than a few names for the catalogue of masterly French preachers; Bourdaloue, Bossuet, Fenelon, Massillon, Fléchier. Many who had a temporary vogue in their day, have been forgotten; but these sustain the ordeal of time. We shall offer a few remarks on some of them, but chiefly on the unapproachable triumvirate.

To Bourdaloue is unhesitatingly given the honour of having raised the French pulpit at once to its greatest height. The judgment of our day is coming more and more to acquiesce in the decision which ranks him clearly first. We may see in La Bruyère how degenerate preaching had become before his day. It was florid, quaint, affected, perplexed with divisions, and overlaid with impertinent learning. He restored it to reason and to nature. No misapprehension can be greater than that which imagines Bourdaloue to have been a man of show, a gaudy rhetorician, or a declaimer. He was, of course, a strenuous Papist, he was even a Jesuit; but assuming his Church to be right, there never was a more unanswerable reasoner in her behalf. It is reasoning, above all things else, which is his characteristic. Seldom does he utter even a few sentences,

without a connected argument. The amount of matter in his discourses, which are sometimes very long, is truly wonderful. His power of condensation, his exactness of method, his singular clearness, and his animated force, enable him to throw an elaborate argument into a single head. The glory of his art is his magical ability to clothe the subtlest reasoning, in diction so beautiful, as to captivate even the unthinking. In our view, his sermons are a study for the young logician. Even when he is defending the extremest errors of Rome, as in his discourse on the saving merit of alms, we feel that we are in the hands of a terrible antagonist. Amidst passages of incomparable fire he seems constrained to indulge his propensity for laying a train of proofs. Thus in his passion-sermon, on the power of the cross, he inserts in the first and greatest part, a series of admirable arguments for the truth of Christianity.

In some points which concern the outward form of the discourse, Bourdaloue left much to be reformed by his great successors. His divisions are bold and numerous, and are stated not only with openness, but with a repetition which we have seen nowhere else. So far from hiding the articulations of his work, he is anxious that they should be observed and never forgotten; but he so varies the formulas of partition, and so beautifies the statement of transitions, by ingenious turns, that the mind is gratified by the exquisiteness of the expression. It had been the fashion to quote the Fathers very largely. Bourdaloue retains this practice. He even seems to wish that his whole performance should rest on citations; and some of them look like centos from Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, and Gregory. But his management of this is graceful and masterly. And it is entertaining to observe with how rich and eloquent an amplification he will paraphrase and apply one of these little Latin sentences, often bringing it in again and again to close some striking period, and making it ring on the ear with happy vehemence at the climax of a paragraph.

If the observation be modified by our protest against the enormities of Popish falsehood, we are willing to say that Bourdaloue was eminently a spiritual, warm, and edifying preacher. Upon the sufferings of Christ, the love of God, the vanity of the world, and the delights of heavenly contempla-

tion, he speaks with a solemnity and an unction, which explain to us the admiration felt for him by Boileau and other Jansenists. The manner in which Bourdaloue pronounced his discourses must have had a power of incantation to which even their greatness as compositions gives us no key. It was his remarkable custom to deliver his sermons with his eyes closed; and he is so represented in his portrait. On coming from the provinces, to preach in the Jesuit Chapel at Paris, he was at once followed by crowds of the highest distinction; and his popularity increased to the very close. For thirty-four years he was equally admired by the court, by men of letters, and by the people. To the Christian visitor in Paris, there is something solemn in the church of St. Paul and St. Louis, to approach the tablet with the simple inscription, HIC JACET BOURDALOUE.

Bossuet was a greater man, but not a greater preacher, than his eloquent contemporary. The reputation derived from his vast learning, his controversial ability, his knowledge of affairs and his strength of will, we very naturally transfer to his preaching, which was nevertheless of consummate excellence. As an author, especially as a master of style, he surpasses them all, if indeed he does not surpass all who ever wrote in French. The power of that somewhat intractable language was never more fully brought out than by Bossuet, to whom the crown of eloquence is therefore given by Voltaire. He was the orator for courts, and we suppose no prince in ancient or modern times, ever had a nobler panegyrist. To learn his argumentative eloquence, we must look to his other works; but in his celebrated Funeral Orations, we have unequalled examples of sublime and original conceptions, arrayed in a diction majestically simple and yet triumphantly splendid. The term which characterizes the discourses of Bossuet, is magnificence. We believe it to be admitted by French critics, that his style is as faultless as that of any writer in any tongue.

There are those who consider Massillon the greatest of French preachers; and the award is just, if we confine our regards to simple elegance of style, traits of nature, strokes of pathos, perfect contexture of the entire performance, and irresistible command of assemblies, and in elocution. Being thirty

years younger than the men we just named, he represents a different school, but it is one which he founded himself. When father Latour, on his arrival at the capital, asked him what he thought of the great orators, he replied, "I find them possessed of genius and great talent; but if I preach, I will not preach like them." Great clearness of thought, perfect sobriety of judgment, profound knowledge of the human heart and of manners, a fund of tender emotion, novelty of illustration, copiousness of language, perspicuous method, and unerring taste, are the characteristics of Massillon. He simplified the divisions of the sermon, and reduced its length, conforming the whole treatment to the most classic models. He is sparing in his citations and unobtrusive in his array of argument. Beyond all competitors, he dissects the heart, reveals the inmost windings of motive, and awakens the emotions of terror, remorse, and pity. In the ethical field, he excels in depicting vice and awakening conscience, in pursuing pride, avarice and self-love to their retreats, and in exposing and stigmatizing the follies of the great. When the aged Bourdaloue heard him, he pointed him out as he descended from the pulpit, saying, "Hunc oportet crescere, me autem minui." Baron, the great actor, said of him to a companion, "My friend, here is an orator; as for us, we are but actors." Whole assemblies were dissolved in tears, or started to their feet in consternation. When he preached the funeral sermon of the King, on the words, "Lo, I have become great;" he commenced by repeating them slowly, as if to recollect himself; then he fixed his eyes on the assembly in mourning; next he surveyed the funeral enclosure, with all its sombre pomp; and lastly, turning his eyes on the mausoleum erected in the midst of the cathedral—after some moments of silence exclaimed, *Dieu seul est grand, mes frères.* "My brethren, God alone is great!" The immense assembly was breathless and awestruck. Voltaire always had on his table the *Petit-Carême* of Massillon, which he regarded as the best model of French prose.

There are discourses of Massillon, which, with the omission of the *Ave Maria*, and a few superficial forms, might be delivered to any Protestant assembly. The union of simple elegance and strong passion has given his sermons a formative influence

in every language of Europe; and they stand at the head of what may be called the modern school of preaching.

Space would fail us, if we were to enlarge upon Fenelon, Fléchier, Bridaine, and other pulpit orators of less note. Chastely beautiful as is the style of Archbishop Fenelon, it is not exactly that which belongs to eloquence. The saintly gentleness of his temper, as well as the doctrines of Quietism which he had embraced, were not the best preparations for passionate oratory. Among his numerous and often delightful works, the number of sermons is not very large. One reason of this may be, that he favoured the extemporaneous method, of which, in his Dialogue on Eloquence, he is the ablest vindicator. There is a sermon of Fenelon's on Foreign Missions, which is full of fine thoughts, and worthy of examination.

The Protestant Churches of France, and of the Refugees, produced some great preachers, of whom the most famous are Claude and Saurin. For solid doctrinal discussion, elaborated into the form of eloquent discourse, the preacher last named continues to be admired. In our own day, there has been a revival of Protestant eloquence, in such men as Vinet, Grandpierre, and Adolphe Monod; and Parisian crowds still follow Lacordaire, Ravignan, Felix, and de Courtier.

The subject has grown upon our hands, and must be dismissed, though we leave untouched the preaching of Germany and Holland, of the contemporary Churches of Great Britain, and the inviting field of the American pulpit.

An enterprising publisher might benefit himself and the Church by issuing, under wise direction, a few volumes of sermons, which should contain none but master-pieces. There are a few such, in each period, which stand out with great prominence, as exhibiting the highest characteristics of their respective authors. In such a selection would be found Bourdaloue's Passion Sermon; Bossuet's Funeral Oration on Turenne; Massillon on the Small Number of the Elect; Barrow's discourse on the Death of Christ; Jeremy Taylor's Marriage Ring; Maclaurin's Glorying in the Cross; Edwards on "Their feet shall slide in due time;" Davies's Bruised Reed; Mason's Gospel to the Poor; Hall's Modern Infidelity; Chalmers's Expulsive Power of a New Affection; and Monod's "God is Love;"

with others, perhaps as worthy, which need not now burden our pages. It has sometimes been made a question how far it is desirable for a preacher to collect and study the written labours of others. There is a use, or rather an abuse, of other men's compositions, which is slavish and dishonourable. No young man of independent mind and high principle, will go to books for his sermon, or for its method, or for any large continuous portion. There is a tacit covenant between preachers and hearers, in our Church and country, which makes it a deception for any man to preach that which is not original. Pulpit larceny is the most unprofitable of all frauds; it is almost certain of detection, and it leaves a stigma on the fame, even beyond its intrinsic turpitude. But surely, an honest soul may wander among valuables without any necessity of thieving. Some have excluded books of sermons from their libraries, and by a "self-denying ordinance" have abstained from perusing them, lest, forsooth, they should damage their own originality. This is about as wise as if an artist should refrain from looking at the frescoes of the Vatican, and the galleries of Florence, Dresden, and the Louvre. We have seen the works of a Western painter, who is said to have acted on such a maxim; he would see no Rafaelles or Van Dycks, lest he should spoil his native manner. He has certainly succeeded in avoiding all that one beholds in these great masters. But in all labours, to the success of which, judgment, taste, and practice must combine, the highest capacity of production is fostered by studying the works of others; and we see not why this is less true in homiletics than in the arts. If a man may not read good sermons, we suppose he may not hear them. The wise student will, with the utmost avidity, both read and hear all that is accessible, of the greatest achievements in the declaration of God's truth. At the same time, he will sit down to his labours as if he had known no performances but his own. He will borrow no man's plan; he will shun all repositories of skeletons and what are ironically named "Preachers' Helps;" and will be himself, even in his earliest and faintest efforts.

In any retrospect of the work of preaching in successive ages, there is one snare which the young minister of Christ cannot too solicitously avoid; it is that of looking upon the utter-

ances of the pulpit with a mere literary eye, as objects of criticism upon the principles of rhetoric and taste. Extensive scriptural knowledge, solid thought, sound judgment, thorough inward discipline, and bursting spiritual emotions, will frame for themselves as a vehicle such a discourse as shall be truly eloquent. In this way, and in this way only, does a discourse on divine subjects come to be subjected to the rules of art. But no rules of art can ensure a sermon which shall please God; and every rule of art may seem to be observed, while yet the result shall be as "sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal." The best sermons are not those which most approach to classical perfection. As preaching is a universal function of the ministry and intended for the whole race, that property which only one man in a million attains cannot be indispensable to its exercise; yet such a property is eloquence. If we could have revealed to us which were the thousand sermons which had most honoured Christ and most benefited men, we should perhaps find among them not one of those which have been held up as models from the desk of professors. "That is a good sermon," said Matthew Henry, "which does thee good." The greatest effects have been produced, in every age, by discourses which sinned against every precept of the schools. The sermon of John Livingstone at the Kirk of Shotts, which was the means of awakening not less than five hundred persons, was never written at all, and if we may judge by what remains to us of his writings, was in a manner exceedingly rude and homely. Yet it was kindled by the fire of God. The more profoundly we are impressed with the utter inefficacy of all intellectual construction and oratorical polish, and feel our absolute dependence on the Spirit of God in preaching, the more likely shall we be to come before God's waiting people with performances, which, however defective or anomalous, as measured by critical standards, shall answer the great end of preaching, being carried to their result by the irresistible demonstration and persuasion of the Holy Ghost.

ART. IV.—*Scripture Readings on the Book of Genesis.* Being Expositions of the Chapter read on Sunday mornings in the Scottish National Church, Crown Court, Covent Garden. By the Rev. John Cumming, D. D.; author of "Voices of the Night," "Voices of the Day," "Voices of the Dead," etc. etc. London, 1853.

The Church before the Flood. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D., Minister of the Scotch National Church, Crown Court, Covent Garden, London. Boston, 1854.

The Tent and the Altar. By the Rev. John Cumming, D. D., etc. Boston, 1854.

A Historical Text-book and Atlas of Biblical Geography. By Lyman Coleman, D. D. Philadelphia, 1854.

WE give the titles of these books, already well-known to a large proportion of our readers, as a proof of the demand for helps in the study of the Sacred History, and at the same time as affording an occasion for a few remarks upon the general subject.

One of the most characteristic features of the Bible is the prominence, not to say predominance, of History in its composition. This peculiarity is more marked than many, who admit the correctness of the general statement, are perhaps aware. The Bible does not merely contain history, and that in large quantities; it is itself a history. The historical Scriptures do not merely occupy a large space in the word of God; they sustain a peculiar and unique relation to the other parts of Scripture. They constitute the frame work into which the others are inserted, or, to use a different but equivalent comparison, the thread on which the other parts are strung. That is to say, the doctrinal, devotional, prophetical, and other parts of Scripture, may all be readily reduced to their appropriate place in the historical arrangement, whereas this process cannot be reversed. Considered as a whole, and in relation to its chosen form, the word of God is not a Prophecy, a Prayer-book, or a System of Doctrine, but a History in which all these elements are largely comprehended.

This unquestionable fact is suggestive of some others, which are not without importance to the student and interpreter of Scripture. In the first place, it throws light upon the

general question, with respect to the utility and worth of history. It certainly seems difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile the lordly scorn or condescending pity, with which some in our own day treat historical studies, with the signal honour put upon this branch of knowledge, and this form of composition, in the very structure of the word of God. The only way in which the force of this consideration can be sensibly impaired, is by resorting to the obsolete idea, that the form of revelation is adapted to a less enlightened and intelligent condition of the race than that to which we have attained. Let those who can, be satisfied with this view of the case; but we, who believe in the Bible as a permanent revelation, not in substance only, but in form, and as exhibiting in both respects the wisdom of its Author, have certainly no need to be ashamed of any means or method of instruction, which has been so highly honoured and extensively made use of, by the Holy Ghost. While uninspired history must always be immeasurably lower, in authority and dignity, than that which is inspired, the historical form, which is common to both, is, by that community, exalted far above the praise or censure of the most fastidious critic, whether utilitarian or transcendental. History, as the world knows to its cost, may be false as well as true, and is not always admirably written; but the man who affects to despise history as such, only adds another to the endless illustrations of that apostolical paradox, "the foolishness of God is wiser than men."

In the next place, and as a specific application of the general idea just suggested, this extraordinary prominence of history in Scripture should lead us to appreciate the intrinsic value of that part of revelation, which is apt to be denied or underrated, even by believing readers, in their zeal for the devotional, practical, doctrinal, or prophetical elements, which likewise enter largely and essentially into the structure of a written revelation. A general pride of intellect, as well as a specific predilection and capacity for certain forms of truth and methods of instruction, may betray even sensible, well-meaning men, into this irreverent depreciation of a part of God's word, which his own divine authority and wisdom have made so remarkably extensive and conspicuous. The notion that the histories of

Scripture are only suited to awaken the attention of the youngest and least cultivated class of readers, but unworthy of the more mature and educated intellect, is far more prevalent than some imagine, and exerts a potent and pernicious influence on many minds, who are not conscious of its operation. The corrective of this evil is a full recognition of the intrinsic value and importance of this part of revelation, as attested by the very fact of its existence and its prominence in the canon of Scripture. However we may argue *a priori* in depreciation of even inspired history, as compared with more abstract or philosophical and systematic exhibitions of the same essential truth, the simple fact that it has pleased God to employ the first named method of instruction, in so large a portion of his written word, is alone sufficient to evince, not only that the method cannot be absurd and worthless in itself, but also that these parts of Scripture are no whit less authoritative or less useful than the rest, which many are disposed to place above them.

But besides this absolute intrinsic value of the Sacred History, entitling it to equal reverence and attention with the other Scriptures, there is also a relative importance which belongs to it and must not be neglected. There is, indeed, a mutual relation and connection between all the parts of revelation, even the most distant and dissimilar, which cannot be overlooked by the interpreter without distorting his views, not only of the several parts, but of the *tout ensemble*. Hence it follows, that some accurate acquaintance with each part of Scripture is an indispensable prerequisite to the thorough knowledge of every other, as well as to correct views of the whole, considered as a uniform and homogeneous system. Nor can any such acquaintance with the parts of Scripture and their mutual relations, how minute soever, be without its use in the interpretation of any one part, or of the whole Bible.

But what is thus true and important, as to all the distinguishable parts of Scripture, is pre-eminently true of those which are distinguished from the others as historical. In other words, while all the parts illustrate one another, a knowledge of this part is indispensably necessary to a correct appreciation of the rest. The history itself may be correctly understood, independently of any aid afforded by the other books; but what

would these others be to us, without the key afforded by the history? This difference is not fortuitous or arbitrary, but arises from the peculiar relation which the history sustains to all the other elements involved in the structure of the sacred volume. If the history has been correctly represented as the basis upon which the other parts are built, the frame in which they are inserted, or the thread on which they are strung, the relation indicated by these figures necessarily implies, that the historical Scriptures are more absolutely necessary to the correct interpretation of the others, than the others are to it. This might be easily exemplified and proved by showing how the incidents of David's life illustrate, and in some cases render intelligible, some of his most interesting compositions; and in like manner, how obscure the writings of Paul would be, without some knowledge of his personal history. And yet the converse of this proposition is not true, at least in any similar proportion; for, although the writings of these holy men, in many cases, strikingly illustrate their biography, it can hardly be said that they are ever needed to give that biography a sense or meaning. And apart from these particular examples, the main fact alleged is easily deducible from the very definition or idea of all history, as the science of events or actual occurrences, which from their nature and the constitution of our minds, must serve as the basis, or at least define the area and sphere, of our more profound and abstruse speculations.

Both from their absolute intrinsic value, then, as a substantive and prominent ingredient in the composition of the Bible, and from their relative importance and necessity as keys to the true meaning of its other contents, the historical Scriptures are entitled to a very different treatment, both in kind and in degree, from that which many are content to give them. It is not, however, from too low an estimate of their importance, either absolute or relative, that this practical abuse of them invariably springs. It often arises from an equally erroneous, but entirely distinct impression, that this part of Scripture, though its value and authority cannot be denied, happily calls for very little exegetical research or labour, being so extremely simple, that the youngest child can comprehend it without effort. This illusion, founded on the fact, that the difficulties,

which present themselves in this part of Scripture, are, for the most part, different in kind from those which occur elsewhere, has had a powerful effect in giving currency to shallow views and superficial modes of study, with respect to the whole subject. It is not too much, perhaps, to say, that some of the crudest speculations in theology are ultimately traceable to this false notion of the Sacred History. Because it presents fewer philological puzzles, fewer vexed questions of grammatical construction, fewer doubts as to the primary import of detached words and phrases, or as to the general subject and connection in extended contexts, than are constantly arising in the poetical, prophetical, or doctrinal divisions of the sacred volume, it is hastily inferred that all is absolutely easy, and that he who runs may read and understand, without a pause and almost without a glance at what is written. This habit of ignoring all perplexities and doubts that are not bound up in knotty points of grammar and philology, has led not only to the false views previously mentioned, as to the comparative importance of the Sacred History, but also to shallow and contracted views of it, in cases where its value remains undisputed. It has led to the extremes of being satisfied with vague and inexact impressions of the history as a whole, without any correct knowledge of details, and to the opposite extreme of studying these details minutely, but apart from one another, and without the least conception of the grand whole which they constitute. These modes of studying the Sacred History, though altogether different in principle and spirit, and familiar to the practice of entirely different classes, may be equally fatal to sound knowledge and correct conclusions. The practical evil, from whatever source or sources it may flow, is one that imperatively calls for a corrective. In attempting to discover or suggest such a corrective, let us set out with just views of the necessary difference between the Sacred History and every other, not only with respect to its authority and source, but also with respect to the way in which we are to learn and teach it. No one has ever yet succeeded in applying the same mode of treatment to an inspired and an uninspired history. All such attempts have been either the effect or the cause of skeptical misgivings as to this essential difference. In a history, which we own to be inspired,

we have nothing to do but to interpret and illustrate. The very form of the narration is determined by infallible authority. In other cases the task of the historian is far more extensive. His materials are to be collected, perhaps from various quarters, sifted, arranged, combined, reduced to shape according to his own discretion. In the Sacred History, his labour and his liberty are both restricted, for his office is entirely exegetical. It follows from this obvious and necessary difference between the two great divisions of Church History, which may be conveniently, though arbitrarily, distinguished by the terms "Ecclesiastical" and "Biblical," that, while they are indissolubly joined together, as integral parts of one harmonious whole, they not only may, but must, be handled in a manner utterly dissimilar; the one requiring for its just exhibition a more free, discursive method, while the other admits only of interpretation, in the wide and comprehensive sense of the expression. It also follows, from the premises established or assumed above, that the investigation of the Sacred History, being an exegetical process, must proceed upon exegetical principles and by means of exegetical methods, including minute study of details, both in themselves and in their proximate connections, as distinguished from indefinite and wholesale generalities.

But it does not follow from these premises, as some seem to imagine, that the microscopical inspection of minute details, however diligent or accurate, is all that is required in order to a just appreciation or a truthful exhibition of the Sacred History. The very habit of detailed investigation, which is thus regarded as the only necessary means to the attainment of the end proposed, may operate itself as a preventive, by confining the attention to detached points, without ever rising to more comprehensive views, without ever looking from the single links to the immense chain which they constitute, or ascending from particular events to the great periods, of which they are the characteristic features, much less to the grand organic whole, of which they are component atoms. However this one-sided method of investigation may disguise itself as faithful and laborious search for truth, it cannot be exonerated from the charge of an empirical contempt for that which gives its favourite details their value, namely, their relation to a great scheme or

cycle of events, all tending to one grand result, and to the fulfilment of one grand design.

If these be the two opposite but coexistent errors which, in our day, prevent or vitiate the study of the Sacred History, any corrective to be efficacious, must afford an antidote to both alike. The defect of large and comprehensive views requires to be supplied no less than that of accurate attention to details. There is a sense, indeed, in which the former reformation may be said to be still more necessary than the latter. Although both are desirable, and even necessary to complete success, yet, if only one should be attainable, the preference is due to large views of the whole scope of the history, because such views facilitate the acquisition of minuter knowledge, and in some degree supply its place when wanting; whereas, it is a lesson of experience that exclusive study of minutiæ has no such tendency, except in minds of a peculiar constitution, to evolve correct views of a general kind. Such views serve at least to delineate the outlines which may afterwards be filled up with minuter parts; but no accumulation of such facts at random, or in insulated items, has a tendency to generate the frame-work under which they ought to be arrranged. On these grounds, chiefly, it is thought best to begin with an attempt to rectify the error of regarding the historical Scriptures as a desultory catalogue of separate events or facts, without a bond of union, or a common relation to a common centre.

This attempt may be facilitated by observing, that the error to be rectified exists in reference, not only to the minute facts which constitute the history, but also to the books in which they are recorded. While some are undoubtedly too much disposed to rob the sacred histories of their individuality, and treat them as a single composition, there is also an opposite tendency to view them as a compilation of detached and independent narratives, without original connection or inherent unity of plan and purpose. To counteract the influence of both these errors, it is necessary to acquire the habit of surveying the whole field, not only from a point of sufficient elevation to command its entire surface, but from several such points, sufficiently distinct and distant to ensure a view of all the phases and distinguishable aspects, which are necessary to

a full and clear impression of the object. Of the many aspects which might be presented in the case before us, three may be selected as peculiarly significant and specially adapted to the end proposed. In the first place, we may look at the whole history as one, without regard to the writers by whom, or the books in which, it is recorded. Or again, we may invert this process so far as to make the several histories, as such, specific objects of attention, with their characteristic singularities of form and substance, yet without losing sight of their organic unity, as parts of one great historical epos. Intermediate between these two phases is a third, in which the prominent figures are those of individuals, the salient points being now neither purely historical, nor, so to speak, bibliographical, but personal or biographical.

In order to a clear view of the field before us, we need not only points from which, but also points at which, to direct our observations. Without such salient points to fix and at the same time to divide our vision, however wide the view presented, it would necessarily be confused and vague. Our first business, therefore, is to look around for landmarks, limits, or dividing lines. Under the second and third aspects of the history above presented, these conveniences are furnished by the very nature of the plan proposed, in one case, by the books, as such considered; in the other, by the *dramatis personæ*, the leading actors in the history itself. Under the first view, which has been distinguished as the purely historical, there must be some analogous advantage, or the view will either be impossible or fail of its effects. This alternative can be avoided, and the necessary aid secured in one way only; by observing the successive variations of the object, to which the history relates, about which it revolves. What is this object in the Sacred History, as such considered?

The history, which occupies so large a space in the inspired word, is not a general history of mankind, for which a space immeasurably larger would have been required; nor is it a mere secular and civil history of the Jews or Hebrews. That race or nation is indeed more prominent than any other, but only on account of its peculiar character and marked position as the chosen people of Jehovah, the depositary of the only true

religion and pure worship for a course of ages; in a word, the ancient CHURCH, at once the preparation and the basis for the Christian Church, which differs from it only in its clearer revelation, in its actual possession of the promised Saviour and the promised Spirit, and in its consequent emancipation from local and ceremonial restrictions. To this temporary, yet divinely constituted body, the most ancient version of the Hebrew Scriptures had accustomed the Hellenistic Jews who used it, to apply the very term (ἐκκλησία) which was afterwards employed to designate the Christian organization. As suggestive, both by etymology and usage, of a society called out and separated from the world, and called together in a new and holy brotherhood, it was no less descriptive of the elder than the younger, of the Jewish than the Christian Church. It is the varying condition of this ancient spiritual corporation, under both its forms, that furnishes the necessary landmarks and divisions, in the vast and otherwise bewildering expanse of Biblical or Sacred History. By watching the vicissitudes of this church or chosen people, and drawing lines of demarcation only where these changes are distinctly visible, not only to a close inspection, but afar off and upon the surface of the narrative, we gain a system of division at once natural and rational, entirely independent of all artificial figments or ephemeral caprices, and as easy to remember as to understand, because wholly inseparable in the memory from the salient features of the history itself. In attempting to apply this simple method, it will be convenient to descend from generals to particulars, first fixing the great primary divisions growing out of the internal relations of the subject, and then, by an analogous but secondary process, the minor subdivisions, into which these naturally fall, without the use or the necessity of mere conventional and arbitrary distribution.

Looking abroad, then, over the whole field of Sacred History, as one unbroken narrative, without regard to the diversity of books or writers, let us consider what great critical conjuncture, what eventful change in the condition of the Church or of the world, may be employed as a primary dividing line, cutting the whole field into two great parts. To this inquiry there can be but one correct or satisfying answer. The great turning

point, not merely in sacred but in universal history, its chronological and moral centre, to which all other events must be referred, and by which their significance must be determined, is the Advent of Christ, the Incarnation of the Son of God. The revolutionary change which it produced, not only in the Jewish Church and State, but in the whole condition of the world, is so distinctly marked and legible in every thing around us, that we cannot imagine a more obvious and natural division of the subject into two great parts, than that which is afforded by this grand event. Such a division is the more convenient for our present purpose, because universally familiar and coincident with what has now for ages been the customary method of determining the dates of history. Apart from the intrinsic dignity and value of the primary epoch thus assumed, it is a practical advantage of great moment, to be able to set out from one already so conspicuous and well known, and requiring no laborious calculations to reduce it to the ordinary methods of computing time. It is a vast advantage, that the primary division of our subject should be one which brings it into close and intimate relation to the other parts of history, instead of being insulated from them, as belonging to some other world, and interesting only to some other race.

Having fixed our eye upon the point through which the first great line of demarcation shall be drawn, let us now look, for a moment, at the two great portions into which that line divides the Sacred History. Unequal as they are, when chronologically measured—the proportion being scarcely that of one to fifty—this immense disparity is rectified at once by a consideration of the mutual historical relation between these two periods. When we consider that the three-and-thirty years of our Saviour's presence upon earth—we might almost say, the three years of his public ministry—have been permitted by the Holy Ghost to fill as large a space in the inspired record as whole centuries and ages of an earlier date, we need not hesitate to draw our lines of distribution on the same safe principle, and give to the Evangelical and Apostolical History a place in some degree commensurate, not only with their absolute importance, but with their relative position with respect to the preparatory dispensation. Taking this dis-

tinctly into the account, we shall perceive both practical convenience and historical exactness in the primary division of the whole Sacred History into two parts, corresponding to the two great books of the inspired record, which are commonly distinguished as the Old and New Testament. Between these inseparable yet distinct fields of historical inquiry stands the august person of our Lord himself, to whom all things in the first of these great periods pointed by anticipation, as the end for which they had a being—to whom all things in the second still point backwards, as the starting point from which their course began, and from which their progress is to be for ever measured.

Of these two periods let us leave the second, for the present, out of view, and concentrate our attention on the first, extending in its wide sweep, from the creation of Adam to the birth of Christ. Applying the same principle of distribution as before, we may inquire again for some great juncture, some critical change in the condition of the ancient Church, on which to found a subdivision of the Old Testament History. Whatever momentary hesitation might arise in some minds, on a first and superficial view of this immense field, more deliberate inspection and consideration can leave little doubt as to the secondary line of demarcation. The most striking contrast here presented in the visible condition of the chosen people, as a Church or spiritual corporation, is unquestionably that between the freedom and comparative simplicity of patriarchal institutions, and the onerous restrictions of the complicated ceremonial system introduced by Moses.

The two periods resulting from this subdivision may be variously designated. One method of describing them is by the use of the distinctive epithets, "Patriarchal" and "Mosaic." But as these may be conveniently applied to more restricted periods, it is better to use other terms not thus appropriated, in application to the two great parts of the Old Testament History. This it has been proposed to do by calling one the period of "Theophany," the other the period of "Theocracy." The kindred terms thus placed in antithesis to one another, are supposed to be descriptive of two grand peculiarities in the condition of the chosen people during these two periods. In either

case, they sustained an intimate relation to Jehovah as their covenant God; but this relation was externally manifested under very different forms in the two cases. Under the earlier or patriarchal dispensation, the communication between God and man was kept up by divine appearances in human or angelic form, of which the Greek name is Theophany, (Θεοφάνεια.) Under the later, or Mosaic dispensation, the chosen race had been matured into a people, and organized as a State, of which Jehovah was the head, not a mere providential ruler, as he is of other nations, but a special and immediate sovereign, corresponding to the human head of other systems, the sovereign people in a pure Democracy, the select few in an Aristocracy, the sole chief in a Monarchy or Autocracy; in strict analogy to which terms, the Mosaic State has been distinguished, since Josephus, by the name of a Theocracy, (Θεοκρατία.) These terms, if not too rigidly expounded, so as to confine all theophanic revelation to the earlier period, and all theocratic organization to the later, but used merely to present these as the prominent characteristics of the two conditions, are convenient and expressive designations of the periods in question, that of Theophany concluding, that of the Theocracy commencing, at the same point, namely, the Mosaic Legislation.

Pursuing the same method which has thus far been adopted, descending from generals to particulars, first dividing and then subdividing, and adhering still to the principles of letting the history arrange itself, to the exclusion of all fanciful and arbitrary methods, let us look successively at each of the great subdivisions just obtained, in order, first, to gain a just view of their character and aspect; and secondly, to subdivide them in their turn. Beginning with the period to which the name Theophany has been assigned, we find the whole of it pervaded by the thing which this name was intended to express. That is to say, we find the immediate divine communications, accompanied by visible appearances, continued from Adam to Moses, with little interruption beyond that arising from the silence of the history itself, as to the greater part of the long sojourn in the land of Egypt. But as we trace this long chain of theophanics, we come to a perceptible change in the structure or connection of the links which form it. This change consists in

the somewhat sudden limitation of the theophanic honours to a single family, within which they are afterwards confined until they give place to the permanent theophany embodied in the theocratic institutions. The particular epoch or event associated with this change, is the calling of Abraham, the segregation of a single person, even from the race of Shem, to be the founder of a new house, and at last, of a new nation, with which the Church was to be not united merely, but identified, for many ages. In the whole extent of the primeval history, from Adam to Moses, there is no such salient point, or line of demarcation, as the one afforded by the calling of Abraham to be, in a peculiar sense, the Friend of God and the Father of the Faithful.

If we now turn from the Theophanic to the Theocratic period, in search of some analogous division, we may find it by observing, what indeed is spread upon the surface of the history, that from the time of the Mosaic legislation there is nothing more than a remote approximation to the full development of that extraordinary system, till we reach the reign of David, when it seems to unfold itself completely, as a matter of experience and practice, for the first and last time, since the reign of David is succeeded by a process of national decline, almost unbroken, till the birth of Christ. This upward and then downward movement, so distinctly marked in the whole drift and current of the history itself, that it only needs to be suggested to awaken the attention even of the superficial reader, marks the reign of David as the culminating period of the whole theocracy, the highest ground that Israel attained while subject to the legal dispensation, and therefore an appropriate dividing line in the protracted interval from Moses to Christ.

In this way we obtain four great divisions of the history contained in the Old Testament; not conventional or fanciful divisions, but spontaneously arising from the natural relations of the subject, and associated with the three great salient points or critical conjunctures, the Call of Abraham, the Law of Moses, and the Reign of David.

By a further application of precisely the same method, each of these four parts may be subjected to a similar division, founded exclusively on changes and diversities in the condition

of the chosen people or the human race. Thus in the period which precedes the call of Abraham, two such vicissitudes and contrasts are discernible, as strongly marked as any in all history. The first is the Fall, the most momentous of all revolutions, connecting the opposite extremes of man's condition by one brief and almost instantaneous occurrence. The other is the Flood, the link between the old world and the new, producing changes almost as complete as would have followed from a fresh creation. In both these cases there are great material revolutions, but produced by moral causes.

In the second of these four great intervals, viz. the one from Abraham to Moses, an obvious line of demarcation is afforded by the migration of the chosen people into Egypt, with the accompanying change in their condition from that of a growing but not overgrown nomadic family, wandering at pleasure through the land of promise, to that of a rapidly increasing nation, settled in a fertile province of a foreign land, without political power or even independence, but with every physical advantage to promote their rapid growth and their acquaintance with the useful arts. Even within the period of this Egyptian residence, a fainter but discernible distinction may be traced between the state of Israel whilst favoured by the Pharaohs, and exempt from every danger except that of amalgamation and absorption in the hospitable nation which protected them, and their condition after the king arose "who knew not Joseph," and exchanged the policy of patronage for that of persecution. This change is as real, although not so clear a line of demarcation between Joseph and Moses, as the migration into Egypt is itself between Moses and Abraham. Still more striking is the next transition, from the bondage and the cruelties of Egypt to the freedom of the wilderness, the line of demarcation coinciding with the Exodus or actual departure of the people out of Egypt. The great covenant transaction at Mount Sinai perfects the transition from a slavish dependence upon human power, to a theocratical dependence upon God. The second period, and the first great primary division, are wound up by the Mosaic legislation, the inauguration of the system under which the chosen people was to live, through every other change and revolution, till the birth of Christ.

Between these distant points of time, however, there is, as we have seen before, a kind of water-shed, or central height, to which the system travels up from Moses and then down to the Messiah. This is the reign of David, between which and the Mosaic legislation, there may still be traced upon the surface of the history distinguishable boundaries, or limits, marking off distinct conditions of the chosen people. Such, for instance, is the Mission of the Spies from Kadesh, and the consequent refusal of the people to go up and take possession of the land. Beyond that fatal limit lies the Mysterious Error in the Wilderness, to the elder race a condign punishment of exquisite severity, but to their sons a wise and merciful provision for their gradual deliverance from parental influence, and for their moral education under the direct control of Moses, or, to speak more properly, of God himself. The condition of the people during these memorable forty years, has no analogy in earlier or later history, and may, therefore, properly be made the basis of a distinct period.

The next dividing line is that presented by the Conquest of the Promised Land, begun by Moses and continued under his successor, Joshua, the son of Nun, with the efficient aid of the contemporary race, whose frequently commended faithfulness and zeal may, no doubt, be ascribed in a great measure to their training in the wilderness, already mentioned. The culpable remissness of the next generation, in waging an exterminating war against the Canaanites, imparts a very different character and aspect to the period of the Judges, during which the people were again and again judicially abandoned to the very enemies whom they had, with a false compassion, spared, and to a multitude of others like them, who continued to oppress them until they repented and returned to God, who then restored them by the agency of military chieftains, or dictators, known in history as Judges. Though the social evils of this period have by some been most unduly magnified, the whole condition of the people was peculiar, and entitles this part of the history to separate consideration.

Towards the close of this long and eventful period, a premonition of some new change is afforded by the gradual translation of the dictatorial or judicial power from the hands of mili-

tary chiefs to those of civil and religious rulers, such as Eli the High Priest and the Prophet Samuel. The change, for which the way was thus prepared, is that from martial law and loose confederation to a settled monarchy, as if to show that no form of government was either indispensably necessary or essentially repugnant to the end for which the theocracy existed. Though the people were reproved for asking this change in the way and at the time they did, the change had been predicted, even to the Patriarchs, and prospectively provided for in the Law of Moses, as one of the most notable transitions in the history, and as such introducing a new period, that of the Undivided Monarchy.

Of the three reigns comprehended under this description, each has a most distinct and marked physiognomy or aspect of its own, and may therefore be considered by itself. The reign of Saul, though divinely sanctioned for a special purpose, is not to be reckoned as a theocratical administration. It was rather an experimental reign, designed to teach the people by experience the true character of such a kingdom as they had desired. To this end Saul was chosen, and surrounded with all possible advantages of a personal, political, and social nature. He was even clothed, in some mysterious manner, with a spiritual influence, and distinguished by great providential favours. But being wholly destitute of a true theocratic spirit, or devotion to God's service in the very way of God's appointment, he was soon at variance with Samuel, who crowned him; with David, who was to succeed him; with his own better judgment and right feelings; and at last, or rather from the first, with God himself, until from bad to worse he became desperate, was cast off, and perished without hope upon the field of battle. These particulars are mentioned to evince that Saul's reign is unique enough to constitute a chapter by itself, having no chronological position of its own, but being interjected as a kind of episode between the reign of David and the judgeship of Samuel, which meet and even overlap each other.

The next step brings us to that high ground towards which the theocracy has slowly been ascending since the giving of the law at Sinai, or at least since the possession of the promised land. There was only an approximation to the full realization

of the system till the reign of David, whose success both as a ruler and a conqueror, his religious zeal and lyric inspiration, but, above all, his implicit and unwavering devotion to the spirit and the form of the theocracy, conspired to place him on its highest elevation, as at once the greatest of the theocratic sovereigns, and the most honoured type of the Messiah. Hence he is far more frequently referred to in the later Hebrew Scriptures, and in those of the New Testament, than any, or than all of his successors, the best of whom are but faint copies of his virtues, and their reigns his own reign lengthened out, as if to fill the interval remaining until Christ should come. Even the powerful and brilliant reign of Solomon belongs to the period of decline, and not to that of culmination, as its splendour and prosperity were rather the reward of David's labours, than the fruits of his own wisdom, and his reign, imposing as it was, contained within itself the seeds of dissolution, as appeared from the defections of the king himself, and from the germination of those hostile powers by which his son was to be overwhelmed. Even this faint outline of the three reigns comprehended in the Undivided Monarchy may serve to show that no equal periods of history are more distinctly marked by countenance and features of their own.

Taking our stand upon the lofty table-land of David's reign, with that of Saul immediately below us upon one hand, and that of Solomon upon the other, let us turn our back upon the former, and look forward far beyond the latter, towards the distant point at which Messiah is to show himself. Between these still remote bounds let us again inquire what dividing lines may be distinctly traced upon the surface of the history itself, without resorting to mechanical contrivances or fanciful inventions. If we still adhere to the original prescription, to be governed by the changes in the actual condition of the chosen people, the most striking contrast that presents itself is that upon the opposite sides of the Babylonian Conquest. The two conditions separated by this line are that of independent nationality before it, and that of foreign domination after it. From David to Josiah, the theocracy, however rent or humbled, still maintained its position as an independent State. From that time onward, with a single brief exception, to be

more distinctly mentioned afterwards, the state, with which the ancient Church had been identified, was subjected to a series of heathen masters. This is the first great subdivision of the interval from David to the Advent. Looking again at this great subdivision by itself, we find a line drawn at the time of the Assyrian Conquest and the downfall of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes. Up to that event the history presents us either with an undivided monarchy, as under Solomon and David, or with the same body politic divided into rival kingdoms, but together forming the same aggregate as ever. After the date of the Assyrian Conquest, ten of the twelve tribes disappear from history. Judah now occupies the place of Israel, in fulfilment of the prophecy of Jacob and of the divine plan, formed and entertained from the beginning, but deferred in execution to allow the chosen tribe the same time and facilities for growing into a great nation, that all Israel enjoyed of old in Egypt. Individual members of the other tribes were not excluded from communion and incorporation with the tribe of Judah. The half, if not the whole, of Benjamin, had all along adhered to it, and Levi, as the sacerdotal tribe, had always been attached to the theocracy. But the theocracy itself, considered as a national organization, was henceforth seated in that tribe, from which the dying Jacob had predicted that the sceptre never should depart till Shiloh came. From David to the Babylonish Conquest, then, the three successive phases, which the history of Israel exhibits, are those of the Undivided Kingdom, the Divided Kingdom, and the Residuary Kingdom.

There still remains to be surveyed for the purpose of division, the last melancholy period of foreign domination, reaching from the death of Josiah in reality, but nominally from the last of his successors, to the Advent. Here the dividing lines are too distinctly marked to be mistaken, being drawn upon the history not of Israel only but of the known world. The changes here are not internal and domestic only, but the changes of great empires, under each of which successively the Jews passed into bondage. The critical junctures, in this portion of their history, coincide with the great revolutions of the age, and in order to distinguish the fluctuations of their own condition, we have only to enumerate the powers that succeeded one another

in a transient but supreme dominion, during the five centuries immediately preceding the nativity of Christ. The history of Israel during these five hundred years is really the history of their subjection to the Babylonian, Persian, Macedonian, Egyptian, Syrian, Hasmonean, Roman, and Idumean domination. Of these names all but two are names of alien heathen powers. The first exception is the sixth, the Hasmonean, an indigenous or native dynasty, created by the Syrian persecutions, and for several generations true to its devout and patriotic origin, but afterwards degenerate and the betrayer of the country to the Romans. The other is the eighth and last, the Edomite or Idumean, a mixed race sprung from the incorporation of the sons of Esau with the sons of Jacob by the Hasmonean conqueror, John Hyrcanus. Out of this race sprang the Herods, the most hated instruments and tools of Roman domination. Whether these names be omitted or inserted in the catalogue, it sets before us a true picture of the last scene in this interesting drama—the salient points and several phases of the closing period in the Old Testament history. For such it is, if we suppose this to extend to the commencement of the New, although, in fact, we are forsaken by inspired authorities long before we reach the end of the Persian domination. But precisely where we are thus thrown upon uninspired authorities, the value of these uninspired authorities begins to be enhanced, not only by the silence of the Scriptures, but by their own intrinsic merit. By a sort of providential compensation, when the guiding hand of Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah is withdrawn, we are permitted to embrace that of Herodotus and Xenophon.

In this rapid and jejune enumeration of the periods into which the Sacred History divides itself, it will be seen that we have treated it throughout as one unbroken narrative, without regard to the precise form of the record, or its frequent changes. This we have intentionally done, in order to present in bold relief the unity and continuity of the history as a whole, and, at the same time, the indefinite variety by which its several portions are characterized. It may also be observed, that the proposed arrangement is entirely independent of minute chronology, and cannot be affected, in its outline at least, by disputed questions as to dates and epochs. This is the more

worthy of attention, because many are accustomed to confound chronology and history, the science of dates and the science of events; the first of which derives its value wholly from the second, which, on the contrary, might still exist without a change of its intrinsic value, if all specific dates should be disputed or forgotten. The striking sentiment of Bossuet, that the error universally acknowledged in the vulgar era, has had no effect upon the truth of history, nor even on the clearness of men's views respecting it, admits of a much wider application. A large proportion of the common chronological disputes are mere puzzles in arithmetic, without effect as bearing on the great events of history, their consecution, or their mutual relations. Except where it affects these, or is necessary to remove apparent inconsistencies, this branch of mathematics may be safely left to those whose taste or business leads them to pursue it. Least of all should any be discouraged from historical pursuits by an infirmity of memory in reference to minor dates, or other chronological minutiæ. Such information is desirable, and ought to be acquired, when the acquisition is not made at the expense of more important knowledge; but it cannot be too strongly recommended to the student of the Sacred History to store the memory with those great features and relations of the subject which are least dependent upon calculation.

We have now presented, in its outlines, one of the three aspects under which we proposed to view the Old Testament History. This is the one before distinguished as the purely historical, because the salient points and the divisions of the subject are derived exclusively from critical conjunctures and eventful changes, in the condition of the ancient Church or chosen people, as an aggregate body. There are still two other views which we intended to present; the Biographical, in which the salient points are individuals, the types and representatives of their respective ages; and the Bibliographical, in which the distribution of the history is founded on the several books in which it is recorded, and due regard paid to the physiognomy and character of these, as independent compositions. But we feel that the draught upon our readers' patience is already great enough, and therefore must reserve the rest of

what we had to offer for another time and place. Our end, for the present, will be answered, if we shall have furnished, even to a few congenial readers, the suggestion of a plan, however simple, by which the elementary minutiæ of the history, instead of being thrown aside or slighted, may acquire a legitimate, though adventitious interest, as subjects of detailed investigation, and a firmer hold upon the student's memory.

Chas. Hodge

ART. V.—1. *Denominational Education.* By the Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge. Published originally in the Southern Presbyterian Review. Philadelphia: Printed by C. Sherman. 1854. Pp. 24.

2. *Letter to the Governor of South Carolina.* By the Rev. Dr. Thornwell.

3. *The Thirty-Third and Thirty-Fourth Reports of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church.* Philadelphia: 1852 and 1853.

4. *Right of the Bible in our Public Schools.* By George B. Cheever, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 285 Broadway. 1854. Pp. 303.

5. *The Position of Christianity in the United States, in its Relations with our Political Institutions, and especially with reference to Religious Instruction in our Public Schools.* By Stephen Colwell. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 1854. Pp. 175.

THESE publications are evidence of the strong and widely diffused interest taken in the subject of Popular Education. They evince also, as we think, that in the midst of apparently conflicting principles, there is a substantial agreement among religious men, as to the most essential points involved in the discussion. We are well aware that the difference between the religious community and those who, in many instances, control the action of our legislative bodies in relation to this subject, is radical and irreconcilable. We are sorry to be obliged to add, that many religious men, from different motives, have been led to throw their influence in favour of this latter party, who advocate the exclusion of religious instruction from our public schools. The religious community, however, as a body, we

hope and believe, are united and determined in their opposition to any such destructive course.

Before proceeding further, we will briefly indicate the points as to which, with individual exceptions on either side, there is, as we believe, a substantial agreement, especially so far as our own Church is concerned, in relation to this whole subject. The evidence is abundant and conclusive that the great mass of our members, ministers and laymen, are convinced, 1. Of the absolute necessity of universal popular education. 2. That this education should be religious; that is, not only that religion ought to be in some way inculcated, but that it should be made a regular part of the course of instruction in all our non-professional educational institutions. 3. That the obligation to secure for the young this combined secular and religious training, is common to parents, to the State, and to the Church. It does not rest on one of these parties to the exclusion of the others, but, as the care of the poor, it rests equally on all, and the efforts and resources of all are requisite for the accomplishment of the object. It is included in what has been said, that the obligation in question presses all these parties as to the whole work of education. One portion of the work does not belong exclusively to one of them, and another portion exclusively to the others, but each is in its sphere responsible for the whole. That is, as the parent is bound to provide not only for the religious but also for the secular education of his children, the same is true with regard to the State and to the Church. 4. That in the existing state of our country, the Church can no more resign the work of education exclusively to the State, than the State can leave it exclusively to parents or to the Church. The work cannot be accomplished in the way in which she is bound to see it accomplished, without her efficient co-operation. The Church, therefore, is bound, without interfering either with the State or with voluntary institutions, to provide the means of thorough secular and religious training, wherever they are not otherwise secured. 5. That in the performance of this great duty, the Church cannot rely on the separate agency of her members, but is bound to act collectively, or in her organized capacity. Consequently, the Board of Education, in aiding in the establishment of schools, academies,

and colleges, is acting on sound principles, whatever mistakes may have been made in the application of those principles in particular cases.

There may be, as before remarked, individual dissentients from one or another of the above positions, but the almost unanimous decision of one Assembly after another, and the concessions of those, who under misapprehension of the ground intended to be assumed, had taken the part of objectors, prove beyond doubt the substantial and cordial unanimity of our Church as to all these points.

The first of these positions need not be argued. The necessity of general popular education is universally conceded. If such education is necessary to other nations for their prosperity, to us it is necessary for our existence. Universal suffrage and universal education condition each other. The former without the latter is a suicidal absurdity. Everything connected with our political well-being, with the elevation and personal improvement of the people, and with the extension and establishment of the Redeemer's kingdom, is more or less directly involved in this great question. The work which as a people we have to do; which, next to the preaching of the gospel, is most immediate and most pressing, is to provide and apply the means for the education of all classes of our varied and rapidly increasing population. This education should be such as to meet the exigencies of the people; giving not merely to all the opportunity of acquiring the rudiments of knowledge, but furnishing the means of higher cultivation, for those who are disposed to avail themselves of them. This may be taken to be the public sentiment of the country and of the Church. In almost all our States provision is made more or less effectively, not only for the establishment of common schools, but also of academies and colleges endowed and sustained by public funds. The free High Schools of Boston, New York and Philadelphia are among the most elevated of our educational establishments.

The second position, viz., that education in all its stages ought to be religous, is one of the great dividing points in relation to this subject. On one hand, it is contended that religion, the Christian religion, including its facts, doctrines and

moral principles, should be a regular topic of instruction in our public schools and higher educational establishments; and that the whole process of education should be conducted with the design of cherishing religious principles and feelings. On the other hand, it is assumed that the State has nothing to do with the religious instruction of the people; that religion must be left to be inculcated by parents and the church; that the only legitimate sphere of state action is secular education. Indifference or hostility to religion; a dread of the union of the Church and State; an apprehension of ecclesiastical domination; the opposition of Papists to religious instruction, and even to the reading of the Bible in the public schools; the difficulty arising from conflicting sects, have led a very large part of the community to advocate or acquiesce in the exclusion of religion from all places of education sustained by the State. It is regarded as the simplest solution of a complicated problem, to confine the State to secular education, and leave religion to be otherwise provided for.

This is the ground publicly assumed by the majority of our public men; it has received, directly or indirectly, the sanction of several State legislatures; it is avowed and acted upon by superintendents and commissioners; it is advocated by some of our most influential religious journals, and by many of our prominent religious men. In the years 1842 and 1843, laws were passed by the legislature of New York, forbidding "sectarian teaching and books" to be employed in the public schools. Everything was regarded as *sectarian* to which any person would object on religious grounds. Every book, therefore, even the Bible, and every sentiment to which the Romanists objected, were banished or expunged when demanded. All religious instruction and prayer have in many cases been proscribed. Teachers have been threatened with dismission, and actually dismissed, for using even the Lord's prayer. E. C. Benedict, Esq., President of the Board of Education of New York, delivered in August last an address, in which he asks, "What should be our rational rule of conduct? Whenever we find a few children together, shall we compel them to lay aside their occupation for the time and read the Bible, or say prayers, or perform some other religious duty? Will it be sure to make

them better? Will it be sure to give them religious instruction —to require it at the dancing-school, the riding-school, the music-school, the visiting-party, and the play-ground? Shall studies, and sports, and plays, and prayers, and Bible, and catechism be all placed on the same level? Shall we insist that secular learning cannot be well taught unless it is mixed with sacred? Shall algebra and geometry be always interspersed with religion instead of *quod erat demonstrandum?* Shall we say *Selah* and *Amen?* Shall we bow at the sign of *plus?* Can we not learn the multiplication table without saying grace over it? So of religious instruction, will it be improved by a mixture of profane learning? Shall the child be taught to mix his spelling lesson with his prayers, and his table-book with his catechism? If there were any necessary relation between religious and secular instruction, which required that they should be kept together, the subject would have another aspect. But no one has ever maintained that the religious teacher, the minister of religion, and the office-bearers of the Church, should mix secular instruction with their more sacred and solemn inculcations.

"Now, the reading of the Bible, the repeating the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, and the Ten Commandments, in school, is ritualistic and educational. It is not for improvement in secular learning, nor in sacred learning. Turn the tables—substitute for reading of the Scriptures at the opening of the schools the simplest and least offensive of the religious ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church—reading from the Missal some portions of it to which in itself there would be no objection; insist that the school should bow at the name of Jesus; shall always speak of the Virgin Mary as the Blessed Virgin or Holy Mother of God, and see if all of us would be willing to send our children there day by day. See if the pulpits and the ecclesiastical conventions throughout the land would not recho the word of alarm; and why should we compel the Jews, who are numerous in our cities, to listen to the New Testament, to repeat the Lord's Prayer, or the Apostles' Creed, or be taught the mysteries of redemption, or leave the schools?"*

* Quoted by Dr. Cheever. The Bible in our Common Schools, pp, 237, 8.

It is against this doctrine, which is now so extensively embraced and so effectively acted out, that the great body of Christians in this country, and of the Presbyterian Church especially, enter their earnest and solemn protest. They regard it as a virtual renunciation of allegiance to God, as destructive to society, and as certainly involving the final overthrow of the whole system of public education. If the Bible and religion are excluded from our public schools, they and their abettors will very soon be swept away, if the country remain, what it now is, Protestant and Christian.

It is to be borne in mind that a very large part of our population is almost entirely dependent for instruction on the public schools. If, therefore, religion is to be excluded from those schools, a large proportion of the people will inevitably grow up ignorant of religion. Commissioner Flag says, in reference to the State of New York, that "to every ten persons receiving instruction in the higher schools, there are at least five hundred dependent on the common schools for their education." Dr. Cheever says: "Perhaps not more than a sixth part of the families in our country ever attend church, or any other schools than the free schools. Consequently, five-sixths of our whole youthful population are left unprovided with the knowledge of the Bible, and any religious instruction, if you exclude it from the free public schools."* We do not answer for these numbers. It is not necessary for the argument to assume more than must be conceded, viz: that parochial schools, Sabbath-schools, and pastoral and parental instruction leave a very large part of the population dependent for their education on the public schools, and therefore, if religion be banished from those institutions, a large portion of the people must grow up in ignorance of religion. This, then, is a fact to be deliberately considered by those, and especially by those Christians, who advocate the separation of secular and religious education. They are practically consigning thousands of the people to utter ignorance of God, of Christ, of morality, and of the method of salvation. They cannot avoid the fearful responsibility which they thus incur. The man who cuts off the regular supply of

* The Bible in our Common Schools, p. 134.

water from a great city, and tells the people they must get water as they can, that the public aqueduct is not the only means of supply, would not act more absurdly or with greater cruelty, than the men who deprive the people of the ordinary and long continued means of religious instruction, and bid them look elsewhere for the most essential kind of knowledge. It is vain to say that religion can be inculcated in the family. Why not leave secular knowledge to be thus inculcated? It is the simple and admitted fact, that, if left to parents, secular education will be, and must be, in the great majority of cases, neglected. But more parents are competent and disposed to teach their children the rudiments of human knowledge, than are qualified or inclined to instruct them in religion. If, therefore, religious instruction be left to parents, it will in most cases be entirely neglected. It is no less in vain to say it is the office of the Church to teach religion. Very true; but the public schools have in all ages been one of the principal and most effective agencies of the Church for accomplishing this mission. You cut off her right hand, and bid her do her work. You debar her access through her members to the young, and bid her bring them up in the fear of God. The Church is the body of Christians, and all Church action is not the action of organized ecclesiastical bodies. Much of the efficiency of the Church is through the activity of her private members, operating as Christians in all the walks of life. The command to teach all nations, given to the Church, is executed not only by the action of presbyteries and synods, of bishops and presbyters, but also by the agency of all the professed followers of Christ, acting in obedience to his command. To tell the Church, therefore, to provide for the religious education of the young, and yet forbid her members to teach religion in the public schools, where alone they can have access to the greater part of them, is simply a mockery. Presbyterians may attend to their own children, and we trust they will do so; Episcopalians may attend to theirs; but who are to attend to the multitudes who recognize no such ecclesiastical connection? Nothing, then, is more certain than that to exclude religious instruction frum the public schools is to give up a large part of the people to ignorance of God and duty. This is not a matter of conjecture, but a fact

of experience; and we beg every man who has the welfare of his country, or the good of his fellow-men at heart, to look this fact deliberately in the face, and to pause before he gives his sanction to the popular doctrine of an exclusive secular popular education.

But, in the second place, the whole theory of separate secular education is fallacious and deceptive. The thing is impossible. The human soul is in such a sense a unit, that it is impossible the intellect should be cultivated without developing, favourably or otherwise, the heart and the conscience. You might as well attempt to develope one half of a man's body, and allow the other half to remain as it is. It is impossible to introduce ideas and facts beyond the mere relations of numbers and quantity, into the mind, without their calling into exercise the other powers of our nature. If a child is to read, it must read something. But what can it read in prose or poetry, in history or in fiction, which will not bring up the ideas of God, of right and wrong, of responsibility, of sin and punishment, and of a future state? How can a teacher reprove, exhort, or direct his pupils, without an appeal, more or less direct, to moral and religious motives? If he tells a child that a thing is wrong, can he avoid telling him why it is wrong, what is the standard of duty, and what are the consequences of wrong conduct? He cannot appeal to conscience without awakening the sense of responsibility to God, and creating the necessity of instruction as to what God is, and as to our relations to him as his creatures. If it be true that we live and move and have our being in God, if our finite spirits are at every point in contact with the Infinite Spirit, the attempt to ignore God, and to bring up a child in ignorance of the Supreme Being, is as absurd and as impracticable as the attempt to bring up a living creature, out of contact with the atmosphere.

This, however, is not the worst of it. The separation of religion from secular education is not only impracticable, it is positively evil. The choice is not between religion and no religion; but between religion and irreligion, between Christianity and infidelity. The mere negative of Theism is Atheism. The absence of knowledge and faith in Christianity is infidelity. Even Byron had soul enough to make Lucifer say:

"He that bows not to God, hath bowed to me."

As in a field, if you do not sow grain you will have weeds, so in the human mind, if you do not sow truth, you will have error. The attempt, therefore, to exclude religion from our common schools, is an attempt to bring up in infidelity and atheism all that part of our population who depend on these schools for their education. There is no middle ground here. If a man is not good, he must be bad; if he is not a Theist, he is an Atheist; if he is not a Christian, he is an infidel; and, therefore, a course of education which excludes religion, must from the necessity of the case be irreligious. Mr. Webster, in his argument on the Girard College case, says, speaking of the exclusion of Christianity from that Institution: "There is nothing original in this plan. It has its origin in a deistical source, but not from the highest school of infidelity. It is all idle, it is a mockery, and an insult to common sense, to maintain that a school for the instruction of youth, from which Christian instruction by Christian teachers is sedulously and vigorously shut out, is not deistical and infidel in its purpose and in its tendency." Again, in still stronger language, when speaking of the plan of keeping the young entirely ignorant of religion until they get their education and can judge for themselves, he says: "It is vain to talk about the destructive tendency of such a system; to argue upon it, is to insult the understanding of every man; *it is mere, sheer, low, ribald, vulgar deism and infidelity.* It opposes all that is in heaven, and all that is on earth that is worth being on earth. It destroys the connecting link between the creature and the Creator; it opposes that great system of universal benevolence and goodness that binds man to his Maker." This language is not too strong; and it is not too strong as applied to the system of excluding religion from our common schools, because, and in so far as, those schools are the sole means of education for a large part of the people.

It is indeed admitted by many advocates of exclusive secular education in common schools, that any institution which assumes, for any considerable period, the whole education of a child or youth, "and yet gives no religious instruction or training, is justly said to give an irreligious and godless educa-

tion."* Very well, this is all we contend for. We readily admit that if adequate provision could be made, and was in fact made, for the instruction of the young in religion elsewhere, there would be no such absolute necessity for its systematical introduction into the common schools. Though even in that case it would be impossible to train and govern advantageously any body of youth, even in secular knowledge, without constant appeals to moral and religious truth. But the fact is, that the common school does assume the whole education of a multitude of children; it is the only education they ever receive, and therefore is in their case "irreligious and godless," if it is merely secular.

The principle of excluding religion from State institutions, cannot be, and is not consistently carried out, even by its advocates. All the popular objections about sectarianism, the union of the Church and State, the injustice of excluding Jews and Romanists from educational institutions which they are taxed to sustain, bear against schools for the deaf and dumb with as much force as against common schools; yet by common consent not only Christianity, but Protestant Christianity, is inculcated in all such establishments. Would the public endure that all religious instruction should be refused to the deaf and dumb, because a Jew or Romanist might object to the nature of that instruction? It may be said, that the only instruction which the deaf and dumb receive is communicated in schools designed for their benefit exclusively, whereas the frequenters of common schools can be taught religion elsewhere. This answer does not touch the principle of the objection, and it is not a fact. The deaf and dumb are taught to read, and when that is accomplished, they might be sent to their friends to be taught religion. And this is the course which consistency would require our opponents to take; but the operation of their principle is here seen too clearly to admit of its being carried out. The children are all together, and constantly under the eye of the observer, whereas the children of the common schools scatter to their homes as soon as the school is dismissed, and therefore the effect of the absence of religious training is

* New Englander, April, 1848, p. 244.

not so clearly seen. It is not, however, the less real. And the man whose heart and conscience would revolt at the idea of leaving the deaf and dumb in ignorance of God and Christ, should not do in the case of thousands, what he would not venture to do in the case of tens.

We are fully persuaded that the attempt to banish religion and the Bible from common schools, which owes its origin and success to Papists, Infidels, and scheming politicians, which is opposed to the practice of all Christian countries, to the judgment of all the great statesmen of the forming period of our country, and to the general usage of our forefathers, Presbyterian and Puritan, will, if persisted in, result in the overthrow of the whole system of popular education. The people will bear a great deal. They may allow men to trifle with their interests; they may submit to measures which encroach upon their rights; but if you touch their conscience, you awaken a power before which all human resistance is vain. If history teaches any thing, it teaches the danger and folly of wounding the moral and religious convictions of men. We owe all the liberty the world possesses to tyrants trespassing on the domain of conscience. Christians, determined not to do what God forbids, and resolved to do what God commands, are the authors and preservers of civil and religious liberty. If our public men for the sake of conciliating the Papists, or of avoiding trouble, undertake to say that Protestant Christianity, in this Protestant and Christian country, shall not be taught in our public schools, we venture to predict that they and their schools will be very summarily overthrown. The reason why so little resistance has been manifested to the edicts of legislatures and superintendents, is that the people utterly disregard them. They care not a farthing for what the State officer at the seat of power says as to what their children shall be taught. The time for resistance will come when these State officers undertake to carry their edicts forbidding religious instruction into effect. We know of public schools, both in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, in which the Westminster Catechism is taught every day; and we believe that, in very many cases, the children in our own common schools are taught just what their parents see fit to have them learn. The safety of the system of public instruc-

tion depends on its freedom; on its being left to receive the form and application which the people may choose to give it; and upon our public men keeping the system out of the control of Papists and Infidels. The country may be deluded and cajoled, and we think here lies the danger, but the people will never submit with their eyes open to a merely secular, which is only another name for an irreligious and godless education.

Among ourselves there exists, so far as we know, scarcely a diversity of opinion on this subject. The *Southern Presbyterian Review*, in an article against "Denominational Education," says, while advocating the State system: "Religion, as a distinct and most important part of knowledge; revealed religion, as the received religion of our country, so far from being excluded from general education, should be made a prominent part of it, from the primary school to the University." It is the principal object of the book of Mr. Stephen Colwell, (a strenuous advocate of State, as opposed to Church schools,) the title of which is placed at the head of this article, to prove the right and the necessity of religious instruction in common schools. "There has never," he says, "been a more suicidal position taken by the most unwise of our politicians or statesmen, or the worst of our internal foes, than this exclusion of Christianity from public education. The worst enemy of humanity could not have devised a doctrine more dangerous to our republican institutions. It is fortunately too absurd, too monstrous, too unthankful, to take deep and lasting root in American soil."* Whether absurd and monstrous or not, it is the reigning doctrine of the day among those who control legislative bodies. On page 105, the author says: "If we have succeeded in conveying to our readers our own conviction of what is due to the present and coming generations of children in our republic, of the civil and religious obligations which will rest on these children when they arrive at maturity, and of the facilities of doing good then to be enjoyed, they cannot fail to see that the Church or denomination which opposes religious instruction in the public schools, is at war with our institutions, with our civilization, and with the public peace and safety. That Bible upon which

* Position of Christianity, &c., p. 98.

the largest portion of the judicial oaths of the United States are administered; that Bible which is the fountain of our Christianity, and which our whole system, civil and religious, assumes to be the Word of God, is the Bible which should be held up to the children in our public schools, announced to be a revelation from the Most High, the will of God, the Old and New Testament of Christianity. It should be taught the children to that extent, and in that way, which an enlightened and liberal piety would dictate." Again, on page 116, he says: "In one sense, it is true, there can be no compromise in religious matters; that which is vital to Christianity cannot be surrendered or kept out of view. The Bible cannot be sacrificed nor kept out of view to conciliate the prejudices of any, whether priest or infidel. It is the manual of Christianity. We cannot concede that the Bible is a mere human production, because it is of the essence of Christianity that the Bible is a revelation from God."

It is then the settled conviction of all parties in our Church, and of the great body of the religious public, that popular education, by whomsoever administered, should in this country be Christian and Protestant. This is a position which we hope and pray may never be given up.

The third position is, that this combined secular and religious education of the young, is the common duty of parents, of the State, and of the Church. It has indeed been argued that if it is the duty of the Church, it is not incumbent on the State, and if incumbent on the State, it is not the duty of the Church. But this is a fallacy. It might as well be said, that if it is the duty of parents, it is the work neither of the Church nor of the State, and if it binds either of the latter, it does not bind the former. The truth is, that it binds all the above named parties equally.

There are other things besides education which impose this common obligation. Individuals, as men and Christians, are bound to relieve the poor; but this obligation rests also on the State, and on the Church in her organized capacity. So, too, the care of the sick belongs, as a duty and privilege, to individuals and to society as a secular and religious organization. Has not the Church its deacons for the very purpose of taking

care of the sick and of the poor? But does this exonerate either individuals or the State from this great natural duty of religion and humanity? The fact, therefore, that education may be proved to be the proper work of the State, is no evidence that it does not belong to the Church; and to prove that it belongs of divine right to the Church, is no evidence that it does not belong, by the same solemn sanction, to the State. It belongs alike to both, and for the same reasons, and on the same grounds; that is, from the design of their institution, from the necessity of the case, and from divine command.

The State is a divine institution. All its legitimate powers and functions have the sanction of divine authority, for the powers that be are ordained of God. Neither the existence nor the powers of the State depend on any social compact as their ultimate foundation. The State is a body of men organized, under divine authority, as a political community, for the protection of human rights, the promotion of the common good, and enforcing of the moral law, *i. e.*, for the punishment of those who do evil, and the praise of those who do well. Such being the design of the State, it has of course the authority to do whatever is necessary to attain the end of its appointment. It can regulate commerce, make roads, administer justice, raise armies, construct navies, provide for the poor, the sick, and the young. It can educate soldiers and sailors for the public service, and why not the people, to fit them for the duties of citizens? There is no function of government which flows more immediately from the design of its institution, than that of providing for the education of the people, because education is the most essential means for accomplishing the end for which the State exists, viz., the prevention of evil and the promotion of good. By the instinct of its being, therefore, revealing its nature, every enlightened State has its schools, academies, and colleges, as well as its poor-houses and hospitals, or its armies and navies.

This duty not only flows from the design for which civil governments exist, but also from the necessity of the case. It is a sound principle, that the State has the right to do whatever it is necessary it should do for the promotion of the general good. If the means for securing the public good can be more

effectually and safely applied by individuals, by voluntary organizations, or by the Church, than by the State, then the latter is not bound to employ these means. But if there is no other adequate provision for the accomplishment of the desired end, it is clearly the right and duty of the State to interfere. It is the universal conviction that popular education is necessary for the public good; it is a no less general conviction that a work so vast as the education of the whole population cannot be accomplished effectually, except by the systematical exercise of the power of the State, and by the application of its resources. We know no one, therefore, who ventures to deny the right in question.

All this is confirmed by the Scriptures. God, in ordaining civil government for the protection of men and for the promotion of the public good, did thereby invest it with all the powers requisite for the attainment of its object. He holds magistrates responsible for the conduct and character of the people, which implies that they have by divine right the authority to teach, or cause them to be taught, whatever is necessary to their well being. The numerous commands given in Scripture to have the people taught, are not addressed to individuals only, but to the community, *i. e.*, they are addressed to men not only in their separate but in their organized capacity. Nations as nations are addressed, commanded, encouraged, and threatened. Ignorance of God and of his law, is condemned and punished as a national sin. The Bible everywhere recognizes the principle that nations, as such, should be under the control of the law of God, and that they should not forget or allow the knowledge of that law to fail from among the people.

It may be said, and has often been assumed, however, that though the State has authority to provide for secular education, it has no right to interfere in teaching religion. This is the ground taken by many advocates of the exclusion of religion from our public schools. It is said the State has no religion; that it has no means of determining what the true religion is; that religious instruction in common schools is the first step towards ecclesiastical domination, or the union of the Church and the State.

If, however, the State is bound to educate at all, it is bound

to impart that kind of education which is necessary to secure the ends of good government. The State does in a multitude of cases assume the whole work of education; it gives all the instruction which a large portion of the young receive. But such education if merely secular, is conceded to be "irreligious and godless." No sane man will maintain, that the State is bound, or has the right, to train up the young in irreligion and atheism. If, therefore, the work of education is, by the providence and word of God, thrown upon the State, it must be an education in religion. The State is bound to see that the true religion is taught in all the schools under its control. This is the common sentiment of all our great men of the last generation, from Washington to a late period. All the early advocates of popular education, the authors of the common school system, as adopted in our several States, have insisted on the vital importance of training the young in the principles of piety and morality.* Those among ourselves who have arrayed themselves against "Denominational Education," have done so on the ground that our "common Christianity," our "common Protestantism," as Mr. Colwell calls it, or "religion"—"revealed religion," as the *Southern Presbyterian Review* expresses it, may be, and should be made a prominent subject of instruction in all our institutions, from the primary school to the University. It is a new, and a latitudinarian doctrine, that the State cannot teach, or cause to be taught, the great truths and duties of religion.

All the arguments which go to prove the right and duty of the State to provide for the education of the people, go to establish the right and duty of making that education religious. If the design of the State is the promotion of the public good; if religious education is necessary for the attainment of that object, and if such education cannot in a multitude of cases be secured otherwise than by State intervention, then we must either admit that the State is bound to provide for the religious education of its members, or assume the absurd position, that the State is not bound to answer the very end of its existence.

It may be objected to this argument, that since the preaching of the Gospel is essential to the public good, the State is

* See abundant proof of this presented in Dr. Cheever's able and important book.

under obligation to secure the preaching of the Gospel to the people. So it would be, were there not other agencies by which that end might be more safely and effectually accomplished. In every case in which other agencies cannot operate, the State is bound to provide its subjects with the ministrations of the gospel. It is under the most sacred obligations to provide chaplains for the army and navy, for military schools, and penitentiaries, and on this principle all Christian States, our own among the number, have ever acted.

The two leading objections to the doctrine, that the State is bound to provide for the religious education of the young, are the following; the one theoretical, and the other practical. The former is, that the State has no religion and has no means of determining what the true religion is; the latter, that in consequence of the diversity of opinion on religious subjects among the people, no system of religious instruction can be introduced into the public schools, which will not offend the feelings, or interfere with the rights of conscience of a portion of the people. In the *New Englander* for April, 1848, already quoted, it is said: "The principle, which has been so extensively adopted in the discussion of this subject, that in this country the State, or civil power, is Christian and Protestant, and therefore that schools sustained and directed in part thereby are Christian and Protestant, and that whoever attends them has no right to object to a rule requiring all to study Christian and Protestant books and doctrines, we wholly disbelieve and deny. The State, the civil power in whatever form, in this country, is no more Protestant or Christian, than it is Jewish or Mohammedan. It is of no religion whatever. It is simply political, interposing, or having the right to interpose, in matters of religion, only by protecting its citizens in the free exercise of their religion, whatever it be; of course excepting such violations of civil rights, or civil morality, as any may commit under a pretence, or a fanatical sense of religion." p. 242. Here, indeed, is a radical difference. We, on the contrary, maintain that the State in this country is Christian and Protestant, and is bound to see that the schools which it establishes are conducted on Christian and Protestant principles, and that the chaplains which it appoints are neither Jews nor Mohammedans. This

country is a Christian and Protestant country, granting universal toleration; *i. e.* allowing men of all religions to live within our borders, to acquire property, to exercise the rights of citizens, and to conduct their religious services according to their own convictions of duty. Turkey is a Mohammedan State, granting a very large measure of toleration to men of other religions. Most of the governments in Europe are Roman Catholic States, granting little or no toleration to Protestants. Sweden is a Protestant State, allowing freedom of action only to the Lutheran Church. What is meant by all this? It means that in Turkey the religion of Mohammed is the common law of the land; that the Koran regulates and determines the legislative, judicial, and executive action of the government. Whenever men associate for any purpose whatever, they do, and must, associate under the control of their religion, whatever that religion may be. If a body of Christian men organize themselves as an insurance company, or as a railroad company, or as the trustees of a college, they are bound to act as Christians in their collective capacity. They can rightfully do nothing as an organization which Christianity forbids, and they are required to do everything which Christianity enjoins, in reference to the work in which as a corporation they are engaged. Thus if a number of Christians and Protestants organize themselves as a State or political community, they are obviously bound to regulate their legislative, judicial, and executive action by the principles of their religion. No law in this country which does violence to Christianity, can be rightfully enacted by Congress, or by any State Legislature; nor would such a law, if enacted, bind the consciences of the people. No judicial decision, inconsistent with the Bible, can be, according to the supreme law of the land, or morally, obligatory. No State legislature would pass a law authorizing polygamy. Such a law being inconsistent with Christianity, would be invalid *in foro conscientiæ*, and a flagrant violation of the common law of the land, which underlies all our State constitutions, and is paramount to all legislative enactments. If a court should divorce a man and his wife for mere incompatibility of temper, they would not thereby cease to be man and wife. Men cannot make void the law of God. They cannot free themselves from the obligation to obey his word.

To say, therefore, that the State, in this country, is no more Christian and Protestant than it is Jewish or Mohammedan, is tantamount to saying, that the people of the country are destitute of all religion, of all faith, of all allegiance to God, and of all regard to the moral law. The utter absurdity, as well as infidelity of this sentiment, is betrayed by the concession that the State is bound to act in accordance with "civil morality." What modicum of moral obligation is intended by that expression, we do not know, but no matter how infinitesimal it may be, it establishes the principle. If the State is bound by any moral law, no matter how attenuated, it is of course bound by the law which its members recognize as divine. The heathen govern themselves by their convictions of moral and religious duty; so do Mohammedans, and so must Christians, unless they are recreant and reprobate. Christianity is the common and the supreme law of the land, from the necessity of the case, because it is the religion of those who constitute the country. Blessed be God, this fact is a historical and established one, which cannot be shaken by denial. It is a fact that Christianity is the religion of the people, that it does control our State action; that no congress or legislature, no court or convention has ever ventured to deny themselves bound by the Bible and the moral law. Our real statesmen, our highest judges, our chief magistrates, the founders of our government, and the ornaments of our country, have with one voice and in various forms acknowledged that Christianity is the law of the land. The Jewish religion allowed polygamy and arbitrary divorce. But no Jew in this country can be a polygamist, or put away his wife at pleasure. No man can legally pursue his ordinary avocations on the Christian Sabbath. No man can blaspheme God or Christ with impunity; and that not simply because these things might lead to a breach of the peace, but because they are wicked, and against the public conscience.

It is the principal object of the work of Mr. Colwell, at the head of this article, to prove that Christianity has ever been recognized as part of the common law in this country. Among the authorities cited are the following. Judge Story, in his Commentaries on the Constitution, says: "It is impossible for those who believe in the truth of Christianity as a divine reve-

lation, to doubt that it is the special duty of government to foster and cherish it among all the citizens and subjects." "Every American colony, from its foundation down to the Revolution, with the exception of Rhode Island (if indeed that State be an exception) did openly, by the whole course of its laws and institutions, sustain in some form the Christian religion, and almost invariably gave a peculiar sanction to some of its fundamental doctrines." "In a republic there would seem to be a peculiar propriety in viewing the Christian religion as the great basis on which it must rest for its support and permanence, if it be what it has ever been deemed by its truest friends to be, the religion of liberty." At the time of the adoption of the constitution of the United States, he says, "The attempt to level all religions, and to make it a matter of State policy to hold all in utter indifference, would have created universal disapprobation, if not universal indignation."*

In the Act for the better government of the Navy of the United States, is the following clause: "The commanders of all ships and vessels in the navy, having a chaplain on board, shall take care that divine service be performed in a solemn and reverent manner, twice a day, a sermon preached on Sunday, unless bad weather or other extraordinary accidents prevent it; and that they cause as many of the ship's company as can be spared from duty, to attend every performance of the worship of Almighty God."—*Colwell*, p. 29.

Judge Duncan, of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in a judicial decision says, "Christianity is and always has been a part of the common law" of that State. "It is impossible," he adds, "to administer the laws without taking the religion which the defendant in error has scoffed at—that Scripture which he has reviled, as their basis."—*Ibid.* pp. 55 and 58.

Mr. Webster made the following noble declaration on this subject: "There is nothing we look for with more certainty than this principle, that Christianity is part of the law of the land. This was the case among the Puritans of New England, the Episcopalians of the Southern States, the Pennsylvania Quakers, the Baptists, the mass of the followers of Whitefield, and Wesley, and the Presbyterians. All brought, and all have

* Position of Christianity, pp. 24, 25.

adopted this great truth, and all have sustained it. And where there is any religious sentiment among men at all, this sentiment incorporates itself with the law. Everything declares it.

"The generations which have gone before speak to it, and pronounce it from the tomb. We feel it. All, all proclaim that Christianity, general tolerant Christianity, Christianity independent of sects and parties, that Christianity to which the sword and fagot are unknown, general tolerant Christianity, is the law of the land."—*Ibid.* 61.

How exalted and noble are these words in contrast with the miserable and shallow sophism that the State is not more Christian than it is Jewish or Mohammedan! If then, it cannot but be, as our jurists and statesmen worthy of the name, declare it in fact is, that a Christian people of necessity constitute a Christian state—a state controlled in all its actions by the truths and laws of Christianity; just as by a like necessity a Mohammedan people constitute a Mohammedan state, controlled by the Koran, it of course follows, that in conducting the work of education, the State in this Christian country is bound to conduct it on Christian principles. It is, therefore, only by a violence to all just and ordinary principles of action, that the public schools in a Christian country, should be no more Christian, than Jewish or Mohammedan. The schools in China are instinct with the doctrines of Confucius; the schools in Turkey are imbued with the spirit of the Koran; and if the schools of America are not pervaded by the truths and principles of Christianity, it will be because we are the most irreligious or the most easily befooled people the world has yet produced. The objection to the introduction of religion into the public schools, founded on the assumption that the State in this country is of no religion, may, therefore, be dismissed as a mere infidel cavil.

The second great objection is, that such is the diversity of religious opinion in this country, that it is impossible to introduce any system of religious instruction into our educational establishments, which will not interfere with the rights of conscience. Mr. Benedict, as we have seen, asks: "Why should we compel the Jews, who are numerous in our cities, to listen to the New Testament, to repeat the Lord's Prayer, or the Apostle's creed, or be taught the mysteries of redemption, or

leave the school?" There are about seventeen thousand Jews in this country, and for their accommodation twenty millions of Christians are required to bring down their system of education to the Jewish standard. There are doubtless some thousands of Atheists and Pantheists in the country, who deny not only the existence of God, but any distinction between right and wrong. By parity of reasoning, we are bound for their benefit to exclude from our schools all reference to God, or to the first principles of morals. Such is the style of argument by which our presidents of Boards of Education, our State superintendents, and even our State legislatures, would overthrow a system of education which has prevailed in all ages in every part of Christendom. If it is a plain principle, that the State has no right to force an individual or a minority to do what their conscience forbids, it is a principle no less plain, though often strangely overlooked, that the minority have no right to force the majority to violate their conscience. The public conscience in every Christian country, and in this country pre-eminently, demands that public education shall not be "irreligious and godless;" and for the State to declare it shall be, under pretence of not wounding the conscience of the minority, is as gross a violation of the rights of conscience, as high-handed an act of injustice, and as gross an absurdity, as was ever perpetrated. Of all methods of solving the difficulty in question, this would appear to be the most preposterous. Suppose a few Christians were to settle in a Mohammedan country, and acquire the rights of citizenship, what would be thought of the demand, that for their accommodation the Koran should be banished from all the schools of the land, that all instruction in the religion of the country should be forbidden? Such a demand would be scouted by every reasonable man. Is not the proposal to banish Christianity from the schools of this Christian country, for the sake of a handful of infidels and atheists, worthy of still stronger indignation?

It may be said, however, that the minority are taxed for the support of the public schools, and, therefore, they have a right to require them to be conducted so as to suit their views. But are not the majority taxed too? Have they no rights in the premises? Besides, are not men taxed for educational purposes,

who have no children to educate? Is not a man with two children often taxed five times as much as the man with ten? Are we not all taxed for railroads, canals, hospitals, and colleges, from which we derive no immediate personal advantage? We get our compensation in the promotion of the public welfare. And those who are taxed for public schools receive a thousand fold the worth of their money in the elevation and improvement of society, even though their children never enter a State institution.

It is evident that all that has been said in reference to the exclusion of Christianity from the public schools, for the sake of Jews or Infidels, applies to the exclusion of Protestantism for the sake of Romanists. If a few thousand Protestants should become citizens of Spain or Austria, and require the Romish religion to be banished from all the public institutions of those countries, the Romanists would see them all reduced to ashes at the stake, before they would even listen to the demand. What effrontery, then, is it for the Papists in this Protestant land, to require that our schools should, for their sake, cease to be Protestant? To what an abyss of degradation was the Empire State led down by her puny politicians, when she submitted all her school-books to be expurgated by Bishop Hughes! With what ineffable scorn for Protestantism and Protestant institutions, must that astute prelate have drawn his effacing pen over the words of life and liberty which glow on every page of English and American literature! May this infamy remain for ever without a parallel, and may those blackened books be soon committed to the flames, and replaced by others luminous with Protestant Christianity! Nothing short of this can ever efface the stigma which mars the lofty brow of that great State.

If the Romanists, however, are our fellow citizens, entitled to the same political privileges, and to the same measure of religious liberty as other portions of our population, what is to be done? In answering this question it should be remembered that this is, in the sense before explained, a Protestant country. The religious character of a State does not depend primarily on the opinions of a majority of its members. It is historically determined. Turkey is a Mohammedan State, though the

Turks constitute a small minority of the people. Here, however, both the historical origin of our government, and the convictions of the vast majority of the people, concur in giving us a Protestant character. This is an undeniable fact, and therefore any solution of the difficulty in question which ignores that fact, must do violence to the public conscience. For a Protestant people to make their educational institutions acceptable to Romanists, cannot be done without their ceasing to be Protestant. It would be just as reasonable for the Papists to require that our political institutions should be accommodated to their religious convictions. Every one who knows anything of the theory of the Romish Church, or who is capable of tracing the logical consequences of the doctrine of Church infallibility, sees and knows that the Romish conscience does and must require the subordination of the State to the Church. It does and must require the forcible suppression of what it regards as heresy. If the Romish conscience, therefore is to be our rule of action, we must give up our republicanism as well as our religion; and if we are besotted enough to give up the latter, the sooner the former is taken from us the better.*

If then this country cannot, and ought not to, give up the Protestant character of its schools to satisfy Romanists, the question returns, what is to be done? The simplest answer to this question is, let Romanists do what Protestants do in Romish countries. Let them have schools of their own. The Christians in Turkey do not call upon the government to sustain their schools. Protestants in Spain and Italy make no such demand upon the Romish authorities. There is no real hardship or injustice, as we have shown, in Romanists being left to provide their own schools, even though they are taxed to

* There is another consideration which shows the unspeakable folly of Protestants attempting to conciliate Romanists by excluding religion from our common schools. The immense sacrifice is unavailing. Schools without religion are not what Romanists want. They are no great friends of popular education at best; and they are decided enemies of all education which is not in the hands of the priesthood. The good people of Salem were simple enough to dispense "with all religious exercises" in their school, "in order," as they say, "that the children of Roman Catholic parents might be free to attend. This change," they add, "failed of producing the desired effect, our (Roman) Catholic brethren having provided instruction for their own children."

sustain the schools of the State. The Quakers are justly taxed for the support of the army and navy, because they have the benefit of their protection, although they disapprove of the means by which security is obtained. If Romanists derive in various ways incalculable benefits from popular education, they may be justly taxed for its support, though they disapprove of its character.

This is one way, and as we think, one that is simple and just, of meeting the difficulty. If Romanists should neglect to establish schools of their own, the result would be, that a large part of their youth would resort to Protestant schools. If the plan suggested, though just, should be regarded as ungenerous, let Romanists be exempted in whole or in part from taxation, on condition that they should maintain a sufficient number of schools for the education of Catholic children, to be approved by the officers of the State.

Still a third method may be suggested. If the State thinks that it is far better that the children of the Roman Catholics should be educated in the Romish religion, than that they should be allowed to grow up in ignorance, let the State contribute to the support of their schools, not as to State institutions for which the State is responsible, but as to schools which do the public good service, though not belonging to the public as a Christian and Protestant body. Our conscience would not object to this. We might contribute to the support of a Turkish hospital, without approving of the religion practised within its walls. These are methods of meeting an acknowledged difficulty, any one of which we regard as incomparably better than the suicidal and futile attempt to banish from our Protestant institutions everything to which a Papist can object.

Besides the difficulty arising from the Romanists, it is further urged as a reason for excluding all religious instruction from the common schools, that Protestant denominations differ so much among themselves, that it is impossible to suit the views of all. On this we would remark. 1. That this difficulty is in a great measure imaginary. It did not originate with Protestants, but with Infidels and Romanists. Our several colleges, such as Yale, Nassau Hall, Jefferson, &c., are frequented by students of all

Protestant denominations, and yet religious instruction is freely given in them all. In Yale, Dr. Dwight was in the habit of delivering to the undergraduates those admirable lectures which have since been published under the title of "Dwight's Theology." Did any one ever object to this? Thirty or forty years ago, religion was taught in every school in New England, without objection from any source.

2. Our second remark is, that this harmony was attained not by limiting the instruction to what is called "general Christianity," but by allowing the people to do as they please. In the great majority of cases, there would be no objection to thorough religious training by the study of the Bible and of the Catechism. If any parent should object, let him have his child either exempted from attendance on the religious instruction, or permitted to study the catechism of the Church to which the parent belongs. What injustice, hardship, or difficulty is there in all this?

3. Let State officers and legislatures, instead of bending all their influence to make public instruction as little religious as possible, endeavour to render it as thoroughly Christian and Protestant as they can. Instead of vainly striving to make the schools acceptable to sceptics and Papists, let them strive to make them what they ought to be—and the people will rise up and call them blessed. Let thoroughly religious and Protestant books be provided for the libraries; let the Bible be made an indispensable text-book in every school; let some approved catechism be taught to every child, and let every care be taken to have the teachers not only competent, but religious, and we venture to predict that where one man is offended a hundred will rejoice. This is only asking the State to return to what it was and did, before scepticism and popery scared it from its propriety, and made it a prey to the enemies of all religion.

Having attempted to show that the State is entitled and bound to provide for the general education of the people; that in this country education should be Christian and Protestant; and that the objections against the introduction of religion into the common schools, made in behalf of Jews, Infidels, and Romanists, are unreasonable and fallacious, the next point to

be considered is the true prerogative of the Church in the matter of education. That secular as well as religious education, the former as a necessary adjunct of the latter, falls legitimately within the power of the Church, we never heard questioned until of late. When under the preaching of the Apostles, multitudes of the Jews and Gentiles were converted to Christianity, they formed themselves into a distinct society. They had their own places of worship, their own schools, and they took charge of their own sick and poor. They acted not only as individuals, but in their collective capacity as a Church in reference to all these objects. They had their officers for the instruction of the young, as well as for the cure of souls, or care of the poor. The idea that they were to leave their children to go to schools conducted by the heathen, and imbued with heathen doctrines and usages, never seems to have entered a Christian mind. Nor does any Christian ever seem to have doubted that it was the right and duty of the Church to provide for the education of her own children. As Christianity advanced, and the necessity and resources of the Church increased, institutions designed for the promotion of learning and religion were established under her influence and control, in every part of Christendom. When the Reformation occurred, the instruction of the young under the care of the Church, was one of the earliest, and one of the principal objects of attention. Calvin in Geneva, Luther in Germany, the Protestants of Holland, France, and Scotland, had their systems of schools, academics, and colleges, under the direction and control of the Church. This was done, not only where the Church and State were intimately united, and because of that union, but also, as in France, where no such union existed. The Christians and Churches of America have always acted on the same principle. The clergy of Boston, and of the neighbouring towns, the representatives and organs of the Churches, had the official control of Harvard. Yale was under the real and effective authority of the Churches of Connecticut. Princeton owes its existence to the Synod of New York and New Jersey. Every denomination of Christians in the land have schools and colleges under their control. It seems rather late in the day to discover that all this is wrong, that the Church

has nothing to do with secular education, that denominational schools, academies, and colleges, under the control of Church courts, are anomalies and dangerous innovations; or that a State legislature is a safer body to which to intrust the great interests of education, than a court composed of ministers and elders, the representatives of the disciples of Christ. It is hard to argue this point. There seems to be but one side to the question. The ablest pens engaged in the attempt to vindicate an exclusive right in the State, to control the education of the people, lose all their wonted power.

The design of the Church includes as one of its essential objects the instruction of the people. Christ said to her: "Go teach all nations." Her ministers are teachers; her great office is instruction. Of course what the Church is required to teach, is the religion of Jesus Christ. She is to do this in the most effective way. Everything necessary for the accomplishment of this object, comes within the scope of her commission, and assumes the nature of a divine command. If she takes the Gospel to a people who cannot read, she is bound to teach them letters. If she goes where the philosophy, the history, the science, and literature of the people are imbued with irreligious and antichristian principles, she is bound to establish institutions in which all these subjects may be taught in combination with the truth. To deny this right to the Church, is to deny her the power to fulfil her great commission. If she is to reap the harvest of truth, she must break up the fallow ground, and extirpate the briers and thorns, as well as sow the seed. You might as reasonably sow wheat in a jungle, as expect to get Christian knowledge and faith established in minds imbued with the doctrines of heathenism. Every missionary body, therefore, has felt that education, the education of the young, secular as well as religious, was indispensable for the propagation of the Gospel and the establishment of the church in heathen lands. Batticotta in Ceylon, Dr. Duff's Institution in Calcutta, Allahabad in Northern India, are all monuments and evidences of the necessity of secular education to the propagation of the Gospel. These are Church Institutions, and to deny the right of the Church to establish such schools, shocks the conscientious convictions of the religious

community, and excites something bordering on indignation. Such denial never could have been ventured on by good men, except to serve a purpose. In their zeal to protect the public schools from injury, and to secure for them the co-operation of the religious community; and in their anxiety lest State colleges or those under the control of self-perpetuating boards of trustees, should lose caste or confidence, a few, and only a few of our leading men, have been led for a time, into the apparent assumption that the Church and Church-courts have nothing to do with secular education. We believe, however, there has been no little misapprehension on both sides, on this subject; and that no party, and perhaps no individual in our Church, is now prepared deliberately to question the right of the Church to have her own schools, academies, and colleges, whenever and wherever they are necessary for the attainment of the great end of a Christian and Protestant education. That Christians in the midst of heathens, that Protestants in the midst of Romanists, not only have the right to such establishments under their own ecclesiastical control, but are solemnly bound by the command of God, and the nature of their vocation as a Church, to have them, no man, we presume, will venture to deny. And that this right which thus inheres in the Church, in virtue of her commission and the design of her appointment, it is to be exercised whenever the ends of a thorough religious education cannot otherwise be attained, we hold to be equally beyond dispute.

The arguments urged against the right of the Church in this matter, are such as these. 1. That if education belongs to the Church it cannot belong to the State. This, we have before remarked, is an obvious fallacy. The care of the sick and of the poor belong, by divine command, to the Church and to the State alike. 2. If education belongs to the Church, it is said, it must be of the nature of religious things, and the duty of superintending it must be in its nature spiritual. This is another fallacy. All that is needed is, to show that education is necessary as a means for the promotion of religion. If the Church is bound to secure the end, she has the right to use the requisite means. The care of the sick and poor is not so much of the nature of religious things, as education is, and yet the care of

the poor, by divine command, belongs to the Church. How easy would it be to retort the objection. If religion, we might say, is a necessary part of education, it cannot belong to the State, for the State is in its nature secular. But those whose arguments we are now considering, admit that the State is bound to secure a religious education for the people. A secular power, therefore, may be bound to do a religious work; then why may not the Church, a religious power, be bound to do a secular work? The fact is, both are bound to do what is necessary for the ends of their existence.*

3d. Another form of the same argument is presented thus: "Education is an affair purely civil, purely temporal. It cannot be shown, that the processes of acquiring the art of reading and writing, have anything more to do with the spiritual operations of our being, than the processes of acquiring any other art; for these are merely arts—arts by means of one of which, when acquired, we may ourselves proceed indefinitely in the acquisition of knowledge; and by means of the other of which, we may act indefinitely in the communication of knowledge. Nor can it be shown, that the process by which any one part of knowledge, not purely moral, is acquired, is any more religious, or has any more relation to religion, than any other part of knowledge; so that every means by which any mortal acquires any knowledge, is as much liable as the district school, to be engrossed by the Church; as indeed it has been in past ages. Nor can it be shown that a company of boys at school, is more liable to spiritual injury, than a company of boys at a tannery or a carpenter's shop; nor that unsanctified study, as they express it, more demands, upon principle, the supervision of the Church, than unsanctified play, or unsanctified work."†

Even if the premises of this argument were correct, the conclusion would not necessarily follow. We might admit that "education is an affair purely civil, purely temporal;" that what a boy is expected to learn in the district school, the

* The Church, it is said, should have the control of things strictly religious, and of none other; for her Master has given this control, and no other; and right reason, as well as divine truth, limits her to this sphere as the one of her true and real power. —*Southern Presbyterian Review.*

† Southern Presbyterian Review.

academy, or college, has no more relation to religion, than what he learns in a tannery or carpenter's shop; and yet consistently assert the right of the Church, on due occasion, to supervise and control it. Architecture, and the building of houses, is a matter purely civil, and yet the Church has the right to build houses and to organize a system of Church extension. The truth is, that any thing, no matter how purely it may be of a civil nature in itself considered, becomes a legitimate matter of Church direction whenever it is a necessary means for the promotion of religion. We, however, deny that education is in its nature a civil affair. On the contrary, the training of the young is of necessity of a moral and religious, as well as an intellectual operation. The Southern Reviewer himself says: Revealed religion "ought to be made a prominent part of education, from the primary school to the University." How, then, can it be "an affair purely civil?" How can the school be sunk to a level with the tannery? Is "the revealed religion" an essential part of the art of tanning leather? It is only by degrading education to a level with a handicraft, that even a plausible pretext can be framed for withdrawing it from the province of the Church.

4th. It is urged that the Church has not perfectly secured the object aimed at, when she had the control of schools and colleges. Even in Scotland, "it has not availed much that the schoolmasters must be members of the Established Church, and in our own country memorable examples are not wanting to prove that we have achieved little in the way of giving education a safe moral direction, when we have placed it most completely under ecclesiastical control." We cannot see the force of this argument. Does the fact that the Church has not fully accomplished her mission, though she has ever been intrusted with the preaching of the gospel, prove that she has no right to preach? or that she should be forbid to exercise that right? How then does the fact, that she has not accomplished her whole work, though she has had the control of education, prove either that she has no right to educate, or that the work should be taken out of her hands and given to the State? Has nothing been done in Scotland by her parish schools? Lives there a Scotchman in the world, or a man in whose veins a drop of

Scotch blood circulates, who has courage to say, it had been well for Scotland had her parochial schools never existed, or that the control of them had been in the hands of her Stuarts and Lauderdales?

5th. The work is represented as far too great for the Church to accomplish. This objection bears only against those, if any there be, who maintain that the Church has the exclusive right to educate. We know no one who takes this ground. It is expressly disclaimed by the Board of Education, and by their able and devoted Secretary. All admit that there is work enough for Church and State, for individuals and bodies corporate, to do. It should, however, be borne on the conscience of the Church, that should the State provide only a secular or irreligious education, the whole work would come on her. She would in that case be bound to declare off from all State schools, and assume the work of providing a proper education for the whole people. She has assumed the work of preaching the gospel for the whole population. The work of education is not greater, and will not prove to be beyond her strength. If God brings the occasion, he will give the grace. The objection, however, from the magnitude of the work, does not bear in the present posture of the controversy. No one wishes to drive the State from the field, so that the Church may have everything to do.

6th. Much the most plausible argument, not against the right of the Church, but against the expediency of the establishment of parochial schools, is, that if Christians of various denominations devote their energy to the establishment of Church schools, the public institutions will be left in the hands of irreligious men. More good, it is urged, can be accomplished, more power exerted in the promotion of religious knowledge by the Christian community giving a right direction to the public schools, than by the establishment of schools under Church control. If this were so, we should, on the grounds of expediency, be opposed to denominational education. It is to be remembered, however, that the establishment of parochial schools has been forced upon the Church, by the irreligious character of the education furnished by the State. No one heard of parochial schools until, under the instigation of Pa-

pists, the State authorities began to exclude the Bible and to expurgate the school books. We, however, do not believe that denominational education will seriously interfere with the interest taken in the schools of the State. Christians see that the public schools are exerting an immense influence on the public mind. They have every possible motive to labour to make those schools as good as possible. The establishment of parochial schools, by raising the standard of education, and by provoking emulation, will tend to improve the whole system of State education.

Neither, then, on the ground of right nor expediency, can the propriety of the Church assuming her position as "one of the parties" in the work of education, be legitimately called in question. By her divine commission she is required to teach all nations. It is impossible that she should fulfil her commission without, in a multitude of cases, engaging in the work of secular education. And, therefore, wherever and whenever the proper religious and secular training of the young cannot be otherwise accomplished, it is the bounden official duty, as well as the prerogative, of the Church, to intervene for the attainment of that object.

Our fourth position is, that in the existing state of our country, our Church cannot properly give up the whole work of education to the State. Having seen that religion is an essential element in the education of the young, and that it is equally the right and duty of the Church and State to provide for them a Christian and Protestant training, it is obvious that the separate duty of these two parties to the work, is one to be determined by circumstances. If the State provides such an education for the people as the conscience of the Church demands, there is no necessity for separate Church action in the premises. And, on the other hand, if parents or the Church make such provision for this object as satisfies the necessities of the State, there is no need for State intervention. The position assumed by our Church and by a large part of the Christian community is, that the State does not in fact, in this country, and cannot rationally be expected to, furnish an education sufficiently religious to satisfy the just demands of a Christian people, and therefore, that it is the duty of the Church, while endeavouring

to make the State education as good as possible, to provide at least for her own members a course of instruction more thoroughly according to her own views. The correctness of this position is fully sustained by the two following considerations. First, that the standard of religious education fixed by the most religious advocates of the State system, is too low. And, secondly, that there is no rational hope of seeing our public schools, as a general thing, elevated even to that defective standard.

In religious education there are two things obviously distinct and of almost equal importance. The first is, the communication of truth to the mind, so that it shall become part of the pupil's knowledge; the other is, the impression of it on the conscience and religious feelings, so as to render it practically operative in the formation of the character and government of the conduct. What, therefore, Christians are bound to require, and what the Church is bound to see as far as possible effected, is that a knowledge of Christianity as a system of divinely revealed truth, should be communicated to the minds of the young; and that that system should be, as far as human agency can go, suitably impressed on the heart, by sincerely religious as well as intelligent teachers. Religious education in this sense of the term, is of necessity a very protracted process. It requires constant and long continued effort. It is only by years of instruction that a child or youth can be brought to such an intelligent and comprehensive knowledge of the contents of the Bible, of its facts, institutions, doctrines, and precepts, as is necessary for his proper moral and religious development as a Christian man. It is not by the simple use of the New Testament as a reading book in the public schools, that this object has ever been accomplished. The Bible must be regularly studied; its doctrines clearly drawn out and inculcated, and the principles of duty exhibited and applied. It is by a course of instruction which renders the pupil an intelligent Christian, so far as knowledge is concerned, that Scotch schools have exerted the wonderful influence universally attributed to them. It is by a similar process of indoctrination, that the Prussian system has availed to preserve religious knowledge among the common people, in the midst of a general apostacy of the clergy into

rationalism. It is evident that no such thorough religious teaching is now contemplated as desirable, or, at least, as possible in our State institutions. The writer in the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, seems to make the introduction of the Bible as "a reading book," the maximum of religious instruction for common schools. "In Maryland," he says, "about the year 1838, by a simultaneous movement, the word of God was introduced as a reading book, first into the public schools of the city of Baltimore, and afterwards into far the greater part of the public and private schools of the State. Those who insist on going beyond this, and require, as a part of public education, that the peculiarities of their particular sect shall be publicly taught to all the pupils in all the schools, manifestly require what they would not themselves be willing to concede to others, and which it is therefore absurd for them to expect that others will concede to them."*

Mr. Colwell pleads for instruction in "general Christianity," that in which all denominations agree. He says, "There is a general Christianity in which men may be saved, who belong to no particular denomination, and are instructed in no peculiar tenets." p. 118. "The simple fact that Protestants admit that men may be saved in any Christian communion, in which the essential truths of Christianity are professed, proves that there is a common ground on which all might meet if they would." p. 119. "This common ground" he adds, "has not been defined, vindicated, and proclaimed, because Christians have spent their strength upon their differences, and not upon their agreement." p. 120. "It is this Christianity which is common to the prevailing denominations, which is to be communicated to, and impressed upon the children of the United States, in the public schools." p. 126.

The objection to this is, that it is indefinite. By common Christianity, one man understands mere philanthropy; another makes it an ethical code, another a system of natural religion. The very fact that it is undefined, renders it unfit for a standard of religious instruction. It means little or much, just as

* It need hardly be remarked, that there is a wide interval between simply making the Bible "a reading book," and requiring denominational peculiarities to be taught "to all the pupils in all the schools." The latter no one demands; more than the former, every friend of religion is bound to require.

every one pleases. If by common Christianity be meant the doctrines common to all who call themselves Christians, including Unitarians and Universalists, it is evident this would not, and ought not to, satisfy the conscience of the Church.

Dr. Cheever in his eloquent plea for the Bible in common schools, quotes Dr. Humphrey, as thus describing the religion to be taught in common schools. "There are certain great moral and religious principles, in which all denominations are agreed, such as the ten commandments, our Saviour's golden rule, everything in short which lies within the whole range of duty to God, and duty to our fellow men." *Cheever*, p. 160. But is this Christianity? Here is not one word of those great doctrines without which Christianity is a dead letter. On another page, he quotes Mr. Webster to much the same effect. "It is notorious that there are certain great truths which are admitted and believed by all Christians. All believe in the existence of a God. All believe in the immortality of the soul. All believe in the responsibility, in another world, for our conduct in this. All believe in the divine authority of the New Testament. And cannot all these great truths be taught to children, without their minds being perplexed with clashing doctrines and sectarian controversies? Most certainly they can."

It is evident that the standard here set up by the advocates of religious instruction in the common schools, is far below what the Church is bound to require. But even this modicum of religious teaching cannot in many cases be secured. The Bible has in many places been excluded by public authority. Everything sectarian, *i. e.*, everything to which Jew or Romanist could object, has been proscribed. The whole influence of government, and the general tendency of the public mind has been to the entire exclusion of religion from the public schools. This exclusion is advocated by politicians and by ministers of the Gospel, by influential religious, as well as secular journals. A very great change has occurred in this matter. Fifty years ago, the Westminster Catechism, as well as the Bible, was taught in all the schools in New England. Now the Bible can hardly be retained as "a reading book." The *New Englander* advocates the exclusion of all religion, and quotes with appro-

bation, the language of Dr. Vaughan in the *British Quarterly Review*. "For our own part," says that gentleman, "we have always entertained a very low opinion of the religious instruction given in day-schools, and of the religious impression produced by it. We have thought that a fuss has been made about it wonderfully greater than the thing itself would justify." Think of that, ye shades of Knox and Calvin! So low as that, have men of our day descended. Too much "fuss" is made about an agency which, next to the ministry of the word, has done more to mould human character and to decide human destiny, than any other in the world. The *New Englander* not only endorses this, but says: "The plan of giving no direct religious instruction, has, in its essential features, been practised generally in New England for thirty years."

Is it not time, then, for the Church to move? If one party, and that the largest and most powerful, advocate the entire exclusion of religion from public institutions, colleges, as well as schools; if another pleads only for that amount of instruction which can offend neither the Unitarian nor the Romanist; if in point of fact, common schools, and colleges under State control, are, in many cases, conducted without the semblance of religious instruction, can the Church, or Christians, leave the whole work of education in the hands of the State? Are we not bound to have institutions of our own, in which the gospel may be fully taught and faithfully inculcated? In so doing we take the most effectual method of elevating public sentiment, and of bringing back the State to a higher appreciation of its duties. If State schools and colleges are conducted without any religious instruction, and other institutions rise around them, in which Christianity is faithfully taught, the former must either become Christian or perish. We do not advocate any indiscriminate action, or the purpose to establish Church schools and colleges wherever they can be placed. If the State institutions are truly Christian, as we know is often the case, especially as it concerns common schools, it would be most unwise to set up rival institutions. What we contend for is, that the Church, as well as individual Christians, has a right by her divine charter to provide for the secular, as well as the religious training of the young; and that in the existing state of our

country it is incumbent on her, in many places, to exercise that right. Wherever thorough religious instruction cannot be incorporated in the common school, the Church is bound to have a parochial school. Wherever there is a college under control of the State, which excludes Christianity from its course of instruction, the Church, or Christians, are bound to provide a Christian College.

The only other position which remains to be considered is, that the Church, in providing that religious education which our present exigencies demand, cannot rely upon the separate action of her members, but is bound to act in her organized capacity, and, therefore, that the principles on which our Board of Education have acted in aiding the establishment of schools, academies, and colleges, are sound, and ought to be approved.

If private Christians establish schools, or academies, or colleges, in which religion is adequately taught, then, in the places where this is done, there is, as before remarked, no call for the intervention of the Church in her organized capacity. But such individual and separate action is altogether inadequate. In the work of domestic and foreign missions, we can depend neither on individual effort, nor on voluntary associations. The Church as such in her organized form, is bound to conduct these great enterprises. It is only by this combined action that the resources of the Church can be called out; that the strong can be brought systematically to aid the weak; and that the requisite security for orthodoxy and fidelity can ordinarily be attained. All these considerations apply with as much force to the work of education, as they do to the work of missions. How many parochial schools, or how many Christian colleges, in our Western States, would have been established without the co-operation of the Board of Education? The necessity of this organized assistance is felt and acknowledged universally. Our New England and New-school brethren have a voluntary society for assisting in the support of Western colleges. Are we to have resort to such a society? Must the battle between ecclesiastical boards, and voluntary irresponsible societies, be fought over again in our Church? The work cannot be left to individual enterprise. There must be concentrated and organized effort. Shall this be by the Church? or by one or more voluntary organi-

zations? There can be but one answer given to these questions, and it has been given by the Church in a way not to be mistaken.

But if the Church is to raise the funds for the support of these schools and colleges, she must control their management. Our parochial schools must be under Church sessions, and our Church colleges under synodical supervision. This is not only right, but necessary for the obvious reasons: First, that the Church, in raising funds for a specific object, becomes responsible for their proper application. Secondly, because the very ground of Church intervention in the matter, is that State schools and colleges do not furnish security for that kind of education which the conscience of the Church demands. It would be easy to refer to a State college long under the control of one of the most notorious infidels in the land; to another where many of the professors were avowed skeptics; and to others where religious instruction is entirely excluded; and where the Sabbath is disregarded—the students being allowed to spend that day as they please. It is not right or reasonable to expect either the Church or Christian men to contribute for the support of institutions controlled by trustees appointed by State legislatures.

It may be said, however, that self-perpetuating corporations furnish all reasonable security. On this it may be remarked, that where such boards of trustees already exist, and have an established character, they ought to be confided in, and nothing should be done in any way to weaken their hands. But when the Church is called upon to aid in the founding a college—it is right she should herself retain the control. If it be known and agreed upon, that the trustees of a college in Wisconsin or Iowa, are to be appointed by a Presbyterian Synod, there is a ground of confidence for the present and the future, that no list of names of a self-perpetuating corporation could inspire. If any man doubts this, let him make the experiment. Let him try to raise funds for a college in the far West, under a self-perpetuating board, and see if he will find it as easy as to secure aid for one under the care of a Synod. Such colleges as Princeton, Jefferson, Washington, Hampden Sydney, have the full confidence of the Church, and are entitled to it. But

when the question is, how shall new colleges, especially in the thinly settled parts of the country, be organized, in order to give due security for their religious influence? the case is very different. Under such circumstances neither State control, nor self-perpetuating trustees, can furnish any such security, either for liberal education or sound religious influence, as ecclesiastical supervision.

It has, however, been said, "the working of systems of secular education, the virtual, if not formal appointment and removal of teachers, the determination of courses and methods of secular teaching, and, in effect, the last appeal in questions of discipline," do not "fall properly within the divinely appointed jurisdiction of the spiritual courts of Christ's house, or constitute the proper themes of promoting the spirituality and peace of the Church." Do these subjects belong more legitimately to a State legislature? Suppose the course of instruction for our youth, the selection of teachers, and final administration of discipline must belong directly to a political legislature, Whig or Democrat, or to a Presbyterian Synod—no good man, we answer for it, would prefer the former. The objection, however, has no foundation. There is no necessity for any of these distracting details being brought before the Synod. They do not come before the legislature. The legislature retains the appointment of trustees, and thus has entire control over the State institutions; but it has nothing to do with these details of management. So the Synod of Kentucky appoints the trustees of Centre College, and leaves to them its management. We are not aware that the spiritual interests of that Synod are injuriously affected by its relation to the college; nor would any other Synod have much to fear from that source.

If the Church then as an organization, is called by its duty to the country and to its divine Master, to aid in securing the establishment of schools, academies and colleges under her own control, wherever such institutions of a proper character do not exist, or cannot be secured, it is hardly open to question that the Board of Education is right in the course which it has hitherto pursued in relation to this subject. That Board is the organ of the Church for educational purposes, and whatever

the Church does in that department is done through that Board. The question whether the field of labour has not so increased as to call for a separate organization, is one of expediency and not of principle. It is analogous to the question whether the work of Church extension should continue to be a branch of the work of missions, or be erected into a separate department. It is obvious, that no new organization ought to be adopted, so long as the work to be done is adequately accomplished by those which now exist.

It is, indeed, said, that "the work of inaugurating a scheme so vast, and so complex, and requiring gifts, knowledge, and experience in its founders, of so varied and comprehensive a character," cannot properly be coupled with the other objects of that Board. This supposes that the Board of Education is to stand in the place and perform the duties of trustees to all the schools, academies, and colleges which it may be called upon to aid. The Board, however, have no more to do with the management of these schools and colleges, than it has with the direction of the Theological Seminaries in which its candidates study. They are the mere agents of the Church for the collection and distribution of money, and for stimulating the efforts of its members. If a pastor informs the Board that he needs aid for the establishment of a parochial school, or if a Synod call upon them for assistance in sustaining a college, such help may be afforded without any very extraordinary "gifts, knowledge, or experience" on the part of the officers of the Board.

We look back on the recent discussions on this whole subject with great satisfaction. It has no doubt done good. It has, on the one hand, led to a clearer view of the duty of the State in reference to the work of education, and to a deeper sense of the importance of Christians exerting themselves to give a truly religious character to the public schools; and, upon the other hand, it has served to produce a stronger conviction of the high part the Church is called to act in this matter, and of the importance of the Board of Education continuing and extending their efforts to establish schools, academies, and colleges, "on a definite religious basis, and under the Church's own care."

Art VI.—*The General Assembly.*

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, met, agreeably to appointment, in the Central Presbyterian Church, Buffalo, New York, on Thursday, the 18th day of May, in the year of our Lord 1854, at 11 o'clock, A. M., and was opened with a sermon by the Rev. John C. Young, D. D., Moderator of the last Assembly, from Luke xxii. 26: "But ye shall not be so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve."

On motion of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, it was resolved that all honorary titles be omitted from the roll of this Assembly.

The Assembly then proceeded to the election of officers, requiring, on motion, a majority of all the votes cast to constitute a choice. The Rev. Henry A. Boardman, D. D., was chosen Moderator, and the Rev. Joseph R. Wilson, temporary clerk.

It was resolved, that the first half hour of every morning session of the Assembly should be devoted to devotional exercises, conducted by the Moderator. These seasons of devotion were generally well attended, and evidently produced a very happy effect.

In looking over the roll of the Assembly the reader will be struck with the unusually large attendance of elders. From some Synods there was not a single vacancy in the lay representation. We regard this as a very auspicious omen. No one present during the sessions of the Assembly could fail to notice the happy influence exerted by the many distinguished laymen who were members of the body. We believe few Assemblies have met in which there was a greater amount of intelligence, and good feeling, or in which a greater unanimity was arrived at in the decision of all important questions.

A paper was presented from the Presbytery of Lake, respecting a limitation of the number of Professors in our Theological Seminaries, which, on motion, was laid on the table. This was done for two reasons; first, because there was nothing in the paper itself to show that it came to the Assembly by order of

the Presbytery; and, secondly, because a commissioner from the Presbytery stated it was not its intention that the document should be forwarded to this body.

Church in the City of Washington.

The Rev. Stuart Robinson presented various papers relating to the erection of a new church in Washington City; including a report of the Church Extension Committee for the City of Washington, the special action of the Presbytery of Baltimore, and a memorial from the ministers in Washington, Georgetown, and Alexandria; all of which were referred to the Committee on the Board of Domestic Missions. Subsequently the following minute was adopted:

The Committee on the Report of the Board of Domestic Missions have carefully considered the matter of the Assembly's Church in Washington City. In various parts of the country, misconceptions of the plan have attached themselves to it. Rightfully understood, your committee are perfectly satisfied that it has strong claims upon our friendly regard. But we are not called on to consider the subject as an original question. The Assembly is committed, and your committee unanimously recommend that in this matter we "take no step backwards." Were there no other considerations forbidding us to falter, the effects of such a course upon the interests and influence of our brethren in Washington, would be enough. They tell us in their memorial, and no doubt they tell us well, "the project came to us from abroad. We appreciate the kindness of the movement, but it will be for our deep injury if not efficiently executed. It was a step which once taken can never safely be delayed. Our character is largely at stake. It is now to be seen whether in this capital we represent a Church hasty in resolving, but feeble in action, or one which wisely counts the cost, and unflinchingly executes its plans."

With reference to the best way of accomplishing what we have commenced, your committee are perfectly aware that this Assembly cannot compel any action on the part of our Presbyteries or churches. The General Assembly can only plead with some the intrinsic merits of the plan, rightly understood, and with others that they should lay aside every objection that is

not a pure matter of conscience and of principle, and come forward to relieve this body from the embarrassments that surround it.

The Committee accordingly recommend the following:

Resolved, 1. That the Church Extension Committee of the City of Washington, appointed by the Presbytery of Baltimore, be requested by this Assembly to continue to act, with the addition of the Rev. Messrs. Gurley and Henry as members of the same.

Resolved, 2. That the papers presented to this Assembly on this subject, to wit, the memorial of ministers in Washington, Georgetown, and Alexandria, the memorial of the Presbytery of Baltimore, and the report of the Church Extension Committee of the City of Washington, be appended to the Minutes of this Assembly.

Resolved, 3. That this Assembly appoint one minister or elder in every Presbytery, to whom, as to a beloved son, this body will commit the charge of this business in the bounds of the several Presbyteries; that these ministers or elders be requested to adopt any plan which they in their wisdom may deem best for the speedy completion of this work; that they be requested, as far as possible, to carry this effort into every particular congregation, however small or feeble; and that they be requested to report as soon as possible, and remit the funds collected to Charles Stott, Esq., Treasurer of the Church Extension Committee, of the City of Washington, or to Samuel D. Powel, of Philadelphia, Treasurer of the Board of Missions.

Resolved, 4. That all our Presbyteries be requested to take measures, at their fall sessions, to carry out the wishes of this body as above expressed, in all cases of failure from whatever cause.

Foreign Missions.

The Rev. John C. Lowrie, D.D., one of the Secretaries of the Board of Foreign Missions, addressed the Assembly in reference to the operations of the past year, and the wants and plans of the Board, giving an interesting and very encouraging account of its condition. The entire receipts of the year are about $20,000 in advance of the year preceding—this, how-

ever, is principally from various societies outside of our Church, and from the Government. The receipts from collections alone, are slightly in advance of last year. It is a melancholy fact, that out of our 2879 churches, but 1350 have made any contribution during the last year—less than half of all of them; and yet an instance has never been known by the Board in which, when this cause was presented to the people, they did not respond to it. The Board feel some uneasiness as to their finances for the future. Of necessity they have been compelled to enlarge their plans, and this will require a larger amount of funds. The Church can easily furnish all necessary means if she will. At present, taking the average of all her members, they do not give one penny a week to this object! He believed our Church could give $1,000,000 a year to Foreign Missions —it would be but $5 a year from each member—or taking all who are accustomed to give into the account, not more than $2 or $3 from each donor. The financial affairs of this Board are satisfactorily conducted—three of the largest donors being members of the Executive Committee, who must know how things stand. The executive expenses of every kind at the office at home, are believed to be considerably less than those of any similar institution in the country. They amount to about eight per cent. on the whole receipts.

The Rev. Mr. Armstrong, Chairman of the Committee on the Board of Foreign Missions, presented the following resolutions:

The Committee to whom was referred the Report of the Board of Foreign Missions, having examined that report with as much care as the time allowed them would permit, recommend to the Assembly that it be approved, and printed for circulation, as in former years.

They would also offer the following resolutions, as embodying the results of their examination of this report of the labours of our Board of Foreign Missions during the year past, viz.

1. *Resolved*, That in the success with which efforts in the Foreign Missionary field have been crowned during the year, there is much occasion for devout thanksgiving to the great Head of the Church, and for an increase in our faith in the blessed promise given in connection with the missionary com-

mission of the Church, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

2. *Resolved*, That the Assembly heartily approve of the manner in which the Board, the Executive Committee, and officers to whom the management of the Foreign Missionary operations of our Church have been committed, have conducted their operations during the year.

3. *Resolved*, That in the multiplied openings for missionary labours, which God in his providence has made during the past year, as well as in the blessings with which he has crowned our efforts as a Church, the Assembly recognize the obligation laid upon the Church for an increase, both of the number of men, and the amount of the means devoted to this work.

4. *Resolved*, That the Assembly would earnestly commend this subject, of an increase both of missionaries and missionary funds, to the careful and prayerful consideration of the pastors and sessions of all our Churches, that they may adopt such measures as, in their judgment, will best secure the attention, awaken the Christian sympathies, and call forth the cheerful and liberal contributions of all the members of their respective Churches.

These resolutions were sustained by remarks from Rev. Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Lanneau, Judge Fine, Dr. Adger, Mr. Painter, and Dr. Spring.

Dr. Adger entered into some statistical comparisons, in order to show that the Synod of South Carolina had contributed more in proportion than other Synods to the cause of Foreign Missions, because, as he suggested, "the ministers and sessions just go forward and do the work themselves." "They had no machinery at all." "This," he regarded, "as an illustration of the admirable working of our Presbyterian machinery." This is very encouraging. The great design of machinery, so far as raising funds is concerned, is to induce "ministers and sessions to do the work themselves." And if South Carolina has advanced so far as to do without the machinery, which less favoured portions of the Church still need, it is a matter of rejoicing. We hope the example may have its due weight in exciting and guiding effort.

Dr. Spring urged with force the idea that the claims of the

cause of missions on the lay members of the Church, had never been duly recognized. The commission of Christ was given to the Church and not to the ministry, and scores of young men who are not ministers must go to promote the Gospel in heathen lands. This is a truth of great importance, and should be expanded and brought to bear practically on the missionary work.

Board of Education.

Dr. Van Rensselaer presented the annual report which treated first of Ministerial Education. The decrease of candidates, which has been so much the ground of regret, must be referred to widely operating causes, and not to such as are peculiar to our own Church. The Evangelical Churches at home and abroad are suffering in the same way. The number of new candidates this year is larger than for many years past, being one hundred and four. The whole number under the care of the Board is three hundred and forty. It was recommended that the appropriations to the candidates should be increased, so as to allow eighty dollars a year to students in academies, one hundred to those in colleges, and one hundred and twenty-five to those in Theological Seminaries. The Board urged in concluding this part of their report, that greater caution should be exercised in the selection of candidates, and greater effort made to increase their number.

Of the second part of the report we present a fuller abstract, borrowed from the public papers.

Christian Education in Schools, Academies, and Colleges—Parochial or primary schools.—The religious part of the instruction is promoted in three ways:—First, by acts of worship, such as prayer, reading the Scriptures, and singing; secondly, by religious instruction in the Bible and Catechism; and thirdly, by Christian government and discipline. A number of new schools have been established during the year; and the munificent offer of $5,000 in aid of the cause has been of the most essential use. The number of schools is over one hundred. Some of the older scholars have professed religion during the year.

Presbyterian Academies.—The two points which require the constant care of Presbyteries are, first, to give religion its

due prominence in the course of instruction; and secondly, to make the Academies first-class institutions in all the departments of secular instruction. A large number of youth in our academies have made a profession of religion during the year. The average would give at least two to an academy. The number of our academies is forty-seven. The Ashmun Institute, designed for the education of coloured youth, under the care of New Castle Presbytery, is nearly ready for organization.

Colleges.—There are fifteen colleges under Synodical supervision, of which nine are well established, the others being of recent origin. In addition to these, three others have charters. After giving a brief account of each college, the Report refers to colleges not under the direct care of the Church, and advocates the position, that when such colleges have the confidence of the Synods, they should be regarded as Presbyterian institutions. The Report expresses the hope that fraternal co-operation will prevail in this department.

Miscellaneous and Teachers' Department.—Thirteen young men have received aid during the year; and among them several sons of our ministers. Two have professed religion during the year.

General Remarks.—1. The right of the Church to educate does not imply an exclusive right, or the necessity of always exercising that right; nor does it compel parents to send their children to Church institutions. Furthermore, it does not *depreciate* other educational agencies besides the Church. 2. The apprehension that Church education brings too much business into our Judicatories, may be removed by leaving most of the management to Trustees. 3. The withdrawal of our influence from the State system is then considered. The education of our own children religiously need not, and does not, prevent us from supporting the public system, any more than the charge which our deacons have of the poor in the Church prevents them from sympathizing with the poor in the community who are outside of the Church. Besides, there is room enough for all classes of schools; and the influence of religious schools will be most salutary upon the State schools, especially in improving their religious character. 4. The centralization of too much

power in the Board, is met by the fact that, in the Presbyterian system, the entire internal management of the institutions is in the Judicatories. 5. The propriety of blending the two departments of the Board in one administrative agency, is left entirely to the judgment of Assembly. Whether another Secretary shall be appointed, or a separate Board be established, or whether the affairs shall be conducted on the present plan, are questions, whose decision by the Assembly, in any way, will be acquiesced in by the Board without the least concern.

Funds.—The following is the state of the treasury:

	Candidates' Fund.	*Schools, &c.*
Receipts,	$34,961 26	$10,726 03
Balance,	8,068 91	1,998 46
Income,	43,030 17	12,734 49
Payments,	35,105 75	12,643 78
Balance,	$7,924,42	$90 71

Total income in these two funds, $55,764 66; payments, $47,749 53.

The Rev. Dr. Hall, as chairman of the Committee on Education, reported the following resolutions, which were adopted:

1. *Resolved*, That in view of the greatness of the office of the Christian ministry, in its origin, its work, and its necessity in the divine economy of salvation, the diminution of candidates in our own and in other evangelical Churches for several years past, is deeply to be deplored, especially as the signs of the times at home and abroad indicate an increased necessity for a greater number of wise, devoted, and amply qualified ministers; and that this necessity is a providential enforcement upon the Church, of the injunction of her Great Head, to pray—to pray in private and in the sanctuary—to pray habitually that the Lord of the harvest will send forth labourers into the harvest.

2. *Resolved*, That the increase of new candidates during the past year demands our gratitude to God, who alone is able to turn the hearts of the sons of the Church from secular pursuits to the self-denying labour of preaching Christ, and him crucified.

3. *Resolved*, That the Assembly, in view of the hopeful signs of increase in the number of candidates, enjoin upon Presbyteries the exercise of great vigilance to guard against the introduction of the unworthy to a course of preparation for the sacred office, while at the same time they make earnest efforts to enlarge the ministerial resources of our Church.

4. *Resolved*, That the Assembly approve of the recommendation of the Board, to increase appropriations to candidates, so that those in the academical course shall receive $80, those in the collegiate course, $100, and those in the theological course $120, with liberty, in special cases, of increasing the appropriations on the recommendation of Presbyteries.

5. *Resolved*, That the Assembly regard Christian training at all periods of youth, and by all practicable methods, especially by parents at home, by teachers in institutions of learning, and by pastors through catechetical and Bible-classes, as binding upon the Church, according to the injunction, "Train up a child in the way he should go," and as having a vital connection with the increase of the numbers and efficiency of the ministry, and of the stability and purity of the Church.

6. *Resolved*, That the efforts of the Presbyterian Church in behalf of schools, academies, and colleges, on a definite religious basis, and under her own care, have met with a success, important in present results, and hopeful for the future, and that these operations deserve to be continued and enlarged, with entire friendliness to all other educational efforts not positively injurious in their tendency; and especially that institutions under the management of members of our own Church, either privately or in corporations not subject to ecclesiastical supervision, in which religion is duly inculcated, ought to be regarded as entitled to confidence.

7. *Resolved*, That the General Assembly (by affirming the Church to be one of the parties in education, and by acting on that principle, in accordance with the practice of all the Reformed Churches) has never denied the importance of State cooperation in this great work, however defective it may be in some parts of the country; but, on the contrary, rejoices in the general enlightenment of the masses under the public school

system, and hopes that all Presbyterians, besides supporting their own institutions, will continue, as heretofore, to be known as the true friends of general education throughout the country, and as the advocates of the Bible in common schools.

8. *Resolved*, That the mode of conducting the operations of the Board on their enlarged scale, be referred to the Board itself, to take such action as shall prevent either department interfering with the other, and as may continue to keep prominently before the churches the education of pious and indigent young men for the gospel ministry.

9. *Resolved*, That the last Thursday of February next be recommended as a day of special prayer for the outpouring of God's Spirit on the churches, and of public instruction on Christian education, especially with reference to the necessity of an enlargement of the ministerial resources of the Church.

As no little discussion had been carried on in the papers, and by pamphlets on the education question, it was naturally expected that the subject would excite unusual interest on the floor of the Assembly. The public discussion, however, seems to have produced, by means of mutual explanations, such unanimity of views, that all the above resolutions, sustaining and endorsing as they do the course of the Board of Education, were passed with scarcely a show of opposition. That the Church has a right to educate—that, under existing circumstances, she is bound to establish schools, academies, and colleges under her own care, wherever the exigencies of religious education are not otherwise provided for; and that the Board of Education is the proper organ of the Church for bringing out and concentrating her educational efforts, seemed to be almost unanimously conceded. We do not believe there are two parties in our Church on any one of these points.

Domestic Missions.

Rev. Dr. Musgrave, Corresponding Secretary of the Board, read the Report. The financial condition of the Board was stated as follows:

The total amount received from April 1, 1853, to April 1, 1854, was	$75,207 80
Balance on hand,	17,753 22
Total,	$92,961 02
Amount paid out,	70,306 44
Balance April 1, 1854,	$22,654 58
Due to Missionaries April 1,	11,076 84
Unexpended balance,	$11,577 74

The receipts were larger during the last months of the year than in the early portion. The amount received from the churches had increased largely during the year, showing that an increasing interest was awaking among the people. The balance on hand on the 1st of April, 1854, was larger than at the same time last year, and would have been still larger but for the payment of some heavy debts. The appropriations will be much larger this year, and therefore there will be need of large collections.

Dr. Musgrave stated how advantageous it was to have a large balance on hand at the commencement of the fiscal year, as the expenditures then called for were large, and the receipts during the first three quarters were small. A good balance in the treasury gave spirit and energy to the Board in the establishing of new missions, and granting increased appropriations. The Board have, however, had no desire to increase the balance. Indeed, they had increased the appropriations this year over the estimates of last year by the amount of $18,000. This liberal course the Board intended to pursue, and they trusted that the efforts of the churches would authorize the increased appropriations, and enable the Board to continue in their present course.

The financial condition of the Church Extension Fund is as follows:

Balance of Church Extension Fund on hand April 1, 1853,	$6,211 33
Receipts for year from individuals,	3,211 93
" " " " churches,	3,086 16
Total	$12,509 42
Appropriations paid during year,	6,177 25
Balance, April 1, 1854,	$6,332,17

There are, however, unpaid appropriations of $8,178 07, which would absorb the balance and leave the fund in debt. There had been founded in the year, sixty-three churches, extending over twenty-two Synods and forty-four Presbyteries. Of these, thirty-five churches had been finished.

The objects of the Board of Missions are to assist feeble churches in sustaining their pastors, and secondly, the extension of the Church by missionary labour and the formation of new churches. The average salaries of missionaries to domestic stations during the year was $402 53. The average salary paid by the Board was $151 55, and the average paid by the congregations $250 98.

Much discussion occurred in reference to the affairs of this Board. On some points the Committee to whom the report was referred, were unanimous, on others they were divided, the Chairman, as it was understood, and perhaps one other member differing from the rest of the Committee. They united in recommending the adoption of the following resolutions:

1. *Resolved*, That considering the present and prospective population of our country, and the influence it seems destined to exert on all the nations, as set forth in the Report of our Board, the work of Domestic Missions, which the Assembly has committed to that Board, is exceeded in its importance and magnitude by no other interest of our Church.

2. *Resolved*, That this Assembly expresses its approbation of the diligent and faithful execution on the part of our Board and its officers of their important trusts, and its thankfulness to God for the measure of success which he has been pleased to vouchsafe to them.

3. *Resolved*, That this Assembly deplores the fact presented in this Report, that while our Church is not only increasing in wealth, but is steadily developing itself by an increase of members, churches, ministers, Presbyteries, and Synods, there is yet no commensurate increase in her Domestic Missionary efforts, as evidenced by the circumstance that the average annual increase of contributions for this object through our Board during the past past four years is only $1913, but during the ten years which preceded the past four years, it was $2692, and the circumstance that we now have actually forty-seven Domestic Missionaries less than we had four years ago.

4. *Resolved*, That in connection with this discouraging view of the past four years, taken into comparison with the preceding ten, the Assembly would record with devout gratitude, that during the year just closed, there has been an increase of the regular church contributions to this cause, amounting to $6000, and would express the hope that this regular flow of the charities of our churches may henceforth never know an ebb.

5. *Resolved*, That this Assembly would express their special approbation of the earnest appeals made in this report by the Board to our Presbyteries, in favour of more vigilant and energetic Presbyterial action in behalf of Domestic Missions.

6. *Resolved*, That this Assembly, while deprecating any wasteful or unnecessary expenditure of Domestic Missionary funds, would express particular approval of the conduct of the Board in increasing, as they have done, the salaries of missionaries in the field. The Assembly would express further the assurance that the Board may proceed to a much larger increase in the allowance to their missionaries, fully relying on the justice and liberality of our people to supply the Board with such an increase of means as will enable it to lessen, to some extent, the privations now endured by our brethren; and while the Assembly express thus decidedly their view of the duty of the Board, they would most earnestly exhort the churches to greatly increased exertions to meet the increased demands on the funds of the Board, which must result from any attempt to do justice to our missionary brethren.

7. *Resolved*, That it be recommended to the Board of Missions to encourage, as far as possible, the organization of the missionary field into districts, embracing several points of labour, with a view to adapting the system to the work of pioneering by an itinerant ministry.

8. *Resolved*, That it be recommended to the Presbyteries to encourage more and more the union of several small congregations in the support of one pastor, which, separately, are unable of themselves to sustain a minister, with a view to the more efficient support of the ordinances of God among them, with less expense to the missionary fund.

9. *Resolved*, That the following named ministers and ruling

elders be appointed to fill the vacancies reported in the Board of Domestic Missions.

(The names are here omitted.)

10. *Resolved*, That Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge be appointed to preach the next annual sermon before the Assembly, and that the Rev. John A. McClung be his alternate.

The discussion respecting that portion of the report in which the committee were unanimous, had reference principally to the salaries of missionaries, and was sustained by Dr. Breckinridge, Rev. Mr. Robertson, Dr. Musgrave, Dr. Young, Dr. McLean, Dr. Adger, Rev. Mr. Logan. There was a general concurrence of opinion as to the inadequacy of the support of our missionary brethren, and the resolutions given above were adopted without opposition.

The Rev. Mr. Woodbridge, a member of the Committee on the Board of Domestic Missions, presented a report on Church Extension from the majority of the Committee, recommending that a Secretary be appointed by the Board of Missions, to take special charge of that work; and also such agents as may be required; that the Committee be still attached to the Board of Missions, but enlarged; that the churches be called upon for annual collections for this object; and that a column be added to the Presbyterial reports for Church Extension.

The Rev. Dr. Adger, from the minority of the same Committee, presented a report, proposing to refer the whole subject of Church Extension back to the Board of Missions; that the Board have authority to appoint a co-ordinate Secretary, but without exclusive reference to Church Extension; that the Board have leave to contribute to Church Extension from their general missionary fund; and calling upon the churches to give more liberally to the Board, in view of this increased demand upon its resources. Dr. Adger said there was a wide difference between these two reports. The majority report looks to the erection of Church Extension into a separate Board. The minority dissent from the majority report, because unwilling to endorse further the system of agencies, and also because they object to a fifth specific collection.

With a view of putting an end to a discussion which promised to consume much time, and with the hope of conciliating the

friends of the counter reports, a motion was made and carried to lay them both upon the table, and to refer the whole subject of Church Extension to the Board.

It soon appeared, however, that this course was not acceptable to a large portion of the Assembly, who thought that the exigencies of the case required the Assembly itself to take some decisive action in the matter. The report of the majority of the committee was therefore taken from the table, and the following paper, embracing all its recommendations, was presented, viz:

Whereas, The Assembly has referred the whole subject of Church Extension, or the building of church edifices, to the Board of Missions; and whereas this Assembly believes this subject to be one of vast importance to the welfare of our whole Church; therefore,

Resolved, That the Board of Missions, in order to give greater efficiency to this work, be instructed, First, to enlarge the Committee of Church Extension. Secondly, to appoint a Secretary for this specific department, if they shall deem it necessary. Thirdly, to bring the cause before the churches in such way as they may deem best suited to secure attention to the importance of the work. Fourthly, to report separately to the Assembly receipts and disbursements of this fund.

And further, This Assembly would earnestly and affectionately enjoin it upon all our churches to take up collections annually for this object, (to be reported in a separate column in the Appendix of the Minutes of the Assembly) and upon all our Presbyteries to see that this is done.

Mr. Stuart Robinson, and Mr. Armstrong opposed the adoption of the above paper, and the latter moved a substitute, which was substantially the report of the minority. Both these gentlemen expressed the opinion that there was a growing dissatisfaction with the working of our Boards. It was time, Mr. Robinson thought, to consider whether there was not a more excellent way. Several brethren from the West spoke with feeling, from their own experience of the necessity of greater exertion in this cause. Among them, Mr. Pawling, from western Missouri, Mr. Goodhue, from Illinois, Mr. Stafford, and others, made very effective appeals to the Assembly. Mr. Comfort, an

elder, from Virginia, made a very forcible speech in defence of the Board, denying, in behalf of the laity, any of those feelings of dissatisfaction which a few of the ministers seemed to entertain. Dr. Spring spoke with much effect on the same side. Dr. Musgrave, Secretary of the Board, closed the debate by one of the ablest and most effective speeches delivered on the floor of the Assembly for a long time. The paper given above was then adopted, with scarce a show of opposition. The sense of the House was so strongly evinced in favour of the Boards, and in opposition to mere speculative objections to their existence, that we presume the controversy will not be renewed. It seems indeed unworthy of debate, whether the body appointed to carry on our benevolent operations be called a Committee, and be appointed by the Assembly, or whether it be called a Board. In the one case it would be a small body, in the other large. The former method has the advantage of simplicity, but the latter has considerations in its favour which are not likely to lose their influence on the Church. In the first place, they have been incorporated in our church policy for years, and a change, without adequate reason, is unbecoming and disparaging. In the second place, they are a necessary intermediate agency between the Assembly and its executive officers. The Assembly cannot conduct its Theological Seminaries otherwise than through the intervention of a Board. It cannot attend the examinations, see to the fidelity of the professors, and the conduct of the students. Neither can it otherwise conduct with advantage its missionary or educational operations. It cannot inspect the action of the executive committee and secretaries. It cannot go into any minute examination of the wisdom of their appointments and disbursements. Some of us are old enough to remember, how our New-school brethren endeavoured to break down the missionary operations of the Assembly, by insisting that, if the Assembly undertook to conduct missions, it must go into all the details; it must sit in judgment on the qualifications of every missionary, and on the economy of every item of expenditure. They saw, what the Church, with few exceptions, now sees, that to abolish our Boards, is virtually to give up the whole work of missions and education. In a small, compact body like the Church of Scotland, with a permanent commission

to refer to in every emergency, it may do for the Assembly to conduct all its operations by simple Committees. But, in a body as large and as widely extended as ours, a division of labour is absolutely necessary. You cannot send a great army on a foraging party, or to build a bridge.

In the third place, the abolition of the Boards would throw a responsibility and power on the Executive Commitees and Secretaries which they ought not to be entrusted with. Their accountability to a body like the General Assembly, which, from its nature, is incapable of effective inspection, would be merely nominal. The whole work would really be in the hands of a very few men, without any real supervision and control. Our complaints against the management of the American Home Missionary Society, whose whole power was in the hands of a few men in New York, should make us sensible that any irresponsible power is a dangerous thing. And, not to prolong an unnecessary discussion, it may be remarked, that our Boards serve the purpose of break-waters. In calm weather they seem unnecessary and an incumbrance. But, when a storm comes, they are an essential protection. So long as everything goes on well, the responsibility of the Executive Committees to the Boards seems merely nominal; and one might be disposed to think they might as well be out of the way as not. But let any thing go wrong; let any emergency arise in which long examination into details is necessary, the existence of a body intermediate between the Committees and the Assembly becomes all-important. As to the objection that the Scriptures know nothing of Boards; that they are not church courts, &c., we would only say, this is the *jus divinum* theory in its dotage. God has not sent his Church into the world as an infant in its swaddling clothes, without liberty of action; he has given her a work to do, which requires the free use of her limbs; and it will be found hard work to bind her with split hairs.

Board of Publication.

Rev. Mr. Smith presented the sixteenth annual Report of the Board. The Report commenced with a general review of the importance of the Board, and the influence which the publication of books and tracts had upon the interest of the

Church. The power of the press was used by the Church as one of the great moral agents in the regeneration of man.

The Board have published sixteen new books during the year, (one of which was printed in German,) of which 38,250 copies were printed and circulated. They had published 10 tracts, of which 26,000 had been circulated. They had also printed and circulated 25,000 copies of the Presbyterian Family Almanac. Total copies of books and pamphlets printed during the year, 595,750.

The circulation of the *Home and Foreign Record* of the Church had increased during the year from 11,000 to 15,000 copies.

The *Sabbath School Visitor* was considered a work excellently adapted to the wants of the day, and was read with pleasure by adults as well as with profit by the young. Its circulation last year was stated to be forty-one thousand. This year it is larger.

The colporteur enterprise is every month increasing in importance. The distribution of books during the year amounted to 135,983 volumes. The number of pages of tracts distributed, 1,300,547. The number of families visited during the year was 68,185. The number of Presbyterian families without the Confession of Faith was 2340, and the number without religious books, except the Bible, 1608. The time spent by 151 colporteurs amounted to forty-one years.

The financial condition of the Board was submitted to the Assembly. The total increase in the receipts this year over last was $12,052 35. The income had increased threefold in ten years. The balance in the treasury on the 1st of last April was $18,000. This amount would appear large, and required some explanation. It arose from the facts that during the last months of the year the receipts had been large, and the Report had been made up only a day or two before drafts to the amount of several thousands of dollars had been presented and paid at the Treasury. The amount, with this deduction, would not be much larger than in former years, and than was required for the management of the business of the Board. There were also some valuable works in press, the publication of which had been unavoidably delayed, and would entail some expense upon

the Board. There had been a gratifying increase in the amount contributed by churches.

On a subsequent day, the Rev. Mr. McMullen presented the Report of the Committee on the Board of Publication, approving the operations of the Board; expressing strong approbation of the Colportage enterprise; recommending the publication of the Book of Psalmody in seven characters, and also an abridged edition of the Psalmody for youth, in both sorts of notes; recommending the publication of the Confession of Faith and tracts in German; suggesting the propriety of increasing Colporteurs' salaries; and expressing much gratification at the financial condition of the Board, and especially at the amount which has been raised without formal agencies; and urging the Presbyteries to establish local depositories. The Report was adopted.

Theological Seminaries.

Agreeably to the order of the last Assembly, a standing Committee was appointed to which the reports and other matters relating to Theological Seminaries were referred.

The Seminary at Danville, having been recently founded, claimed, on account of the numerous documents to be considered, the first attention of the Assembly. Dr. Edgar, as Chairman of the standing Committee on Seminaries, reported that the papers relating to this Seminary, are a plan for the government of the Seminary, reported to this Assembly by a Committee appointed by the General Assembly of 1853; a Report from the Committee of Endowment appointed by the Assembly of 1853; a Report from the Committee on Charters appointed by the same Assembly; the first annual Report of the Board of Directors; the first annual Report of the Board of Trustees; an agreement between the Synod of Kentucky and the General Assembly; an agreement between the General Assembly and the Centre College of Kentucky, and a charter with an amendment thereto, granted by the Legislature of Kentucky to a Board of Trustees under the care of the General Assembly.

This Committee recommends that the plan be approved by the General Assembly, certified by the Stated Clerk, and trans-

mitted to the Board of Directors of the Seminary for publication; and that the remaining papers be approved and printed in the Appendix to the Minutes; that the charter granted by the Legislature of Kentucky be accepted by the General Assembly, and that the agreements between the General Assembly and the Synod of Kentucky, and the Centre College of Kentucky, be ratified by the General Assembly; and that the Committees on Endowment, and on charters, covenants, &c., be discharged, the latter having fully accomplished their work, and the unfinished part of the work of the former being hereby, according to their request, turned over to the Board of Trustees of the Seminary; and that a day be appointed by the General Assembly for the election of some suitable person as a professor in said Seminary, the Board of Directors being permitted, according to their suggestion, to retain the services of the Rev. Joseph G. Reasor as teacher of Oriental and Biblical Literature for the present, and for the election of suitable persons to the vacant places in the Board of Directors.

When the usual motion was made to approve of the report of the Committee, the Rev. Dr. McMasters moved as an amendment, that the approval of the report should not be construed as expressing, in any way, any judgment of the Assembly unfavourable to the continued operation of the Seminary at New Albany. This amendment he sustained in an able and well digested speech, in which he endeavoured to show that the location of the Seminary at Danville was obtained at the last Assembly by an improper withholding of information, and by the unfair suppression of discussion. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, with his usual ability successfully vindicated himself and the other friends of the Danville Seminary from the imputation of unfair suppression of information, or of freedom of debate. Dr. McMasters afterwards withdrew his amendment, with the understanding that it was to be subsequently presented as an independent proposition. The motion was then put and carried, to approve and adopt the report of the Committee on Seminaries, so far as it related to the Seminary at Danville.

It was probably owing to an oversight, that the motion was made so comprehensive, and not limited to the approval of the annual report of the Board of Directors; as it was, the vote car-

ried with it the approbation and sanction of the Assembly, of the new Plan of the Danville Seminary, and of the several charters and covenants above referred to, though not one of these documents was read, and the Assembly therefore was ignorant of their details. We doubt not, the approbation of the House would have been given, had these documents been read in full, but we consider it unfortunate, as a matter of precedent, that papers of so much importance should be adopted on the mere report of a committee, and in ignorance of their contents.

The Rev. Mr. McClung, on the day following, introduced a resolution to the effect, "That the General Assembly has no intention to interfere with the Seminary at New Albany, in any way, nor with such Synods as shall continue to be united in the support of such Seminary, nor with any of the churches under the care of said Synods."

The speaker put himself at once in sympathy with the house, by disclaiming all belief that there had been anything dishonourable in the conduct of the friends of the Danville Seminary, or any intentional suppression of documents. He then proceeded to sustain his motion, by showing that all the Synods asked for, was to be allowed to go on with their Seminary; that a large amount of money, some $100,000, was at stake; that the institution had already done good service and was likely to do more. His speech was characterized by so much good sense, good feeling, wit and humour, that it carried the house completely with the speaker, and his motion was adopted without opposition.

Princeton Theological Seminary.—The Committee on Seminaries recommended that the annual report of the Board of Directors be approved, and printed in the Appendix to the Minutes. As this report contained the recommendation of the Rev. Alexander T. McGill, as Professor in the department of Church Government, Pastoral Theology, and the composition and delivery of sermons, in the Princeton Seminary, it gave rise to considerable debate.

By some few of the members the right of the Directors to make any such recommendation was called in question. To this it was replied, that by the plan of the Seminary, the Directors were authorized and required to recommend to the Assembly

such measures as they deemed the interests of the Seminary demanded; and that the Assembly had, in numerous instances, sanctioned the exercise of this right to recommend candidates for vacant professorships, both in the case of the Western Seminary at Allegheny, and in that of Princeton. Experience had shown that such recommendations, without at all encroaching on the free exercise of the judgment of the Assembly, tended to produce unanimity and confidence. The Directors are appointed for the very purpose of watching over the institutions committed to their care; they are reasonably supposed to know better than more distant members, what their interests demand; and it is reasonable, that other things being equal, the wishes and judgment of the immediate guardians of an institution, should have great weight with the Assembly.

It was further objected, that it was not seemly or proper that a professor in one seminary should be called to occupy a post in another. To this it was answered, that there was no good reason why a man should not be transferred from one seminary to another, if his usefulness could thereby be increased. His physical constitution might be much better suited to the locality of one seminary than to that of another. His qualifications might be better adapted to the post to be filled in one than to that occupied in another. The real question for the Assembly in such cases to decide was, where can the person nominated best promote the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom. The Church had acted on this principle. The Synods of South Carolina and Georgia had called Dr. McGill from the seminary at Allegheny to that at Columbia, without disapprobation from any quarter. It was, however, objected that there was something invidious in an older seminary calling a professor from an institution more recently established, and which had met with many severe trials. To this it was answered, that the Directors of the Princeton Seminary had always acted with peculiar deference and respect to the insti tution at Allegheny. Dr. McGill, while in the service of the latter Seminary, had been repeatedly invited to other institutions, but the Directors of Princeton, though needing his services, had never interfered to disturb his relation to Allegheny. When a year ago it was desired to bring about his election to a

chair in the Princeton Seminary, nothing was done by the Directors until it was ascertained that his connection with Allegheny was finally dissolved. On the present occasion his recommendation was without preconcert, and without the most remote intention of embarrassing a sister institution. The vote in the Board was without debate, by ballot, and simply expressed the sense of the Board as to the person whom they deemed best qualified to fill the vacant professorship. Having expressed that judgment, it was left to the discretion of the Assembly to say where Dr. McGill could best serve the Church.

Dr. Campbell, an elder, urged as a further objection that a fourth Professor, and especially a Professor of Pastoral Theology, was unnecessary. He thought it would be much cheaper and quite as effective to present each student with a copy of a good book on the subject. This speech, notwithstanding the ability and influence of its author, made on the house about the same impression that a recommendation by a minister might be expected to make on a medical convention, to educate a surgeon by putting a copy of Cooper's Surgery into his pocket.

The friends of the Allegheny Seminary, the elders, Messrs. Lawrence, Schoonmaker, and Campbell, and ministers, Messrs. Bronson, McAboy, and others, while defending the interests of that institution with zeal, and evincing a high sense of the value of Dr. McGill's services, manifested an excellent spirit, and the whole debate was free from everything adapted to give pain, or, upon reflection, to cause regret.

We think the whole matter, under Providence, was led to a conclusion satisfactory to the Assembly and to the Church at large, by the candid and conciliatory letter of Dr. McGill to the Rev. Dr. Breckinridge, and by him presented to the Assembly. The letter is as follows:

THURSDAY, May 23, 1854.

To the Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge—Dear Sir—Please announce to the General Assembly, on my behalf, at such time as you judge proper, that the nomination of myself to the vacant Professorship in the Seminary at Princeton, has been altogether unexpected, and without the slightest agency of mine. Were it a proposition to transfer me to another Semi-

nary, for the performance of the very same duties which I attempt to do at Allegheny, no inducement could lead me to entertain it for one moment. I could never consent to any act, which would appear to disparage an institution with which I have been identified so long, and whose patrons and Board of Directors I love and honour.

But the chair is different. The duties are more in accordance with my taste; less onerous, by nearly one-half, and such as would, so far as I can judge, comport better with my fragile strength. For these reasons, not to mention others of minor force, I have not felt it my duty to decline this nomination.

The Assembly, I hope, will appreciate my reasons for making this intimation. It is to satisfy the wishes of friends, to save misunderstanding, and to take a just share of responsibility, where the providence of God seems to indicate the path of duty. Very respectfully,

ALEXANDER T. MCGILL.

As this letter placed his acquiescence in the recommendation of the Princeton Directors on the ground of his health, and of his preference for the department which it was proposed he should fill, it enabled the Assembly to vote for his appointment, without even the appearance of preferring one Seminary to another.

The Report of the Board of Directors was therefore approved, and a day appointed to proceed to the election of a Professor.

Western Theological Seminary.—The Committee reported that the papers referred to them relating to this Seminary, were the Annual Report of the Board of Directors and the Annual Report of the Board of Trustees, which were approved and ordered to be printed in the Minutes.

Union Theological Seminary.—The Committee recommended that the Reports of this Seminary for 1853 and 1854 be approved and printed in the Minutes, and that a special Committee be appointed to bring in a suitable minute in reference to the death of the lamented F. S. Sampson, D. D., late Professor in that Institution.

Mr. S. P. Anderson, chairman of this special committee, subsequently presented the following minute, which was adopted.

The Assembly, in recording a memorial of this severe bereavement, would express its deep sense of the greatness of the loss which the Church has sustained in the death of one of her most learned, talented, and pious ministers. Fitted by nature and by grace for great and extended usefulness, he had devoted all his powers to the cause of Christ, undeterred by sacrifices which that consecration demanded, and which were remarkable in their degree, and protracted in their duration. He was eminently suited to the high and responsible post to which the voice of the Church had called him—a post which he again and again refused to abandon, even when tried by offers most tempting to human cupidity, love of ease, and ambition. To a varied and accurate scholarship he added uncommon powers of communicating knowledge and stimulating the intellects of his pupils, and a heart on fire with love to God and zeal for his service. As a preacher, a theologian, and an instructor, he occupied a place in the front rank.

The withdrawal of such a labourer from the field at such a juncture, is a loss to be felt by the whole Church, and to be recognized as one of those mysterious providences that are to be met in humble and adoring silence, rather than in a spirit of proud inquiry.

The Assembly, in view of this loss, would tender its affectionate Christian sympathies to the Directors and remaining Professors of the bereaved Institution, and would unite with them in beseeching the Great Head of the Church to raise up for them speedily, another of like mind and heart, to take his place and fulfil his duties.

Election of Professors.—The Rev. Alexander T. McGill, D.D., was elected to the chair vacant in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, the Rev. John N. Waddell, D.D. was elected Professor of Pastoral Theology and Church Government in the Danville Seminary, and the Rev. William S. Plumer, D.D., was elected to fill the chair, left vacant by the election of Dr. McGill, in the Allegheny Seminary. By vote of the Assembly the Directors of that Institution were authorized to arrange the departments of instruction to suit the wishes of the Professors.

Transfer of the Theological Seminaries to the care of Synods.—A memorial was presented from the Synod of South Carolina recommending such transfer, was referred to the Committee on Seminaries. That Committee reported to the House a resolution declaring the transfer proposed was inconsistent with the legal and moral obligations which the Assembly had assumed in relation to its Theological Institutions.

The Rev. Dr. Kirkpatrick said that the Synod to which he belonged would not desire to urge this measure in the face of legal and moral obligations, but he thought something ought to be done to relieve the Assembly of this burden. Dr. Adger said there was no zeal in South Carolina on this subject; that his own views on the subject had undergone a change. Mr. Armstrong, and Mr. Wilson, of Virginia, said that much discussion had been had in their part of the Church, in relation to the necessity of some such measure. Dr. Breckinridge showed that some $400,000 or $500,000 had been given to our Theological Seminaries on the expressed or implied condition that they should be under the control of the General Assembly, and therefore to transfer them to the Synods within whose bounds they happened to be placed, would be an obvious breach of trust.

The recommendation of the Committee was adopted by the Assembly.

Election of Professors in Theological Seminaries by the Directors.—The Rev. Dr. Kirkpatrick presented a resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Seminaries, inquiring into the expediency of so altering the plan of our Theological Seminaries as to give the right of the election of professors to their several Boards of Directors. That Committee subsequently reported, "That in the present stage of the sessions of the Assembly, and the present state of its business, the questions involved in this overture cannot receive mature consideration," and therefore, "recommend that no further action be taken with regard to this subject," which was agreed to.

This is a very different proposition from the preceding. The Assembly might retain the absolute control of the Seminaries, so as to fulfil all conditions of the trust assumed in their management. The Synod of Kentucky retains the control of Centre College, though the Trustees appoint the Professors, because

the Synod elect the Trustees. If, therefore, the Assembly elect annually the Directors of a Seminary, renewing the whole Board year by year, or as now, in the course of three years, the control would remain with the Assembly. A motion to this effect was presented by Dr. Murray to the previous Assembly, at the close of its sessions, but not discussed for want of time.

There are grave considerations both for and against the proposed alteration, and it is desirable that the attention of the Church should be seriously turned to the subject before any decisive steps are taken in the matter.

Judicial Case.

The Judicial Committee reported the case of the complaint of the Session of the church of Wooster, against a decision of the Synod of Ohio.

The facts in this case appeared to be substantially these:— Dr. Day, a member of the church at Wooster, having married a lady belonging to the Baptist denomination, their children, out of deference to her feelings, were not baptized. Notwithstanding this fact, Dr. Day was elected an elder in that congregation, and served in that capacity for some years. The Session of the church becoming dissatisfied with this state of things, presented the question *in thesi* to the Presbytery of Wooster, whether a man who neglected to present his children for baptism, ought to be permitted to act as a ruling elder in any of our churches. The Presbytery answered the question in the negative, and gave a deliverance on the importance of infant baptism. In consequence of this action of the Presbytery, Dr. Day resigned his office as elder, and his name was omitted from the roll of the Session. After a time, however, he wished to resume his office, and the Presbytery not having contemplated his special case in their action, recalled their deliverance on baptism, and ordered the Session to restore Dr. Day to the Session. The case being carried to the Synod of Ohio, the action of the Presbytery was sustained. From the Synod, it came by complaint to the Assembly. The Assembly sustained the complaint, and adopted the following minute as expressing their judgment in the premises:

Whereas, It appears from the record that Dr. Day was re-

moved from the session of the church of Wooster, by his own resignation of his office in that church, and not by the judicial action of the Session, it was not competent for the Presbytery to order his restoration to office by the Session; and, therefore, the judgment of the Synod of Ohio, confirming such action of the Presbytery, was erroneous, and ought to be, and is hereby *reversed*, and the complaint of the Session, so far as it relates to this point, is sustained.

Division of the Synod of Philadelphia.

The Committee of Bills and Overtures reported, without any expression of opinion, the requests of certain Presbyteries belonging to the Synods of Philadelphia and Virginia, to be constituted into a new Synod.

Whereupon, the following resolution was presented by the Rev. Stuart Robinson:—

Resolved, That the requests of these four Presbyteries be granted, and that the Presbyteries of Carlisle, Baltimore, and Eastern Shore, from the Synod of Philadelphia, and the Presbytery of Winchester, from the Synod of Virginia, be hereby set off and constituted a new Synod, to be called the Synod of ———, which body shall meet in the F Street Church in the city of Washington, on the last Tuesday, (31st) of October next at 7½ P. M., and be opened with a sermon by the Rev. Wm. S. Plumer, D. D., or in his absence by the oldest minister present, who shall preside till another Moderator be chosen; and that thereafter the Synod convene on their own adjournment."

After an extended discussion, the resolution was adopted, and the blank was filled with "Baltimore," as the name of the new Synod.

Division of the Synod of Pittsburgh.

The following petition from the Synod of Pittsburgh was presented by the Committee of Bills and Overtures:

"*Resolved*, That the next General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States be petitioned to erect a new Synod, embracing that part of the Synod of Pittsburgh which lies west and north of the Allegheny and Ohio rivers; and in case it shall erect the new Synod for which this Synod

asks, to call it by the name of the 'Synod of Allegheny,' and to appoint its first meeting to be held in the First Church, City of Allegheny, at the same time at which the Synod of Pittsburgh shall hold its next meeting; to be opened with a sermon by the Rev. William Annan, who shall preside until the election of a Moderator."

This petition was granted, and the Synod of Allegheny was accordingly constituted.

Systematic Benevolence.

Several overtures relating to this subject were received and referred to a special committee, of which Mr. David Hadden, elder from the Presbytery of Louisiana, was Chairman. This Committee subsequently presented a report, which after some modification was adopted, as follows:

1. *Resolved*, That this Assembly hereby enjoin upon the pastors of our churches to give greater prominence, in the ministration of the word, to the doctrine of the Scripture, as interpreted and set forth in our standards, (more particularly in Chap. XXVI. Sec. 2, of the Confession of Faith; in Question 141 of the Larger Catechism; in Chap. VII. of the Form of Government, and in Chap. IV. Sec. 5, of the Directory for Worship,) viz; that "Saints, by profession, are bound to maintain an holy fellowship and communion in relieving each other in outward things, according to their several abilities and necessities, which communion, as God offereth opportunity, is to be extended unto all those who in every place call upon the Lord Jesus," "giving and lending freely according to their abilities;" and, in conformity to this doctrine, recognizing as one of the ordinances established by Christ, in connection with the sermon, prayer, and praise, "a collection raised for the poor and other purposes of the Church."

2. *Resolved*, That the Presbyteries which have not anticipated the provisions of this action of the Assembly, are most earnestly and affectionately enjoined, 1st. At their meetings following the rising of this Assembly, to take order that the ministers and church sessions in their bounds shall be directed to adopt some practicable method by which an opportunity shall be afforded, and an invitation given, to all the members of their

congregations to contribute regularly to the objects of Christian benevolence recognized by the Assembly in the organization of the Boards of the Church, and to such other institutions as to them may seem right. 2d. And at every spring meeting to institute a proper inquiry into the diligence of ministers and church sessions in executing the provisions of such method.

3. *Resolved*, That the Presbyteries are further enjoined to enter on record, and report to the next Assembly, their action on the first part of the foregoing resolution; and also to record at their next and all subsequent spring meetings, the result of the inquiry prescribed, and report the same to the General Assembly with the usual Annual Presbyterial Report, stating the delinquencies and diligence of pastors and church sessions.

4. *Resolved*, That there shall be appointed by the Assembly a standing committee on Systematic Benevolence, which shall be charged with the reception and examination of such reports, and the presentation to the Assembly of their aggregate results.

5. *Resolved*, That the Boards of the Church are invited to aid in the proper execution of the foregoing arrangements of the churches in such official communications with the Presbyteries, as may seem proper.

6. *Resolved*, That the Professors in our Theological Seminaries are respectfully requested to give proper attention to the right training of the future pastors of the Church, in view of the duties herein contemplated.

Further, the Committee recommend the following plans for contribution:

1. A committee may be appointed by the session for each object of benevolence, and a particular month assigned in which they are to do their work, by calling upon the people, or otherwise obtaining contributions.

2. All the objects to be aided may be presented in separate columns, and each contributor called upon to say what he will give quarterly or annually.

3. Weekly or monthly collections may be taken up, and thrown into a benevolent fund, which the session may divide among the several objects approved by them, in such proportion as they think proper.

Ministerial Support.

A paper was presented from the Synod of New York, in relation to this subject, which was referred to a committee consisting of one ruling elder from each Synod, Judge Fine, of the Presbytery of Buffalo, being chairman.

1. *Resolved*, That we affectionately and earnestly recommend to the churches under our care, that they scrupulously avoid holding out any inducements to a minister to become their stated supply, or settled pastor, which will not be realized.

2. *Resolved*, That we earnestly recommend to every Presbytery, that unless suitable provision be made for the support of a minister or stated supply, they decline to give their aid or sanction, as a Presbytery, to settle him in any congregation which is unable to furnish such suitable provision.

3. *Resolved*, That we recommend to the elders, and deacons, and trustees of our churches and congregations, to meet together on some day before the 1st of November next, and yearly thereafter, or oftener, if necessary, and institute the inquiry whether the minister or stated supply is properly and fully supported; and if they find that he is not so supported, to take immediate measures to increase his support, and report to their Presbytery at its next meeting.

4. *Resolved*, That we recommend to the Presbyteries to require of every minister to preach on the subject of Ministerial Support—"that, laying aside all false delicacy, they enlighten their people upon this, as upon any other branch of Christian duty, pleading not for themselves, but for their Master, if haply they may reclaim their respective charges from a grievous sin, which must bring down God's displeasure;" and that the Presbyteries call upon every minister to answer whether he has complied with their injunction.

5. *Resolved*, That Messrs. B. M. Smith, Stuart Robinson, and James N. Dickson, be appointed a Committee to publish this report, and that the pastors be directed to read it from the pulpit at such time as may be considered most convenient.

On several different occasions the subject involved in the above report was brought to the attention of the Assembly. There was a general expression of opinion, especially on the

part of the elders, to the effect that the salaries of our ministers are in most cases inadequate; and much sympathy was manifested, especially for our domestic missionaries. We do not think, however, that the right ground was taken, either in the discussion of the subject, or in the report of the committee. We despair of seeing any thing effectually accomplished in this difficult matter, until there is a practical recognition of the two great scriptural principles, that every minister devoted to his work, is entitled to a comfortable support for himself and family; and that the obligation to furnish such support, does not rest exclusively upon the congregation which the minister serves, but upon the whole Church. The plan commonly adopted in our Church, has been, to allow a minister to look to his own people for a support; and if they are not able to furnish it, he must either suffer, or turn to some secular occupation. Two consequences inevitably follow—there is a great deal of privation unjustly imposed upon men who are among the most laborious and self-denying of our ministers; and a great deal of the time and effort of the clergyman is withdrawn from his appropriate work, and devoted to secular pursuits. The result, in a multitude of cases, is, that the minister becomes, in a great measure, a secular man, and often becomes rich. The paid clergy are those to whom the people give a sufficient salary to prevent the necessity of their resorting to making money for their own support.

The great difficulty is, that in proportion as you throw the support of the clergy on the Church at large, you encourage selfish negligence on the part of individual congregations. This is an evil, but it is far less than those which attach to our present plan—which is not only inefficient, but unjust and unscriptural. The Free Church of Scotland at first divided the "sustentation fund equally" among all its ministers, allowing each congregation to add what it saw fit to the amount received from the general fund by its pastor. This plan was found to encourage the selfish congregations to depend unfairly upon the more liberal. To avoid this difficulty, last year the plan was modified. "It was arranged that each congregation should undertake to raise annually a certain sum for the fund (the sum to be fixed by the committee and the office-bearers of the con-

gregation conjointly); that all the contributions up to this standard rate should form a general fund, calculated, if realized in full, to yield £127 (say $635) a year to each of the present 730 ministers; that whatever sum should be contributed by any congregation above this standard rate should be added to the stipend of its own minister, until that stipend reached £157 ($785), and that any contributions over that should form the fund for Church Extension." This plan does not operate to limit the salaries of ministers in expensive positions to the $785 they may receive from the general fund, but it operates to secure an adequate compensation for all the ministers of the Church. The stipend actually furnished from the fund to each minister the past year was about six hundred dollars. If some man in our Church of the requisite influence, ability and leisure, would devote himself to devising and carrying into effect some fair and scriptural plan of ministerial support, he would be one of the greatest benefactors of the Church and country.

Finance Committee.

This Committee presented the following Report, which was adopted.

The Committee on Finance, to whom the Reports of the Treasurer of the Trustees, and of the Board of Trustees of the General Assembly, and the memorial of members of the Committee on Finance of 1852, were referred, respectfully report, that they have examined the Report of the Treasurer for the year past, and find the same correctly stated from the Treasurer's books, and recommend that it be approved.

The whole financial affairs of the Board of Trustees have been thoroughly investigated twice within three years; first, by an able special Committee appointed by the General Assembly in 1851, who reported in 1852; and again by an able special Committee of the Board of Trustees, whose report is presented to the present General Assembly. Both committees have thoroughly explored the sources of financial information, from the commencement of the funds and accounts; have expended months of faithful labour with untiring perseverance, to furnish all the intelligence it was possible to glean from books and papers, and have performed a work of exceeding value and

importance to the interests of the General Assembly. It is but just that these labours, both of the special Committee of 1852, and the Committee of the Board, prompted by love to Zion and her interests, should be gratefully acknowledged by the General Assembly.

Your Committee recommend that the losses sustained heretofore by the trust funds, be repaired; and that a special committee be appointed by the General Assemblyfor that purpose.

The principle of averaging the losses that have heretofore occurred, between the several trusts represented in the common fund invested at the time the losses occurred, seems to your committee, under the circumstances set forth in the Report of the Board of Trustees, equitable; but in future, this committee recommend that there be endorsed on each security held, a distinct designation of the particular trust or trusts to which it belongs, so that any future losses shall fall upon the trust or trusts interested in the investment.

The Report of the Board of Trustees is reported to the General Assembly, with the recommendation that the following resolutions be adopted:

1. *Resolved*, That the Report of the Board of Trustees is approved, and it is recommended by the General Assembly to the Board of Trustees to open a new set of books in accordance with the Report of the Board, and to cause hereafter a distinct account of each trust fund to be kept therein.

2. *Resolved*, That (unless the authors of the fund otherwise specially direct,) any investment may cover more than one trust, at the discretion of the Board of Trustees, *provided* the amount of the interest of each trust in the investment shall be endorsed on the mortgage or ground rent; so that hereafter, in case of loss, the same may be charged to the account of the trust or trusts interested in the security.

3. *Resolved*, That so much of the direction of the General Assembly of 1852 to the Board of Trustees as implied that each trust must be separately invested, be rescinded.

4. *Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be furnished by the Stated Clerk to the Board of Trustees, and that the Reports of the Treasurer, and of the Board of Trustees, with the memorial of members of the Committee on Finance of

1852, referred to this Committee, be printed in the Appendix to the Minutes of the present General Assembly.

The special Committee recommended in the foregoing report, was accordingly appointed, and consists of Messrs. Cortlandt Van Rensselaer, John C. Backus, Kensey Johns, Stacy G. Potts, R. L. Stuart, and James N. Dickson.

It was then

Resolved, That the thanks of the Assembly be given to the two Committees referred to in this report, and their chairmen respectively, the Hon. Stacy G. Potts, and the Hon. Kensey Johns, for their time, labour, and skill in preparing their reports on the finances of the Assembly, and that the Clerk send them a copy of this resolution.

Commissions.

Rev. Dr. Young from the Committee on Bills and Overtures, reported,

Overture No. 7. An overture from the Synod of Kentucky, as to the right and propriety of appointing commissioners for the trial of judicial cases. The Committee recommended the following action:

Resolved, 1. That the appointment of commissioners for the trial of judicial cases is consistent with the Presbyterian form of Church Government, and agreeable to the usage of our Church, as well as to the usage of the Church from which she sprang—the Presbyterian Church of Scotland.

Resolved, 2. That in the formation of judicial commissioners, the General Assembly direct that the following procedure be observed: (1.) That the number of members appointed on any such commission shall be equal to the number required to constitute a quorum of the appointing body. (2.) That any member of the Court that forms the commission, if he shall see proper to do so, be allowed to sit as a member of the commission, in addition to the number appointed. (3.) In a commission formed by the General Assembly, not more than one member shall be appointed from any one Synod, and in a commission formed by a Synod, not more than three members shall be appointed from any one Presbytery.

Dr. Young sustained this overture at length. Chancellor

Johns spoke with effect on the other side of the question. Dr. McMasters moved to postpone the resolutions offered by the Committee with a view to send down a proposition to alter the constitution, so as to answer the end contemplated in the overture. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge moved as a substitute a proposition to be sent down to the Presbyteries changing the representation in the Assembly from Presbyterial to Synodical. He thought the Assembly, and of course the lower courts, had the power to appoint commissions, and that the best way was for them to do so whenever necessity called for such action, without any declaration of the Assembly in its favour. Finally the whole subject was laid on the table. It was evident the House was not prepared to adopt the overture proposed by the Committee, and perhaps it is best to let the matter rest until the Church is brought to see that our present mode of conducting judicial cases is impracticable, and that we must in some form introduce the principle of judicial commissions.

SHORT NOTICES.

A German Dictionary, by J. Grimm and W. Grimm. "In the beginning was the Word." Vol. I. Leipzig, 1854: XCII. and 1824 columns. (Deutsches Wörterbuch, von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm. Im anfang war das Wort. Erster Band. A—Biermolke. Verlag von S. Hirzel.)

The completion of the first volume of the long expected German Dictionary of the Brothers Grimm gives us an opportunity of saying a few words about it. The labour of editing this Dictionary has been taken upon two pairs of shoulders, but at the same time it engages *two heads*. To obtain the necessary freedom of action for both these scholars, they have agreed to divide the labour in such a manner between themselves that each volume shall be from the hand of *one* of the brothers; so that the first volume is entirely from the hand of Jacob Grimm. This

scholar is now in his seventieth year. He is a Hessian by birth, and very much attached to the particular section which he calls his native country, although he seems at the same time zealous of promoting the unity of Germany. That which really constitutes the indissoluble chain by which all Germans are united, in spite of their divisions, is their *language*, and to the study and elucidation of this, Jacob Grimm, by a peculiar train of events, has been enabled to devote his most successful labours. He was born at Hanau, on the 7th of January, 1785. His father died when he was very young, and the limited means of the family would have made it impossible for his mother to give her children a liberal education, had not an aunt of theirs, who was lady of the chamber to the Electress, sent Jacob and his brother Wilhelm to the Lyceum at Cassel. His grandfather was a Reformed minister; the grandson, we fear, has now widely departed from the faith of his youth. He studied law at the University of Marburg, where he lived on the narrowest allowance. Among his teachers he liked Savigny best, and soon attracted his notice. Numerous visits to Savigny, and freedom of access to his rich library first introduced him to that branch of study in which he was afterwards to become so celebrated. In 1805, Savigny proposed Grimm's joining him at Paris, to assist him there in his literary occupation. Here his inclination for the study of the literature and poetry of the Middle Ages was very much increased by the great amount of leisure at his command, his access to the manuscripts of the Paris libraries, and the purchase of some scarce books. On his return he was appointed to some office in the War Department at Cassel, with a yearly salary of 100 thalers. In this employment he was kept indescribably busy, and the quantity and the dulness of the work were very distasteful to him. In 1808 he obtained the situation of librarian to the king of Westphalia; his salary here was above 1000 thalers, and his duties but nominal; he devoted himself, therefore, without intermission to the study of the old German language and poetry. From 1813 until 1815 he was Secretary of Legation to the Hessian minister, in which capacity he was frequently in Paris and Vienna, where he made good use of his opportunities for philological studies and researches. With the next year begins the most tranquil, laborious, and productive portion of his life. He had at length obtained the place of librarian in the Cassel library, which he had so much desired. Here, too, he was once more with his brother Wilhelm, who was employed in the same way. In 1830 the two brothers were called to the University of Göttingen, which they left seven years after to return to Cassel. From

this retirement they were called in 1841 by the new king of Prussia, who put an end to their continual anxiety about the means of subsistence and gave them an honourable position as Academicians and Professors at the University.

It was in 1837, when they returned from Göttingen, that a Leipzig publisher proposed to them to engage in the preparation of a great German Dictionary. With some reluctance they assented; and after the lapse of seventeen years, and through the assistance of more than a hundred scholars all over Germany, we are now in possession of the first volume. Were we to tell about it all that is ready to leap from the point of our pen, of the satisfaction and the disappointment we have experienced in glancing over the columns of this long expected work, this notice would soon swell into an article of no ordinary length. This *Word-book* is not a *della Crusca*, nor is it like the Dictionary of the French Academy, nor could it be compared to Johnson or Webster; it is *sui generis;* the only work to which we would even attempt to place it parallel, is Richardson's English Dictionary; but still the likeness would be a remote one. The examples form the great bulk of the book; and yet these are selected from a curious range of authors, arbitrarily fixed as to its beginning, arbitrarily stopped, and arbitrarily selected. The etymology, the very *eye* of the work, is bright of aspect, keen of penetration, and large of scope. The definitions are mostly given in *Latin*, sometimes in German, sometimes in French, Spanish, Italian, and even Lithuanian, and a great many times not at all. In short, it is a great, it is a learned work, such as the Grimms alone could produce. A *Dictionary* in the common acceptation of the term, a work for the various general purposes of consultation, for natives or foreigners, it is not.

Ueber den Naturlaut, von J. C. E. Buschmann. Berlin, 1853. Quarto.

Everybody is acquainted with lists of words of different languages, made out to exhibit a certain affinity between those languages or groups of languages. The *nature* of this affinity is not determined by the similarity or identity of certain words expressing the same idea in different languages. For a word may be simply *borrowed;* such terms as *alkali*, *oxygen*, *jungle*, *tattoo*, *violoncello*, *dragoman*, would be no proofs whatever of any connection between the English and the Arabic, Greek, Hindustani, Polynesian, Italian, and Turkish languages; a single individual may transfer such a word from one country or language into another. Or a word may be *derived* from another

language, and naturalized, as *beef*, *veal*, *mutton*, from *bœuf*, *veau*, *mouton*. This would only go to show that at one time there was *a* connection between the nations speaking these languages; what that connection was, may frequently be inferred from the kind of words introduced in this manner; thus, the words here cited would imply, as Wamba expounds, that each of these animals (viz. the ox, the calf, the sheep,) "is Saxon when he requires tendance, and takes a Norman name when he becomes matter of enjoyment;" in other words, that the conquering race, and, in consequence, the higher classes were Normans, whilst the conquered race or the lower classes were Saxons. The same thing would be testified to, if it were found that ecclesiastical and legal terms are French, whilst those referring to common life are Saxon. Again, when we find that the English *red* is in German *roth* (pronounced *rote*), *dead—todt* (pronounced *tote*), *lead—loth* (pronounced *lote*), and find a similar uniformity prevailing in the modification of many other words thus belonging to the two languages, with such slight changes as the one pointed out, we shall justly infer that the ancestors of the English and the German must have spoken the same language, and that the present difference of their languages must have arisen from a continued separation in space, which now is still producing the different dialects in one and the same country. But if we find that the English word *sack* is in German säck, in French sac, in Spanish and Portuguese saco, in Italian sacco, in Latin saccus, in Greek σάκκος, in Dutch zak, in Danish saek, in Swedish säck, in Welsh and Irish sac, Cornish zah, Armorican sach, Anglo-Saxon sæc, Hungarian saak, Hebrew, Chaldee, and Ethiopic sak, Coptic sok, Polish sak, etc., etc., we may at first attempt to show that one nation derived the use of the thing together with its name from another nation. But this expedient will fail, when we find such instances of the wide prevalence of a single word for the same thing, not to be rare; or when it is unlikely or impossible for one reason or another that one nation should have borrowed the term from another, or when the nations are so widely separated that such a conclusion would be preposterous. The only legitimate inference would be that this and similar instances are but the scattered relics of an original unity of languages, a conclusion which forms one of the grand results of comparative philology. Still, if we were able to show that such identity or similarity of sound applied to designate the same thing, arose from something in the human mind and the organs of speech, which necessitated man to use it whenever and wherever he wished to designate such a thing, the argu-

ment would cease to be valid for the original unity of speech, but it would become very strong for the unity of the race. The proper reply to such a mode of proceeding, however, would be twofold. First, such a necessity supposed to exist would degrade man to a brute. It is only the lower creation which make their wants known by the same barking, howling, neighing, or grunting in every age, and in every country; and it is only the same species of bird that sings the same song in every land, and at all times; whilst man is *free;* man is above instinct. The second reply is, that even the greatest philologists have never yet ventured to approach what is fitly termed "the mystery of roots," i. e. the philosophy of the phenomenon that, for example, the root *I* in such a multitude of languages means *to go*, and not *to stand*, and the root *STA* means *to stand*, and not *to go*.

Now, in nearly every one of those lists above alluded to, we find the terms for *father* and *mother*. These certainly, as far as their roots are concerned, are thought to be remarkably alike, in a great number of languages. What is more natural, than to suppose, that whatever else of the recollection of their homes and childhood the migrating nations lost, they carried with them these, the appellations of their dearest relations? It had indeed been remarked, at a very early period, that as the sound *pa* and *ma* appeared so easy, and, so to say, natural to the child's lips, it is probable that the parents got those words from the child; still, this conjecture, if to such it really amounted, merely asserted that this was the case in the original language, and that thence they were derived into other languages. *Buschmann*, who was early distinguished by the friendship and by the high esteem, as a linguist, of Humboldt and Bopp; who edited the former's great work on the Kawi language; to whom the whole enlargement of the original plan, and hence, the greater part of the work itself, is due; who is also known by his other works on some of the Polynesian and American languages, and who has lately begun a learned work on Aztec names, is the first who has attempted, systematically, to show that these appellations are due to what he terms the *Naturlaut*, a law by which the child designates its first acquaintances by sounds most easily articulated. To prove this view, he puts the hypothesis: the child would choose the harder sounds *pa*, *ta*, *ap*, *at*, to designate the father, and the softer sounds *ma*, *na*, *am*, *an*, to designate the mother, and farther, that this process, would, in many instances, be reversed; and then he collects these designations in a great number of languages (their names alone cover several pages), and classifies

them according to those four pairs of sounds. In a philological point of view, the labour the writer has performed is a thankworthy one; as to the conclusion at which he arrives, it cannot claim to be anything more than a hypothesis, and that not a new one.

The Numerals in the Tschudic Group, as also in Turkish, Tungusian and Mongolian. A dissertation read in the Academy of Sciences, on the 17th February, 1853, by W. Schott. Berlin, 1853. 4to.

(Das Zahlwort in der Tschudischen Sprachenclasse, wie auch im Turkischen, Tungusischen und Mongolischen. Von Wilhelm Schott, Ferd. Dünunter's Verlagsbuchhandlung.)

The numerals have always been considered as peculiarly fit for philological 'monographs,' and that because the other parts of speech are so closely intervoven with one another that any single one can scarcely be treated of without involving a discussion of the whole grammar besides. Then, also, numerals denoting ideas which, of necessity, are not exposed to modification, are less likely to change greatly, when passing from one language into another; or, when one language separates from its trunk, and becomes independent. All who have even glanced at this subject, must have been struck with the remarkable likeness of these words in the Indo-European languages. So the numerals of the more improved tribes belonging to the Malay-Polynesian family, with few exceptions, are the same in all. Among the less improved ones, the relics of an original unity are more frequent in the lower numbers than in the higher. Hence we have a number of valuable works confined to this subject: Alex. von Humboldt's "Considérations générales sur les signes numériques des peuples," Bopp on the Numerals in the Indo-European Languages, Lepsius on the Origin and Relationship of the Numerals in the Indo-Germanic, Semitic, and Coptic Languages; Donaldson, too, has made the Hebrew numerals the subject of a special investigation in his *Maskil le Sopher*. Yet the first remark above made, perhaps, needs limitation; for even the isolated numerals are at times discovered to be rather closely connected with some other parts of speech. Not to mention the ordinals, where, for instance *primus* is but the superlative of *prae*, as πρῶτος of πρό, *first* of *fore*, and *erst* of *ehe* (ere); or *secundus=sequundus*, that which always *follows*;—compare the Sanscrit *pancá*, five, with *pâni*, hand (with its *five* fingers); in Hawaiian *lima* denotes both 'hand' and 'five'; in Polish *piec* is "five," and *piesc* "fist;" compare the German *finger* with *fünf* (five); language considers only *one* hand, because one hand generally does the work, whilst the *feet* always go together; hence we must compare *toe* with *ten*, and Germ. *zehe*

with *zehn*. The terms for *ten* in the Malay languages have nearly all been shown by Bopp to be related to the Sanscrit *pûrna* 'full,' because that number *completes* the series of the decimal system.

The numerals, then, having generally more of the nature of abstractions than other parts of speech can have, form the easiest and most obvious tests of relationship; and it is for this purpose that SCHOTT has subjected the apparently widely differing numerals of the Tschudic, Turkish, Tungusian, and Mongolian languages to a rigid analysis, and that with great success. The nature of the work admits of no abstract. We would only state for the benefit of our non-philological readers that the Tschudic group comprises mainly the Finns, the Esthnians, the Laplanders, the Livlanders, and the Ugrians including the Magyars and the Ostiacs, whilst the Tungusians are spread over the whole of Eastern Siberia, and are better known in China under the name of Mantchu-Tatars. Schott is really the highest authority on this class of language, generally comprised under the name of the Tataric family, having first established their connection some fifteen years ago.

Ueber die Sprache der alten Preussen, in ihren verwandtschaftlichen Beziehungen, von Franz Bopp. Gelesen in der Akademie der Wissenschaften, am 24 Mai, 1849, am 25 Juli, 1850, und am 24 Febr. 1853. Berlin, 1853. 4to.

This treatise, which consists of three discourses held at the sessions of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, has been reprinted from its Transactions. It forms an addition to BOPP'S Comparative Grammar, and really enlarges its plan. That grammar compares the Lithuanian alone with the other Indo-European languages, whilst this treatise gives an interesting view of *the language of the ancient Prussians*. These two languages, together with the Lettic, form a narrower circle entirely distinct from the Teutonic on the one hand, and from the Slavic on the other, though of sufficiently near relationship to the latter to give plausibility to the author's conjecture that the separation of the "*Lettic*" languages from the Slavic took place in Europe. For the degree of affinity among languages depends entirely upon the time when they separated and individualized themselves. So we conclude that the Slavic and Lettic languages were separated later from the Sanscrit, than the Classical, Teutonic, and Celtic languages, and yet earlier than the Medo-Persian and East Indian languages, because we see, for instance, that none of the European branches partakes as much as the Zend, the ancient and the modern Persian, the Kurdish, the Afghan, and the Armenian, of the degeneracy of

S into *H* before a vowel, both in the beginning and in the middle of a word. Thus has Comparative Philology enabled Ethnology to say in what order of time pre-historic migrations, from a common Asiatic centre, of the different nations of Europe took place. The investigation before us is confined to a single document, as otherwise the language is quite defunct. Bopp with his usual ingenuity gives a grammatical analysis, especially of those forms which deserve more attention on account of their more striking relations to the Lithuanian and Lettic proper.

Geschichte der Englischen Sprache und Literatur von den altesten Zeiten bis zur Einführung der Buchdruckerkunst. Von *Dr. Ottomar Behnsch.* Breslau, 1853, 8vo. pp. 228.

This is a learned work on *the history of the English language* before it *was* English, a work not attempted before, either in English or in German. In the introduction it discusses the influence, permanent or transitory, of the Celts, the Romans and the Germans, on the language of the inhabitants of what is now called England. In the body of the work we have a very interesting view presented of the mighty and important changes which the language and the literature of that portion of the Island have undergone in ancient times. We have here, for the first time, a clear representation of the transitions observable in the progress of that language; first from the extinction of the Celtic and Latin languages to the appearance of the Anglo-Saxon, and the formation of a rich Germanic literature, through the influence of Christianity with its flood of ecclesiastical and theological (Latin) terms; then from the invasion of the Norman-French to the final disappearance of the old Anglo-Saxon; and finally, from the mutual interpenetration of these two languages to the rise of an entirely new, and yet old, language, the English, now so widely spread, and so justly extolled. Thus, the whole history naturally falls into three periods: the Anglo-Saxon, from 500 to 1066; the Norman, from 1066 to 1362, when Edward III. decreed that the language used in the pleadings before the tribunals, should be in English, and not in French, as before; and thirdly, the old English period, from 1362 to 1500, closing with William Caxton, whose first printed work, "The Game and Playe of the Chesse," was finished on the 31st of March, 1474. The printing press, of course, gave the language that firmness and security which it has possessed since, and which has preserved it from such great changes as those to which it was exposed before.

The Pronunciation of Greek; Accent and Quantity. A Philological Inquiry. By *J. S. Blackie*, Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh. Edinburgh, 1852, 8vo.

Studien ueber die Alt- und Neugriechen und ueber die Lautgeschichte der griechischen Buchstaben. Von *Dr. Johann Telfy*, K. K. Professor der Klass. Philologie u. Lit. an der Pesth Un. Leipzig, 1853, 8vo.

Greek scholars are aware that the controversy concerning the proper pronunciation of Greek, once rallying round the standards of Reuchlin and Erasmus, has been revived in our day. Thus far, however, the firing has all been on one side. The "conservatives" of every land, however much they differ from one another, have tacitly agreed, it seems, to let the storm pass, to hide their heads, ostrich-like, in the sand, and, in the meantime, to remain in quiet possession and continued practice of what their opponents call gross insults to the spirit of a noble language, and arbitrary, ridiculous absurdities; whilst the "reformers" have hitherto failed to make any decided impression for want of agreement among themselves, and on account of a haste and rashness observable in most of them, which, as is well known, are not the characteristics of a true reform. The two treatises whose titles we have given, are some of the grape shot fired into the obstinate enemy's castle. The one comes from Hungary, the other from Scotland; both from Professors of the Greek language. The Hungarian is an enthusiast for Modern Greece, denies that the Slavonians left any permanent traces in Greece, maintains that the Greeks of the present day are the genuine, almost unmixed offspring of the Pericles, the Demosthenes, the Thucydides; that their language is a true counterpart of the classical Greek, and that everybody that does not pronounce Greek as modern Athens does, commits sacrilege. Professor Blackie is more moderate. He admits that the modern Greeks have widely departed from the pronunciation of the language of their forefathers, as it may be ascertained from other sources, that the Erasmians, on the whole, come very near the ancient classical pronunciation; and yet he demands that in deference to the present inhabitants of Greece and Turkey, we should adopt the modern Greek pronunciation. Télfy gives us the steps of his investigation, Blackie nothing but results. The latter, however, claims an attentive hearing, because, as he tells us, he has worked his way through Havercamp's great collection of older writers on this subject, he has compared the arguments used in the old Cambridge controversy with those advanced by "a well-informed modern member of the same learned corporation;" he has consulted the learned Germans; he has been in Greece, and continues to

read modern Greek; and because he has examined those passages of the ancient rhetoricians and grammarians that touch upon the various branches of the subject. Among the proofs adduced to show that the language of Homer is not dead, occurs a passage from a newspaper, beginning: Ὁ Κοσσοὺτ ἔν Ἀμερικῇ Τῇν 6 Δεκεμβρίου κ.λ. We must confess that the enthusiasm and the violence evinced by both these writers are not calculated to convince their opponents, unless these should happen to possess more candour than opponents generally do.

Apocalyptic Sketches. Lectures on the Book of Revelation. Second series By Rev. John Cumming, D.D., minister of the Scotch National Church. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston, 1854. pp. 532.

These lectures are not a continuous commentary on the Apocalypse, but discourses on subjects, founded on passages in the last three chapters of the Revelations. The author believes that the glories predicted in this part of the word of God, "are about to emerge far sooner than many believe."

Manual of Missions; or, Sketches of the Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church: with maps, showing the stations and statistics of Protestant Missions among unevangelized nations. By John C. Lowrie, one of the Secretaries of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 683 Broadway.

This volume meets a widely extended want. Every one interested in the work of missions has felt the need of a compact and accessible account of the whole field, so as to be able to see at a glance what is now doing in this department. The author has accomplished an important work in the most satisfactory manner.

The Twenty-four Books of the Holy Scripture, carefully translated according to the Massoretic Text on the basis of the English version, after the best Jewish authorities; and supplied with short explanatory notes. By Isaac Leeser. Philadelphia: Published at 371 Walnut street. Quarto, pp. 1011.

This large and handsome volume is the work of the learned leader of the Synagogue in Philadelphia. He says of himself that he "is an Israelite in faith, in the full sense of the word; he believes in the Scriptures as they have been handed down to us; in the truth and authenticity of prophecies, and their ultimate literal fulfilment." The object of the work is to furnish not a commentary, but an improved version of the Jewish Scriptures. The author adheres generally to the English version, departing from it, however, in innumerable cases, in the form of expression. The notes have reference almost exclusively to the sense of words and phrases, giving the different renderings, in many cases, of his authorities, which include all

the most important Hebrew writers on the Scriptures, ancient and modern. The reader will perceive, from what we have said, that the plan of the work is excellent; and he will find much to instruct and interest him in the manner in which it is executed. A work on a similar plan, from a competent Christian scholar, would be a very valuable contribution to our biblical apparatus.

The two views of Episcopary, Old and New. Philadelphia: Stavely and McCalla, 12 Pear street: [orders supplied at two dollars a dozen, and mailed at that price postage paid.] 1854. pp. 57.

There is no form of doctrine for which we have less respect than High Church Episcopacy. Our evangelical Episcopalians seem to be much of the same mind, judging from the portraits which they draw of the high church party. The two systems are contrasted, and the contrast sustained by authorities in the above pamphlet, which will be found well worth a perusal.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

A. H. Baier, Symbolism of the Christian Confessions and of Religious Parties. Vol. I. Symbolism of the Roman Catholic Church. Division 1. The idea and the principles of Roman Catholicism. 8vo. pp. 252. 28 ngr.

H. Ewald, History of the People of Israel till the time of Christ. Second Edition. Vol. III. David and the Kingdom in Israel. 8vo. pp. 787. 3½ thalers.

E. W. Hengstenberg, Christology of the Old Testament and Commentary on the Messianic Prophecies. Second Edition. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 603. 2 thalers 12 ngr.

J. N. P. Oischinger, Speculative Development of the Principal Systems of Modern Philosophy, from Descartes to Hegel. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 328. 1 thaler 12 ngr.

M. A. Uhlemann, Inscriptionis Rosettanæ hieroglyphicæ decretum sacerdotale accuratissime recognovit, latine vertit, explicavit, cum versione græca aliisque ejusdem temporis monumentis hieroglyphicis contulit atque composuit, glossario instruxit. 4to. pp. 181. 4 thalers.

By the same, Philologus Ægyptiacus, or explanation of Egyptian words gathered from Greek and Roman writers. 8vo. pp. 32. 8 ngr.

C. Frantz, History of the Worship of Mary and Anna in the Catholic Church. 8vo. pp. 202. 18 ngr.

L. Saalschuetz, Form and Spirit of the Hebrew Poetry of the Bible. 8vo. pp. 116. $\frac{2}{3}$ thaler.

Joach Curaei, Exegesis perspicua et ferme integra controversiæ de sacra cœna, first published in 1574, now again edited by D. G. Scheffer. 4to. pp. 63. $\frac{1}{2}$ thaler.

J. C. K. Hofmann, The Scripture Proof. Part II. Division 1. 8vo. pp. 407. 1 thaler 24 ngr.

M. Baumgarten, The Night Vision of Zechariah. Part I, containing the first three chapters. 8vo. pp. 386. 2 thalers.

A. Bisping, Exegetical Manual to the Epistles of the Apostle Paul, to be completed in three volumes of two parts each. Vol. I. Part 1. Epistle to the Romans. 8vo. pp. 372. $\frac{5}{6}$ thaler.

The Book of Enoch, translated and explained by A. Dillmann. 8vo. pp. 67 and 332. 2 thalers 4 ngr.

H. Ewald, Annual of Biblical Science. Vol. V. for 1852-3. 8vo. pp. 356. 2 thalers. Containing the Christian Book of Adam, translated from the Ethiopic, with remarks by A. Dillmann. (Also issued separately, pp. 144. $\frac{2}{3}$ thaler.) The Scripture Canon of the Abyssinian Church, by the same. Explanation of Persian words of the Old Testament, by M. Haug. Explanatory remarks upon the Psalms. The external testimonies in favour of the Gospel of John. Review of the writings upon Biblical Science which have appeared in 1852-3. On Religion and Government in Germany.

W. Neumann has published an essay on the Peace Offerings of the Old Testament, under the title Sacra Vet. Test. Salutaria. 8vo. pp. 45. 8 ngr.

The third division of Kurtz's Church History, just published contains an account of the Oriental Church, from the Trullan Council to the fall of Constantinople. 8vo. pp. 205. 21 ngr.

H. Heppe, The Development of the Confessions of the Old Protestant Church of Germany, the Old Protestant Union, and the present position and task of Protestantism in regard to Confessions. 8vo. pp. 425. $1\frac{1}{2}$ th.

J. Nickes, De libro Judithæ. 8vo. pp. 71. 12 ngr.

W. Gass, History of Protestant Dogmatics in its connection with Theology generally. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 488. 2 thalers.

Ascension and Vision of the Prophet Isaiah, translated from the Ethiopic and Latin into the German, with a commentary and a general introduction by Dr. H. Jolowicz. A contribution to the sources for the knowledge of early Christianity. 8vo. pp. 94. 18 ngr.

T. Kock, Sophoclean Studies. No. 1. On the Aristotelian idea of Katharsis in the tragedy, and its application to King Œdipus. 4to. pp. 75. $\frac{2}{3}$ thaler.

T. Benfey, Manual of the Sanskrit Language. This is now completed by the appearance of the Glossary. 8vo. pp. 374. The former parts contain a grammar and Chrestomathy; the cost of the whole is 14 thalers.

E. Lekebusch, The Composition and Origin of the Acts of the Apostles investigated anew. 8vo. pp. 434. 2 thalers.

E. Meier, The Song of Solomon, with a German translation, explanation, and critical edition of the Text. 8vo. pp. 168. $\frac{2}{3}$ thaler.

J. P. Lange, The History of the Church. Part I. The Apostolic Age. Vol. II. 8vo. pp. 654. Cost as far as published, 5 thalers.

E. v. Lasaulx, The Fall of Hellenism, and the confiscation of its temple property by the Christian emperors. A contribution to the philosophy of history. 8vo. pp. 150. 26 ngr.

M. A. Lenzi di Torcegno, Compend of the history of Italian Literature from the tenth to the eighteenth century inclusive. 8vo. pp. 103. $\frac{2}{3}$ thalers.

E. Bertheau, The Books of Chronicles, as the 15th part of the Condensed Exegetical Manual to the Old Testament. 8vo. pp. 432. 2 thalers. The exposition of Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther by the same author is promised shortly.

J. Richers, The History of the Creation, Paradise and Flood explained. (Genesis, i.–ix.) 8vo. pp. 474. 2 thalers, 8 ngr.

J. T. A. Wiesinger, The Epistle of James explained. 8vo. pp. 211. 24 ngr. This is in continuation of Olshausen's Biblical Commentary on the New Testament. The rest of the General Epistles, which are now alone wanting to complete the work, are to appear in a short time.

M. F. Rampf, The Epistle of Jude, the Apostle and Brother of the Lord, historically, critically, exegetically. 8vo. pp. 432. $1\frac{5}{6}$ thalers.

W. O. Dietlein, Lectures on Catholicism and Protestantism. 8vo. pp. 243. $\frac{3}{4}$ thalers.

H. Ewald, On the Origin, Meaning, and Composition of the Ethiopian Book of Enoch. 4to. pp. 78. 24 ngr.

W. Neumann, Jeremiah of Anathoth. An exposition of his Prophecy and Lamentations. No. 1. 8vo. pp. 160.

E. Gerhard, Greek Mythology. Part I. The Greek Divinities. 8vo. pp. 601.

Bibliotheca Tamulica, or the principal works in Tamul, edited, translated and provided with notes and glossaries. By C. Graul. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 203.