



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1855.

No. III.

John W. Alden

ART. I.—*The Zurich Letters; or, the Correspondence of several English Bishops, and others, with some of the Helvetican Reformers, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth.* Chiefly from the Archives of Zurich. Translated from authenticated copies of the autographs, and edited for the Parker Society, by the Rev. Hastings Robinson, D. D., F. A. S., Rector of Great Warley, Essex, and formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Second edition, chronologically arranged in one series.

WHAT will be the ultimate destiny of the established Church of England, it is perhaps impossible to foretell, and therefore, vain to conjecture. We know of no book, however, which throws so much light upon its origin, genesis, growth and complicated structure, as the one before us. It completely exposes the hypothesis lately put forth by D'Aubigné, that the English Reformation proceeded primarily from the people, and was a purely religious Revolution. It is equally at variance with the opposite sentiment, that it was nothing more than a political change dictated by the pride or the policy of her rulers. The truth is, as usual, to be found in the mean between the two extremes. The circumstances of the times were, unquestionably, favourable to the progress of the Reform-

ation in England, up to a certain point; but they were adverse to a perfect and thorough Reformation. The insular position of the realm—the jealous pride of the people—their habitual and hereditary impatience of foreign control, or interference in their domestic affairs—(a salutary quality which their Anglo-Saxon descendants in America seem to have inherited)—rendered them naturally averse to the Papal Headship. The indisposition of Henry VIII. and his Protestant successors to submit to foreign dictation, had been repeatedly evinced from the earliest times, and was equally felt by the nation at large. The innate and unrelaxed tendency of Rome to unite and identify her spiritual claims with secular ambition—which has ever rendered her despotism so intense, so peculiar, so profound, so all-engrossing wherever her sway has been submitted to—will probably in the righteous retributions of Heaven, furnish its own correctives and antidote. Abhorrence of political Popery, is, we are persuaded, at the bottom of the Know-Nothing movement now going on so extensively in America; and opposition to the temporal power of the Pope, cannot fail to present a powerful barrier to the success and spread of the papal system—so long as civil liberty and national independence are prized and revered.

These considerations are sufficient to show that D'Aubigné's view of the subject is both defective and erroneous. The common Papal explanation of the phenomenon of the English Reformation—to wit, that it was wholly brought about by the lust of Henry, the ambition of Cranmer, and the political interests of Elizabeth, is still more unsatisfactory. The Reformation in England never could have made such progress, had it not been flowing on in the same current with the nation's sympathies, and had it not been essentially pervaded, purified, sustained and sanctioned by the word and Spirit of God. In so far as its objects and agents were political, it was, in inception and origin, in marked contrast with the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland, but as compared with England before that period, it was a religious revolution to rejoice in, and to be thankful for—a displacement of ignorance, and superstition, and a substitution in their room of the true doctrine and service of God.

It is not only freely conceded, but vaunted by Macaulay, that the English Reformation was not the work of Theological Reformers, like Calvin and Knox, men who were governed exclusively by religious considerations, and who sought only religious objects, but by men like Somerset and Cranmer, of whom one was little more or better than a mere politician—and the other, though at heart a good man, was too timid and feeble to resist the powerful will of Henry and Elizabeth. It is to this circumstance that he very justly ascribes the pompous ritual, the splendid liturgy, the magnificent ecclesiastical edifices, and the peculiar orders and officers of the English establishment. To the same source, as we shall soon see, may be referred the Popish doctrines which were retained and which were so little in harmony with the purer elements of the Reformation. During her long religious gestation, the Church in England has been like Rebekah in her travail—the children have struggled together within her—the Esau of Popery, red all over like a hairy garment, and the Jacob of Protestantism; Jacob the supplanter—Jacob the prince with God, prevailing by piety and prayer. Two nations have been in her womb, and two manner of people have been separated from her bowels; and may we not indulge the prophecy and prayer, that in this case also the older shall serve the younger? (Gen. xxv. 21–26.)

That the English Reformation bears a very striking resemblance to the constitution of the Christian Church in the first quarter of the fourth century, has been often affirmed by its warmest admirers. In both instances, the Revolution was essentially Christian, but the constitution of the Church and the organization of the Hierarchy were studiously and skilfully adjusted to the constitution of the State—to the majesty of the empire—to the personal tastes and habitudes of the ruling princes—to the secular interests and immediate worldly successes of the Church, favoured by the sovereign and established by law. The adaptation of the constitution of the Church to that of the State, was in both cases remarkable, but in neither accidental.*

* The characteristic, historical, and doctrinal difference between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, is well brought out in a pregnant passage of S. T. Coleridge. "Whatever is not against the word of God is for it—thought the founders of the Church of England. Whatever is not in the word of God is a

The mingling of the political with the religious element; in the English Reformation, and the frequent conflicts between the two, are apparent on almost every page of this varied and interesting correspondence. The Queen and the Reformers are perpetually in an attitude of opposition. She, as is well known, having little sympathy either with the religious doctrines or practices of the thoroughly Reformed Churches, and being attached to the Reformed Party principally from the circumstances of her descent from Ann Boleyn, a decidedly Protestant Princess, her personal and political interests, and her high intellectual sympathy with the progress of knowledge and literature, was a Protestant by "position" (as the grammarians say) rather than by principle. To the last she insisted on retaining the crucifix in her private chapel, greatly to the grief and scandal of her best advisers, in discouraging the marriage of the clergy, and generally in restricting the liberty of speech and action, with an iron will and an iron hand.

What Bishop Burnet, with an excess of charity, says of her father, Henry VIII., is strictly true of Elizabeth. She is rather to be reckoned among the great than the good princes. In many personal qualities—in intellectual abilities and accomplishments—in indomitable strength of will—in the clear discernment of statesmanlike qualities—in instinctive and well-nigh unerring tact in the choice of able counsellors—personal proficiency in the literature of the times—unyielding courage amid pressing difficulties and appalling dangers—in the commercial prosperity, in the military renown, and in the literary splendour of her protracted reign, she must be reckoned among the most illustrious of the long and often brilliant line of English royalty. Her personal weaknesses, on the other hand, were scarcely less remarkable; haughty, hard-hearted, vain beyond the common vanity of her sex and station,

word of man—thought the founders of the Church of Scotland and Geneva. The one proposed to themselves to be reformers of the Latin Church; that is to bring it back to the form which it had during the first four centuries; the latter to be the renovators of the Christian religion, as it was preached and instituted by the Apostles, and the immediate followers of Christ thereunto specially inspired. When the premises are so different, who can wonder at the difference in the conclusion?" Notes on Jeremy Taylor, Vol. 5., p. 149: Shedd's edition. A page or two before, he had spoken of "The first grand apostasy from Christ to Constantine."

passionate, perverse in her dealings with her dependents, profane in speech, moody and capricious—*semper varium et mutabile*—prone to unreasonable and unseemly, if not criminal fondness for unworthy objects, often terminating in unmerited cruelty and excessive and implacable disgusts; economical in the administration of her government to spare her exchequer, quartering herself on her wealthy nobles, often to their permanent embarrassment, and yet rendering herself ridiculous by the variety and costliness of the splendid robes with which she bedizened her plain person, even when worn and wrinkled by time and trouble.*

This volume is uniformly religious in its tone and temper, but not in its topics. It is a record of the familiar and friendly correspondence of the English and Continental Reformers—Sampson, Sandys, Foxe, Parkhurst, Grindal, Jewel, with Bullinger, Martyr, Gualter, Cassander, Hubert, Simler, Sturmius, Farell, Beza, Calvin—names renowned and venerable. Associated in true friendship, in Christian communion and godly labours here, in a sacred fellowship of suffering and sacrifice on earth, now doubtless they rest from their labours, and their works do follow them—their troubles ended, their services and sacrifices graciously received and rewarded graciously, they now worship and rejoice together in the heavenly city! There is, to us, something strange and solemn in being brought so near to men whom we have been so long in the habit of venerating at a distance—in being admitted to their secret counsels, in being honoured, as it were, with their personal confidence, in being witness to the treasured hopes and feelings of their hearts, as only a free epistolary correspondence can admit us. The very age and body of the times is imaged here. We have the contemporary impressions, original judgments in relation to the most interesting characters and memorable events of this important period. The characters are as various and as picturesque as the pilgrims in the Canterbury tales. Courtiers, theologians, politicians, students, schoolmasters, kings and queens, every extreme of life and every turn of fortune, the manifold accomplishments, the basilisk

* In Letter 64 we have an interesting account of Elizabeth by her eminent and learned teacher, R. Ascham.

beauty of Mary, Queen of Scots, together with her dark intrigues, her incredible and inscrutable hypocrisies and her bloody crimes, whom nothing but her high courage and heroic death save from utter detestation and contempt. What Malcolm says of the death of Cawdor was eminently fulfilled in her.

“ Nothing in her life
Became her like the leaving it; she died
As one that had been studied in her death,
To throw away the dearest thing she owed
As 'twere a careless trifle.”

We have Philip of Spain, narrow-minded, ambitious, superstitious, and despotic: Burleigh, the able minister of the crown, servile toward his imperious mistress, but truly devoted to the interests of his country, which he had perhaps unconsciously, but sagaciously and habitually identified with his own: Leicester, plausible and pleasing to a woman's eye, but dark, insincere, insidious, aspiring, murderous: Robert, Earl of Essex, impetuous, brave, proud, self-confident, but without solid judgment, without settled principle, dazzling others by the brilliancy of his achievements, and the still greater brilliancy of his promise and pretensions; himself dazzled by courtly and royal favours, impelled by arrogance, ambition, and an evil genius to a criminal enterprise and a bloody end—these figures pass before us in the perusal of this volume, as in a magic mirror.

The special and crowning value of the book, however, arises from the light which it throws upon the views of the early English Reformers, on the two great subjects of theological doctrine and church government. It is exceedingly instructive, as showing what were the genuine doctrines of the Reformation, and as evincing the harmony of all the leading divines English and Continental; plainly setting before us the views which they derived from the direct, impartial, and independent study of the word of God, especially in regard to those doctrines usually denominated Calvinistic.*

Would that we could see a revival and return of harmony between the English and Continental Churches, based upon

* See especially on this subject, the letter of Bishop Grindal to C. Hubert, the 67th of the series.

scriptural consent of doctrine and evangelic agreement of sentiment and feeling!—such as is everywhere expressed in these letters; articulately, affectionately and emphatically in letter 65th.

The tone of deference and affection, in which the most eminent prelates of that period addressed these foreign Presbyterian divines, not only precludes the notion that they imagined they enjoyed any official superiority over them, but it is evident that they regarded any deviation from the simplicity of service and order, which then prevailed in the Reformed Continental Churches, not as matter of triumph and rejoicing, but as a lamentable necessity of the times. So far were they from recommending to their Presbyterian correspondents, the adoption of the English forms and offices and ceremonies as “a more excellent way,”—that they repeatedly express their own unwillingness to assume the state and title of Prelates, not because appalled by the awful sanctity of the office, but because alarmed and shocked by its resemblance to Rome, and offended by “the pomps and vanities” with which it was inseparably connected, by the will of the sovereign and the constitution of the realm. The great burden of the book is a long lamentation over “the relics of the Amorites, the rags of Popery,” which the Queen, who was fond of glitter and finery in everything, insisted on retaining. Accordingly, we find them consulting these Presbyterian friends, brethren, and fathers, asking their judgment on the practical question, how far they might admit these things with a good conscience, affirming openly that the only circumstance of sufficient weight in their estimation to justify conformity, was the apprehension, that, if they should refuse, more pliant tools would be found, who would not hesitate to sacrifice fundamental doctrine; and it was only from the dread of this, that their Continental correspondents advised and sanctioned the course adopted by the English Reformers.

It is really not a little remarkable that the very things which were borne with reluctantly and impatiently at that time, which were regarded as blotches and blemishes on the fair face of their Church, should in a generation or two after, and ever since, be pointed to as her peculiar glory. It is, as

Swift would put it—as if a man should have an ugly wart or wen upon his face, and transmitting it faithfully to his son, the youthful Adonis should pride himself hugely on what had been the shame and grief of his more discerning father. Laudism in a following age, and Puseyism in our own, are but the natural and necessary expansion of the Popish elements then retained by authority and submitted to by compulsion. It is perfectly plain, that the English Reformation “begun” and to a certain point “continued” by the royal authority, was, alas! “ended,” long before it should have been, or would have been, had it rested with the Reformed Theologians, and the most godly among the laity of England. The simple truth was, as Beza said, that the Papacy never was abolished in that country, but rather transferred to the Sovereign.

In regard to the subject of church government, there seems to have been no material difference of opinion between these English Reformers and their foreign and Presbyterian correspondents. The strong likelihood is, that if their circumstances had been reversed, each party would have acted as the other did; and the proof of this is found in the fact, that the Presbyterian divines counselled what the English Reformers did, as the best that could be done in their circumstances. Both parties agreed in holding that there is no one form of organization prescribed in the New Testament, as essential to the existence of the Church; and that while certain general principles are therein enjoined as of perpetual obligation, the details of church polity and government may be varied to suit the exigencies of particular times and places.

High Churchmen take the opposite ground. Romanists and Anglicans hold that the Church in its essential nature is an external society organized in a particular form, and can exist in no other. High Churchmen of a different class, while they do not make the mode of external organization essential to the being of the Church, deny that the Church has any discretion in matters of government, any more than in matters of doctrine. They affirm that everything that is lawful is prescribed, and, therefore, of perpetual and universal obligation. If either of these theories were correct, we should expect to find the platform of church government prescribed in the New Testament

with the same particularity and distinctness, as the frame-work of the Jewish theocracy is laid down in the Old Testament.

When God means to order anything, he can speak so as to be understood. He can declare his will so plainly that it shall be impossible to misunderstand him. Thus Moses received clear directions in regard to the minutest details connected with the divine constitution of the Jewish Church; the size, shape, and texture of every part of the tabernacle; the material, fashion, and ornaments of the priests' robes; and every thing pertaining to the offices and order, to the discipline and service, to the constitution and *cultus* of the Jewish Church. The utmost fidelity in this matter is urged upon him twice in the compass of a single chapter: Ex. xxv. 9, 40. "According to all that I show thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it." "And look that thou make them after their pattern which was showed thee in the mount." Now, it is perfectly notorious that there is no such clear pattern, no such fixed and definite model, given us in the New Testament. On the other hand, the duties pertaining to certain offices recognized and referred to in the New Testament Church, and directions in regard to the details of the worship of God, are few, scanty, vague, and general, but amply sufficient. "Let all things be done decently and in order," is the Apostolic prescript. It should seem, indeed, that visible and invariable uniformity was by no means prevalent in the various churches existing in Apostolic times, founded by the Apostles themselves, and under Apostolic control. If an exact resemblance to the Apostolic Church, in all its usages, offices, and institutions be declared essential to the existence of the Church at present, then it is clearly demonstrable that there is no such thing as a Christian Church now in existence. There were many offices in the Apostolic Church which no longer exist, as apostles, prophets, healers of the sick, deaconesses, and others.*

The constitution of the Apostolic Church was peculiar and

* In his chapter on the Worship of God, in his work on Church Government, Owen makes several just and striking observations in answer to the Query 13th, "Are not some institutions of the New Testament ceased?" &c. p. 465, Gould's edition.

inimitable, and was never designed to be permanent and universal. The Apostolic office itself was, from its conditions and purpose, temporary and personal—incapable of transmission or succession. It was essential to the Apostolic commission, that it should be derived directly and personally from the Lord Jesus; and as the Apostles were the constituted witnesses of the fact of his resurrection—the point around which the whole body of Christian evidences, truths, and doctrines revolved—the cornerstone of Historical Christianity—it was essential to the character of an Apostle that he should have seen Christ personally after his resurrection. Now let us try those “who say they are Apostles and are not” by these tests; let us examine the credentials of these boasted and boasting “successors of the Apostles”—by what all acknowledge to have been the signs of an Apostle. We might present those signs as summed up by Paul and fulfilled in him. Are they Apostles? Have they seen Christ? Can they work miracles? Can they bear personal witness to the great fact of the resurrection? Are they inspired to declare the unrevealed will of God? No! not one thing that is alleged in Scripture, as peculiarly a sign of an Apostle, can these successors of the Apostles do! The failure is not partial or equivocal, in one point, on one test, but unmitigated, unredeemed, total, throughout, universal, and ignominious. Successors of the Apostles, that have nothing particularly in common with the Apostles! As well might any ordinary English constable claim to be the successor of Alfred the Great and Queen Elizabeth. We fancy we hear the ancient, inspired, infallible Apostles saying to these their bastard sons, “Peter I know, and Paul I know—but who are ye?”

If the Bible had been constructed on the High Church theory, it would have been very different from what it actually is. It would have been abundant, minute, and explicit, in relation to every thing connected with the constitution and government of the Christian Church. The laws in regard to the validity and transmission of orders, and the rules of succession, would have been as numerous and definite, as were those which related to the Levitical economy. But such is not the case. It is certainly remarkable, on the hypothesis, that the theory which we combat is there, that while the Scriptures say so little

in regard to the constitution and transmission of ecclesiastical offices, they should say so much in regard to articles of faith, and moral dispositions and duties. It is evident that the inspired writers must have conceived that definite instructions in relation to the first and a fixed form were comparatively unimportant, and that the last were absolutely, for all times and all men, essential. Now it is just here, in regard to the nature and importance of Christian doctrine and moral duty, that all the Reformed Churches, at the period of the Reformation, and all evangelical Churches now, are substantially of one mind. The admirable harmony between the evangelical Churches and the Bible, which is their common bond and bulwark, deserves to be particularly pointed out. We have seen that the New Testament makes little of ecclesiastical descent and details, but much of doctrine and duty. Sometimes external authority and ecclesiastical tradition are brought face to face in opposition with essential and inspired truth. Thus our Saviour vehemently rebuked the constituted authorities and recognized teachers of the Jewish Church, for a wicked and wilful perversion of the divine law; charging them with making the law of no effect through their traditions. Paul, in the same spirit, said to the Galatians, "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach unto you any other gospel than we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

The inevitable consequence of assuming that the Bible teaches more than it actually does teach, is the substitution of human for divine authority. Experience teaches certain things to be necessary, or at least highly expedient, which the New Testament does not enjoin. These things the Church is constrained to include in her organization, and then they are enforced as of divine right; and brethren are censured or rejected for not acknowledging them as such. This vitiates the nature of religion, and inevitably corrupts the Church. Things that are external and entirely independent of the spiritual life, are made essential. Wherever this principle is adopted, another consequence is sure to follow. What is human is made of more consequence than what is really divine. Among Romanists, if a man denies the supremacy of the Pope, he is led to the stake, while he may violate every precept of

the Decalogue with comparative impunity. The Puseyites consign to perdition all who renounce the jurisdiction of prelates, but they are latitudinarians in matters of doctrine. Churches which excommunicate a member for singing hymns, often admit drunkards to their communion. We need not deceive ourselves. If men assume the authority of God, they will drive themselves and those who submit to them to destruction. If they teach for doctrine, the commandments of men, they will make the word of God of no effect. While, therefore, we hold firmly to the authority of the Scriptures, and submit gladly to all that it enjoins; and while we believe that the great principles of Church polity are clearly revealed, and should be universally adopted, it is no less important that we should resist all high-church assumptions, and refuse to regard as divine that which is merely human.

G. Addison Alexander.
 ART. II.—*The Coptic Language.*

THERE are some kinds of knowledge which a bad custom has too much restricted to the class by courtesy called *learned*, and withheld from many quite as able to appreciate their value, and in multitudes of cases far more curious and inquisitive respecting them. Among the kinds of knowledge here referred to is the knowledge of strange languages, not in their philological minutiae, much less in their metaphysical principles, but in their general history and structure, with reference to which one dialect may differ from another just as faces do, and yet have just as real a generic likeness. The observation and enjoyment of this lingual physiognomy requires no extraordinary gifts or training, as a previous preparation, no abstruse or transcendental processes and methods in the actual process of investigation. The plainest and least educated traveller in foreign lands, if possessed of any natural shrewdness and propensity to observation, may derive enjoyment from variety of looks and manners, forms and institutions, without caring to philosophize about their causes. In like manner we have often

met with persons who made no pretensions to a learned education, but who felt a lively interest in diversities of language, and a wish to know wherein they differed from each other; a kind of curiosity which, no doubt, has been much increased by the missionary movements of our own day, and which ought to be encouraged, beside other reasons, on account of its reflexive influence upon that great and glorious enterprise. However necessary it may be to cherish higher motives for promoting it, the cause must be a gainer by the use of every new incentive to exertion or to liberality, however trivial or unimportant in itself considered.

To that particular indulgence and encouragement of public curiosity, of which we have been speaking, there can be no objection on the score of pedantry, or incongruity; because the information to be given is the most elementary and superficial, and requires a mere smattering in him who gives it, and who differs from his pupils only in the accidental circumstance of knowing what they happen not to know, but are as capable of understanding as he is himself.

To exemplify these obvious and perhaps superfluous suggestions, we assume that there are some of our readers who would like to have some definite, though general idea of that ancient idiom, which they often read or hear of, as the sacred language of the Copts or hereditary Christians of Egypt, and shall undertake to gratify this wish, without the least regard to the wants or the opinions of those readers, who already know more about the subject than ourselves.

The Coptic language is a mixture of Greek and old Egyptian. This compound character is evident even in the alphabet. While most of the letters retain their Greek names and forms with little alteration, there are several added to express sounds unknown to the Greeks, such as our *j*, and *sh*, and those peculiar modifications of *h*, *s*, *t*, which are found in several Semitic dialects, but are equally unknown in Greek and English. The additional characters by which these sounds are represented, are derived from the Egyptian hieroglyphics. According to Plutarch, the old Egyptian alphabet consisted of twenty-five letters, of which eighteen were consonants and seven vowels. In the sounds given to these characters, there were no doubt

dialectic variations, not expressed to the eye, as the hieroglyphic symbols always represented the initial letter of the corresponding word, which was not invariably the same in all the dialects.

These dialects are three in number, the Theban or Sahidic, the Memphitic, and the Basmuric, the last being distinguished from the other two by its superior softness, the Memphitic by its aspirations, and its fondness for the vowel *i*.

The words *Copt* and *Coptic* are derived from the old name of the country, the radicals of which are still distinctly traceable in the Greek modification or corruption, from which we borrow the word *Egypt*.

Most of the indigenous Egyptian words still extant in the Coptic are reduced by grammarians to monosyllabic roots, such as *pe* (heaven), *kah* (earth), *so* (to drink). With these are mingled, especially in the versions of the New Testament, a multitude of Greek words in their crude form; not only nouns (as *χώρα*, *λαός*), but particles (as *ὁ*, *ἄρ*, *κατά*), all which are treated as Egyptian vocables.

Besides the usual modes of derivation, by vowel changes, and by the addition or reduplication of consonants, the Coptic, like the old hieroglyphic language, has unambiguous instances of composition, properly so called; a striking point of difference between it and the great Semitic family, to which, in some respects, it bears a strong resemblance. Besides the combination of two radicals, the Coptic language also exhibits that of radicals with intensive, negative, and other qualifying particles. Thus, from *na* (pity) and *nau* (to see), are formed the derivatives or compounds *atna* (pitiless) and *atnau* (invisible); from *sōnt* (to create) and *er* (to make), *rephsōnt* (a creator) and *repher* (a maker); from *nau* (to see), and *moushi* (to walk), *sinnau* (a sight) and *jinmoushi* (a walk.) These few examples will suffice to show the capabilities of the language for the expression even of nice distinctions, if its actual advantages and capabilities of form and structure had been duly improved by use and cultivation.

Coptic nouns are of two genders, for the most part not distinguished by their form. But masculines become feminine by adding the vowel *e* or *i* in different dialects, as *shōm*, *shome*,

father and mother-in-law; *hieḅ*, *hiebi*, male and female lamb. Sometimes, by a simple prolongation of the vowel, as *ouro*, *ourō*, king and queen. Sometimes, both changes take place at once, as *son*, *sōne*, brother and sister. In the absence of distinctive forms, the gender is distinguished by the article; or by the addition of *male* and *female*.

The Copts have an article, indefinite and definite. The former consists in the prefix *ou*, as *rōmi*, man, *ourōmi*, a man. The plural form is altogether different, consisting in the prefix *han* or *hen*. This is prefixed even to Greek singulars, as *hen-apostolos*, apostles. The definite article distinguishes both gender and number. The singular masculine is *pe* or *pi*, the feminine *te* or *ti*; the plural, common to both genders, *nei*, *ne*, or *ni*. The alternative forms here given belong, for the most part, to the different dialects. Corresponding to these forms in the hieroglyphic writing, are the three initials, *p*, *t*, *n*.

Not unfrequently the vowels of the Coptic article are omitted, and the consonant prefixed directly to the noun. Before certain other letters, these are sometimes changed to *ph* or *th*. An interesting example of this change is that afforded by the word *ouro*, king; with the article, *phouro*, the king, by the Greeks written *Φαραῶ*, and in English *Pharaoh*. That this was not a personal but an official designation, is expressly affirmed by Eusebius,* and abundantly clear otherwise. This coincidence of forms demonstrates, at the same time, the truth of the Mosaic narrative, and the antiquity of the native element in the Coptic language.

By adding to the article the vowel *a*, representing the verb *to have*, is formed what may be called a possessive article, as *pa*, corresponding to the Greek *ὁ τοῦ*, *ta* to *ἡ τοῦ*, *na* to *οἱ* and *αἱ τοῦ*. Thus, in Matt. xxii. 21, *τῷ Καίσαρος* is rendered by *napouro*, which consists of the noun *ouro* (king), with the article, *pouro* (the king), and the possessive prefix, *napouro*, the things of (or belonging to) the king. The possessive article, thus formed, is then combined with suffix pronouns, *pa* (mine), *pek* (thine), *pen* (ours), &c. In the old sacred dialect, these pronominal suffixes are joined directly to the noun itself, precisely as in Hebrew.

* Οὕτω γὰρ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τοὺς βασιλεῖς ἱερμνεύουσι.

A large proportion of the Coptic nouns remain unaltered in the plural number, and can only be distinguished from their singulars by the article prefixed, or the construction. The extension of this practice to words borrowed from the Greek, produces a curious grammatical phenomenon, as in the forms *apostolos*, *piapostolos* (the apostle), *niapōstolos* (the apostles). Some nouns, however, form a plural by the change or addition of a vowel, and some are as anomalous as the "broken plurals" of Arabic grammar: e. g. *sea* is *iom*, but *seas*, *amaiōou*.

Coptic nouns are not declined in the proper sense of the expression, the distinction of cases being supplied by particles prefixed, especially by *ente*, *en*, *em*, *e*.

Other prefixes form adjectives from verbs, or add an intensive force to those already in existence. The degrees of comparison are expressed, as in French, by prefixing the word *more* (*houo*, *houe*, *houa*), or other words suggestive of the same relation.

In nothing is the language more unlike most others than in its numerals, which bear little or no resemblance either to the Greek or Hebrew. The simple cardinals, with some dialectic variations, which we need not notice, are as follows. 1. *oua*. 2. *snau*. 3. *shoment*. 4. *phtouo*. 5. *tiou*. 6. *soou*. 7. *sashph*. 8. *shmoun*. 9. *psit*. 10. *mēt*. The tens are not formed from the units, but are mostly independent forms, e. g. 20, *jouōt*. 30, *mab*. 60, *se*. 90, *pestaïou*. The same is true of the higher numbers: e. g. 100, *she*. 200, *shēt*. 1000, *sho*.

There is more resemblance to Semitic forms in the Coptic pronouns: e. g. *anok*, *anak*, *ank*, suggests at once the Hebrew *J* (אֲנִי). *Entak* is sufficiently like אַתָּה to betray a common origin, while the final *k*, which has been lost, both in Arabic and Hebrew, reappears in the suffixes of both. The same general resemblance may be traced in the pronoun of the first person plural, *anon*, *anan* (אֲנֵינוּ), and some others. It is very curious, that even where the likeness seems to disappear in Coptic, it may still be traced in the old hieroglyphic notation. For example, in the third person singular, the forms *entoph*, *enthoph*, might seem wholly unconnected with the Hebrew (הוּא), till we trace them back to their original in the hieroglyphic *u*. Besides the suffix pronouns, which the Coptic has in common with the Hebrew

and its cognate tongues, it exhibits the peculiar feature of pronominal prefixes, answering the same purpose.

Fragments of pronouns are also used to distinguish the persons of the verb. Thus, *peja*, to speak, is inflected: *pejai*, *pejak*, *peje*, *pejaph*, *pejas*, *pejan*, *pejoten*, *pejau*. The tenses are distinguished by auxiliary verbs prefixed to the root: to form the present, *ei* (sum) and its inflections; to form the perfect, *ai* (fui); the imperfect, *nei* or *nai* (eram); the future, *eie* (ero) &c. The imperative and infinitive are expressed by the unaugmented root, the participle by the same with the relative pronoun (*e*, *et*) prefixed to it.

The Coptic passive is sometimes formed by internal changes of the root—as *shat* (to cut), *shent* (to be cut), *tôt* (to persuade), *têt* (to be persuaded); but much more frequently by the addition of a syllable (*ēu*, *ēout*),—as *talo* (to impose), *talēu*, *talēout*; *tako* (to corrupt), *takēu*, *takēout*. The second and longer of these affixes belongs to the Memphitic dialect. The impersonal use of the third person plural as a substitute for the passive, belongs rather to the syntax, and is probably peculiar to no language. The only things peculiar in the Coptic particles are the frequent use of the asseverative adverb *je*, where it would seem to be superfluous in other languages, and the coexistence of an absolute and construct form in prepositions—those in *a* changing it to *ō*, and those in *e* taking the terminations *au*, *ēt*, *ēti*, when combined with suffix pronouns. In the Coptic Scriptures many Greek particles are retained without change, such as *ὁ*, *τὸ*, *ἀλλὰ*, *οὖν*, *ἔτι*, *ἀνὰ*, *κατὰ*, *ἵνα*, *ὅπως*, *ὥστε*.

The father of modern Coptic learning in Europe seems to have been Athanasius Kircher, whose *Prodromus Ægyptiacus*, published at Rome, in 1636, and his *Lingua Ægyptiaca Restituta*, eight years later, furnished the first valuable helps in the study of the language. Something was done to promote it by Walton, in his Introduction to the Oriental languages, (London, 1653), and also by Lelong, Vinding, and Bonjour. The grammatical work of Blumberg, did not appear till 1716, and in the same year David Wilkins published the Coptic version of the New Testament, from manuscripts in the Bodleian library, collated with those of Paris and the Vatican, and accompanied by a

Latin version. Fifteen years later this was followed by a similar edition of the Pentateuch. Towards the middle of the century, Tuki began, at Rome, his series of liturgical publications, which continued to appear at intervals for twenty years, concluding with the Pontifical and Ritual, (1764.) The same writer published a grammar in 1778. That of Scholtz appeared about the same time, edited by Woide. The vocabulary of the same writer came out five years later.

In the early part of the present century, the most distinguished names are those of Rossi in Italy, Quatremère in France, and Münter in Denmark. Still later, England takes its turn. In 1830, Henry Tattam published his *Compendious Grammar*, followed in a few years by his *Lexicon*. In 1836, he edited the Coptic version of the *Minor Prophets*, and after an interval of sixteen years, the *Major Prophets*, the book of *Job* having appeared in the meantime. During the same interval, two editions of the Coptic *Psalter* had been published; one by Ideler, (1837), and the other by Schwartz, (1843.)

Valuable additions to the philological apparatus of the Coptic scholar have been made within the last few years. Among these are the *Lexicon* of Amadeus Peyron, (1835), and his *Grammar* (1841)—the *Vocabulary* of Parthey, compiled from Tattam and Peyron, (Berlin, 1844); the *Coptic Grammar* of Schwartz, edited after his death by Steinthal, (1850), and that of Uhlemann, with a *chrestomathy* and *glossary*, intended for the use of students, (1853.) To these may be added Bœtticher's editions of the *Acts* and *Epistles*, (1852), and the *Pistis Sophia*, a Gnostic work, copied and translated into Latin by Schwartz, and posthumously edited by Petermann, (1851.)

The interest attaching to this ancient tongue is twofold, and connected partly with biblical learning and partly with church history. The general use of Greek in Egypt might have seemed to make a vernacular version of the Scriptures superfluous; but on the contrary they were translated into two distinct dialects, if not into three. Though much later than the Syriac, these Egyptian versions are highly interesting to the learned.

The historical interest belonging to the Copts arises from their having, as early as the third, if not the second century,

received Christianity from the Greek colonists in Egypt; in the sixth century adhered to the Monophysite opinions, and refused submission to the Council of Chalcedon; in the seventh century encouraged the Mahometan invasion of their country, and enjoyed the favour of the conquerors for ages, to the exclusion of the orthodox or Greek Church. They are still governed by a Patriarch of Alexandria, but in a very low condition, retaining the Coptic as their sacred language, although the Arabic is their vernacular. Of late years they have become more prominent as objects of missionary labour and research.

Essex H. Stearns.

ART. III.—*The Principles of Metaphysical and Ethical Science applied to the Evidences of Religion.* A new edition, revised and annotated for the use of Colleges. By Francis Bowen, A. M., Alford Professor of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity, in Harvard College. Boston: Hickling, Swan and Brown, 1855.

ACCORDING to the purpose intimated in a brief notice of this work in our last number, we have given this book considerable attention. On closer scrutiny, it has not depreciated in our estimation. Nor can we say that certain radical defects, which seemed patent to us on a first cursory glance, disappear on a more thorough examination. Yet, on the whole, our respect for the intellectual and moral qualities of the work and its author has been enhanced by a more intimate knowledge.

The hearty and even intense theism of the book presents a warm side to the sympathies of good men, not excepting those who may think that the author has pushed some of his speculations on the Will, Power, and Causality, to an extravagant length, in his eagerness, not only to vanquish the atheist and sceptic, but to disarm them of their only practicable weapons. It indicates a degree of learning, of acquaintance with the literature of the subject, a power of metaphysical discrimination and analysis, a classic neatness and elegance of style,

which certainly places it among the most respectable American contributions to the sciences of which it treats. The author, of course, has occasion to discuss the nature of virtue. The ability and earnestness with which he insists on the true idea of virtue, and combats all attempts to analyze it into anything simpler, better, or other than itself, give his work a value which would outweigh many lighter faults. And our readers will agree with us, that it is something in these days, for a work on metaphysics and their relations to religious belief, to be at once able and scholarly, and also free from mysticism, and other obscurities not inherent in the difficulties of the subject.

We regret to find any serious drawbacks in a work, which, in so many aspects, we highly estimate.

Professor Bowen rightly maintains that the true idea of cause involves that of efficiency. A cause contains and exerts that power which produces the effect to which it stands related as cause. It is, therefore, more than simple uniformity of antecedence, as Brown, Mill, and other philosophers at the "extreme left" of the empirical school, contend. But his inference from this, that there are no causes to be found in the material universe, we deem gratuitous. He says, "true causes cannot be found in the material universe." Had he said, *first* causes cannot be found there, the deliverance would have been true. But he goes further. He denies that there is "*any power or efficient agency whatever in brute matter, even by transmission, or as derived from a higher source.*" (p. 117.) His elaborate arguments in support of this dogma, appear to have been wrought out for the purpose of sweeping away all objections to the conclusion that the "course of nature is nothing but the will of God producing certain effects in a constant and uniform manner." We humbly submit, that this momentous conclusion does not depend upon so precarious a premise. If material objects are endued with power to produce certain effects, by "transmission" from God, then, to all intents, they are "but the will of God producing certain effects," in and by them. The will of God is indeed the first cause; but it acts through second causes, which become such indeed, only because they are made such. Night always precedes day. So likewise does the approach of the sun towards the horizon, and the conse-

quent emanation of its rays over the earth. According to the universal convictions and language of men, the latter is, the former is not, the cause of day. Why? Because the one is not, the other is, a radiant substance, adequate to the production of the effect. This case is one of a thousand, showing, not only that cause implies efficiency, but, that material objects have efficient properties, derived of course from God, and are, therefore, second causes, but none the less causes for that. Professor Bowen argues that "power is not transmitted, but is always primitive," from the fact, of there being no evidence that the act following volition "propagates itself, or produces, by its own inherent energy, another event in the external universe," (p. 120.) What then? "With man, indeed, it is impossible, but with God all things are possible."

Our author presses this point at great length, and with his utmost powers of reasoning and eloquence, not only because he thus prevents the atheist from finding any cause but God, for the material universe, but because he supposes the received doctrine to which he objects, involves fatalism as a logical sequence. He says, "once admit that efficient causation belongs to matter, that one particle really *acts* on another particle by its inherent power or principle, and necessitates a change of its state, and it follows that the displacement of a grain of sand *must* alter the history of the universe. Each event is bound by iron necessity to all preceding and all subsequent events, the chain of Fate extending from the fall of an atom up to the throne of God." p. 116. This conclusion appears to us a great deal broader than the premises. Supposing matter with all its properties in various substances to be created and upheld by God, is it not under his control? And can he not adjust, and bound, work and counterwork it, at his pleasure? Where then is the chain of Fate, where any "iron necessity," beyond the free will of the Most High? That "a displacement of a grain of sand should alter the history of the universe," is true on one system, no further than on the other.

In further defence of his theory of causality, our author contends, that will is everywhere and always a true cause, and the only cause in the universe; nay, that the very idea of cause is derived wholly from the conscious exercise of power by our

own wills, and is thus wholly empirical. He says, "the will is the only known instance of efficient causation in the universe." "The idea of cause has its origin in internal experience, in the consciousness of volition and action." "Hence association leads us to believe that every other event must have a cause." Yet he speaks of this law or idea as "necessary," and concedes that "it has a better claim to be considered original and spontaneous than any other."

Now the consciousness we have, that we are the causes of our own volitions is one thing; the firm persuasion that every event *must* have a cause is another, which may indeed be wakened into consciousness by the acts of the will, or by other observed instances of causation, but is in no manner contained in, or derived from them. That *some* events have a cause is indeed matter of experience. That *all events must* have a cause, is one of those necessary first truths which shine in their own light, and are incapable of any evidence stronger than themselves. That there is no efficient cause in the universe but will, is true; only as we deny the existence of dependent causes, or, in other words, deny the character of causality to those efficient, which derive their causal energy from God. This is to deny it to all creatures—the human will itself. The will has its power by derivation from and dependence on the will of God, as truly as anything from which effects proceed in the material universe. And this none the less, although it is a kind of cause that acts freely. So, after all, the question is, whether there are any such things as second causes in the universe; or whether creatures may properly be deemed real, efficient causes, although their efficiency is wholly derived and dependent. We do not wish to dwell on this question. It is answered by the spontaneous actions, the most intimate convictions, and the universal language of mankind. And if it be not thus answered right, then there is no longer such a logical fallacy as, *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*.

As might be expected, from his dread of Fatalism and his great exaltation of the prerogatives of the Will, Prof. Bowen asserts the power of contrary choice, and discharges upon the deniers of it, all the indignant eloquence of which he is so fertile, against fatalistic theories. Of course the question is not, whether man is

free; but whether this notion is fairly included in freedom. Our author says, "neither external nor internal causes determine the will." How then can it be determined at all, even by itself? We suppose, however, he means causes extrinsic to itself or its own activity. But in illustration of this sentiment, he answers the claim of his antagonists, that the character of choice is determined by a "motive, a pre-existent, a concomitant longing or desire," by saying, that on this supposition "the motive means nothing but *the man himself wishing for some object.*" "The assertion, that the motive determines the will, therefore, is only an abstract statement of the fact, that the *man wishing* determines the *man acting*, or that the will determines itself, which is precisely the theory of the advocates for human freedom." If this is all, we would simply ask, if one can act or choose contrary to his wishes, and choose freely. In other words, does not the author's own account of freedom and the self-determining power exclude the idea of contrary choice? We contend that no higher liberty than that of doing as we please, and choosing according to our inclination, is conceivable or desirable. If there be any higher liberty than this, it has never yet been brought to light, certainly not by our author. As to any choices determined by "neither external causes," nor reason, nor desire, nor persuasion, nor inducement, of what avail can they be, but to inaugurate the reign of "all-powerful contingency?" And how much is this to be preferred to Fate? Indeed, what is this but fate, in the form of dire fortuity, swaying our destiny by an "iron necessity?" Where are reason, freedom, responsibility, or motive, and encouragement to improve ourselves, on such a theory? Says Prof. Bowen, "both the creation of things and the direction of events are his," (God's), p. 224. If this be so, then human freedom involves nothing inconsistent with God's disposal of all events. We have nothing to say of idiosyncratic and personal aberrations. But we do say, that the great body of those against whom he so vehemently inveighs as Necessarians, hold to no necessity beyond that implied in God's ordering of all events, and in men's acting as they wish, all which, as we have seen, is virtually, however unconsciously, conceded by our author himself.

We are glad to see that he holds that the infliction of pain

in punishment for sin, is no disproof of the benevolence of God. This is one of those seminal principles, which consistently carried out, would upturn the foundations of Unitarian theology. In common with most writers on Natural Theology, he teaches that pain often proceeds from benevolence, because it subserves useful purposes. It is true that, in our present state, it is thus serviceable. But is it not possible for man to be so constructed as to realize the highest purity and bliss, without the instrumentality of pain? Was not this his condition in Paradise? Is it not in Heaven? How then can we account for this intervention of pain in order to our well-being now, except on the supposition that it is a visitation for sin; that it implies our apostacy from God; that it proceeds from justice tempering the allotments of his mercy? We think no solution of the problem of human suffering satisfactory which undertakes to explain it, *in any of its forms*, by the benevolence of God merely. No solution meets the case, which stops short of the original apostacy, and of the holiness and justice of God.

Professor Bowen thinks there is a proneness "to exaggerate the amount of moral evil in the world." He will have it, that we are apt to let stupendous and singular crimes so fill our eyes, as to blind us to the comparative innocence of the race.—p. 314. "Bad men are not so bad as they seem."—p. 316. "If we judge men by their intentions, instead of their outward conduct—and it is the former alone which the divine conduct assumes directly to regulate—much of their seeming lawlessness and wickedness disappears."—p. 322. We will not expatiate on the futility of such attempts to extenuate the depravity of a race, declared by the highest authority to be "dead in trespasses and sins, by nature children of wrath." The Bible is simply echoing all fact and history, when it declares that all have gone out of the way, and there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Mr. Bowen himself betrays his faintness of heart when he says, "No wonder that the doctrine of original and total depravity of the human race has obtained so ready an acceptance with most theologians, even on grounds apart from Scripture."—p. 310.

As might be expected from his doctrine of the will, the author accounts for the origin of evil by the supposed impossibility

of preventing sin, without impairing or destroying free agency. p. 375. This easy solution of the difficulty which we find recurring in a certain class of writers, from Pelagius down to Dr. Squier, in his "Problem Solved," would answer well enough if it were true, or if its truth could be admitted, without undermining our faith in God's Universal Providence, and in the perpetual conservation of the inhabitants of Heaven in holiness and bliss. Either of these indispensable truths supposes in the Almighty the power to render certain the exercises of free agents, without impairing their free agency.

This book pains us most when it comes to the hallowed precincts of revealed religion, not so much for what it affirms, as for what it ignores. It is all the sadder, inasmuch as the author displays so much mastery of the whole field of Natural Religion, and so much of elevated moral sentiment, and even religious sensibility, so far as natural religion can inspire it. Withal, he insists, with great justice, that even the principles of natural religion, i. e., principles sufficiently manifested by the light of nature, to render those culpable who do not see and conform to them, are, in fact, really unknown to the race, except so far as they are brought home to us in all their fulness and clearness by revelation. Men are culpably blind to the light which reveals them. Hence revelation is needed to brighten and clarify our knowledge of natural religion. This is unquestionably so. But is this all? Does Christianity merely revive our lost knowledge of natural religion? No, says Mr. Bowen. "We need helps to obedience. The inducements to right conduct must be strengthened by a fuller view of the consequences of sin." p. 462. And what truths does the Bible reveal for this purpose which are peculiar to Christianity? In order to find something thus distinctive of Christianity, our author goes through a long and most elaborate argument, to prove that we have no reliable proof of our immortality by the light of nature, and that this sublime truth is first made sure by the testimony of revelation. He also assures us, that "Christianity first revealed the paternal character of God!" If he has specified any other addition, or "help to obedience," which distinguishes Christianity from natural religion, we have been unable to find it. And is this all?

Then, in the sorrow of our souls, we say such a scheme gives us nothing of Christianity but the name. Every one of its distinctive mysteries and life-giving elements is gone. It contains no gospel. It gives no Redeemer. It is a kind of religion to which men will never long cling. If they do not go forward to something more distinctive and vital than a cold reproduction of natural religion, they will ere long let it go for infidelity or atheism. Such is, and such ever must be, the course of Socinianism. A system so barren, comfortless, rayless, can never be the light of the world. It cannot long be felt to be worth contending for or retaining.

While we are sorry to note such blemishes in a book of so much merit, we will add a further suggestion. The book is designed for Colleges. It originally consisted of two courses of lectures delivered before the Lowell Institute of Boston, which has already had the merit of giving birth in a similar way to the able treatise of Dr. Hopkins on the Evidences. It is, (we judge, with little alteration in other respects,) broken into sections with appropriate headings, for the purpose of adapting it to use as a text-book. All our experience and observation have convinced us, that a good class-book can rarely be produced, unless prepared specifically for the purpose. All popular lectures, essays, and general dissertations, will lack the simplicity, precision, and condensation, which are so essential in the class-room. They are too diffuse at some points, too meagre at others. They present matters in a form ill adapted to recitation. Few men, even of those eminent in these departments, are capable of writing good text books; and fewer still have written them. Able as Whately's *Logic* is, it was originally prepared as an article for an encyclopedia. And how surely do those who are compelled to teach it, wish it were recast in a form better suited to their purposes! How sensible the relief in passing from the use of this, to instruction in treatises so clear, methodical, and compact, as Paley's *Natural Theology*, or Alexander's *Moral Science*! We think moreover, that the book under review, although far from being more faulty on this score than most works of the sort, would, nevertheless, gain vastly in the number of its readers, and in general influence, if it were thoroughly condensed. Amid the

multitude of books claiming readers in this busy age, those especially which are addressed to educated minds, have the best chance of success, that crowd the greatest amount of matter into the smallest space in which it can be clearly set forth; who seize the main points on which a question turns, and condense the light they can throw upon them into a focus, omitting a multitude of minor reflections, even if not unimportant, as so many veils which bewilder and tire the reader. Now, more than ever before, brevity is the life of books, not less than the soul of wit.

Professor Bowen tasks himself in several introductory lectures, in settling the proper method of investigation and sources of proof in reference to the being of God and religion generally. He rules out metaphysics as wholly irrelevant, just as much so as the measures of space would be to the mensuration of our spiritual nature. His whole speculations about cause have this aim. If there are no causes in the material universe; if that universe exists; if created spirits are unable to create it, then the *bare fact* of its existence, aside from all metaphysics, proves a Supreme Creator, endowed with the wisdom, power, and goodness requisite for its production. So the moral constitution of man implies that moral excellence in his Maker, which alone would have endowed him with such a constitution. Thus facts, not metaphysics, according to our author, become the proofs in natural theology. And his metaphysical reasonings are designed simply to exorcise metaphysics from the controversy; because he holds them just as irrelevant as pure mathematical analysis would be in chemistry, in place of "the logic of the crucible, the scales, and the blowpipe." Speaking of the nature and logic of religious belief, he states the question thus:

"What is the nature of religious belief properly so called, and by what kind of testimony is it supported? Are we here concerned with realities, or with abstract speculations? And do we look to demonstration or to moral certainty as the result of that inquiry? The question is not yet, be it observed, whether the belief is legitimate or the testimony sufficient; of that hereafter. I do not now ask whether religion be true, but how we are to prove or disprove it; what arguments are to be admit-

ted into the discussion, and what considerations are shut out as irrelevant? I use the word *religion* here in its most comprehensive sense, including both theology, as a system of doctrines and principles, and practical piety."—pp. 34–5.

The subject thus brought to view is the logic of theology in its entire range, doctrinal and practical. Its great importance is manifest. Without adding to what we have already said upon natural theology as a separate science, we propose to devote the residue of this article to some suggestions upon the Logic of Christian Theology.

Logicians very properly divide our knowledge into two sorts; that which we possess by intuition, which discerns self-evident truths and first principles; and that which we acquire by reasoning, wherein we deduce truths before unknown from what was or is known. It is obvious that the former comprehends that part of our knowledge which is most sure and universal to our race. The latter, however, comprises much the larger portion of what we know on most subjects. To prevent mistake, nevertheless, it is to be observed, that all our perceptions and cognitions by the senses and by consciousness—of external objects and of the exercises of our own minds—are in their nature intuitive. Our knowledge here is obtained by immediate intuitive insight, not by any process of reasoning. The knowledge thus given, together with the intuitive first principles and necessary ideas of reason before mentioned, constitute either the premises of all reasoning, or the premises from which all other premises are ultimately deduced. An additional source of original premises must be brought to view, as belonging to the very pith of our present subject. We mean testimony. Very much of our knowledge is derived from the testimony of other persons, divine or human. All human conduct supposes a certain confidence in human testimony, which, however, may be weakened or destroyed by various circumstances going to impeach its credibility. Dr. Reid classes this among the *contingent* first principles of human belief; contingent, because, had it been the pleasure of God, we might have been so made that human testimony would neither deserve nor receive our confidence in any circumstances. There is no doubt that confidence in human testimony is so far a principle of our nature, that we

believe, and ought to believe, many matters of fact, not from any personal intuition of these facts; not from any process of argument; but from the testimony of other men. Nearly all our knowledge of history, and of facts occurring not under our own eye, rests on this basis. It is rare that our beliefs thus founded are fallacious, unless something appears to discredit the veracity of the witness, or to indicate that he was deceived or had imperfect means of knowledge. And when, from the number of the witnesses, the impossibility of collusion, the abundance of corroborating circumstances, all suppositions of falsehood or incompetency are excluded, belief in this testimony is well founded, and, to every candid mind, unavoidable.

In reference to the testimony of God, no suppositions which can, by any possibility, invalidate it, have place. And inasmuch as Christianity, so far as it adds anything to the light of nature, is founded wholly on the testimony of God, and consists only of truths supported by that testimony; it follows that our first sources of knowledge, and the fundamental premises for all Christian reasonings must be found in the Bible itself. This will not be disputed by any who deserve the title of Christians; with others, we have now nothing to do.

So far, however, as apologetics are concerned, we may say, in a word, that the divine origin, and inspiration of the Scriptures, depend on two sorts of evidence; external and internal. The external evidence relative to the genuineness and integrity of the canon; and in regard to the actual occurrence of the miracles which are its outward divine attestation, is attended with all the conditions of trust-worthiness. It cannot be discredited, except on principles, which would shatter all confidence in most reliable, and even recent facts of history, as Whately has well shown in his "historic doubts" about Napoleon. But the more conclusive, and for all classes, obligatory evidence of the divinity of the Bible, is the internal. It is the self-evidence, the radiance of divinity, which it carries in its face. Its authors speak as never man spake. Thus there is laid upon all to whom the Bible comes, an instant and inevitable obligation to receive it, and its fundamental truths; not as the word of man, but as the word of God. Hence, unbelief is inexcusa-

ble. No candid mind can fail to be convinced by this evidence. So the dread penalty on all who refuse to believe the Gospel, when declared to them, is vindicated—"He that believeth not, shall be damned."

There is also, with reference to some of the chief truths of Revelation, a self-evidence, beyond that which merely evinces the divine origin of the Bible as a whole. Many of its main doctrines carry their own evidence to the mind, when once they are distinctly stated to it; and this none the less, even though, without revelation we may be wholly incapable of knowing them adequately, or even at all. We seldom distinctly apprehend intuitive truths of any kind, till they are suggested to the mind, from without it. A large class of these in morals and religion, have first been duly and adequately presented to us in the Bible. But when so presented, the mind is intuitively convinced of their truth, if its faculties are in a sound state. What the Bible affirms to be true of human corruption, guilt, helplessness, finds its attestation in every man's conscience. So what it affirms of the unity, perfection, infinitude, wisdom, holiness, righteousness, and benevolence of God, of the excellence of his law, of our own immortality and accountability, at once satisfies the instinctive demands of our rational and moral nature. We are so constituted that we cannot be satisfied with any other view, while this instantly commends itself to every mind not utterly blinded or bewildered by sin. The necessity of atonement laid in the deep foundations of man's sin and God's purity, is felt co-extensively with that sin, as all the dire sacrifices and penances of heathenism prove. Hence, when the only perfect and sufficient expiation is presented in the word of God, and is made the very centre of Christianity, the mind intuitively sees it to meet all the exigencies of God's glory, and man's need; to be what alone could be looked for, from a holy God having purposes of mercy towards the guilty. Hence arises a preparation, if we may so speak, a moral and intellectual adaptation to accept, as implicated in this whole method of salvation, those high Christian mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, which unaided reason could never even guess, which baffle comprehension, which offer a ready pretext for unbelief to those to whom the cross is an

offence; but which have ever commanded the faith of Christendom. And out of all this, we need scarcely add, that the doctrine of regeneration by the Spirit, when duly declared to the enlightened conscience of man, is at once felt to be a necessity of his fallen nature. Thus it is strictly true, that unless torpor or defilement of conscience prevent, by manifestation of the truth we commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God. And conscience is a faculty which, in reference to objects purely moral and religious, is intuitive in its perceptions, immediate in its judgments. As to other great doctrines, which touch religious experience effectively, but less vitally, they are so involved in these, that they are deduced from them by a single step of inference, and cannot be denied without denying them implicitly, and if logical consistency be adhered to, expressly: e. g., to deny personal and eternal election, is to deny either regeneration, or that God has eternally purposed his own acts.

We have thus dwelt upon the self-evidencing character of the vital truths of revelation, as distinguished from the self-evidence which this revelation bears of its divine origin, because it has to do so largely with the interpretation of Scripture, which, after all, is the most essential element in the logic of Christian theology. In fact, the inspiration of the Scriptures being once agreed upon, as it is, by all Christians, all other questions in theology resolve themselves into questions of interpretation. We wish not to be misunderstood, as stretching the self-evident character of Christian truths beyond the limits we have indicated. We do not apply it to the forms in which polemics and speculatists often state them. Nor would we tie it to any human dogmatic statement. And we maintain that sinful blindness, the stupefaction and defilement of the conscience, often disables men from seeing what is in itself self-evident. For there must be not only light, but a healthy eye, in order to right vision. Further, we only extend it to that class of truths, which, when stated, are either at once affirmed by the conscience, as the being, perfections and law of God, and our own condemnation thereby; or to those requisites to redemption, which we know, in our most intimate convictions, are worthy of God and necessary for our peace and purity. It is clear that, of all evi-

dence short of the testimony of God, self-evidence is the strongest by which any truth can claim or enforce belief. What is self-evident we cannot doubt. All arguments which go to contradict, or end in contradicting, self-evident truths, must be fallacious, whether we can detect the fallacy or not. An argument which appears to prove that we ought not to love God, or speak the truth, or are not sinners, never can be valid. It contradicts our most intimate moral convictions. It is just like Berkeley's argument to prove that there is no external world. Even if it seem an adamant chain of logic in which no flaw can be detected, we never can practically believe it, or fail soon to make it evident, that we believe there is a God; a law of righteousness; an external world. As intuitive evidence is superior to all outside proof or argument, so it can never be really in conflict with the Bible—the testimony of Him who cannot lie. Truth can never contradict truth.

Here applies the plain logical maxim, that of two contradictories, both can never be true. Christian polemics therefore have to combat those who in some form claim to have established the *contradictory* of some Christian truth or truths. And as we now have to do exclusively with those who profess to accept the Bible as the word of God, the effect of such contradictories on the part of those who conceive they have established them, must be to lead them to strain the interpretation of Scripture into agreement with them. As the Scriptures are true, they cannot teach the contradictory of truth—therefore, says the objector, not of this particular truth, which I have established by indubitable evidence. Whatever violence there may be required in turning the literal into the figurative, and prose into poetry, the particular doctrine so impugned, must be interpreted out of the Bible. It does not belong there. It never can have been the intent of God to put it there. The Scripture truths so reasoned and interpreted away, by those calling themselves Christians, as all know, are the high mysteries which surpass comprehension, such as the Trinity, Incarnation, Original Sin, Predestination, and those which, although intuitively evident to the spiritually enlightened mind and conscience, are nevertheless revolting, a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to carnal pride, such as sin in its bondage, pollution, and curse,

and grace in all its remedial provisions of atonement, justification, and sanctification. And of all these, we need hardly add, more that is essential is thus impugned by some, less by others.

Of these, it is claimed that the contradictory is, in some instances a self-evident truth, in others, some immediate and unquestionable inference from a self-evident truth, and partaking, therefore, of its certainty. How then shall these alleged contradictions be disposed of? The first thing to be said here is, that the seeming contradiction is between an erring and an unerring mind. "Let God be true, but every man a liar." There are a thousand possibilities that man may have mistaken the averments of God, or wrought up what is merely a strong persuasion of his own mind into an intuitive truth. It is impossible for God to lie. Then, even of intuitive truths, or truths established by other incontestable evidence, it is impossible for man, by any logical analysis of which he is capable, to define all their points of contact, or methods of agreement. We know intuitively that we are free-agents. We know as intuitively, that we cannot free ourselves wholly from sinful inclinations, that "the flesh lusteth against the spirit, so that we cannot do the things that we would." Every man knows the first of these truths, every man whose conscience is duly enlightened, knows the second. But few can define what is included in each, so perfectly that it shall not seem to contradict something included in the other. Yet this is due to the weakness of our understandings. There is and can be no real contradiction between them. We know that there is not, and are never troubled with the suspicion of any, until we attempt to explicate them into mutual logical harmony. In regard to simple ideas, this attempt must of necessity fail. Being un-compounded, they are incapable of analysis. If we take truth, beauty, goodness, colour, &c., every attempted analysis will mix something with them that does not belong to them. Language serves only to awaken ideas of these things in minds already possessing them. But by no definition or analysis could we convey the idea of white, or of moral obligation, to those who have it not.

This suggests the remark that, if we cannot master the logical relations and harmonies of much that we are compelled

to believe, even of some self-evident truths, much more may this be true in respect to the relations of certain self-evident truths to the unquestionable affirmations of God in his word. God's word is true. So are self-evident truths. Yet we may be unable so to define or explain some of these, as to show how they can meet at every point, and not cross and cut each other. And if we could, we should no longer be dealing with the revelations of that God "whose judgments are unsearchable and his ways past finding out." Aside from revelation, innumerable facts in nature and providence cannot be explained on any principles which do not lead us up to the impenetrable recesses of God's infinitude. What scale do we possess for the mensuration of immensity? That act of God which may seem to contradict some self-evident principle, so far as its relations are visible to us, may be in precise accordance with that principle, in those vast and complex relations which open out to the view of the Omniscient. Children often deem the best and kindest measures of their parents harsh and inexplicable. Or rather we might say, they cannot see why they are not so, except as they confide in the tried wisdom and goodness of these parents. When their minds expand in riper age, they see herein their own folly and their parents' wisdom and goodness. In reference to the Infinite Mind, we are less than babes.

Looking at the objections to Christian doctrines most assailed, in the light of these principles, to what do they amount? The doctrine of the Trinity is assailed with the objection that three cannot be one. But how does this prove that God may not be one as to substance, three as to persons? Is it said that no instance can be found among creatures of a plurality of persons in one being? But if there be not, who can prove that there might not be, if God had so pleased; much more, that there may not be, and is not, tri-personality in God?

So of the two natures and one person in Christ, How can two be one? says the Socinian. But why may not the two-fold in one respect, be one in another? Has not even man a two-fold nature joined in one and the same person? And whether he have or not, who can show that the one of these is the contra-

dictory of the other, or that all these things are not possible to God?

As to all the allegations, that the doctrine of a strictly vicarious atonement revolts the instinctive feelings and contradicts the intuitive convictions of our race, inasmuch as these teach us that a good being cannot refuse to pardon the penitent without exacting equivalent sufferings in a substitute, we assert that the instinctive feelings and judgments of our race teach just the contrary. That sin must be compensated by adequate suffering, and cannot otherwise be remitted, without dishonour to God and disorder in the moral system, is the intuitive belief of the human race, as shown by their religious rites. The whole Christian Church has been unable to find peace and hope in anything short of the substituted sufferings of their Redeemer. So distant is this precious truth from contradicting the intuitive convictions of the soul, it is in harmony with them. If any suppose otherwise, it is because they mistake their own perverted feelings and moral judgments, for the intuitive beliefs of their race.

But there is no subject in regard to which the attempt has been more frequently or confidently made, to emasculate the plain meaning of the Bible, by the force of intuitive principles alleged to contradict it, than that of inability. It is contended that this doctrine contradicts the most self-evident facts of goodness and justice in God, and free-agency in ourselves. We have only to repeat what we have already said, that self-knowledge and the knowledge of God's law are no sooner awakened in the soul, than we perceive our inability and God's justice, no less immediately and intuitively than our own free-agency. In proof of this, we appeal not to theories, but to the consciousness of every child of God, as that consciousness utters itself in his devotions. If any cannot reconcile the two into logical consistency, this only proves that they fail in their attempts to explicate or define them.

The most inviting field for this kind of assault upon fundamental truths, lies in the doctrine of original sin and its adjuncts. That our race is fallen into a state of sin and misery, few have the front to deny, in the face of the appalling and undeniable facts which surround us. Mr. Bowen indeed, and a

small school of soft religionists try their skill in disguising or attenuating these facts. But they dare not utterly disown them. Now, if the facts are admitted, it is clear that they involve all the difficulties which the scriptural doctrine of original sin involves, and more and greater difficulties without that doctrine, than with it. The grand difficulty lies in the fact that our race comes into being under conditions which involve them in immediate, or, according to the concessions of all with whom we now have to do, in speedy sin and consequent misery. This, at least, is conceded by all who do not make shipwreck of the whole doctrine of sin and grace. Moreover, they cannot deny that infants, before moral agency, are subject to pain, disease, and death. All that the Scriptures add to these undeniable facts is, 1. That this corruption of nature which always and only develops itself in sinful acts, is itself sinful, inasmuch as they affirm, that men are "by nature children of wrath," "that which is born of the flesh is flesh," and the "wages of sin is death." 2. That this dire estate of sin and misery in which men are born, is a penal visitation for the sin of their first parent, in whom they had a probation, and who fell, while on trial as their representative. "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." "By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation." "In Adam all die." Now it is claimed that this view, according to which one is condemned, or suffers judicially, or is punished, for the sin of another, directly contradicts the self-evident principles of justice, and therefore must be interpreted out of the Bible. But those who allege this, omit a material circumstance which makes this self-evident maxim wholly irrelevant. Whatever degree of force it may have in reference to vicarious suffering simply considered, it has none whatever in reference to being punished for the acts of a lawfully constituted representative. To say otherwise is to impeach the justice of the dealings of God and man with families, communities, and nations. For herein the sins of the fathers are constantly visited upon the children, of the ruler upon the nation, of the principal upon the surety. If we cannot explain these facts into obvious harmony with all other truths, yet they are far from being in direct contradiction to any self-evident principles. The great principle, therefore,

which underlies the doctrine of imputation, and which this objection denounces as contradictory to the first principles of justice, pervades the providence of God, and enters largely into the dealings of man. The objection then is suicidal; it proves too much; if good for anything, it leads not merely to Pelagianism; not merely to Infidelity; but to sheer, unmitigated Atheism. But whatever objection lies against the scriptural view, lies with vastly greater force against that substituted for it. For according to this, these terrible evils were visited upon man without allowing him any probation, without being the penalty of any sin, and in mere arbitrary sovereignty. It is this scheme, if any, that contradicts our first moral intuitions, with an emphasis too, which loomed up in the mind of one of its chief advocates as the "conflict of ages," and urged him back to the poor fiction of a pre-existent state of trial, as the only refuge from infidelity.

Not only so, but the rejection of imputation on these grounds undermines all vicarious punishment, and severs the eternal *nexus* between sin and suffering in moral beings. Thus it contradicts our first moral intuitions. It prepares the way for expediency and utilitarianism in ethics and divinity. It shatters the doctrine of an atonement truly vicarious, by destroying the principles on which it rests, and turning it into a mere demonstration, based on expediency. Whether the views we advocate are theoretical merely, or whether they are not based on most solid grounds, let all history declare.

It is also objected, that, according to this view, God is the author of sin, since our very nature is sinful, when we come into the world. Of course it cannot be true, that God is the author of sin. But if the effect of God's withdrawing his favourable presence from men is, that they, in all the principles of their internal activity become disordered and corrupt, we know that he does thus withdraw from men in punishment for their personal sins, giving them over to a reprobate mind, to their own heart's lusts. This does not make him the author of sin. Neither does he become the author of sin, when he withdraws his favourable presence, his restraining and sanctifying grace from the race, in punishment for the sin of their head and representative.

It is further insisted that the doctrine of sinful dispositions anterior to and causative of sinful acts, contradicts the self-evident principle, that sin pertains only to acts. We deny that this is a self-evident principle. On the contrary, nothing is plainer from the whole language and conduct of mankind, than that they not only intuitively judge evil dispositions worthy of condemnation, but that their condemnation of evil acts is very much graduated by their estimate of the dispositions which prompt these acts. We have dwelt somewhat longer upon original sin and its adjuncts, and reproduced some views which are doubtless familiar to most of our readers, because it is upon this point particularly, that latitudinarians concentrate their assaults. They ply appeals to the softer sensibilities of our nature, with an ingenuity which would deceive, if possible, the very elect—appeals which, if valid for this purpose, are valid against the providence and perfections, yea, the being of God. A similar process is adopted by another class against the doctrine of eternal punishment. Our object has been simply to show that while the true doctrine (whatever points of mystery it involves,) contradicts no self-evident principles, as they allege, this rationalistic substitute for it, goes athwart such principles on all sides. It has all the difficulties of the scriptural scheme it would supplant, besides many others peculiar to itself. Taking the facts of providence and history as they are, no scheme approaches the doctrine of the Bible and the Church, in clearing away the perplexities of the subject.

As we have seen, purely moral truths are self-evidencing when fairly presented to, and apprehended by the mind. Religious truths, so far as they have the moral element in them, i. e., not purely positive enactments, possess the same character. We have seen that this is so, just as far as the doctrines of the Bible pertain to the moral consciousness. They find an immediate witness there. The higher Christian mysteries indeed, such as the Trinity and Incarnation, are incomprehensible; they are wholly undiscoverable by human reason; they are not, however, contradictory to any first principles of right reason; they are far enough from being directly and in themselves self-evident, yet they are so cognate with, and essential to the whole method of our redemption, that there is a

moral and intellectual adaptation to welcome them, as the history of all Christendom testifies. A religion without mysteries transcending sense and finite reason could scarcely be the religion of the Infinite God. Indeed, more or less immediately, everything terminates in mystery. *Omnia exeunt in mysterium.* Even this has a moral power in it of the very highest moment. It inspires awe, reverence, and adoration, which belong to the essence of true devotional feeling. "We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery."

The fact that the principal Christian truths are intuitively evident to the enlightened moral faculty when duly presented to it, while many are unable to explain them into accordance with their philosophy, has led some of this latter class to attempt a solution of the difficulty, not by concluding that their philosophical system is wrong, but that there is a conflict between the intellect and the feelings in regard to religious truth. This error assumes a two-fold form. The first is that of pure mysticism. This bases all knowledge on feeling, and makes it a mere product of what they call the "perceptive power of Christian love." Another form is that which strives to preserve a basis of evangelical feeling in company with rationalistic theology. According to this theory, the intellect demands one set of doctrines, pious feeling another. That is true in fact which is true to the intellect. That is for edification which is true to pious feelings. What is often welcomed and demanded by the feelings, and is to be held fast and used as edifying, must, when tested by the intellect, be repudiated as false. We do not wish here to repeat the obvious and unanswerable objections to such a theory. Argument would be lost upon him, who does not see, intuitively, the impossibility of pious feeling being excited by what is false to the intellect, or that all feeling must be in view of what is first apprehended and believed by the cognitive faculties, and that consequently that system of belief, which is embraced by the intellect, alone can shape religious feeling, or be the real faith of the man. Our object rather is to point out the source of the error. It lies in mistaking the intuition of self-evident moral truths, which the mind receives without any process of reasoning, and despite all reasoning to the contrary, for mere feeling, or the dictates of

mere feeling. This is all the more natural, inasmuch as the moral, like all the æsthetic cognitions, are immediately followed by correspondent feelings pleasant or painful, of like or dislike. This circumstance led Hutcheson and some other moral philosophers to resolve the moral faculty into a mere sensibility, or susceptibility of feeling differently in view of different moral actions. They forgot that this difference of feeling, in view of different moral actions, can arise only in view of different moral qualities perceived by the mind. These qualities are none the less perceived, although perceived intuitively. In fact, intuition is the highest form of knowledge and exercise of reason. Herein, more than in aught else, we are in the image of God as to our knowledge. Intuitive truths are the most sure and fundamental of all truths—saving always the supreme authority of God's word. Any other view would resolve conscience into a mere irrational instinct; dethrone reason from the empire of the soul; and turn all religion into mere blind fortuitous impulse. Any philosophy which contradicts these moral and spiritual intuitions must be false. So far from being intellect in opposition to feeling, it is a low and treacherous kind of intellectual activity arrayed against our highest and surest intelligence. The only reason why in such a case the latter moulds pious feeling, while the former cannot, is that we trust the one and distrust the other, so far as they are in conflict. If men hold a philosophy in conflict with evangelical principles, it will doubtless control their feelings, so far as conscience and spiritual discernment are wanting, or are feeble. Truly pious men who are fettered in the toils of a false philosophy, may swing towards and away from the truth, just in proportion as the higher spiritual intuitions are vivid or faint. But in either case, the intellect will govern the feelings, and there will be no conflict between them.

But has philosophy no place in religion? Here all depends on what we mean by philosophy. As no truth can contradict any other truth, so true philosophy cannot contradict the word of God, while it may often be of service in illustrating its truths, and defending them against the assaults of philosophy, falsely so called. Nothing is plainer, other things being equal, than that any man is an abler expositor and defender of Chris-

tian truth, for being master of the truth in mental and moral science. But no philosophy should have a hearing which contradicts the fundamental truths of Christianity, as they are manifoldly set forth in the Bible, as they have been held by the Israel of God always and everywhere, as they are witnessed in the consciousness and affirmed in the devotions of genuine Christians. No philosophy is to be regarded, which contradicts intuitive truths or divine revelation. But it is only by a stretch of license that we call any thing of this sort philosophy. It is in reality only an attempt at reasoning which contains some flaw, whether we can see it or not. This holds in regard to all metaphysical speculations of every kind, and all processes of deduction and inference, which are arrayed against divine testimonies, or axiomatic truths. Nor can any essentially greater contradictory weight, as against revelation, be allowed to physical science. It is to be considered, however, that physical science touches theology only indirectly, and that it has only remote relations to soterology and anthropology. What we now understand by the physical sciences, scarcely had even an incipient existence when the Bible was written. They have been mostly formed by experiments which bring to light facts otherwise occult, and not palpable on the surface of things. The sacred writers only describe facts of appearance in the material world, in the ordinary language of life. Theologians as well as scientific men, must not be in too great haste to conclude, that because any physical science appears to establish laws at variance with this language of the sacred writers, there is, therefore, any real conflict between it and revelation, unless it is directly repugnant to some momentous revealed truth. When ethnologists deny the descent of our race from one original pair, we give place to them not for an hour, because they directly contradict a fundamental doctrine of Christian anthropology. But as to the question, whether the apparent motion of the sun is real, or arises only from the motion of the earth, who does not regret that Turretin's works are deformed with an elaborate argument to prove that the latter opinion is a dangerous heresy, because the Bible speaks of the sun's rising! And may not the cause of Christian truth receive injury, if theologians are too precipitate in pronouncing any

alleged discovery in physical science, which does not accord precisely with the popular language of the Bible, but which touches no vital spiritual truth, a dangerous heresy? May it not be safe to wait in such a case, till truth, which in these matters is the daughter of time, is undeniably elicited and established? We need not fear the result. Whenever it is so established, it will be as surely and evidently established, that there is no real discrepancy between it and revelation. Every real truth in nature and providence will be found to run towards Christianity. "All shall be gathered in to me, headed up in Christ, whether of things in heaven, or things in the earth."

It is not to be forgotten, moreover, in reference to the logic of religion, that the discoveries which God has made of himself, while they have grown more luminous and full at each successive stage, have also with every increase of light, brought to view more and more that is unsearchable and past finding out, in his works and ways. Every new revelation brings with it new and profounder mysteries, which stretch to heights and depths beyond all human insight. It is the glory of God at once to manifest himself and to conceal a thing, and so to manifest himself as to conceal much pertaining to that wherein he thus manifests himself. The very light by which he discloses, is also such as to hide parts of his ways. "He *covereth* himself with light as with a garment." Any light, therefore, which so unveils him as to leave nothing obscure or inexplicable to human reason, is surely not from him. What he enables us to see, only intimates still more of the unseen. We must still, in every stage, walk by faith and not by sight. They who are left to sneer at a "sightless faith," while they boast of solving the "great problem" of evil, are to be pitied for their infatuation. They must be mournfully ignorant of that faith which is the evidence of things "not seen." In fact, all increase of knowledge by finite mortals, on any subject, also increases our knowledge of the extent of our ignorance. He whose knowledge does not deepen his sense of his own ignorance, is rather a sciolist than a philosopher.*

* "True, therefore, are the declarations of a pious philosophy: 'A God understood would be no God at all.' 'To think that God is, as we can think him to be, is blasphemy.' The divinity, in a certain sense, is revealed: in a certain sense is concealed: He is at once known and unknown."—*Sir William Hamilton.*

Closely allied to this subject is the logic of future events as related to religion, in other words, of prophecy. Except so far as we may, to a certain extent, calculate future events in the material world from the uniformity of the laws of nature, we are dependent for all knowledge on this subject upon revelation. From the mere intuitions and reasonings of our own minds, we know not what a day or an hour may bring forth. In order to ascertain the general scope of prophetic revelation, with the laws of its *exegesis*, we can only apply the inductive method. We must judge of the future by the past, and reason from God's ways in prophecies that have been fulfilled, to his ways, in those that have not been fulfilled. That all the knowledge which God gives us of the future is mingled with much that is unknown, and that our highest welfare demands that it should be so, is undeniable. We know in general that we must die, and that we cannot live much beyond seventy years. But what else do we know, or is it well for us to know, about the time and manner of our death? From the first germinant promise in Eden to the coming of Christ, the future advent of a great deliverer from the curse, was constantly kept before the minds of the people of God, as the object of their faith. By rite and symbol, promise and threatening, the character of the deliverer and the nature of his mission were pre-intimated and foretold, with increasing clearness and fulness, up to the very time of his advent, and so far, that the Israelites indeed, in whom was no guile, and who were waiting for the consolation of Israel, could not fail to recognize him when he came. And yet all this previous light, precious and sufficient as it was for the Church in its then state, was to that which attended and followed our Saviour's advent, as that of the moon and stars to the sun. The same principles, we apprehend, apply to vicissitudes of the Church yet future, so far as they are the subjects of prophecy. The great principles and general facts, which it concerns us to know, are so clearly revealed that he who runs may read them. But the details are veiled in an obscurity which will be dissipated only by the event, if we may judge from the extent to which any minute system of prophetic interpretation was ever obtained in the Church, or has been verified by the event, or from the highly

figurative and symbolical language in which the biblical predictions on these subjects are clothed. The doctrines of immortality, of the resurrection, of the second advent of Christ to judgment, and the salvation of his people, of future and eternal bliss or woe for all, are so plain that they have commanded the faith and shaped the life of the whole Christian Church. As to details, those who have undertaken to make out dates, places, and other like particulars, have adopted theories as discordant as the ground upon which they proceed is uncertain. The only question here, respects the proportion of the known to the unknown, prior to the fulfilment of the event. The attempts to enlarge the proportion of the former have not been deficient in number, zeal, confidence, or an absorbing interest in this department of interpretation. They have, however, failed to command any general or extensive assent among the people of God. Of late, indeed, a new method of prophetic interpretation has appeared, which claims to shun the difficulties of previous systems, and to establish, by a most rigid induction, a calculus for the resolution of prophetic symbols, which enables us to determine their meaning with infallible certainty. It professes to derive the law of their interpretation from the manner in which such symbols were uniformly interpreted in Scripture. But when we find that a chief law on which the whole scheme depends, viz. that "living agents represent living agents," encounters confessedly an exception in the fat and lean kine of Pharaoh's dream, it appears that this alleged law will not bear the lowest test of a valid induction, even that *per enumerationem simplicem*.* It does not hold of all *known* cases. How then are we warranted, without express divine authority, in asserting it of the unknown? If, of six known bodies, we find gravity operating in five, but not in the sixth, what sort of induction is that which would erect gravity, in such circumstances, into a universal property or law of matter? To go no further then, we are estopped *in limine*, from relying on this new organon, for results more satisfactory than those obtained in the attempts which preceded it.

It may be added, in conclusion, with regard to those who,

* Premium Essay on Prophetic Symbols, by the Rev. Edward Winthrop, p. 28.

like the ancient servants of God, or weak Christians now, have only a rudimental knowledge of the truths of salvation, that if they receive these truly and sincerely, they of course receive implicitly that which is involved in them, even the whole doctrine which is according to godliness. They are, therefore prepared to receive it when it shall be fully and fairly unfolded to them expressly and in detail. And the manner in which they receive these fuller disclosures of saving truth is among the chief criteria of the spirit with which they received its rudiments. So the pious Jews received Christ and his instructions when he appeared in person. So those weak in the faith now grow in knowledge as they grow in grace, and when they become strong men, have a keen relish for the strong meat of high Christian truth, which, as babes in Christ, they could not bear. But either implicitly or explicitly, the whole Church of God, by which we mean, not any visible hierarchy or corporation, but his faithful people, have ever held the evangelical system against all assaults, whether from the ritual or rationalistic side; and with greater or less explicitness on particular points, according to the opposing heresies which they were called to confront or contradict. And as to the greater part of the doctrines of Christianity, illuminated by God's Spirit, they have seen their truth by an immediate and certain intuition, which no human tradition, authority, or sophistry could render dubious. They know in whom they have believed, for they have an unction whereby they know all things essential to salvation, and especially the things that are freely given them of God. They know that it is the truth and no lie, and that no lie is of the truth.

What is true of the growth of individuals, is also true of the growth of the whole Church in the knowledge of divine truth. Progress is its law. This progress, however, is not in the way of ignoring or denying the great principles of the doctrine of Christ which are patent in the word of God, and have sustained the faith and hope of his people in all ages. It consists in the fuller knowledge and comprehension of them in themselves, their mutual harmonies, and the boundaries which separate the sphere of knowledge from the sphere of mystery. All true progress implies permanence. If there be anything better

than a tread-mill motion, it requires a firm foothold. Thus, by proving all things and holding fast that which is good, we shall go onward, "till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the truth in love, grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ." Eph. iv. 13-15.

J. M. Sherwood, ed.

- ART. IV.—1. *A Pastor's Sketches; or, Conversations with anxious inquirers respecting the way of salvation.* By Ichabod S. Spencer, D.D., Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, New York. New York: M. W. Dodd, Brick Church Chapel, City Hall Square, 1850.
2. The Same: Second Series. Sixth Thousand. Same Publisher, 1855.
3. *Triumph in Suffering. A Discourse delivered at the funeral of the Rev. I. S. Spencer, D. D., Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church in Brooklyn, L. I.* By Gardiner Spring, D.D., LL.D., Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church in the city of New York. New York: M. W. Dodd, Publisher, 1855.
4. *Sermons of Rev. Ichabod S. Spencer, D. D., late pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, L. I., Author of a Pastor's Sketches; with a Sketch of his Life.* By Rev. J. M. Sherwood. In two volumes. New York: Published by M. W. Dodd, corner of Spruce Street, and City Hall Square, 1855.

THE qualities of a good pastor, and pulpit talents of a high order, are not always found united in the same person; but then it is a mistake to suppose that there is anything incompatible in the work of a Christian pastor out of the pulpit, and his work viewed simply as that of a preacher. One may be preparatory and supplementary to the other. But men differ not only in respect to the gifts which pertain to public speaking,

but in those which will give them success in the work of pastoral visitation. Some appear to be formed for social life, and have great conversational powers; others, in proportion as they give themselves up to habits of study, feel inclined to withdraw from general intercourse with men. It is not pride, nor indifference which influences them, but they may feel too sensitively the rough contact which is frequently incident to such intercourse.

Again, one man has a peculiar fondness for all inquiries which relate to our ever-varying moral and mental states. Human nature is his study; he wishes to view it, in all its types; to look at the mind in all its postures; to mark the operation of different motives; to notice its shifts when attempting to evade the conclusions of right reason, and ignore the truth; in a word, to learn the true, from the false, action of the moral and intellectual powers. Another man, equally devout and sincere, as a servant of Christ, will have comparatively little interest in all investigations of this character, especially when conducted on this experimental plan. We think we do not mistake when we say that it was doubtless Dr. Spencer's taste for the study of human nature, the human mind and character, in living man himself, no less than his sense of responsibility as a Christian pastor, which made him so diligent in his visitations among the families of his charge. He seems to have made every man, with whom he was thrown into official contact, a study as to his peculiar moral and mental characteristics. When he went out of his study, it was to study men, to make them his books. His visits were not those of mere routine or gossip, a species of dissipation which unfitted him to return to his books and his pen; they rather quickened his intellectual operations and furnished him with many hints, especially for the latter.

In the preface to his second series of Sketches, he speaks of an advantage which he always strove to improve: "When it was practicable, he studied the subjects [of the conversations recorded in the volume] beforehand. Having met an individual once, and expecting to meet him again, he carefully considered his case, aimed to anticipate his difficulties, studied the whole subject intensely, and in many cases wrote sermons upon it,

the substance of which afterwards came out, to a greater or less extent in the conversation. Thus, the conversations aided the sermons, and the sermons aided the conversations." Everywhere, throughout these volumes of Sketches, and, to some extent, of the Sermons, the author's love of inquiry into the moral and mental states of men, and that knowledge of the heart which springs from a jealous self-introspection, are apparent. The secret of his success and power in handling the word of life, and of his marked peculiarity of character, as a spiritual adviser, lay not only in his experimental knowledge of the truth, and excellence of the gospel, but in his singular knowledge of human nature. It is a species of knowledge which is of the utmost importance to success in the ministerial work. A pastor can better dispense with a knowledge of German criticism and literature, and some other branches of valuable learning, than with good sound common sense. But this no diploma can confer; he can obtain it in no school, in no college or seminary, but only from the study of men and of his own heart. Men of peculiar eccentricities, who are unable, or perhaps, unwilling to adapt themselves to their fellow men, have seldom been found to be eminently useful in the ministry. Presbyteries, it is obvious, are bound to pay as great attention to such trials as are designed to keep "weak" men out of the ministry, as to those which are intended to exclude the ignorant. And it has ever seemed to us that Presbyteries have no business more responsible than that of receiving candidates for licensure; for, in practice, it is found far more easy to say to an applicant that he would do well to withdraw his application, than it is to refuse a license, or withhold ordination; and in most cases the judgment of the Presbytery, after having examined the applicant respecting his acquaintance with experimental religion, and the motives which influence him to desire the sacred office, settles with him the question as to his call to preach the gospel. This question is tacitly proposed by every young man who applies to be received by a Presbytery as a candidate. To all who have been so received, and to all the youthful ministry, we commend the example of Dr. Spencer, as it may be gathered from his Sketches, not to be servilely imitated, but to illustrate the great advantage which a

minister acquires, when he goes out into the highways and hedges of the country, or dives into the feculent lanes of the city, to mingle with men, and especially to seek out those who are crushed down by poverty, or degraded by ignorance and vice.

Ichabod Smith Spencer was the youngest but one of eleven children, and was born at Rupert, Vermont, on the 23d day of February, 1798. At the age of eighteen, he became hopefully pious, and united himself with the Church of God. He was fitted for college at the Academy in Salem, N. Y., where it was his privilege to enjoy the ministry and paternal counsels of that venerable and beloved man, whose praise is in all the churches, the Rev. Alexander Proudfit, D. D., whom he never ceased to regard with filial affection. He graduated at Union College, where he maintained a high standing in his class, in the year 1822. While employed as principal of the Grammar School in Schenectady, he engaged in the study of theology under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Andrew Yates, Professor of Moral Philosophy in Union College. He subsequently became Preceptor of the Academy in Canandaigua, N. Y., where he completed his theological studies so far as to be licensed to preach the gospel, by the Presbytery of Geneva. This was in November, 1826.

He continued at the head of the Academy in Canandaigua, for nearly two years after his licensure. It was in the summer of 1828, when he received and accepted a call from the Congregational Church in Northampton, Mass., the same church of which Jonathan Edwards had been so long pastor. He left Northampton for Brooklyn, L. I., in 1832, having gathered into the church, as the fruits of his ministry in the former place, in all two hundred and thirty-three persons. Not an individual was to be found, old or young, in his whole parish, one of the largest in New England, with whose name and countenance he was not familiar. It may be mentioned, as a proof of the reputation which he had already gained, that when it was known that he contemplated removing from Northampton, he received an urgent call from the Park Street Church, Boston; but he believed that the will of his Divine Master pointed him to Brooklyn, and he accordingly accepted a call from the Second

Presbyterian Church, then newly organized and feeble. Here he prosecuted a laborious and successful ministry for more than twenty-two years, until his death. The church was a colony, numbering less than forty members, and worshipped for a while in a school-room. His congregation steadily increased, and at length, erected their large church edifice, which was soon filled with people. Dr. Spencer preached incessantly; for the first twenty years, he was in Brooklyn three times on the Sabbath, habitually.

“Few ministers of the everlasting gospel,” says the venerable Dr. Spring, “if any, are more industrious, and few have less occasion to lament misspent and wasted hours. The result was, that he became one of the best and most effective preachers of the age. Few habitually spake like him in discourses of such instructiveness, such attractive persuasion, such withering rebuke of wickedness, or such happy effects upon the minds of men. He ‘spake the things which became sound doctrine,’ and declared ‘the whole counsel of God.’ He was cautious and wise, but he was urgent and in earnest. He was often tender to weeping, yet was he a most fearless preacher. There was a large commingling of the ‘son of consolation’ with the ‘son of thunder,’ in his character. I have heard him say that he did not know what it was to be ensnared or embarrassed in preaching God’s truth, and that the thought of being afraid to utter it because it was unpopular, never once entered his mind. There was something of nature in this, and more of grace; he was fearless of men, because he feared God. There was great variety in his preaching; he was not confined to a few threadbare topics; his mind and heart took a wide range, and brought out of his treasure ‘things both new and old.’ Nor was he given to crude and imperfect preparations for the pulpit; a volume of sermons might be selected from his manuscripts, which would be a beautiful model for the youthful ministry, and a great comfort to the church of God. His Sabbath evening lectures on the Shorter Catechism, as well as portions of his lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, will not easily be forgotten by those who heard them.”

As a pastor, Dr. Spencer greatly excelled. He always carried a book containing the names and places of residence of all

the members of his congregation, in which he made such entries as might serve to help his memory, and guide him in his visits and conversation, and in which he registered the date of each visit as it was made. It was his rule to call on each family of his congregation once every year, and as much oftener as sickness, affliction, or other circumstances seemed to render it desirable. He had a happy faculty of knowing people; he observed the new faces in his congregation, traced the individuals out, and soon became acquainted with them. Probably the account he gives of his labours, in his new-year's sermon for 1852, would fairly represent his labours from year to year: "Looking back now upon the ministry I have exercised another year, I confess that I am ashamed, and ought to be ashamed, of the feebleness of my ministrations, and that they have been performed with no more faith, and no higher spirituality. On this account, I would be ashamed and abased before God. But I am not ashamed of the affection which I have ever borne to my people, of my desires for their good, nor of the amount of labour and industry which I have employed. In the year 1851, I preached two hundred and nine sermons.

"I visited all the families of the congregation once, and in special instances more than once. The number of these calls was four hundred and twenty-one.

"I visited sick people and dying ones in one hundred and twenty-one different instances.

"I aimed to find opportunity for conversation with those who were not members of the church, that, conversing with them alone, I might if possible, persuade them to seek the Lord. And as they seldom came to me, for the most part I went to them. Such private conversations, and some of them protracted, numbered two hundred and fifty-nine.

"I attended prayer-meeting forty-six times; and other religious meetings sixty-two times; and officiated at thirty-four funerals.

"I did not neglect the poor; I aimed to search them out, and, according to my ability, gave them pecuniary relief. I am sorry the relief was so small, but I am sure it was given with good will in seventy-two instances."

In 1830 Dr. Spencer was called to the Presidentship of the University of Alabama. In 1832, soon after his removal to

Brooklyn, he was invited to the same office in Hamilton College. In 1833, he received a unanimous call to the Essex Street Church, Boston, of which the Rev. Nehemiah Adams, D.D. is now pastor. In 1835 overtures were again made to him from the Park Street Church, Boston, and at the same time he received the tender of a call from the Pine Street Church, in the same city. Many formal calls and numerous overtures were made to him, from time to time, from many different places. In 1853, he was elected to the Professorship of Pastoral Theology in East Windsor Theological Seminary, Conn. In 1836, he accepted the Professorship Extraordinary of Biblical History in Union Theological Seminary, New York, which place he held for about four years.

At the time the New-school body separated from the Presbyterian Church he remained firmly in his ecclesiastical connection, and by this public act, when there were not lacking powerful influences and examples to draw him into schism, gave the strongest testimony in his power that he did not approve of the divisive movement. We do not pretend that he supported all the measures of which the New-school party complained, and which they made the ground of their action, in separating from the Church. In this respect he was like many others, who stood firmly in their places, and retained the confidence and affection of their brethren. On the other hand, it would be doing Dr. Spencer great injustice to represent that he approved of the errors and abuses which the measures complained of were designed to remedy. He was too conservative and orthodox to have any sympathy with the excised heresies, and irregular proceedings, which induced to excise the portion of the Church in which they prevailed.

We have alluded to this subject simply because the chief objection we have to the Sketch of his Life, by Mr. Sherwood, is the notice which he takes of Dr. Spencer's position, in relation to what Mr. Sherwood calls "the dismemberment of the Presbyterian Church." One would suppose from the attention which the author of the Sketch gives to this topic, that Dr. Spencer had taken some conspicuous part in the discussions and measures of that day. And yet we doubt whether his name ever appeared in public, on any occasion, in connection with them. He was

not a member of the General Assembly; and, if he was present at the meeting of the Synod of New York, at Newburgh, he does not appear to have taken any prominent part. The truth is, Dr. Spencer was then comparatively young, and little known in the ministry of the Presbyterian Church. It was but ten years since his licensure, and but five since he came to the Presbyterian Church, from Northampton. Mr. Sherwood says that Dr. Spencer felt that what his brethren, with whom he remained in ecclesiastical connection, had done, "was a high-handed procedure, unwarranted by the state of the Church, and greatly injurious to the cause of truth, and the interests of the Presbyterian Church. And in his own place ecclesiastically, and to individuals on both sides, he never hesitated to speak of it thus." Now if there is anything in the writings of the deceased in which he defines his own position, and which justifies the above statement, we think the public are entitled to it; and if there is not, we think the statement ought never to have been made. He was a man of great precision and carefulness, and had his own way of stating his views; and we do not believe that he would have authorized any man to state his position for him. It is doubtless true that he did not approve of the formation of the New-school General Assembly; but that he was "suspected" by his brethren, with whom he remained ecclesiastically connected, cannot be proved. We know that he was a highly esteemed and useful member of the Presbytery, and that no one was listened to with more respectful attention, in all its discussions. And in the Synod, we know that, on almost the only occasion when he was present, at the opening of that body, for many years, he was elected its Moderator. We dismiss this subject, with a remark used in the last number of this work, that it is obvious that no satisfactory history of the division of the Presbyterian Church can be expected during the present generation. When the grave has covered the actors of the scenes referred to, those who come after us may be able to do justice to all concerned.

Although a man robust in appearance, Dr. Spencer suffered under a painful malady for years. It assumed a more threatening aspect in January, 1854. The violence of the attack, however, after a time subsided; he was able to travel again, and at length

preached to his people, which he did for the last time, on the 30th of July. Dr. Spring thus describes the closing scenes of his life :

“During the last three or four weeks of his life, so severe were his sufferings, that he was not inclined to much conversation. But on the Monday preceding his death, being comparatively free from pain, and perceiving that his time was short, he called his family about his bed, requested them to be so arranged that he could see them all, and separately address each one of them. He told them that he expected to die, and expected to go to heaven, and expressed the hope that he should meet them all there. In his own simple manner, and with all the tenderness of a dying man, he opened to them the way of life by Jesus Christ, spoke to them of his own confidence in the Saviour, and urged them to ‘cling to Christ and the Bible’ as their only hope.” “It was just after this affecting scene, that I knocked at his door. And never was I more kindly directed than in making this fraternal visit. I had some fears, from what I knew of his self-scrutinizing spirit, that I might find him in a depressed state of mind. But as he drew near the close of his struggles, God was kind, and gave him sweet indication of his paternal love. There he tossed, day after day, and night after night, upon that couch of racking pain, with a mind as clear as Newton’s, and a heart as peaceful as a child in its mother’s bosom. The great peculiarity of his Christian character, was his shrinking humility, and self-diffidence. More than once, in the days of his unbroken vigour, I have heard him say, ‘I have mistaken my calling; I never was fit for a minister of the Gospel.’ No one else thought so; yet he retained this self-diffidence to the last. I said to him, ‘Brother Spencer, I am afraid you are about to leave us.’ He replied, ‘I think so.’ I took his hand, and he said, ‘You see I am strong; I may rally, but it is more than probable that I shall leave you by to-morrow morning.’ ‘Is it peace with you, brother?’ His body was in agony; he tossed his head on the pillow, and replied, ‘It is all peace.’ He paused, and fixing his piercing eye upon me, said, ‘I am afraid it is too much peace. I cannot discover in myself those evidences of personal godliness which justify me in enjoying such abundant peace.’ I could not repress a

smile at these sweet words, and then reminded him of those words of the Lord Jesus, when he said, 'I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.' He simply replied, 'Pray with me;' and then called his family around his bed, where we knelt and prayed together for the last time. His sufferings continued without any abatement, with the exception of a few tranquil hours, which he employed in giving to those around him his last counsel and charge, commending them to God, and testifying his own precious hopes, and the prospects that cheered him as he bade them farewell. He subsequently conversed but little. His manly frame was exhausted. Three days after this the strong man bowed himself to the impotence and dust of death. An inscrutable Providence made him a partaker in his Master's sufferings; abundant grace made him a partaker in his glory." We do not observe that the date of his death is given either by Dr. Spring or by Mr. Sherwood. We think that event occurred on November 24, 1854.

The "Pastor's Sketches" have been some time before the public, and received the verdict of approval; but as they are productions which indicate their author's peculiar power, and illustrate his remarkable fidelity and wisdom, in dealing with anxious inquirers after the way of salvation, by which his fame was principally achieved, and on which it will no doubt chiefly rest, we must give them some attention. They grew out of the materials which accumulated on his hands, from his habit of keeping a record of the conversations he held in his pastoral visitations. For strictly religious books they have had an almost unprecedented sale. We are rejoiced at this; for while they contain some things which we wish the author had left out, they are replete with wholesome instruction, and the weighty theological truths they contain, as if winged by the engaging and often thrilling narrative, will be borne where the merely argumentative treatise could never have found access. Nor are we surprised at the popularity of these Sketches. Dr. Spencer possessed an insight into human character, and a power of graphic delineation, which, if he had cultivated it, would have made him a master in this species of writing. We do not discover that there is any material falling off in the

second series, a result which might have been well apprehended. Some of these sketches, so far as we can judge, might with advantage have been considerably extended. Dr. Spencer has not in all cases permitted us to see, although he has greatly excited our curiosity, the process by which he succeeded in bringing the troubled mind out of deep distress. Take, for example, "The Miserable Heart, or Delusion and Infidelity;" if he had given the conversations which he had with his young friend, and the condensed arguments which he wrote down for her, we think it would have formed perhaps the most instructive of all his Sketches. We sympathize deeply with such a case as he describes; we feel somewhat as we do for the heroine of a tragic story, who pines in the gloom of a prison; and we would fain learn how the walls were scaled, or undermined, or the brazen doors opened, and the prisoner set at liberty.

The publication of his first book made him immediately known, far and wide, to a considerable class of persons who are labouring under despondency, or religious difficulties of some kind. "I have been," he writes in a letter to a friend, "a very imprudent man in my publications, for they have brought upon me more labour than I could describe—a correspondence of a most delicate and difficult nature, extending from Canada to Florida, and conversations without number and without end, with multitudes of people in religious trouble. A gentleman from Montreal has just left my study after two hours of conversation upon his terrible gloom. A young theological student from Connecticut spent last Sunday evening with me till midnight. I have some of the most wonderful religious histories, I am sure, that ever existed, which I will tell you about when I see you, but *I shall never print them*. [Qu. Did Dr. Spencer suspect that some of these wonderful histories might have been communicated to him, merely to be edited for the press?] In some cases my patients have wonderfully recovered, and in others they are as hopeless as ever. Nerves are strange things; never get nervous."—*Sketch*, p. 110.

The practice of keeping a written account of conversations with persons under religious trouble, and of interesting incidents in pastoral experience, has been very generally recommended to young ministers. So far as making such a record,

in some cases, is concerned, we are disposed to think that the recommendation is a wise one; but we must, at the same time, express the hope, that it will not be understood as extending to the publication of these private *memoranda*. It is not every man that has the same insight into human character, the same skill in meeting cavils and solving questions of conscience, the same discriminating judgment, the same soundness of theology, the same gift of cautious and accurate statement, the same power of description which belonged to the lamented author of these Sermons and Sketches. Moreover, if it comes to be understood that the interviews which a pastor has with members of his flock, are not only subject to record, but that the record may be given to the public, through the press, will not candour and freedom of intercourse in such interviews be put in peril? Is not the pastor's position, in respect to his spiritual patients, so far as the duty of reserve and silence is concerned, often analogous to that of the physician? Besides, human nature is weak, and sometimes betrays its weakness in strange and unexpected ways. There are not wanting persons, who, if they know a minister is in the habit of making memoranda of wonderful histories and remarkable experiences, with a view to publication, would seek to put themselves in his way, merely to gratify the vanity of seeing their own case in print.

As to this whole matter of recommending the plans and ways of one minister to be adopted by others, it should be done with caution. Young pastors may, no doubt, learn much, and should seek to learn all they can from the example of older ones, but should not be encouraged to become servile imitators. What one man can do well, another never succeeds in. Dr. Spencer excelled many, perhaps most, of his brethren, as a watchful pastor; he has been as much excelled by others in other parts of the ministerial work. And we wish to take this occasion to say generally, let no man's peculiarities, his style of preaching, his peculiarities of enunciation, articulation, or gesticulation, be made the model for all others to imitate. Because one man becomes an eloquent and impressive preacher of sermons, written out in every word, to the dotting of every *i*, and the crossing of every *t*, let it not be supposed that this is the true method for every other man. And, on the other hand,

because one minister succeeds admirably in extemporaneous preaching, let it not be supposed that every other minister must throw aside his pen and manuscript, and adopt the same method. It is natural for one man to speak in figures and poetry; when excited, he must speak so, or not at all. Let him speak in figures. Another is without imagination; he always speaks in plain prose. Let him speak in plain prose. One man never speaks in ordinary conversation without gestures; if they are natural, and have character and meaning, do not attempt to teach him, even if they are not in accordance with the rules of the "Complete Speaker," to lay them aside. Another man never uses gestures; he cannot possibly make a graceful one; do not attempt to make him display his natural awkwardness. He may have a burning, earnest spirit, which will do more for him than the most finished graceful manner. Nature is fond of variety, a truth which should not be forgotten, even in endeavouring to make Christian orators and effective Christian ministers. We need not a Procrustean bed in our colleges and theological schools, but the art of teaching every man to understand himself, to know what are his own peculiar gifts, and how he may most effectively use them for the glory of his Master.

As to the Sermons, which the enterprising and worthy publishers has given us, in these two volumes of nearly a thousand pages, Mr. Sherwood informs us that Dr. Spencer had made a careful selection from his sermons, to the number of one hundred and thirty-seven, which he regarded as most worthy of publication. He had prepared twenty-three of these for the press, all of which are here published; and we are given to understand, that the residue of the volumes was selected from the remaining one hundred and fourteen. We think it a highly auspicious circumstance, that the author of the Sermons had so large an instrumentality in designating those which should be given to the public. Ordinarily, the author of such productions is the best, and, in many cases, he is the only competent, judge of what should be given to the public. We are satisfied that great injustice has sometimes been done by posthumous publications. Partial relatives and parishioners wish some memento of a deceased friend and pastor; but in making the selection,

perhaps just those discourses which the author would have committed to the flames, are committed to the press. Such publications should be rarely made; and, when resolved upon, should be made with the greatest care, by some man of critical skill and cultivated literary taste, who would not publish for a deceased friend what he would not publish for himself. The example of some of our venerable clergymen, who devote the evening of their days to the publication of such portions of their writings as they wish to be preserved, imposes no such difficult and delicate task upon survivors. The course of Dr. Spencer, in making the above-named selection, was the next best thing he could do; and relieved his affectionate biographer and editor of a great responsibility.

The Sermons are all characteristic of their author; but are of course of varied excellence. Those contained in the first volume are mainly practical; and those in the second, doctrinal. We might enrich our pages with many fine passages; and we cannot forbear to present a few, as specimens of the author's style. The following will be found in his sermon on "Sorrow for the death of friends:"

"The sorrow of those who have no hope has a character and depth which arise from their own unbelief and the false estimates they put upon the world. They judge of the happiness of others very much as they judge of their own. And since their own felicity is found in the world, they sorrow for those who are taken out of it, as if they were deprived at once of all their enjoyments. They think of the dead very much as if stripped of every comfort, and consigned to the dark and cheerless tomb. This is common. Go out with me and I will lead you to a desolate habitation where the widow weeps with her fatherless children, and bemoans the lot which has taken the husband and father away from the comforts of life. Draw near. Listen. What is she saying? Alas, says she, that dear companion of my life has gone! That friend on whom I leaned, that father of my children, that tender husband who sought to do me good, has gone from all the enjoyments I hoped he would have shared with me! He sleeps in the cold grave! No comfort can reach him! No voice of friendship breaks the eternal silence of the tomb! Turn again to another habitation. Here is a mother, but she is child-

less! Fresh tears flow unbidden at the recollection of her babe! Poor babe, (she is saying,) he sleeps in his little grave! No mother's kindness can reach him! I can never do him good! he has gone to his cheerless and lonely tomb!"—Vol. I., p. 159.

"If we are to give our bodies to the grave, we know who owns it, who has conquered it, and robbed it of its victory. Ah, more: we know how he robbed it. Our best Friend, our Almighty Saviour, has been down into its bosom. He has softened, sweetened, sanctified that bed of sleep! Oh! if I am a Christian, I would rather go by that dark path to heaven, than go like Elijah with his chariot and horses of fire! It will be more like Christ. I shall lie where he lay. I shall prove his love. I shall experience his power. This dead body shall rise, and in heaven, a sinner saved, redeemed, loved, raised from the dead and taken into the family of God—in heaven, I shall love to tell what Jesus Christ hath done for me! Angels shall hear it! I will tell it to the old prophets! I will hunt up my fathers who got there before me, and tell it to them! I will wait for my children to die, and as they come there, I will tell it to them! Oh! my God, my God! this is enough! I will praise thee for it for ever! Oh! I am comforted now. I can bury my friends, my minister, my father, my daughter; I can set my foot upon the grave; and, with a heart filled with comfort from the God of heaven, I can wait the day when that stilled heart shall beat again, and those dumb lips shall speak from the opened coffin, and we shall be caught up together in the air." Vol. I., pp. 162, 163.

Frequently, in these discourses, we perceive that the author had an eye for the beauties of nature, and a pen capable of describing them; as in the following passage from the one on "Contentment."

"It is not one of the distinct and separate sensibilities of the heart, standing by itself and to be examined and understood alone, so much as it is a general sensibility which mingles with and tempers all others—which spreads its cast and character over the whole. It is not the rock on the landscape nor the rill—it is not the distant mountain of fading blue which loses its head in the heavens—it is not the tree, or the flower, or the contrast between light and shade, or that indescribable some-

thing which seems to give it life, as if the grass grew, and the flowers breathed, and the winds were singing some song of pleasure, or sighing some mournful requiem. It is none of these. These can be more clearly described. But it is rather that softness, that mellow light, which lies over the whole—which sleeps on rock, and river, and tree, on the bosom of the distant mountain, and on the bosom of the humble violet that blushes in the sweetness of its lowly valley.”—Vol. I., pp. 278, 279.

He everywhere deals earnestly with the consciences of men. In the Sermon entitled “Delay of Conversion,” occur the following solemn and instructive words:

“What becomes of those who die, we know not; thank God, we know not. They are in his hands. There we must leave them. But among all the instances of supposed conversion on a sick bed which I have known (and I have known many in a ministry of twenty-five years), only four of those who recovered gave in after life any evidence of the religion which they thought they had gained when they were sick! Only four! Where were the nine? yea, the more than ninety and nine? Only four! What a lesson on the delay of conversion! what an appalling lesson! The mists of delusion seem to be thickening around the bed of the graceless. He neglected religion, delayed it all his life, and now in his dying moments he seems to be most peculiarly exposed to the dreadful, damning hope of the hypocrite! The hour of dying! oh! what an hour for conversion! Distracted thoughts, disordered mind, increasing danger, strange alternations of hope and fear, contradictory symptoms, physicians and medicines to occupy attention! a pained body! weeping friends to minister their last offices of kindness before we leave them! parents, wives, children to be left in this cold, wicked world! the grave! eternity and all that is in it!—these are some of the things which press upon the hour of death! My friends, my dear friends, leave not your conversion to that hour.”—Vol. I., p. 401.

How tenderly he addresses the believer's heart in the “Sketch of the Plan of Salvation!”

“One of you has been saying: Years have rolled on since I first became a communicant. Grace met me, I hope, a great while ago. But it was grace. There was nothing in me then,

and there is nothing in me now by reason of which I could ever live to God, and hope to be purified and live with him in heaven. The more I see of my heart, through all this course of years, the more experimental proofs I find that just by the grace of God I am what I am. Another of you has been saying: This hope of mine is the work of God. I am a new creature, and God's workmanship in Jesus Christ. Once I was far different from this. I neglected religion; I did not love God. I was worldly. I was envious. I was covetous. I was proud and unforgiving: but now I can forgive my bitterest enemies. I love God, and love his service. I can give up the world and take Jesus; and I humbly hope that he who has begun a good work in me will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ. Another of you has been saying: A few years since, I thought the world was everything. An ardent boy, my heart panted for riches, honours, pleasures. My thoughts were all occupied about the world; I plunged into it; I forgot God! I forgot death! I neglected prayer! I was bound toward perdition! But grace rescued me from my dreadful delusion and peril! God opened my eyes, and led me to seek first the kingdom of heaven. Another of you has been saying: A little while ago, I was a wild giddy girl; I cared little for the love of God! I lived for the pleasures of the world. If I prayed at all, it was by constraint, and not from the attractions of holiness, and the love of my God. But grace saved me. It was God's own operation. He sent the message which opened my eyes to see the precipice on which I was sporting, and down which it is a thousand wonders that I had not plunged! He opened my heart to the love of Jesus; and made me know that his love is better than all other loves. Oh, I would not go back to the world:

'Jesus, I my cross have taken,' etc.

—Vol. II. pp. 404, 405.

The experienced pastor speaks in the following:

"In the early part of my ministry, I used to aim very often to soothe the afflicted, and encourage the darkened and depressed, by a reference to natural principles, such as the courses of this world, the common lot of life, the uselessness of repining, the mercies still left, or some such thing. I have done with all

that. I do it no more. It never did any good. It only dammed up the currents of grief for a little while, to become the more deep and dreadful, when they burst away the frail barrier. It never carried healing to the grief-spot of the heart. It only smothered the fires of trial, to burn the more fiercely and more deeply too, when, in a little while, the heart should find they were only smothered. I hope, I have done with all that. I have learnt its inefficacy. If I cannot lead to the exercises of faith, I cannot do a smitten heart any permanent good."—Vol. II., pp. 456, 457.

He shows his heart, his earnest spirit, as a preacher of the gospel:

"These are hard times! Their trials strike deep! They make a minister feel as Isaiah did, when, forsaken by those who ought to have sustained him, he retires from his toils for man, to indulge his tears with God, and, seated on the lone crag of the mountain rock, he wraps his face in his mantle: 'Lord, who hath believed our report?' They make a minister feel as Jeremiah did, when, his message rejected by so many, he seems to wish he had never been born: 'Woe is me, my mother! thou hast borne me a man of strife and contention to the whole earth.' Or, when he seems resolved to renounce a useless ministry, which made him so miserable: 'The word of the Lord is made a reproach unto me, and a derision daily; then I said, I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name:' he resolved never to preach another sermon. This oppressive, this miserable idea, drove me upon this text. (Eph. ii. 4-7.) It had two influences upon me. One was, I dared not form a plan of a sermon; I dared not select any theme from this wide field of the gospel, and attempt to explain, divide, demonstrate, and apply it under the ordinary rules of composition. The other was, I hoped, yes, I did hope, and I bless God that I can hope, that a passage like this, just the ideas of the Holy Ghost, without any plan or arrangement of mine, and a passage, so full of the mercy of God, might still find some access to your hearts."—Vol. II., 392, 393.

Here we see the same hand that wrote the "Pastor's Sketches:"

"One poor sinner, now I trust redeemed, said to me lately:

'I never knew till you told me that I might fly to Christ now, and just as I am. That amazed me. I was such a stranger to him. You told me to give God my heart just as it is. That surprised me. I thought you did not know me. Fly to Christ just as I am? To Christ now? Such a stranger to him? Give God my heart just as it is? I had never thought anything about Christ! He had always been last in my thoughts, as one to resort to after I was religious—and fly to him first? Fly to him now? Stop trying and he do all? Impossible! You did not understand me! My powers seemed stunned! It was entirely new truth to me.' So she thought then. But she has learnt better now. Before she believed, she says: 'I cannot describe my ineffectual efforts to grope and feel after Christ through thick darkness. I could not find him. I could only cry, Jesus, Master, have mercy on me, and ask him to take my heart—for I could not give it to him—and make it for me what I could not make it myself. I never knew the promises were for me, until you told me. I thought they were not for me.' 'Not for you!' said I. 'It is the lie of the devil! They are for you if you want them. It is the very act of faith to take them, and trust Christ to do all he has said.'—Vol. II., pp. 443, 444.

Preaching like this must have made a strong and lasting impression on the minds of hearers. We are not surprised that Dr. Spencer was successful in gathering a large and influential congregation in Brooklyn, that he was always acceptable in the pulpits of his brethren, and not only to the cultivated, but to the less cultivated among his hearers; nor that he was frequently solicited to enter other fields where a high order of talent was demanded. We think we understand what Mr. Sherwood means, when he says that Dr. Spencer was not what is commonly understood by a *popular* preacher. He did not covet popularity. He did not, for form's sake, take a text from the Bible, and then preach upon any other subject, save the doctrines and duties of the Bible, esteeming it the chief end of the preacher, to attract a crowd, who must have their modicum of excitement as well on a Sabbath, as on any other evening of the week, and in the church as well as in the theatre. He was not influenced by the fear that his people,

young or old, would tire of regeneration, justification, imputation, faith and repentance. His interest in these doctrines was too hearty to allow the admission of such a fear, or even the suspicion that they could fail to seize with power upon the attention and hearts of men. He did not think it necessary to assume theatrical grins and starts, and seek to provoke smiles that he might win souls. He did not let Paul "serve" him with a "text," while "Epictetus, Plato, Tully preached." But, we venture to say that within the walls of the Second Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn, under the preaching of the lamented Spencer, audiences have been held in as rapt attention, and the souls of men as deeply moved, as by any oratory of the greatest masters of rhetorical science. His preaching was in the true and noblest sense popular. It was addressed to the understanding of the plainest people. His manner, and weighty thoughts, his appeals to the conscience and the heart, were fitted to win respect for him as a minister of Christ, even from those, who, with itching ears, for the excitement and amusement of the hour, run after those who cultivate the flippant, *ad captandum* style, which the experience of the platform has taught them is sure to bring down the house—a respect for him, which was sure to bring them back, in their season of affliction, or of solemn thoughtfulness, to sit at his feet, and learn the way of salvation. Men who because they must advertise the pews and draw a full house, and be reported in the Monday's *Times* or *Herald*, fail to preach the gospel, may succeed in all that they propose to do; but let them not be surprised if their admiring hearers, when they become hungry for the bread of life, resort to others to be fed. It is evidence of a lack of earnestness, and of real talent—talent to appreciate as well as set forth the great soul-moving truths of the gospel, when a professed preacher of the gospel leaves those truths, to descant upon themes of mere passing interest, in a flippant, wordy style, to tickle the ears of the unthinking. The church may be made to have the attractions of the theatre, but then it will be, so far as moral impression is concerned, a theatre. There can be no more enlivening themes than those contained in the gospel, the incarnation and sufferings of Christ, the lost estate of sinners, the mercy of the cross,

judgment and eternity; why then leave these for the paltry topics of merely temporary interest.

We have reserved but little space to notice such doctrinal peculiarities as have struck our attention, in examining these volumes of sermons. Among those which are distinguished in the work as doctrinal, we find such as bear the following titles: "The Light of Nature," "Atonement," "Legal and Evangelical Justification distinguished," "Election," "The Mercy of God." A great and important truth lies at the foundation of the sermon on the "Light of Nature," viz., its insufficiency to teach men true religion: but, in his course of argument, he repeatedly makes the impression, that he means to deny any such thing as a light of nature, in respect to the being of God, his nature, or the worship which belongs to him. He says that most of those ideas found in the heathen classics, which have been so much commended, came, probably, not from the light of nature, but from tradition, handed down from Noah or Abraham; or they were derived from intercourse with the Jews. "The real utility of all the light of nature on the subject of religion consists in this; that it demonstrates its own insufficiency for teaching us a single important truth, and thus turns us over to the word of God." "Alone, it teaches nothing. It never did. God never said it could." Among the truths which he specifies as those which the light of nature fails to teach, are, the existence of one God, and the attributes of the Deity, naming two as examples—immutability and goodness. "How often," he says, "is that passage in the Epistle to the Romans quoted, only to be perverted for bolstering up a conclusion, directly the opposite of its own! '*The invisible things of him from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, even his eternal power and Godhead.*' What is the Bible conclusion? It is this; '*so, then, they are without excuse.*' Excuse for what? For having a knowledge of God? That would make the Apostle talk like a madman! No. Without excuse for not knowing God. But what is the conclusion of our poetic and naturalizing Christians? It is that the light of nature, the creation, the things that are made, are quite sufficient to give man a knowledge of God! And this conclusion they take for the foundation of theories, and songs, and lectures, though

directly in the face of the conclusion stated in the text itself. The text plainly affirms the practical inefficacy of the works of God to teach men religious truth. It says they are not taught, they are without excuse. They are only condemned, instead of being enlightened and saved. They do not read nature rightly."—Vol. II., pp. 16, 17.

Now we do not call in question, as we have said, the correctness of the doctrine which lies at the foundation of this discourse, that the light of nature is insufficient to teach man true religion. But it is clearly a mistake to suppose that to defend this doctrine it is necessary to deny that the light of nature teaches any truth, even the existence of one God. When the Apostle represents the heathen as without excuse for not knowing God, we ask a question which Dr. Spencer does not ask in this sermon, Why without excuse? Obviously because they had light enough from the things which are made, to know that they were changing the glory of the uncorruptible God, and were guilty of horrid impiety, when they made images like to corruptible man, birds, four-footed beasts and creeping things, and worshipped them as divine. They had not light enough to answer that ancient question, "How shall man be just with God?" but they had sufficient to teach them the folly and inexcusableness of idolatry. It is the object of the apostle in Rom. i. 18–23, to show that God had given such a revelation of his existence and character that idolaters were inexcusable for being idolaters. This revelation is given externally in the works of creation, and in the very soul of man, or in the constitution of his nature. When any of the heathen do by nature the things contained in the law of God, they show the work of the law written in their hearts. Rom. ii. 14, 15. Whenever they perform any moral act which the revealed law requires, they prove that they have light, that a rule of duty has been engraven on their hearts. The same thing is proved by the operations of their conscience, and the correct moral precepts of some of their sages. This light, this rule of duty, is that by which they will be tried on the last day, and which will condemn them. But if they have no light, how are they without excuse, and by what law will they be condemned?

The Sermon on the Atonement, which is admirably calculated

to commend the orthodox view to those who have been prejudiced against it, appears nevertheless faulty to us, in its construction; especially, in the distinction which the author endeavours to make between "two different methods of apprehending the atonement." He does not profess to treat the subject doctrinally, or so much as a "matter of theology, as of experience." One method of apprehending the atonement is to view it as a satisfaction rendered to divine justice and authority for the indignity done to them by sin. The other method, according to Dr. Spencer, makes the essence of the atonement to be a satisfaction rendered to the Deity for the offence of the sinner. And he enters into a lengthened argument to prove that our hearts ought to apprehend the Saviour's atonement, not so much as a plan to prepare the way to save sinners, not so much as a transaction due to law, as a more personal and special sacrifice to meet the sins, sorrows and wants of the soul itself. The difficulty we have with this distinction is, that we do not see how a guilty soul can apprehend the atonement as a sacrifice to meet his own spiritual necessities, unless he first, and at the same time, apprehends it in its relation to law, and as sustaining the honour of that law, while the sinner is pardoned. But the discourse makes the impression deeply, and in this respect is highly valuable, and will no doubt be read with profit in latitudes where the orthodox statement is viewed with suspicion and dislike, that the atonement of Christ was made for the very persons of those who are saved by it.

But we must conclude: while the Sermons are no ordinary productions, and contain an amount of manly, able discussion, not often met with in volumes of mere sermons, we are inclined to the opinion, intimated on a preceding page, that Dr. Spencer's fame will rest mainly on his "Pastor's Sketches." These will make his name known in the distant hamlets of the land, and will perpetuate his usefulness long after his hearers and his own generation have mingled with the dust.

ART. V.—*Eutaxia; or, the Presbyterian Liturgies: Historical Sketches.* By a Minister of the Presbyterian Church. New York: M. W. Dodd, Brick Church Chapel. 1855. pp. 260.

IT is a very prevalent impression, that the use of liturgies in public worship, is one of the peculiarities of prelatical churches. Not only Episcopalians, but many Presbyterians are in the habit of specifying episcopacy, confirmation, and the use of a liturgy, as intimately associated, and as the distinguishing characteristics of prelacy. As to confirmation, it is true that considered as a sacrament, or a rite conferring grace, it is peculiar to the ritual and hierarchical system. The grace conferred in baptism is, according to that system, confirmed and increased by the imposition of the bishop's hands in confirmation. For such a service there is no warrant in Scripture; and it is entirely incompatible with the whole evangelical theory of the Church, and of the method of salvation. But confirmation, as a solemn service, in which those recognized in their infancy as members of the Church, on the faith of their parents, are confirmed in their church standing, on the profession of their own faith, is retained in form or in substance in all Protestant Churches. In the Lutheran, and in most of the Reformed, or Calvinistic Churches on the continent of Europe, children baptized in infancy, when they come to years of discretion, are publicly examined as to their knowledge of Christian doctrine, and, if free from scandal, are called upon to assume for themselves their baptismal vows, and are recognized as members of the church in full communion. In most Presbyterian churches in Great Britain and Ireland, and especially in this country, something more than competent knowledge and freedom from scandal being required, in order to admission to sealing ordinances, baptized youth are not as a matter of course admitted to the Lord's supper, on their arrival at the years of discretion. It is our custom to wait until they are prepared to make a credible profession of a change of heart. When this is done they are confirmed; that is, they are recognized as members of the church in full communion, on their own profession. The same examination as to knowledge, the same profession as to faith,

the same engagements as to obedience—in short, the same assumption of the obligations of the baptismal covenant, and the same consequent access to the Lord's table, which in other churches constitute confirmation, in ours constitute what we are accustomed to call admission to sealing ordinances. The only difference is, that we require more than knowledge and freedom from scandal as the condition of confirming baptized persons as members of the church in full communion. It is a great mistake, therefore, to represent confirmation as a prelatical service. In one form or another, it is the necessary sequence of infant baptism, and must be adopted wherever pedo-baptism prevails.

It is a still greater mistake to represent liturgies as an adjunct of episcopacy. The fact is, that the use of liturgies was introduced into all the Protestant churches at the time of the Reformation, and that in the greater number of them, they continue in use to the present day.* As Calvin's liturgy is the basis of those adopted in other Reformed Churches, we think our readers will be glad to see so much of it as is given in the work before us.

“THE FORM OF CHURCH PRAYERS.

“On week-days the minister uses such words in prayer as may seem to him good, suiting his prayer to the occasion, and the matter whereof he treats in preaching. “For the Lord's Day in the morning is commonly used the Form ensuing. After the reading of the appointed chapters of Holy Scripture, the Ten Commandments are read. Then the minister begins thus:

“**INVOCATION.**—Our help is in the name of God, who made heaven and earth. Amen.

“**EXHORTATION.**—Brethren, let each of you present himself before the Lord, with confession of his sins and offences, following in heart my words.

* In the instructive and well written work, whose title stands at the head of this article, there is given an account of the liturgy introduced into the Church at Geneva by Calvin; of the Geneva liturgy as adopted in France; of the liturgy of John Knox, introduced into Scotland; of the liturgy of the German Reformed Church, or of the Palatinate; of the Dutch Reformed liturgy; and of the liturgical forms prepared and reported to the old Synod of our Church, by the Committee to whom was referred the revision of the Directory for Public Worship, published in 1787. This committee consisted of the Rev. Drs. Rodgers and McWhorter, and the Rev. Messrs. Alexander Miller and James Wilson. The Synod did not adopt them, Dr. Green, as he informs us in his Life, being one of those who voted in favour of their adoption.

“**CONFESSIO**N.—Lord God! Almighty and Eternal Father: We acknowledge and confess before thy holy majesty, that we are miserable sinners; conceived and born in guilt and in corruption, prone to do evil, unfit for any good; who, by reason of our depravity, transgress without end thy holy commandments. Wherefore we have drawn upon ourselves, by thy just sentence, condemnation and death. But, O Lord! with heartfelt sorrow we repent and deplore our offences; we condemn ourselves and our evil ways, with true penitence beseeching that thy grace may relieve our distress.

“Be pleased then to have compassion upon us, O most gracious God! Father of all mercies; for the sake of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord. And in removing our guilt and our pollution, grant us the daily increase of the grace of thine Holy Spirit; that acknowledging from our inmost hearts our own unrighteousness, we may be touched with sorrow that shall work true repentance; and that thy Spirit, mortifying all sin within us, may produce the fruits of holiness and of righteousness well-pleasing in thy sight: through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

“This done, shall be sung in the congregation a Psalm; then the minister shall begin afresh to pray, asking of God the grace of his Holy Spirit, to the end that his word may be faithfully expounded, to the honour of his name, and to the edification of the church; and that it be received in such humility and obedience as are becoming.

“The form thereof is at the discretion of the minister.

“[Prayer which the ministers are accustomed to make.]

“**FOR ILLUMINATION**.—Most gracious God, our heavenly Father! in whom alone dwelleth all fulness of light and wisdom: Illuminate our minds, we beseech thee, by thine Holy Spirit, in the true understanding of thy word. Give us grace that we may receive it with reverence and humility unfeigned. May it lead us to put our whole trust in thee alone; and so to serve and honour thee, that we may glorify thy holy name, and edify our neighbours by a good example. And since it hath pleased thee to number us among thy people: O help us to pay thee the love and homage that we owe, as children to our Father, and as servants to our Lord. We ask this for the sake of our Master and Saviour, who hath taught us to pray, saying: Our Father, &c.

“ At the end of the sermon, the minister having made exhortation to prayer, beginneth thus :

“ INTERCESSION.—Almighty God, our heavenly Father! who hast promised to grant our requests in the name of thy well-beloved Son: Thou hast taught us in his name also to assemble ourselves together, assured that he shall be present in the midst of us, to intercede for us with thee, and obtain for us all things that we may agree on earth to ask thee. Wherefore, having met in thy presence, dependent on thy promise, we earnestly beseech thee, O gracious God and Father! for his sake who is our only Saviour and Mediator, that of thy boundless mercy thou wilt freely pardon our offences; and so lift up our thoughts and our desires toward thyself, that we may seek thee in a manner acceptable to thy holy and reasonable will.

“ FOR RULERS.—Heavenly Father! who hast bidden us pray for those in authority over us: We entreat thee to bless all princes and governors, thy servants, to whom thou has committed the administration of justice; and especially * * * May it please thee to grant them the daily increase of thy good Spirit, that with true faith acknowledging Jesus Christ, thy Son our Saviour, to be King of kings and Lord of lords, unto whom thou hast given all power in heaven and on earth—they may seek to serve thee and exalt thy rule in their dominions. May they govern their subjects, who are the creatures of thy hand and the sheep of thy pasture, in a manner well-pleasing in thy sight; so that as well here as throughout all the earth, thy people, being kept in peace and quiet, may serve thee in all godliness and honesty; and that we, being delivered from the fear of our enemies, may pass the time of our lives in thy praise.

“ FOR PASTORS.—Almighty Saviour! we pray for all whom thou hast appointed pastors of thy believing people, and intrusted with the care of souls and the dispensing of thy holy Gospel. Guide them by thy Spirit, and make them faithful and loyal ministers of thy glory. May they ever hold this end before them: that by their efforts, all poor wandering sheep may be gathered in and made subject to the Lord Jesus Christ, the Shepherd and Bishop of their souls, and in him daily grow up and increase in all godliness and truth. And, O Lord!

deliver thy churches from the mouth of ravenous wolves and hirelings, who seek only their own ambition or profit, and not the exaltation of thy holy name, and the safety of thy flock.

“FOR ALL CONDITIONS OF MEN.—Most Gracious God, Father of all mercies: We beseech thee for every class and condition of our fellow-men. Thou who wouldst be acknowledged as the Saviour of all mankind, in the redemption made by thy Son Jesus Christ: Grant that such as are yet strangers to thy knowledge, and in the darkness of captivity to ignorance and error, may, by the enlightening of thy Spirit and the preaching of thy word, be led into the right way of salvation; which is to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. May those whom thou hast already visited with thy grace, and enlightened with the knowledge of thy word, grow daily in all godliness, and be enriched with thy spiritual gifts. So that we all, with one heart and one voice, may ever praise thee, giving honour and worship to thy Christ, our Lord, Lawgiver and King.

“FOR AFFLICTED PERSONS.—God of all comfort! We commend to thee those whom thou art pleased to visit and chasten with any cross or tribulation; the nations whom thou dost afflict with pestilence, war, or famine; all persons oppressed with poverty, imprisonment, sickness, banishment, or any other distress of body or sorrow of mind: That it may please thee to show them thy fatherly kindness, chastening them for their profit; to the end that in their hearts they may turn unto thee, and being converted, may receive perfect consolation, and deliverance from all their woes.

“FOR PERSECUTED CHRISTIANS.—More especially we commend to thee our poor brethren scattered abroad under the tyranny of Antichrist, who are destitute of the pasture of life, and deprived of the privilege of publicly calling on thy holy name. We pray for those who are confined as prisoners, or otherwise persecuted by the enemies of thy gospel. May it please thee, O Father of mercies! to strengthen them by the virtue of thy Spirit, in such sort that they faint not, neither fall away, but constantly abide in thy holy calling. Succour them, help them as thou knowest they may need; console them in

their afflictions; maintain them in thy safe keeping; defend them against the rage of devouring wolves; and augment within them all the graces of thy Spirit, that whether in life or death, they may glorify thy name.

“FOR THE CONGREGATION.—Finally, O God our Father! Grant also unto us, who are here gathered in the name of thy Holy Child Jesus, to hear his word [and to celebrate his holy Supper], that we may rightly perceive our lost estate by nature, and the condemnation we have deserved and heaped up to ourselves by disobedient lives. So that conscious that in ourselves there dwelleth no good thing, and that our flesh and blood cannot inherit thy kingdom, with our whole affections we may give ourselves up in firm trust to thy beloved Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, our only Saviour and Redeemer. And that he, dwelling in us, may mortify within us the old Adam, renewing us for a better life, wherein we shall exalt and glorify thy blessed and worthy name, ever, world without end. Amen.

“THE LORD’S PRAYER.—Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name: Thy kingdom come: Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven: Give us this day our daily bread: And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors: And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.

“THE CREED.—Lord, increase our faith.

“I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ, his only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried; he descended into hell; the third day he rose again from the dead; he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost; the Holy Catholic Church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Amen.

“THE BLESSING,

“Which is pronounced at the departure of the people, according as our Lord hath commanded in the Law.—*Numbers* vi. 23.

“The Lord bless thee, and keep thee;

“The Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee;

“The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.

“Whereunto is added, to remind the people of the duty of alms-giving, as is it customary upon leaving the church,

“Depart in peace: remember the poor: and the God of peace be with you. Amen.”

We give also the form for the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

“THE MANNER OF CELEBRATING THE LORD'S SUPPER.”

“Note, that on the Sabbath before the Supper is to be celebrated, it must be announced to the people, in order that each may prepare and dispose himself worthily to receive it. Also, that children be not brought to the Communion until they have been well instructed, and have made profession of their faith, in the Church. And again, that strangers, who are yet rude and ignorant, may come to be taught in private.

“On the day of the celebration, the minister in the conclusion of his sermon adverts to it, or else, if the matter be in hand, refers his whole discourse to the same, expounding to the people what our Lord would say and signify by this mystery, and after what manner he would have us receive it.

“The following prayer is to be added to the usual prayer after the sermon:

“THE LORD'S PRAYER.—Our Father, which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy Name: Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven: Give us this day our daily bread: And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors: And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.

“THE INVOCATION.—Most gracious God! we beseech thee that as thy Son hath not only once offered up his body and blood upon the cross for the remission of our sins, but hath also vouchsafed them unto us, for our meat and drink unto life eternal: So thou wilt grant us grace, with sincere hearts and fervent desires, to accept this great blessing at his hands. May we by lively faith partake of his body and blood, yea, of himself, true God and man, the only bread from heaven, which giveth life unto our souls. Suffer us no longer to live unto ourselves, according to a corrupt and sinful nature; but may he live in us, and lead us to the life that is holy, blessed and unchangeable for ever. Thus make us true partakers of the new and everlasting testament, which is the covenant of grace.

And thus assure us of thy willingness ever to be our gracious Father; not imputing unto us our sins, but providing us with all things necessary for our good, that we may magnify thy name by our works and words. Fit us, O heavenly Father! to celebrate at this time the blessed remembrance of thy beloved Son. Enable us profitably to contemplate his love, and show forth the benefits of his death: That so receiving fresh increase of strength in thy faith and in all good works, we may with greater confidence call thee our Father, and evermore rejoice and glory in thy name. Through Jesus Christ thy Son, our Redeemer. Amen.

“THE CREED.—Let us now make profession of our faith in the doctrine of the Christian Religion, wherein we all purpose by God’s grace to live and to die.

“I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth: and in Jesus Christ, his only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried; he descended into hell; the third day he arose again from the dead, he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy Catholic Church; the communion of Saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Amen.

“Then the minister maketh this

“EXHORTATION.—Attend to the words of the institution of the holy supper of our Lord Jesus Christ, as they are delivered by the Apostle Paul.

“For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you: That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying: This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord’s death till he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and

drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.

“We have heard, brethren, in what manner our Lord celebrated the Supper among his disciples; whence we see that strangers, who are not of the company of the faithful, may not approach it. Wherefore, in obedience to this rule, and in the name and by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, I excommunicate all idolaters, blasphemers, despisers of God, heretics, and all who form sects apart, to break the unity of the Church; all perjurers, all who are rebellious against fathers and mothers, and other superiors, all who are seditious, contentious, quarrelsome, injurious, adulterers, fornicators, thieves, misers, ravishers, drunkards, gluttons, and all others who lead scandalous lives; warning them that they abstain from this Table, lest they pollute and contaminate the sacred food which our Lord Jesus Christ giveth only to his faithful servants.

“Therefore, according to the exhortation of St. Paul, let each of you examine and prove his own conscience, to know whether he have true repentance of his sins, and sorrow for them; desiring henceforth to lead a holy and godly life; above all, whether he putteth his whole trust in God's mercy, and seeketh his whole salvation in Jesus Christ; and renouncing all enmity and malice, doth truly and honestly purpose to live in harmony and brotherly love with his neighbour.

“If we have this testimony in our hearts before God, we may not doubt that he adopteth us for his children, and that our Lord Jesus addresseth his word to us, admitting us to his Table, and presenting us with this holy sacrament, which he bestows upon his followers.

“And notwithstanding that we feel many infirmities and miseries in ourselves, as namely, that we have not perfect faith, and that we have not given ourselves to serve God with such zeal as we are bound to do, but have daily to battle with the lusts of our flesh; yet, since the Lord hath graciously been pleased to print his Gospel upon our hearts, in order that we may withstand all unbelief; and hath given us this earnest

desire to renounce our own thoughts and follow his righteousness and his holy commandments: therefore we rest assured, that our remaining sins and imperfections do not prevent us from being received of God and made worthy partakers of this spiritual food. For we come not to this Supper to testify hereby that we are perfect and righteous in ourselves; but on the contrary, seeking our life in Jesus Christ, we acknowledge that we lie in the midst of death. Let us then look upon this sacrament as a medicine for those who are spiritually sick; and consider that all the worthiness our Lord requireth of us, is that we truly know ourselves, be sorry for our sins, and find our pleasure, joy, and satisfaction in him above.

“First, then, we must believe these promises, which Jesus Christ, who is infallible truth, hath pronounced with his own lips: That he is truly willing to make us partakers of his body and of his blood, in order that we may wholly possess him, and that he may live in us, and we in him. And although we see here only the bread and wine, let us not doubt that he will accomplish spiritually in our souls all that he outwardly exhibits by these visible signs; he will show himself to be the heavenly bread, to feed and nourish us unto life eternal. Let us not be unthankful to the infinite goodness of our Lord, who displays all his riches and his wealth at this table, to distribute them among us. For in giving himself, he testifies that all he hath is ours. Let us receive this sacrament as a pledge that the virtue of his death and passion is imputed unto us for righteousness; even as though we had suffered in our own persons. Let none perversely draw back, when Jesus Christ doth gently invite him by his word. But considering the dignity of his precious gift, let us present ourselves to him with ardent zeal, that he may make us capable of receiving it.

“And now, to this end, lift up your minds and hearts on high, where Jesus Christ abideth in the glory of his Father, whence we expect his coming at our redemption. Dwell not upon these earthly and corruptible elements, which we see present to our eyes, and feel with our hands, to seek him in them, as if he were inclosed in the Bread or in the wine. For then only shall our souls be disposed to receive food and life from his substance, when they shall thus be lifted up above

worldly things, even unto heaven, and enter into the kingdom of God, where he dwelleth. Let us be satisfied to have this bread and this wine for witnesses and signs; seeking spiritually the truth where God's word hath promised that we shall find it.

“This done, the ministers distribute the bread and the cup to the people, having warned them to come forward with reverence and order. Meanwhile a Psalm is sung, or a portion of the Scripture read, suitable to what is signified by the Sacrament. The Supper being over, is used this or the like

“**THANKSGIVING.**—Heavenly Father! we give thee immortal praise and thanks, that upon us poor sinners thou hast conferred so great a benefit, as to bring us into the communion of thy Son Jesus Christ, our Lord; whom having delivered up to death for us, thou hast given for our food and nourishment unto eternal life. Now, also, grant us grace, that we may never be unmindful of these things; but rather carrying them about engraven upon our hearts, may advance and grow in that faith which is effectual unto every good work. Thus, may the rest of our lives be ordered and followed out to thy glory and the edification of our neighbours: Through Jesus Christ our Lord; who with thee, O Father! and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth in the unity of the Godhead, world without end. Amen.

“Then, all the congregation standing, is sung the Hymn of Simeon, after which the minister dismisses the people with

“**THE BLESSING.**—The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen.”

The liturgy prepared by Knox for the Church of Scotland, and which continued in more or less general use for a century after the Reformation, was framed after the model of that of Geneva.

Why has the use of liturgies by the Reformed Churches been either wholly, as in the case of the Scotch and American Presbyterians, or partially, as in the case of the Dutch Church in this country, been laid aside? The reasons are various, and some of the most influential peculiar to Presbyterians. One reason, no doubt is, the general dislike to be trammelled by forms; which dislike is the natural product of

the spirit of liberty, which is inseparable from the principles of Presbyterianism. The consciousness of the essential equality of all in whom the Spirit of God dwells, and the conviction that those whom Christ calls to the ministry, he qualifies for the discharge of its duties, naturally produces a revolt against the prescription by authority of the very words in which the public worship of God is to be conducted. Those who can walk are impatient of leading strings. It cannot be doubted that the theory of Presbyterianism is opposed to the use of liturgies. In the ideal state of the Church—in that state which our theory contemplates, where every minister is really called of God, and is the organ of the Holy Ghost in the exercise of his functions, liturgies would be fetters, which nothing but compulsion could induce any man to wear. How incongruous is it with our conception of the Apostolic Church, that John, Paul and Peter should be compelled to read just such and such portions of Scripture, to use prescribed words in prayer, and to limit their supplications and thanksgivings to specified topics! The compulsory use of liturgies is, and has ever been felt to be, inconsistent with the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. It is inconsistent with the inward promptings of the Spirit of God, as he dwells and works in the hearts of his people. As no genuine, living Christian can bear to be confined to a prescribed form of prayer in his closet, so no minister, called by the Spirit to the sacred office, can fail to feel such forms an impediment and a constraint. They are like the stiff, constraining dress, imposed on the soldier, for the sake of uniformity and general effect, which he is glad to throw off when in actual service. The Scriptures, therefore, which in all things outward, conform to what is the inward product of the Spirit, do not prescribe any form of words to be used in the worship of God. There are no indications of the use of liturgies in the New Testament. There is no evidence of the prevalence of written forms during the first three centuries. They were gradually introduced, and they were never uniform. Every important Church had its own liturgy. The modern Anglican idea of having one form of worship for all churches, never entered the minds of the early Christians. We fully believe, therefore, that the compulsory use of a liturgy is inconsistent with Christian liberty; and that the disposition to

use such terms, as a general rule, decreases with the increase of intelligence and spirituality in the Church. Without questioning or doubting the sincere and eminent piety of hundreds and thousands of the ministers and members of churches which continue in the trammels of prescribed liturgical forms, we still believe that one of the causes why the Church of Scotland never submitted to the authoritative imposition of an unvarying form of public worship, and gradually dispensed with the use of a liturgy altogether, is to be found in its superior intelligence and piety.

Another cause of the fact in question, is to be found in the essential or unavoidable inadequacy of all forms. They are not only inconsistent, when authoritatively imposed, with the liberty of Christians, but they are, and must be, insufficient. Neither the circumstances, nor the inward state of the Church, or of any worshipping assembly, are always the same. It is true, adoration, confession, thanksgiving, supplication, and intercession, are always to be included in our addresses to God; but varying inward and outward circumstances call for different modes of address, and no one uniform mode can possibly satisfy the spiritual necessities of the people. Sometimes the minister goes to the house of God burdened with some great truth, or with his heart filled with zeal for some special service in the cause of Christ, the conviction of sinners, the edification of saints, the work of missions, the relief of the poor; but he is forbidden to give utterance to the language of his heart, or to bring his people into sympathy with himself by appropriate religious services. Sometimes general coldness or irreligion prevails among the people; sometimes they are filled with the fruits, and rejoicing in the presence of the Spirit; sometimes they are in prosperity, sometimes in adversity. It is as impossible that any one form of worship should suit all these diversities, as that any one kind of dress should suit all seasons of the year, or all classes of men; or that any one kind of food, however wholesome, should be adapted to all states of the human body.

Besides these general causes there are others, perhaps still more influential, of a specific character, which produced the distaste for liturgies in the minds of the Presbyterians of Great

Britain and America. The real question in their case, was not liturgy or no liturgy, but whether they should submit to the use of the liturgy of the Church of England. Besides, therefore, the general objections to any prescribed, unvarying form of public worship, all the specific objections entertained by Presbyterians against the services of the English Church operated in this matter. The English liturgy was framed on the avowed principle of departing as little as possible from the Romish forms. It was designed to conciliate those who were yet addicted to the papacy. It retained numerous prescriptions as to dress and ceremonies, to which conscientious objections were entertained by the majority of Protestants. It required the people to kneel in the reception of the Eucharist, which was so associated with the worship of the host, that many left the Church of England principally on that account. Its baptismal service could not be understood in its natural sense otherwise than as teaching the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. It required the minister to commit to the grave all baptized persons who did not die by their own hand, or in a state of excommunication, "in the sure hope of a blessed resurrection," no matter how heretical or how profligate they may have been.* It was constructed on the platform of the Romish Calendar. Not only the great Christian festivals of Christmas, Good Friday, and Easter, which Protestants on the continent continued to observe, were retained, but particular services were prescribed for a multitude of holy days. There was a special service for the first, second, third, and fourth Sundays in Advent; then for Christmas, and the first Sunday after Christmas; then for the circumcision of Christ; then for the Epiphany; then for the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth Sundays after Epiphany; then for Septuagesima; then for the second and first Sundays before Lent; then for each of the Sundays during Lent; then for Good Friday, Easter, and the five Sundays after Easter; then for Ascension-day; then Whitsunday; then Trinity Sunday, and each of the twenty-five Sundays after Trinity; then St. Andrew's-day; St. Thomas's day; Purification of the Blessed Virgin; St. Matthias, St.

* This objectionable feature of the English liturgy has been removed from the Book of Common Prayer, as adopted by the Episcopal Church in this country.

Mark, St. Philip, St. James, and the Apostles, St. Barnabas; Nativity of St. John the Baptist, St. Peter, St. Bartholomew, St. Matthew, St. Michael and all Angels, &c. &c., All Saints, the Holy Innocents, &c. How foreign is all this to the simplicity of the gospel! It would seem impossible to live in accordance with the spirit of the English service-book without making the Christian life a formality. In perfect consistency with these and similar objections to the English service-book, as a whole, we feel bound to say, that we fully and cordially agree with the celebrated Robert Hall, at least as to the Morning and Evening Prayers, that for evangelical sentiment, fervour of devotion, and majestic simplicity of language, it is entitled to the highest praise. And as to the Litany, which is at least a thousand years old, and no more belongs to the Church of England than the Creed does, we know no human composition that can be compared with it. These excellencies, however, which, in a great measure were derived from forms already drawn up by the Reformers on the continent,* do not redeem the character of the book considered as a whole.

This book, so objectionable, as a whole, in its origin, adjuncts and character, was forced on the English Church and people by the civil power, contrary to their will. Bishops, clergy and parliament for years endeavoured to have it rectified, but at last submitted. The attempt to enforce its observance on the Scotch Church, led to one of the most wicked and cruel persecutions the world has ever seen. Is it wonderful, then, that a strong repugnance to the very name of a liturgy, should be roused in the minds of the Presbyterians of Great Britain and of their descendants in America? Of the liturgies of Calvin, of Knox, of the Huguenots, of the German and Dutch Reformed Churches, they knew nothing. A liturgy in their minds meant the Book of Common Prayer, framed for the comprehension of papists, enforced by the will of Elizabeth, rejected at the cost of property and life, by their pious ancestors. It would be contrary to the laws of our nature, if such a struggle as this did not lead to some exaggeration of feeling and opinion on the other side. No candid man can blame the non-Conformists of England, or the Presbyterians of Scotland,

* On the extent to which the English Liturgy is indebted to the continental Reformers, see pp. 187-200, of the work under review.

if their sad experience of civil and ecclesiastical tyranny in enforcing an obnoxious prayer-book, led them to the extreme of denouncing the use of all forms. That one extreme produces another, is the tritest of aphorisms. The extreme of insisting that certain forms should alone be used, begat the extreme of insisting that no forms should be allowed. It is obvious however to the candid, that between these extremes there is a wide and safe middle ground. That safe middle ground is the optional use of a liturgy, or form of public service, having the sanction of the Church. If such a book were compiled from the liturgies of Calvin, Knox, and of the Reformed Churches, containing appropriate prayers for ordinary public worship, for special occasions, as for times of sickness, declension, or public calamity, with forms for the administration of baptism, of the Lord's Supper, for funerals and for marriage, we are bold to say that it would in our judgment be a very great blessing. We say such a book might be *compiled*; we do not believe it could possibly be written. It may be difficult to see why it should be so; but the fact can hardly be doubted, that prayers written by individuals are, except in cases of uncommon religious exaltation, or in times of the powerful effusion of the Spirit, comparatively worthless. A prayer to suit the Church must be the product of the Church. It must be free in thought, language and feeling from everything which belongs to the individual. It must be the product, in other words, of the Holy Ghost. The only way to secure this result is either to take the prayers recorded in the Scriptures, or those which the Spirit, whose office it is to teach us how to pray, has uttered through the lips of the children of God, and which have in the process of ages, been freed from their earthly mixture, and received the sanction of those in whom the Spirit dwells. For a man to sit down and write a volume of prayers for other people to use, and especially a liturgy for the service of the Church, seems to us very much like John Wesley's making his five volumes of sermons a creed.

These two conditions being supposed, first, that the book should be compiled and not written; and secondly, that its use should be optional—we are strongly of opinion that it would answer a most important end. The great objections to the use of liturgies are, that the authoritative imposition of them is

inconsistent with Christian liberty; secondly, that they never can be made to answer all the varieties of experience and occasions; thirdly, that they tend to formality, and cannot be an adequate substitute for the warm outgoings of the heart moved by the Spirit of genuine devotion. These objections we consider valid against all unvarying forms authoritatively imposed. But they do not bear against the preparation and optional use of a Book of Common Prayer.

The advantages which we would anticipate from the preparation of such a book, or of a return to the usage of the early Churches of the Reformation, are principally the following: In the first place, it would be a great assistance to those who are not specially favoured with the gift of prayer, and thus tend to elevate and improve this important part of public worship. We believe that *ex tempore* preaching, when the preacher has the requisite gifts and graces, is the best preaching in the world; without those gifts, in no ordinary measure, it is the worst. So, as we have already admitted, *ex tempore* prayer, when the spirit of prayer is present, is the best method of praying; better than any form prescribed by the Church, and better than any form previously prepared by the man himself. We have also admitted that the disposition to use written forms, as a general rule, decreases in proportion to the increase of intelligence and spirituality of the Church. All this being conceded, it is nevertheless lamentably true, that the prayers are, in general, the least attractive and satisfactory part of our Church services. This may arise partly from the fact that the qualifications for this part of public worship are more rarely possessed than those requisite for acceptable preaching. It is certain that many eminent preachers have been remarkably deficient in the gift of prayer. This is said to have been the case with President Davies, Robert Hall, and Dr. Chalmers. It is evident, that to pray well requires a very unusual combination of graces and gifts. It requires a devout spirit; much religious experience; such natural or acquired refinement as is sufficient to guard against all coarseness, irreverence, and impropriety in thought or language; such inward guidance or mental discipline as shall render the prayer well ordered and comprehensive. These gifts, alas! are not common in their

combination, even among good men. Another reason for the evil in question, is that so little attention is commonly given by our ministers to previous preparation for conducting this part of divine worship. They labour hard to prepare to address the people; but venture on addressing God without premeditation. Dr. Witherspoon says that the Rev. Dr. Gillies of Glasgow, who in his judgment exceeded any man he had ever heard in the excellency of his prayers, was accustomed to devote unwearied pains to preparation for this part of his ministerial work, and for the first ten years of his pastoral life never wrote a sermon without writing a prayer appropriate to it.* This was Calvin's habit, and many of the sermons printed in his works, have prayers annexed; an aid which Calvin found needful, and no man living need be ashamed of employing.

We have assumed that as a general thing the public prayers in our churches do not meet the desires and exigencies of the people. We have felt this so often ourselves, we have heard the feeling expressed so often from all classes, that we presume the fact will not be denied. The late venerable Dr. Miller, whose long and wide experience gave him the opportunity of correct judgment, was so sensible of this evil, that he devoted the last labours of his useful life to the preparation of a work on Public Prayer. Of the faults which he laments, he says, in his fourth chapter, he will mention only a few, and then enumerates no less than eighteen! Among these are the following: the frequent occurrence of set phrases; ungrammatical, or low colloquial forms of expression; want of order; minuteness of detail; excessive length; florid style; party or personal allusions; humorous or sarcastic expressions; turning the prayer into a sermon or exhortation; extravagant professions; want of appropriateness; want of reverence, &c., &c. If such evils exist, it is a sin to disregard them. It is a sin not to labour to correct them. As one means of such correction, not the only one, and perhaps not the most important one, would be a collection of prayers for public worship of established character, sanctioned by long approbation of the people of God, and by the authority of the Church; something sanctioned and not prescribed, as in the case of our Book of Psalms and Hymns. Such a book would afford models, guides, and helps which we

* See Dr. Miller's "Thoughts on Public Prayer," p. 294.

all need. It would be something which those who felt their weakness could fall back upon, and which even the strongest would in hours of depression be glad to resort to. It has often been said that there is no more propriety in a minister's using prayers prepared to his hand, than in his using sermons written by others. If he is fit to preach, he is fit to pray. There is, however, very great difference between the two cases. In preaching, the minister is not the organ of the people, in prayer he is. They listen to his preaching, they join in his prayers. It is of great importance to their spiritual edification and comfort that there should be nothing with which they cannot sympathize, or which offends or disturbs their feelings. If the preacher offends them, that is one thing, but when they themselves draw near to God, and are made to utter incoherent, wandering, or irreverent prayers, it is a very grievous affliction.

It is, however, quite as much in the celebration of the sacraments, and in the marriage and funeral services, as in public prayer, that the evils Dr. Miller complains of, are experienced. The sacraments are divine institutions intimately connected with the religious life of the Church, and inexpressibly dear to the people of God. A communion service properly conducted and blessed with the manifested presence of the Spirit of God, is like an oasis to travellers in a desert. It is not merely a season of enjoyment, but one in which the soul is sanctified and strengthened for the service of God. How often is the service marred, and the enjoyment and profit of the people hindered by the injudicious and unscriptural manner in which it is conducted. We do not now refer to the tedious length to which it is often protracted, or to the coldness or deadness of the officiating minister, but to the inappropriateness of the exercises. The true nature of the sacrament is lost sight of; incongruous subjects are introduced, and the communicant is forced either to strive not to listen to what the minister says, or to give up in despair all hope of really communing. Very often the introductory prayer is just such a prayer as might be offered in a prayer-meeting. It has no special reference to the Lord's supper. It includes such a variety of subjects—petitions for young and old, converted and unconverted, for revivals, for temporal

blessings—that it is absolutely impossible for the people to keep their minds on the service in which they are about to engage, and no less impossible that they should be in a proper frame of mind for it. Such a prayer is frequently soon followed by an address on any topic which happens to suggest itself; any truth of Scripture, or any duty, no matter whether it has any special reference to the Lord's supper or not. Sometimes in the very midst of the service the minister undertakes to explain the ordinance—to refute the doctrine of transubstantiation, or to establish the true doctrine concerning Christ's presence—or, he sets forth the qualifications for acceptable communion, and calls upon the people to examine themselves—or to do something else which is absolutely inconsistent with their doing what they then and there ought to do. The service is often ended with protracted prayer, embracing all the usual variety of topics and carrying the mind far away from the proper object of attention. We know from our own experience and from the testimony of innumerable witnesses, that this is a common and a very sore evil. The people of God are defrauded of their spiritual nourishment. They sit down to the table of the Lord, only to have the food withdrawn or withheld, and other things offered in its stead. This produces almost a feeling of resentment. It seems such a wanton injury.

It is absolutely essential to the proper and profitable celebration of the sacraments, first, that their true nature should be apprehended; and secondly, that the unity and harmony of the service should be preserved; that is, that nothing should be introduced into the prayers, or other portions of the service, which tends to divert the attention of the people from the one object before them. The celebration of the Lord's supper is an act of worship. It is an approach to God in Christ; it is a drawing near to the Son of God as the sacrifice for our sins. The soul comes with penitence, faith, gratitude, and love to the feet of Jesus, and appropriates the benefits of his death, and spiritually feeds on his body and blood. To disturb this sacred communion with the Saviour, by inappropriate instructions or exhortations, is to frustrate the very design of the ordinance. It produces the same effect upon a devout mind as is produced by sermonizing prayers, which render devotion impossible. It

is a very mistaken zeal for our Church, which leads any man to deny or to defend these frequent blemishes in her sacred services. The Presbyterian order of worship does not need such apologists.

The same general remarks are in a measure applicable to the mode of celebrating marriage and of conducting funerals. Our ministers and people feel the need of some practical directory and appropriate form for these solemn occasions, which are often rendered unimpressive and unedifying by the manner in which they are conducted.

One great advantage, therefore, which we think would attend the introduction of such a book as has been described, is the improvement it would tend to produce in the conduct of public worship, and in the celebration of other religious services. There is another advantage of scarcely less importance. There are literally thousands of occasions on which public worship should be conducted and the dead buried, when no minister is at hand. In vacant churches, destitute settlements, in the army, the navy, in merchant vessels, there is a demand for some authorized forms. For the want of a Presbyterian work of the kind intended, the English Prayer Book is used in all parts of the world. Our army and navy officers, when there is no chaplain, and when disposed to secure for those under their command the benefits of religious worship, no matter what their denominational connection, almost universally resort to the liturgy of the English Church. That book, therefore, has gone wherever the English language is used; and it will continue to be resorted to, even by Presbyterians, until their own Church provides a book better suited to their necessities. We are not unmindful of the excellent "Manual for Sailors and Soldiers" published by our Board; but it is evident we need a work of a wider range, and one having the sanction of antiquity and Church authority.

In the purity of our doctrine, in the scriptural character of our ecclesiastical polity, in the simplicity of our mode of worship, the Presbyterian Church has an exalted position, and a hold on the affections of her people, which nothing can destroy. But she has suffered more than can well be estimated from those faults in the conduct of her simple services, which our

most venerable ministers have so often pointed out, and from failing to supply her scattered children with those aids for religious worship which their exigencies demand. We do not desire to see anything introduced which would render our public services less simple than they are at present—but merely that means should be taken to secure that what is done should be done well. If God would put it into the heart of some man of large experience in the pastoral life, who has dwelt long upon the mount; a man familiar with the literature of the subject, and with the high intellectual gifts the work demands, to compile a book containing prayers for public worship, and forms for the administration of the sacraments, marriage and funerals, he would do the Church a great service, whether the book ever received the sanction of our ecclesiastical judicatories or not. As public attention, among Congregationalists, the Dutch Reformed, the German Reformed, and Presbyterian Churches, has become more or less turned to this subject, it is hoped that something may be done which shall be for the interest of the great non-episcopal portion of the Protestant communion.

It is a very common impression that any attempt to construct a Book of Common Prayer would be playing into the hands of the Episcopalians. First, because it would imply a concession in favour of liturgies; secondly, because no book which could now be framed, would be likely to compare favourably with the English Prayer Book; and thirdly, because it would be impossible to give to any new book the authority and sacredness which ages have conferred upon that. We cannot believe that anything which would really improve our public service, could operate unfavourably to the interests of our Church. There would be no concession to Episcopal usages, even if Presbyterians should return to the custom of their forefathers, and introduce a liturgy into all their churches. But this we regard as impossible and undesirable. We might as well attempt to restore the costume or the armour of the middle ages. There is a very great difference between the uniform and universal use of a form of prayer, and the preparation of forms to serve as models, and to be employed when no minister is present. As to the second consideration above mentioned, we are not disposed to admit the unapproachable excellence of the English

forms. The best parts of the English Prayer Book are derived from sources common to all Protestants. We believe a book could be prepared without including anything not found in the liturgies, framed by the continental Reformers, which, as a whole, would be far superior to any prayer-book now in use. As to the want of the sacredness which belongs to antiquity, this, of course for the time, is an unavoidable defect. The most venerable tree, however, was once a sapling. It is no good reason for not planting a tree, that it has not, and cannot have, the weight of centuries on its boughs. No man objects to founding a new college because it cannot at once be an Oxford or a Harvard. Besides, this objection would be in a measure obviated, by including in such a book nothing which had not been in the use of the Protestant Churches ever since the Reformation. Let it be remembered, that we have not advocated the introduction of a liturgy, but simply the preparation of a book which may be used as the occasion calls for it.

Thos. Hodges.

ART. VI.—*The General Assembly.*

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church met in the First Presbyterian Church, Nashville, Tennessee, at eleven o'clock, A. M., May 17th, 1855, and was opened with a sermon by the Rev. H. A. Boardman, D. D., Moderator of the last General Assembly, from 1 Tim. iii. 1: "This is a true saying, if a man desireth the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work."

After the sermon, the Moderator proceeded to constitute the sessions with prayer.

On motion, a Committee on Elections was appointed, consisting of Messrs. Gildersleeve, James Wilson, and Judge Fine, to whom any cases of informal commissions and want of commissions, should be referred in the organization of the Assembly.

The sermon of Dr. Boardman was, by a vote of the Assembly, referred to the Board of Publication to be published as a Tract.

The Rev. Nathan L. Rice D. D., of St. Louis was elected Moderator.

Theological Seminaries.

The second annual report of the Directors of the Danville Theological Seminary was read. Twenty new students have been received. There have been thirty-seven students present during the year. The report speaks encouragingly of the assiduity and piety of the students. Also that all the students had been taught, according to the plan of instruction adopted by the last Assembly, as one class, in all the various studies, with the exception of Hebrew, and the Faculty speak highly of the effect of this mode of instruction. The Trustees have purchased a valuable Library for \$5,000, which is especially rich in works relating to Ecclesiastical History, the Papal controversy, Polemic Theology and Biblical Literature. They have also purchased a suitable building for the students, and recitation rooms, &c. This arrangement is merely temporary. The Board discourages any curtailment of the time of vacation now extending through the summer. Some of the students have even now felt the pressure of their studies on their health. It had been hoped that the fund for the endowment of another Professorship would be provided by the Southwestern Synods, but the financial embarrassments of the past year have prevented any effort to make collections until after this meeting of the Assembly. The Board very earnestly calls the attention of the Assembly to the difficulty of obtaining the Presbyterial recommendation which is necessary for candidates desiring aid from the Board of Education, and requests that it may be made allowable for two of the Professors to give such recommendations. The report was referred to the Committee on Seminaries.

The second annual report of the Trustees of Danville Theological Seminary, was also read, which gives an encouraging account of the financial affairs of the institution. No subscriptions have as yet been made out of the bounds of the Synod of Kentucky; the Board believes that but very little of the amount subscribed will fail to be collected. The report was referred to the appropriate Committee.

The annual report of the Board of Directors of Union Theological Seminary was read. The report announced that there have been twenty-three students present during the year, of which twelve were new students. A donation of 175 volumes has been made to the Library. It contains at present 4184 volumes. The conduct and progress of the students have been commendable. Three students have finished their course of study during the year. Arrangements have been made to give instruction in the department vacated by the death of Professor Sampson, and means set in operation to endow a fourth Professorship. The report was committed as usual.

The report of the Board of Directors of the Western Theological Seminary was read. During the year fifty-two students have been present: of which twenty were new members. Eleven have been graduated. Mr. Samuel Wilson has been elected Assistant Professor in Hebrew and History, in order that the time of the other Professors may be more fully applied to the fulfilment of the duties of the fourth Professorship, which is now vacant. The Board ask that the same division of labour and departments be made in the Professorships as was made last year, with respect to Princeton—Dr. Elliot being made Professor of Polemic and Historical Theology and Church Government; Dr. Jacobus's chair being entitled that of Oriental and Biblical Literature and Exegesis, and Dr. Plumer's chair, that of Didactic and Pastoral Theology; and the remaining chair, now vacant, that of Ecclesiastical History and the composition and delivery of Sermons.

The forty-third annual report of the Board of Directors of Princeton Theological Seminary was read. The report shows that fifty-two students had been received during the year. The whole number present during the year was 109. One student has died. The conduct of the students has been exemplary. Several have the foreign missionary work in contemplation. Owing to frequent absence from examination at the end of sessions, a resolution was passed by the Board that no student then absent shall be admitted to his standing in his class next year, until after a satisfactory examination. Thirty-two students have been graduated. The Board recommend the increase

of the Professors' salaries to \$2,000 each, owing to the increased price of living.

The thirtieth annual report of the Trustees of Princeton Theological Seminary was read. It included the report of the Treasurer. By will of Miss Catharine Naglee, which has been decided by the courts, after litigation, in favour of the Seminary, the sum of \$9,053.06 has fallen to the Seminary fund, two-thirds of which have been paid. They have appropriated, according to the discretion given by the terms of the will, \$2500 of this fund as a Scholarship—to be called the Catharine Naglee Scholarship, and \$2800 to purchase a house, to be occupied by Dr. McGill. They report also the bequest of \$4000 by Mr. John Huff of Philadelphia, to be applied to education. Also a bequest of \$250 by Dr. Patrick Gannon of Albany, which is directed by the will to be loaned to indigent theological students, and returned by them when they are able. They report also various liberal donations to the library, among which are 730 volumes, many of which are very rare and valuable, from Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, from whom it is understood another donation will be soon made, including a library on the subject of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, amounting now to 1400 different publications; another on the Sabbath, numbering about one hundred different treatises; another on the Divinity of Christ, now numbering near 200 volumes; and another on Church Government; and another on the Baptist Controversy.

Various other donations have been made to the library from different individuals.

Memorial on Appeals and Complaints.

The Committee on Bills and Overtures reported an overture from the Synod of Cincinnati proposing the following question, viz., Does the language of the Book of Discipline, in Chap. vii. Sec. 4, imply that when notice of a complaint is given, the *reasons* of the complaint shall also be given as in the case of appeals?

On this overture the chairman of the committee stated that the committee were divided, the majority being in favour of recommending that an affirmative, and the minority recom-

mending that a negative answer be given. The report was accepted.

It was then moved that the report of the majority (which was the report of the committee) be adopted.

The adoption of the report recommending an affirmative answer to the above question, was advocated by Messrs. S. R. Wilson, Dumont, Peters, and Krebs, and opposed by Dr. Plumer, Messrs. Strahan, Banks, and Finley. Those who argued in favour of the report of the majority, urged that the reasons for a complaint should be given, as well as for an appeal, because the complaints and appeals are virtually the same. The opponents argued against the report, because complaints and appeals are different modes of redress. The fact is, they are alike in some respects, and they differ in others; and the Assembly were of opinion that the points in which they are alike, render the statement of the reasons as necessary in the one case as in the other, and therefore adopted the report of the majority.

Right of Presbyteries as to giving or withholding permission to prosecute a call, in certain cases.—The question was overtured whether, when a congregation and minister are agreed as to the amount of salary, the Presbytery has a right to refuse to install, because the salary is inadequate? The Committee recommended that the question be answered in the affirmative. Their report, after a slight debate, was adopted.

Board of Missions.

The Rev. Dr. Musgrave, Secretary of the Board, presented the report, of which the following is an abstract.

Operations of the Year—Statistical details.—The number of missionaries in commission, April 1, 1854, was 340, to which have been added, to April 1, 1855, 185, making the whole number 525, being more by two than in the year previous.

The number of churches and missionary stations, wholly or in part supplied, (so far as reported,) by our missionaries, is 819.

The number of newly organized churches, is 36.

The number of admissions on examination is 1,778, and on certificate 1,568, making a total of admissions of 3,346.

The number in communion with churches connected with the Board is 20,412.

The number of Sabbath-schools is 305; of teachers, 2,350; and of scholars, 14,548. (In this Report the Board have omitted all Union Schools, and have included only those which are Presbyterian or denominational.)

The number of baptisms is 2,125.

The number of houses of worship erected or finished is 51.

Of the 525 missionaries who have been in commission during the year, 179 have sent in no special report for the Assembly—more than one-third of the whole number; consequently we must increase all the returns one-third, to make them correct.

Appropriations.—The appropriations made to our missionaries from April 1, 1854, to April 1, 1855, have been, at the office in Philadelphia, \$48,735.42, and at the office in Louisville, \$25,759.00; making a total of \$74,494.42.

The appropriations made from April 1, 1853, to April 1, 1854, were, at the office in Philadelphia, \$42,547.50, and at the office in Louisville, \$32,874.42; making a total of \$75,421.92.

From this statement it appears that the appropriations made at the office in Philadelphia exceeded those made the year before, \$6,187.92, and at the office in Louisville they were less by \$7,115.42; thus making the total appropriations this year less than the year preceding, by \$927.50.

For the purpose of further comparison we may state, that the appropriations made from April 1, 1852, to April 1, 1853, were, at the office in Philadelphia, \$35,273.58, and at the office in Louisville, \$21,637.50; making a total of \$56,911.08.

From this statement, it appears that the appropriations made at the office in Philadelphia exceeded those made two years before \$13,461.84, and at the office in Louisville, \$4,121.50; thus making the total *excess* of appropriations this year above those made from April 1, 1852, to April 1, 1853, \$17,583.34.

Receipts.—The total amount of receipts from all sources from April 1, 1854, to April 1, 1855, is \$71,834.47; to which add balances on hand in the different Treasuries, April 1, 1854, \$22,654.58; making the available resources of the Board during the year, \$94,489.05.

The amount paid out at the different Treasuries for the same time, is \$78,944.76, leaving an available balance in all the Treasuries on the 1st of April 1855, of \$15,544.29. The amount due the missionaries at the same date was \$10,004.59, leaving an unexpended balance of \$5,539.70.

The aggregate receipts have fallen off, as compared with the preceding year, \$3,373.33. The falling off has been in individual or special donations and legacies \$2,827.03, and in the contributions of the churches \$546.30; owing no doubt to the pecuniary pressure and commercial embarrassment throughout our country during the past year. While the receipts at the office in Philadelphia, including the Presbyterial Treasuries were larger by \$1,958.76, the receipts at the office in Louisville show a falling off of \$5,332.09. The wants of the Western Executive Committee, were, however, fully met. Drafts by that Committee upon the Treasury at Philadelphia, during the year, to the amount of \$13,091.00, (which was more by \$7,600.60 than the year preceding,) were promptly paid, and repeated instructions forwarded by the Corresponding Secretary of the Board to that Committee, not to reduce their appropriations to the missionaries, nor to defer the payment of their salaries, but to draw promptly and freely upon the Treasury at Philadelphia, whenever their funds were insufficient to meet their liabilities.

The balance in the Treasury on the 1st of April, 1855, is less by \$7,110.29 than the amount which was reported in hand on the 1st of April, 1854. This in connection with the fact that at the close of the fiscal year, the amount due the missionaries was \$10,004.59, shows the indispensable necessity of enlarged contributions by the friends of the cause, and the imperative duty of increased caution on the part of Presbyteries in recommending, and the Board in granting future appropriations. Indeed it is obvious that unless the resources of the Board are augmented, they will not be able to continue much beyond this year, their present scale of appropriations without involving themselves in debt; and as the appointments are generally made for twelve months, if the current receipts are not increased as the year advances, retrenchment must

commence before the termination of the year, if a debt is to be avoided during the year succeeding.

Clothing.—Clothing valued at \$9,137 40 has been received during the year, and distributed among the missionaries who needed it. Of this amount, \$6,150,18 were received at the office in Philadelphia; \$2,107:34 at the office in Louisville; and \$879.88 at the depot in Pittsburgh. From the letters of the missionaries acknowledging the receipts of the clothing sent, we have no doubt that it has been very gratefully received, and that it has added very much to their health and comfort. Our friends, however, are cautioned against permitting their donations of clothing (which are never deducted from the salaries of the missionaries) to interfere with their *cash* contributions to the Board.

Resolutions of the General Assembly.

Dr. Backus, from the Committee on Domestic Missions, reported the following resolutions on the report of the Board:

Resolved, That the General Assembly has reason to express profound gratitude to Almighty God, for the success with which he has been graciously pleased to crown the efforts of our Church in the prosecution of this most important and interesting work. Notwithstanding the past year has been one of uncommon commercial embarrassment, and extensive failure of the crops throughout the country, which has affected severely all benevolent operations, yet the receipts have been but very slightly diminished; and the Board has been able to increase the number, and enlarge the salaries of its missionaries; and the Great Head of the Church, while granting no little encouragement to nearly all our missions, has visited many of the churches under the care of the Board with special outpourings of the Holy Ghost.

Resolved, That this Assembly would express its approbation of the faithful, judicious, and efficient execution, on the part of the Board and its officers, of the important trusts committed to them; and would call the attention of the Presbyteries and Churches to the earnest appeals made in the report in favour of a more diligent and liberal co-operation in this great work. No cause has a stronger claim upon the Christians of this land, with its immense territory and rapidly increasing population,

than that of Domestic Missions. The Assembly is pained, therefore, to learn that 1546, more than one half, of our churches, still withhold their contributions from this important work.

Resolved, That this Assembly approves of the conduct of the Board in increasing its appropriations to its missionaries; and while it earnestly desires that the present scale should be continued and even increased, yet it cannot recommend such an anticipation of funds as would involve any large debt at the close of the year; but would urge the Board and Presbyteries to renewed efforts to bring out the liberality of the churches, that while graduating their receipts they may still further increase them; that thus our missionaries may be relieved of many of those privations they have endured, and their efficiency and usefulness be greatly increased.

The Assembly moreover would embrace this opportunity to urge upon all our churches to cherish a deeper sense of their responsibility in this matter, and systematically to contribute of their substance to meet the increasing demands of our country and the world.

On motion of Dr. Plumer the following resolution was adopted, viz.

Resolved, That this Assembly rejoices in the evidences submitted to it, of the abundant labours and faithfulness of the Secretaries and other Executive officers of our several Boards; and feels it a privilege to give this public expression of its confidence in their wisdom and energy.

The subject of Church Extension embraced in the report of the Board of Missions, as it gave rise to the most protracted and interesting debate of the late Assembly, will be noticed under a distinct head.

Board of Education.

The report of this Board was presented by the Rev. Dr. Van Rensselaer.

Candidates.—The number of new candidates is 125, which is much the largest number of any year since the division of the Church. The number last year was 104, and in late years it has sunk down even to 60. Thanks be to God for his mercy! The total number of candidates on the roll this year is 364, against 342 of the previous year.

Officers and Agents.—Dr. James Wood has been chosen an Associate Secretary. Dr. McCluskey and Rev. Thomas Castleton have acted as agents in different parts of the field, but they have recently entered upon other arrangements.

State of the Treasury.—The total income of the year, in all departments, including balances, has been \$55,366.88, and the expenditures \$52,131.97. The Board will need an increase in its receipts next year, in order to continue the scale of increased appropriations to candidates, and to do justice to the work committed to their hands.

Christian Education in Schools, Academies and Colleges.—*Parochial or Primary Schools.*—Some new schools have been established during the year, several of which are of great interest and importance. But the aggregate number, judging from imperfect statistical returns, has not increased. The munificent sum of \$5,000 has been, for the third year, placed at the disposal of the Board, by one of the friends of the cause.

Presbyterial Academies.—The number of these institutions is fifty-two. They are found in all sections of the Church, and are doing a great work in the cause of literature and learning. Some of them have been favoured with revivals of religion during the year; and one of them reports, since its organization, the conversion of about one hundred of its youth, of whom ten or twelve are looking forward to the ministry.

Colleges.—The report gives a notice of each college under Synodical supervision. The total number of our ecclesiastical colleges, in operation, or with charters expecting to commence operations, is twenty. Several of these, however, are yet in their infancy, and most of them are struggling to effect an endowment. All such institutions have their trials and troubles; but the foundations must be laid in season, and the results be left with God.

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

Resolved, That the Assembly has heard with emotions of fervent gratitude to God, of the prosperity which has attended the operations of the Board during the past year; that our joy in view of the increased number of candidates for the ministry, is proportioned to the sorrow felt in former times, at the small-

ness of the numbers reported as seeking this holy office, and that we offer solemn thanksgiving to the Head of the Church for these gracious tokens of his favour.

Resolved, That while all suitable scriptural efforts should be made to enlighten the young men of the Church on the nature and importance of the Christian ministry, and so direct their thoughts to that field of labour, yet our Presbyteries ought to use great care in requiring of their candidates such gifts of intellect, learning, piety, and aptness to teach, as give reasonable assurance of usefulness in the sacred calling.

Resolved, That as the knowledge of God is almost the only knowledge that men cannot do without, so religious instruction is almost the only kind of instruction that may not be excluded from our schools, it being the end of learning "to repair the ruins of the fall by teaching to know God aright, and out of that knowledge to love him and obey him;" that, therefore, the General Assembly re-affirms its approval, so often expressed in former years, of the policy of the Board in reference to the establishment of Christian schools, academies and colleges.

Resolved, That this General Assembly, in recommending the establishment of institutions under its own care, has never intended to depreciate truly Christian schools, academies, or colleges, under private, corporate, or State management, but cordially acknowledges and welcomes them as co-partners in a great work, and invokes the blessing of God upon their instructions. And, although the public schools are far from being what they ought to be in respect to religious teaching, yet, instead of the withdrawal of Presbyterians from the support of the public system, the General Assembly recommends the putting forth earnest efforts, wherever practicable, to improve its condition, especially by keeping in the public schools the Bible, as the great text-book of human instruction.

Resolved, That the Presbyteries be reminded of the increased wants of the Board, and the necessity of increasing contributions to meet them, and that they be requested to adopt such measures for the accomplishment of the end in view, as to them may seem proper.

Resolved, That the General Assembly has a high appreciation of the importance of infant baptism, as an ordinance of

God and a means of grace, and enjoins it upon the pastors and elders of our churches to enlighten Christian parents on their duty and privilege, and to use all proper means to induce them to dedicate their offspring to God in this holy sacrament. Further, the Assembly earnestly calls the attention of the lower judicatories to the relation of baptized children to the Church, and recommends to church sessions to maintain a Christian watchfulness over these lambs of the flock, and to use faithful and affectionate efforts to bring them to the communion of the Church.

Resolved, That the Assembly has full confidence in the efficacy of prayer, and therefore, while it would exhort the members of all the churches under its care, to "pray without ceasing," that "the Lord of the harvest would send forth labourers into his harvest," it appoints the last Thursday of February, eighteen hundred and fifty-six, to be observed as a day of special prayer, for the outpouring of the Spirit on our baptized children and youth, more particularly those who are under instruction in our various institutions of learning, and recommends that public services be held in all our churches on that day.

Dr. Plumer said one of the resolutions called for the printing of the annual report. It is known there is a dispute in Scotland as to the plurality of Theological Seminaries. This report takes sides on that controversy. He moved that that part of the report be stricken out. The motion to strike out was carried.

Board of Publication.

Rev. Mr. Schenck, Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Publication, read the report of that Board, of which the following is an abstract.

The report reviewed three departments of the operations of the Board: 1st. The Department of Production. 2d. Of Distribution. 3d. Of Sustentation.

I. *Of Production.*—1st. The great object of this Board is to furnish to the Church and the world a religious literature. This literature is not to be either a substitute for, or a rival to the pulpit, but an auxiliary. Bible history contains many intimations of the propriety of making a vigorous use of the press,

many of which were noted: The providence of God teaches the same lesson. The Church must use the press in self-defence, for every evil principle is making diligent use of it. The Board of Publication is issuing and diffusing a literature which shall lead men to repentance, faith, duty, and finally to heaven. All other objects are subordinate to this. 2d. It is an object of the Board to set out the whole system of divine truth in all its completeness. It believes that this is the likeliest way to save souls. 3d. It is another object to provide a denominational literature. While it teaches to love all who bear the Saviour's image, it exhibits the peculiar claims of our own Zion on our love and veneration. 4th. It seeks to furnish such works as may be useful to ministers of the gospel. The minds of her ministers are the foundations from which the ordinary supplies of truth are derived by the Church. Many ministers are able to purchase very few theological works. The Board aims to supply the best, and as cheaply as possible, to them. 5th. It aims to supply a juvenile literature, especially a Sabbath-school library. Many of the numerous religious books now published, and especially for Sabbath-schools, are very defective. The Board aims by its publications, to "feed the lambs." 6th. The Board calls attention to the great variety of its publications.

The Publishing Agent reports that the Board has published, during the year ending March 31, 1855, as follows: 37 new books, of which 83,750 copies have been printed; 12 new tracts, including the "Presbyterian Almanac," of which have been printed 65,000 copies. Total copies of new books and tracts, 148,750. Reprints of former publications, 317,700 copies. Total copies of books and tracts, 466,450.

Total of copies of books and tracts published since the organization of the Board, 4,954,688.

Periodicals—Circulation of *Home and Foreign Record*, 17,000 copies; increase within the year, 1,750 copies. *Sabbath School Visitor*, 41,000 copies.

II. *Distribution*.—173 colporteurs have been labouring in 27 States and in the British Provinces. They have sold 97,853 volumes; given away 10,780 volumes; distributed 1,046,964 pages of tracts; number of families visited 79,092.

Donations made by the Executive Committee, 6,365 volumes, and 342,662 pages of tracts. Total number of volumes put in

circulation during the year in every way, 262,403. Let the distribution of the Board continue to extend at the same rate as for the last six years, and at the end of ten years it will be found distributing annually over two and a half millions of copies of its publications.

Receipts for the past year, from all sources,	\$87,599
Total payments for past year,	91,319
Excess of payments,	3,719
Receipts from sales of books,	65,793
do. for Colportage,	14,015
Balance now in Treasurer's hands,	14,476
Deficiency of Colportage Fund,	4,176

The number of churches contributing to Colportage is steadily increasing, although yet far too small. Very little collecting agency has been employed, and the Board has every reason to feel encouraged with the progress of the past year, and the prospects before it.

Dr. Jones stated that there was an entire unanimity among the members of the Committee on all the resolutions except the fourth. The resolutions are as follows:

The Committee to which was referred the report of the Board of Publication, together with sundry papers pertaining to the same general subject, submit for the consideration and action of this Assembly the following resolutions, viz.

Resolved, 1. That our ministers and elders be earnestly exhorted to secure a wide circulation to the "*Home and Foreign Record*," now published at so reduced a price, as to make it accessible to the poorest members of our Church.

Resolved, 2. That this Assembly regards with much satisfaction the efforts of the Board to provide a class of books appropriate to the wants of ministers, and also a choice collection of volumes suitable for Sunday-school libraries. It would also renew its recommendation of the "*Visitor*," believing it to be a valuable supplement to this department of our religious literature.

Resolved, 3. That we commend the policy of the Board in increasing, during the past year, the amount of donations of books to seminaries of learning, indigent ministers, and others;

and we recommend the continuance of the same policy, to the utmost extent compatible with the finances of the Board.

Resolved, 4. That the Board be instructed to prepare, with as much expedition as practicable, a collection of Tunes and Hymns, together with a system of instruction adapted to the young; in order, by this means, to promote the cultivation of sacred music by our youth, and to facilitate the use of this delightful part of devotional service in family worship; and in making this collection, the Board is authorized to add to such tunes and hymns as may be adopted from the "Psalmist," one-third as many more to be selected at its discretion. (Afterwards laid on the table.)

Resolved, 5. That the success attendant on the labours of our colporteurs calls for gratitude to the Head of the Church; and that we exhort all our churches and ministers to co-operate in this important department of labour, both by making annual collections for the Colporteur Fund, and by furnishing every facility for the thorough visitation of all our congregations by our colporteurs.

Resolved, 6. That we regard with special gratification the resolution of the Reformed Dutch Church to adopt and place its "*imprimatur*" on a portion of the volumes issued by our Board; and we hereby authorize the use of the German Hymn Book, prepared by the Reformed Dutch Church, in the German congregations belonging to our own branch of the Church.

Resolved, 7. That the matter of translating our Confession of Faith into the German language, be left to the discretion of the Board of Publication, and that it be recommended to increase the number of tracts, in the German language, already issued by our Church.

Resolved, 8. That the Board be authorized to make a selection, not exceeding fifty in number, from Rouse's version of the Psalms, and to have the same printed on separate sheets, in such forms as to admit of their being bound up with our other Psalms and Hymns, whenever desired.

Resolved, 9. That a preacher be appointed by this and ensuing Assemblies, to deliver a discourse before each General Assembly, in behalf of the Board of Publication, and the cause it is designed to promote.

Foreign Missions.

Rev. Joseph Warren, of Northern India, from the Committee on the Board of Foreign Missions, reported that they had examined their report, approved it, and recommended that it be printed. Also recommended the adoption of the following series of resolutions :

1. *Resolved*, That this Assembly desires to express the unabated interest of the Church in the work of Foreign Missions, still to approve the principle on which the work has been carried on by the executive committee and officers of the Board; and to render to our divine Master sincere thanks for all the encouragements that have attended it, during the past year, in connection with the missions.

2. *Resolved*, That we are especially bound to be grateful for the degree of interest felt on the subject by the churches, as manifested by the support the Board has received during a year of great financial embarrassments, the donations from the churches having largely increased, when no collecting agents were employed.

3. *Resolved*, That while the Assembly are encouraged by the advance of the spirit of evangelization, which is the spirit of Christ, thus exhibited by the churches, they are still grieved to recognize, in the absence of contributions, year after year, by many churches, the evidence that much is yet to be done to secure for the foreign missionary cause a proper place in the hearts of the people of God. Out of 2,976 churches, only 1,357 have reported collections for this cause.

4. *Resolved*, That it is the duty of every Christian in our communion, to work for Foreign Missions, and that, therefore, our pastors and church sessions will have failed in their duty, until an opportunity shall have been offered to every member of our churches to aid this cause.

5. *Resolved*, That the present remarkable state of the countries, in both Europe and Asia, calls loudly upon us to extend greatly our operations for the evangelization of the world; because our opportunities and means are the measure of our duty.

6. *Resolved*, That in order to enlarge our operations among the Indian tribes of North America, an opportunity for doing which has been so graciously afforded us, the Board be authorized and encouraged to employ such additional assistance as the exigencies of this branch of the missionary work may require.

7. *Resolved*, That this Assembly rejoices in what God has wrought for, and by, the ancient and honoured Church of the Waldenses; and regretting that there is still lacking the sum of \$7,000 of the \$20,000 which it was intended to raise in this country for the Theological Seminary of that Church, recommends the completion of that scheme to the benevolence of all our people, especially to those to whom God has entrusted abundant means.

The report was accepted.

The Committee also handed the Clerk a list of nominations for Directors, to fill vacancies occurring during the present session.

Walter Lowrie, Esq., Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions, addressed the Assembly at length, giving a detailed report of the agencies at work in the various foreign fields.

The following is an abstract of the printed report of the Board, which gives the most important statistical information:

Abstract of the Eighteenth Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Missions.

The Board acknowledge with gratitude to God their obligation for the distinguished favours that have been conferred upon every department of their work during the past year.

The receipts from all sources, including a balance

from last year of \$1,267.52,	\$184,074 17
-------------------------------	--------------

Expenditures,	175,705 10
---------------	------------

Leaving a general balance of	\$8,369 07
------------------------------	------------

Of which, unexpended amount of moneys received for sale of the Omaha Reservation, and appropriated to Indian Missions in Kansas and Nebraska,

\$8,282 00

Leaving a balance in the Treasury for the general purposes of the Board, of \$87 07

Publications.—The Board has continued to occupy the usual number of pages in the *Home and Foreign Record*, which has a circulation of something more than 16,000 copies.

Of the *Foreign Missionary*, 20,000 copies of the newspaper and 3,250 of the pamphlet edition of thirty-two pages, have been printed and circulated. Various circular letters have been printed and circulated among the churches, and upon these and the *Missionary Journals*, the committee have relied mainly to do their agency work.

Missionaries and Assistant Missionaries sent out.—Six Missionaries (one of whom had been in this country on a visit) and twenty-two male and female Assistant Missionaries, making 28 in all, have been sent out during the year.

Missions among the Indian Tribes.—The Board has seven Missions among the Indian Tribes, viz. among the Chippewas and Ottowas of the State of Michigan, among the Omahas of Nebraska, among the Iowas and Sacs of Kansas Territory, and among the Creeks, Seminoles, Chickasaws, and Choctaws of the Southwestern Indian Territory. Measures have been adopted for the commencement of a new Mission among the Ottoes of Kansas.

Connected with these Missions there are eleven stations and out-stations, and nearly as many more preaching places, eight Missionaries, sixty-three male and female Assistant Missionaries, and five Native Helpers; seven churches and two hundred and ten church members; eight boarding and two day schools, embracing five hundred and fifty pupils, in various stages of their education.

The number of communicants in connection with these churches, has more than doubled during the past year. The schools have had a larger number of pupils, and better attendance, than in former years; whilst most of the tribes, but especially those in the State of Michigan and in the Southwestern Territory, are making most encouraging progress in every department of civilization.

Missions in Africa.—The Board has two Missions in Africa;

one in Liberia, which operates upon the coloured emigrants and the natives of the country; and the other at the island of Corisco, twelve or fifteen hundred miles to the south and east of Liberia, and nearly under the equator, which operates exclusively upon the aboriginal population of that island and the neighbouring continent.

In connection with these Missions, there are six stations, six ordained Missionaries, three Licentiate Preachers, nine male and female Assistant Missionaries, of whom eight are white persons, and the remainder coloured emigrants from this country; seven schools, one of which is a classical school, with one hundred and fifty pupils; five churches, and about one hundred and fifty church members, being an increase of about thirty over the number reported last year. One small volume has just been printed in the language spoken by the Corisco people, and most of the Missionary brethren there are engaged in the study of the language, and will soon be able to proclaim the unsearchable riches of Christ to thousands of the people around them in their own tongue.

Missions in India.—In India, the Board has four Missions, viz. Lodianna, Furrukhabad, Agra, and Allahabad; thirteen stations and out-stations; twenty-six ordained Missionaries, two of whom are natives of India; twenty-three female Assistant Missionaries from this country; thirty-four Native Helpers; eleven churches, with two hundred and ninety native communicants; four printing presses, from which have been issued over 8,000,000 pages; thirty-six schools, several of which are high schools, with upwards of 4,700 pupils. These statistics show an increase of two churches, thirty native converts, about 1,700 pupils, and 5,000,000 printed pages over the last Annual Report.

Some of the church members have finished their course and have been enabled to triumph over the last enemy. There is still a loud call for more labourers in this field.

Mission in Siam.—In Siam there is one Mission, connected with which there are two ordained Missionaries, one Licentiate Preacher and physician, two assistant female Missionaries, and one Native Helper; one boarding school, with twenty-six pupils.

The missionaries have sustained the usual religious services, and have devoted more time than usual to missionary tours in different parts of the country, and in some regions where the gospel has never before been heard. One of the missionaries is still engaged in the work of translating the Scriptures in Siamese. The report contains brief notices of large unevangelized communities, other than the Siamese, but who are accessible at Bangkok, and to whom the gospel might be preached. Who will be the first to go and carry them the glad tidings of salvation?

China.—The Board has three missions in China, viz. at Canton, Ningpo, and Shanghai, and a mission, also, to the Chinese, in California. Connected with these missions there are fourteen ordained missionaries, two physicians, fifteen female missionary assistants, three native helpers, eight schools, with one hundred and seventy pupils, two printing-presses, from which have issued upwards of 4,000,000 pages. The missionaries have been actively employed in the various duties of preaching, translating, teaching, distributing religious books and tracts; and those of the medical profession in the duties of the dispensaries, in addition to their other labours.

Mission in South America.—The only mission that has yet been established in South America, is at Buenos Ayres, and this, though of only one year's continuance, has already received very encouraging tokens of the divine favour. Measures have been adopted for the commencement of another mission at Bogota.

Missions to Papal Europe.—The Board has no missionaries in Europe under their immediate direction. Their appropriations have been made to evangelical societies, which are known to be prosecuting the work of evangelization with zeal, energy and wisdom; and the results of their labours, especially in France and Italy, are most encouraging. The appropriations made by the committee to these societies, including \$4,827.88, contributed for the endowment of the Theological Seminary at La Tour, during the year, have amounted to \$12,613.98.

Mission to the Jews.—The Board has three missionaries among the Jews of this country—viz. in New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore—two ordained ministers, and one licentiate

preacher. These missionaries have free access to their brethren in all these places, and in many cases, it is believed, with happy results.

Summary.—The Board has under its direction, besides what is done for Papal Europe, twenty separate missions; 59 ordained missionaries, 5 licentiate preachers, 114 male and female assistant missionaries, 43 native helpers, 25 churches, and about 659 native communicants; 26 schools and 6,596 pupils; 6 printing-presses, from which have been issued more than 12,000,000 of pages during the year.

Systematic Benevolence.

Dr. Thornwell, chairman of the Committee on Systematic Benevolence, presented the report. It sets forth the following points: That the benefactions of God's Church have been lamentably small; that our people have been too much in the habit of looking on giving as a matter of Christian liberty; those who apply for aid to any great cause, have been regarded as beggars. The reason of this has not been because the people of God are niggardly, but because the principle of giving has been misunderstood. The Scripture view is clear. It is God who honours us in receiving our gifts, instead of our honouring him, or rather he honours us in permitting us to honour him. We are the beggars who solicit the favour of having our gifts accepted. Thus almsgiving has ever been found a blessing to the donor. This principle needs to be extensively understood. This alone is necessary in order to excite our people to do their full duty in this matter. The Assembly have done right in urging all the churches to cultivate this grace. The pastoral letter of the Synod of Baltimore on this subject received special commendation, and a wider circulation of it was suggested. It also recommended the re-enacting of the resolutions of last year.

Who have a right to vote for Pastors?

The Committee of Bills and Overtures reported an Overture from the Rev. Angus Johnston, asking, whether baptized persons attending and supporting a Church should be allowed to vote for pastors.

Considerable adversity of opinion seems to have prevailed as to the proper answer to be given to this question. The Committee recommended that it should be answered, by saying, that communicants in good standing, baptized persons attending and supporting the Church and submitting to its authority, are entitled to vote in the election of pastor—thus restricting the right of suffrage to communicants and baptized persons. Dr. Plumer moved to strike out that part of the report allowing baptized persons, not communicants, to vote; thus restricting the right to those in full communion. This view was sustained by Rev. Mr. Hart, Mr. Hays, and Dr. James Smith; the last named gentleman stated, that in the congregation of which he is pastor, the baptized persons and those contributing to the support of the gospel, but not communicants, had under his influence, publicly renounced their right to vote. He said, he would be much mortified to see the Assembly take opposite ground. Judge Fine said there were two classes of persons entitled to vote for pastor; first, church members, and second, those contributing money to support the pastor, and as the overture simply asked, whether baptized persons, when not communicants, had a right to vote, he proposed the assembly should answer by a simple, Yes. This would give the right of suffrage to communicants and contributors, whether baptized or not. Finally the whole subject was laid on the table and the overture dismissed without an answer. The Assembly no doubt preferred allowing the several congregations to act as they saw fit in the premises, under the general guidance of the Book, which says, “In the election of a pastor, no person shall be entitled to vote, who refuses to submit to the censures of the church, regularly administered; or who does not contribute his just proportion, according to his own engagements or the rules of the congregation, to all its necessary expenses.” As this excludes from the right of voting only those who refuse to submit to censure, or neglect to contribute to the necessary expenses of the congregation, it follows that all other members of the congregation, whether communicants or baptized, or neither, are entitled to vote. It seems to us, therefore, that the view presented by Judge Fine is the only one consistent with our Book. At the same time, if any congregation chooses

to restrict the right to narrower limits, they are free to do so, provided they do not violate the rule quoted above. We are glad to see the Assembly declining to answer questions which the Book has already settled. If the motion to restrict the right of voting to communicants had prevailed, it would have effected a change in our standards, and, therefore, been null and void.

Synod of Baltimore.

The Rev. Dr. Backus presented a memorial from ministers and elders of the Presbytery of Baltimore, and also one from the ministers and elders of the Presbytery of Carlisle, asking the General Assembly to dissolve the Synod of Baltimore, erected last year. Rev. Mr. Henry presented a protest from the Presbytery of Baltimore against dissolving the Synod of Baltimore, and also the action of the said Synod to the same purpose. A paper was also presented from the Synod of Philadelphia, asking that the Synod of Baltimore should be dissolved, or that the Presbytery of Carlisle should be restored to the Synod of Philadelphia; also, a memorial from the Presbytery of Philadelphia asking that in case the Presbyteries of Carlisle and Baltimore wished to be restored to the Synod of Philadelphia, this be done.

These papers were referred to a select committee, which subsequently, through their chairman, Professor Phillips, made a report, recommending the continuance of the Synod of Baltimore, composed substantially of its present Presbyteries, directing the Synods of Philadelphia, Baltimore and Virginia, to settle their respective boundaries, as best to secure the efficiency of their own bodies, the convenience of individual members, and the harmony of the Church; and further recommend to the parties concerned to agree that the Susquehanna river be the western boundary of the Presbytery of Donegal, and also to consider whether it will not be the best for their own interests to detach the Presbytery of Huntingdon from the Synod of Philadelphia, and attach it to the Synod of Baltimore, and to transfer the Presbytery of Luzerne from the Synod of New Jersey to the Synod of Philadelphia, and that the Rappahannock river be the boundary between the Presby-

tery of Winchester in the Synod of Baltimore and the Presbytery of East Hanover in the Synod of Virginia, according to the petition of the church in Fredericksburg, and the consent of the Synods interested.

The Rev. Dr. Backus moved the indefinite postponement of that report, to offer a paper proposing to dissolve the Synod, and restore the Presbyteries to their former connection, and directing the Synod of Philadelphia to take the division of that body into consideration, and report to the next Assembly such a line of division as, placing the cities of Baltimore and Philadelphia in different Synods, shall best promote the convenience and wishes of its members, and the advancement of religion in its bounds.

The Rev. Dr. Backus said the committee, though aiming to act in a conciliatory manner, had regarded the question as one of etiquette, and had omitted all reference to principles. He admitted that there had been some feeling excited by this subject, and that it had manifested itself through the press. A periodical of some little notoriety has actually been sent here for circulation, to bear upon this question, a reply to which, in proper terms, would require the use of language unbecoming this House. He wished to say, however, that the charge that the Secretary of the Board of Missions had meddled with this subject, was entirely without foundation. He had kept aloof from it.

In the remarks he would make, he contended, 1. That the practice of dividing a Synod without consulting, is contrary to the spirit of our constitution, and tends to create dissatisfaction, and opens the door to disorder. This principle seems to have been admitted from the origin of our Church, with but few exceptions, and some of these exceptions were afterwards reversed. Dr. Backus cited a number of cases, showing, in numerous instances, where the Assembly had been applied to, to change boundary lines, &c., and where the Assembly had steadfastly refused to grant the requests, simply upon the ground that parties interested had not been consulted. For instance, in 1839, the Synod of Mississippi and Presbytery of Tombigbee sent up a petition to the Assembly to include the Presbytery of Tombigbee in their bounds; but the Assembly

refused on the ground that the Synod of Alabama had not been consulted. The next year, and the next, the subject was brought up in the same form, and the Assembly refused to grant the request because the Synod of Alabama had not acted; and to grant the petition without such action, would be affecting the constitutional rights of that Synod.

The Assembly does not divide Synods, nor Synods Presbyteries, nor Presbyteries churches, without consulting them. What would members of any Presbytery here say, were their Synod to cut their Presbytery in two without saying a word to them about it? Or, what would you say, if this Assembly this year should, without consulting you, cut your Synod in two, no matter how sincere the representations that it was for your good and that of the Church? The Synod is placed there to have charge of that particular section of the Church; and by calling its Presbyteries together, all necessary arrangements can be made for such action as may be desired. Is there any thing in this oldest Synod of yours that she should be treated so unceremoniously? It has been said that this Synod has had this subject before it for twenty years, and has been unable to come to any decision. But it has been before the Synod but five times in twenty years, and one of those times the Synod petitioned to be divided, and the Assembly refused to do it.

It was urged in the last Assembly that such a city as Baltimore ought to be the centre of a Synod; but will it be believed that eleven out of fourteen of the ministers in the city of Baltimore are opposed to any such Synod, according to the division which has been made?

2. The act of the last Assembly in dividing the Synod of Philadelphia, and erecting the Synod of Baltimore, was an aggravated case of interference with the rights of an inferior judicatory. The brethren who took the lead in that movement, were ignorant of the true state of the case. It is not true, as has been asserted, that the last Assembly had all the facts before them. The ignorance of the promoters of this scheme, appears in the fact that the old Synod of Philadelphia is cut into two separate parts. This may be said to be a matter of little importance; but you surely do not intend to chop up the

Church in this fashion. Three of your Presbyteries have shown their strong desire to have you retrace your steps, and the others concerned seem to admit that there should be some modification.

No lines in our Church deserve to be drawn with more care than those of this Synod. The old Synod, extending over Mason and Dixon's line, was a band to bind together our country's union. The brethren who moved in this matter agree that to retain this feature is an important point. But by the present arrangement scarcely any territory from the slave States is left in the Synod of Philadelphia, and, therefore, you at once establish sectional lines. Again: The whole tendency of this division is to draw brethren off from institutions with which they have always been connected, and attach them to those to which they do not naturally belong. Is it fair for brethren to come in among us, and attempt to disturb our old attachments, before they are hardly warm in their seats? As things stand, there must be a constant contention on this subject, or one party or the other must succumb.

Moreover, unless you reverse the decision of the last Assembly, you establish a *precedent*, which he could not believe this body would be willing to do. All he asked was that the Assembly would just put them where they were before; and then direct the Synod in any way you choose. This is not only the constitutional method, but it is the only practical way to do what needs to be done. The Synod of Baltimore cannot, by any possibility, of itself make the lines satisfactory. The Synod of Philadelphia was engaged in a course for bringing about a division, when you unceremoniously took your knife and cut us in two. He hoped they would place the old Synod where they found it, and allow them some voice in fixing their own lines.

Rev. Mr. Emerson said he represented the Presbytery of Carlisle. He referred to the Book for the constitutional right to divide Synods. For twenty years it had been felt that the Synod of Philadelphia should be divided, but the Presbyteries never could agree; and there was a prospect that there never would be a division if the matter was left to them. For this reason the matter was brought before the last Assembly.

Three Presbyteries had acted in the matter before it came before that Assembly, and in favour of it. The Presbytery of Carlisle instructed its Commissioners to the General Assembly to take ground in favour of the decision. The Synod was erected by the Assembly, but no sooner was it done, than an anonymous paper was circulated, urging the members of Carlisle Presbytery not to attend the new Synod, but to go to the Synod of Philadelphia. [Mr. Emerson then read the action of the Synod of Baltimore, protesting against its being dissolved.] We have heard a great deal about taking care that these ecclesiastical divisions should not become sectional lines. But as things now stand, both the Synods of Philadelphia and Baltimore extend across Mason and Dixon's line. Immediately on the adjournment of the Synod of Baltimore, secret emissaries had pervaded their churches, with persuasions and entreaties to them to go back to the Synod of Philadelphia. But, with the matter fully before them, the Presbytery of Carlisle had voted nineteen to twelve against the proposal to go back to the old Synod, or against dissolving the new Synod. Carlisle Presbytery wishes that the General Assembly will let them alone. He was astonished to find a protest here from thirteen ministers and a large number of ruling elders against the action of the last Assembly. Of these ministers, six are not pastors; and of the elders, many are in the same church, or in vacant churches.

But you are counselled to dissolve this Synod for the sake of peace. But it will *not* promote peace to send us back where we do not wish to go, and such a course would assuredly divide Carlisle Presbytery. He had seen a map of the territory circulated here, to show that the territory of the Synod of Philadelphia had been cut in two by the new Synods. He denied it. There is a right of way of fifty miles or more of territory, which they may occupy if they choose. The reason they have to go through Baltimore Synod is because the railroads run that way.

Rev. Mr. Sheddan said he held in his hand the map which had been alluded to. He had felt some indignation that he had been accused of showing it around in this Assembly. He spurned such an imputation. He had brought it here this

morning because the subject was to come up, and it had simply got out of his hands for a few moments.

Rev. Dr. Andrews here stated that the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia had resolved that it was expedient to abide by the decision of the last Assembly.

Mr. Sheddan resumed, and explained the map he held in his hand, showing that the right of way alluded to was thirty miles of mountains, occupied by nobody, and that the Synod of Philadelphia was virtually cut in two. He had been in the Synod of Philadelphia before his removal to New Jersey, and he would say there was never a more united Synod; and he knew, by his own observation, that Carlisle Presbytery was strongly attached to Philadelphia. The Synod of Philadelphia was caught napping last year; and then it was that the knife was inserted. Now there could come up to you nearly half of Baltimore, and nearly half of Carlisle, and say, We are unwilling to be separated from our old relations. It has been said Carlisle would divide if restored to Philadelphia; but there is evidence enough that there is contention there already, and that it will be there whether you restore them or not.

Rev. Dr. Spotswood presented the instructions of the Presbytery of New Castle—the oldest but one of the Presbyteries of our Church, and therefore entitled to some consideration. There is no excitement in his Presbytery on the subject, and they will acquiesce in any measure the Assembly may adopt. They are in favour of the motion for dissolving the new Synod. They are dissatisfied because the Assembly did not act with due courtesy, and also dissatisfied with the lines.

Professor Charles Phillips, from the Committee on the subject, said the Committee had heard the parties, and had hoped that some things said here would have been omitted. He then read the report they had presented, explaining its details, and justifying the course recommended. Nothing material had been said here this morning, which was not heard by the last Assembly. The Assembly has a right to come in and settle the bounds of Synods and Presbyteries, although this right should be exercised with courtesy. The Synod of Virginia, in this particular case, had been treated with as much discourtesy

as the Synod of Philadelphia, and yet they had said nothing about it.

Rev. Mr. Wilson of Winchester had hoped that the report of the committee would have been adopted. Among the first things he had learned, was to regard with veneration the acts of the General Assembly. At Buffalo, it was understood that the subject had been thoroughly canvassed in the lower judicatories, and petitions had been adopted by them and sent up to the Assembly. The Presbytery to which he belonged had with difficulty come to the resolution to ask the General Assembly to unite them to the new Synod. They had entertained great regard for the brethren of their previous connection. But since it had been done, they had seen it to be best. The fact that the Synod of Philadelphia objected to the decision of the Assembly should not be a reason for a reversal of the last Assembly's order. Other Synods had been thus divided by lines not altogether agreeable to them, but they had submitted. So should the Synod of Philadelphia do. They have promised to do so in their ordination vows. The Assembly has not transcended its powers. Why should not its decision be acquiesced in? He was greatly amazed at the declaration of his brother, Dr. Backus. The last time he had seen Dr. Backus was at the close of the second meeting of the Synod of Baltimore. Dr. Backus had there voluntarily arisen and stated, that although at first opposed to the division, he was now satisfied, and that from his first hearing of the Assembly's vote he had determined to bow to that decision, and give his cordial support to the new Synod. How had he fulfilled that resolution? He was also amazed because Dr. Backus's opposition was founded on reasons which do not exist. He had said he was fearful that there would be a drawing off from the institutions to which he was attached. There was no ground for such a fear. Not one of the members of those Southern Presbyteries would interfere with any brother's preference. Could Dr. Backus suppose that the speaker could ever lift *his* hand or voice against the beloved institution at Princeton, where he had sat at the feet of the same venerated instructors? He had preached in three States, and there is no more promising field than that lying between the two existing Synods.

There were no Presbyterian churches there, and he thought it well that members in passing through that section should see it. He wished the conservative influence of these Synods to be preserved. Winchester and Eastern Shore Presbyteries are unanimous in this request. So is a majority of Carlisle Presbytery. Shall we, then, go home, spend a year in contest, and then come up to make the same request? He believed that the last General Assembly had acted wisely with all the facts before them, and he hoped that the present Assembly would confirm their decision. His impression was that this opposing influence was outside of the Synod, and if those outside would only let them alone, it would be seen that the new Synod was an efficient one, and that they could act in harmony. But any other course will increase the difficulties already existing. He hoped, therefore, that the Synod should be continued until facts showed that they deserved censure, or until it was shown by their opposition to their sister Synod that they ought to be disbanded.

Rev. Mr. Lapsley moved to lay the resolution of Dr. Backus on the table, and the motion was carried.

The question then recurred on the report of the Committee. The previous question was called for and sustained.

The report of the Committee embracing the preamble and resolutions was then adopted, and is as follows:

The Committee to whom were referred the papers relating to the Synod of Baltimore, reported that they find the matter in hand to be one of much difficulty and delicacy—one in which the feelings and the rights of beloved and esteemed brethren are deeply interested, and, therefore, one demanding much prudence and forbearance from all those immediately concerned; that the last Assembly had before it nearly all the material facts in the case, and that, whatever acts of discourtesy it may have committed, it but exercised what all admit was a power within its hands, although perhaps, an extreme one. The question is then reduced mainly to one concerning the propriety of certain boundaries of the Synod of Baltimore and Philadelphia. The Committee therefore unanimously recommend the following resolutions.

Resolved, 1. That the Synod of Baltimore be continued, composed substantially of its present Presbyteries.

Resolved, 2. That the Synods of New Jersey, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Virginia be, and they are hereby directed so to settle their respective boundaries, as to best secure the efficiency of their own bodies, the convenience of their individual members, and the harmony of the Church.

Resolved, 3. And the Committee recommends further, that it be suggested to the parties concerned, to agree that the Susquehanna river be the western boundary of the Presbytery of Donegal; and also to consider whether it will not be the best for their interests to detach the Presbytery of Huntingdon from the Synod of Philadelphia, and attach it to the Synod of Baltimore, and to transfer the Presbytery of Luzerne from the Synod of New Jersey to the Synod of Philadelphia, and that they all shall report to the next General Assembly.

Resolved, 4. That the Rappahannock river be established as the boundary between the Presbyteries of Winchester in the Synod of Baltimore, and of East Hanover in the Synod of Virginia, according to the petition of the church in Fredericksburg, and the consent of the Synods interested.

Delegates to, and from other Churches.

The Rev. Mr. Cumming was the delegate from the General Association of New Hampshire. The statistical information communicated, is to be found in the following paragraphs of his address :

“*Mr. Moderator* :—It is with pleasure that I extend to this Assembly the Christian salutation of the General Association of New Hampshire. Our General Association embraces one hundred and fifty eight ministers, divided into fourteen local Associations. We have on our minutes 187 churches, a few of which belong also to the Londonderry Presbytery. These churches contain 20,309 communicants. During the past year no general revival of religion has been experienced, yet we have enjoyed gentle showers in many places. Our Missionary Society is earnestly looking after the feeble and destitute churches, and trying to build up the waste places. Our treasury has received \$8,723 during the year, of which about

3,000 has been paid to the American House Missionary Society in New York, and the balance expended in sustaining forty-five missionaries in forty-nine feeble churches and congregations.

“Our Bible Society has raised about \$7,000, distributed 28,000 Bibles and Testaments, and by its Colporteurs visited 46,000 families. We design to have the whole State supplied as often as once in five years, and many places every year.

“Sabbath-schools are sustained in all our churches. They are attended by a large portion of our congregations, as well adults as children. Our Sabbath-school libraries furnish a large portion of our families with choice reading matter. Our Common-School system pervades the whole State, and every child from four to twenty has an opportunity of obtaining a good English education. Of a population of 320,000, 90,000 are reported as attending our Common-Schools. To sustain these schools, the State raises by tax \$205,000. We have also fifty-three incorporated Academies. The venerable Dartmouth College is efficiently pursuing its work under a corps of nineteen officers, with three hundred and fifty-three students. Our expenses for education are not less than \$300,000 for tuition; and including board, books, &c., would probably not fall below $1\frac{1}{2}$ millions.”

The Rev. Messrs. Sabin and H. M. Storrs, delegates from the General Association of Massachusetts, informed the Assembly that there were in connection with the Association over 500 ministers and about the same number of churches; that the Unitarians, formerly nearly equal in number to the Orthodox, were now reduced to 160 ministers; and that the Theological Seminary at Andover was in a flourishing condition, having one hundred students, a larger number than they had had for several years. Mr. Storrs said he was surprised to learn, since his visit to the West, that the people of Massachusetts were regarded as a staid, sober and settled community; whereas in fact there is no State in which thought is so unsettled, where Infidelity and Romanism are so active, if not so powerful.

This is a statement the correctness of which we do not question. It suggests an inquiry into the causes of this remarkable fact. Why is it that in a community founded by one

of the most orthodox and pious set of men the world ever saw, where the truth has always been free, where intelligence and education are more generally diffused than in any other community of equal extent on earth, why is it that in such a community thought is more unsettled, that Unitarianism is so prevalent, and that Infidelity and Romanism are more active than in any other State of the American Union? All such results are doubtless due to the joint operation of many causes. We do not pretend to be able to indicate them. We, however, are satisfied that one of the most efficient is to be found in the unscriptural church organization, which has prevailed in Massachusetts. If God has ordained a particular form of church polity, a departure from that form must inevitably be productive of evil. We believe that the independency of each worshipping assembly, is just as unscriptural and just as much opposed to the genius of Christianity, as the independence and isolation of each individual Christian man. Where there is no discipline over churches, the result must be the same, as where there is no discipline over individuals. If any Christian church should be organized on the principle of allowing every member to hold and profess just what opinions he pleases, it would very soon lose its distinction as a Christian character altogether. In like manner, where a denomination, or community of individual congregations, is organized on the principle of Independency, that community will be apt to lose its Christian character. If a garden is conducted on the plan of letting the weeds and fruits have an equal chance, the weeds will soon overrun the ground. There is a difference between license and liberty. The latter is not inconsistent with authority and supervision. What would become of a State in which each county and township was independent of all the rest? What would become of our national union, if we had no common legislature or judiciary? What would become of the Presbyterian Church, if one congregation might be Augustinian, another Pelegian, and another Socinian? So long as any man is free to join the Presbyterian Church or not, and so long as he is liable to no civil pains or penalty for renouncing its faith, there is nothing inconsistent with religious liberty in the exercise of spiritual discipline over all the churches embraced in

our communion. That thought is more unsettled and infidelity more active in a community in which Independency has been more fully carried out, than any other in our country, is just what, according to our views, might have been expected.

The Rev. Mr. Thayer, the delegate from the Consociated Churches of Rhode Island, stated in his address, that there were 53 churches with 2500 churches included in their body, which were in a prosperous condition.

Delegates were, as usual, appointed to represent the Assembly before the General Associations of New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Rhode Island. The Assembly declined to continue the interchange of delegates with the General Association of Connecticut, on account of the offensive character of the communications from that body, and for other reasons. Those reasons we have not seen fully stated in any report of the proceedings of the Assembly, but from what we know of the facts of the case, we are persuaded that the publication of the report of the committee, on whose recommendation the Assembly acted, will satisfy the Christian public that the discontinuance of our correspondence with the General Association of Connecticut was due to our self-respect and to the cause of truth.

The committee also recommended that in accordance with the action of the Assembly of last year no delegate should be appointed to the Synod of the German Reformed Church. This recommendation was not adopted, and after some debate, on the motion of Dr. Krebs, the committee were instructed to nominate delegates to that body. When, however, the nomination was made, Dr. Plumer, in view of the difference of opinion as to the propriety of sending any delegate, moved to lay the subject on the table, which motion was carried; and therefore no delegate was appointed.

Ashmun Institute.

Rev. A. Hamilton, D. D., from the Presbytery of New Castle, addressed the Assembly in regard to the interests of the Ashmun Institute. The name chosen for the Institute was that of an early and devoted friend of the African race. Its location is within the bounds of the New Castle Presbytery, which embraces Chester county in Pennsylvania, New Castle in Del-

aware, and Cecil county in Maryland. Its aim is thoroughly to educate pious young coloured men so that they may be able to preach to and teach their own race here and in Africa. A charter has been secured from the State of Pennsylvania. Local agents have been appointed, and about \$2,000 secured. A few words in regard to the necessity of such an institution: No such institution exists in our country. It is needed, for no college in the North or West admits them. There are occasional exceptions to this. The Governor of the State of Maryland, in Liberia, graduated at Bowdoin College, and is a man of fine talents. His State papers would do no discredit to the Governor of any of our States.

We have forty coloured churches in New Castle. The coloured people have a great tendency to segregate themselves in their religious worship, from the whites, and few coloured preachers have more than a common education. As a general thing, far more is doing in the South for them than elsewhere. Many men devote much of their time to preaching to the slaves—who does not recollect Dr. C. C. Jones?—some their entire time in this way. Our missionary efforts in Africa need them. White men only can labour there as a forlorn hope. Does not the General Assembly owe it to herself, placed as she is by God's providence, to use her efforts to elevate, educate and christianize the African race? Will she not help us in some way?

Dr. Plumer introduced the following resolutions in regard to the Ashmun Institute.

Resolved, That this General Assembly has heard with pleasure of the design and practical effort on the part of the Presbytery of New Castle, to establish a school in which coloured young men of piety may receive a thorough Classical and Theological education, fitting them for the work of the ministry, and for teaching among the destitute thousands of this country, and the millions of Africa.

Resolved, That we regard this work as an important preliminary work, aiming at the highest good of the African race, wherever found; and hereby express our cordial approbation of it, and recommend our churches cheerfully and liberally to cooperate in this work of faith and labour of love.

These resolutions were advocated by Drs. Plumer, Boardman, and S. R. Wilson, and adopted.

Commissions.

Dr. Lacy, from the Judicial Committee, reported on the resolution offered by Dr. Wines, instructing the Judiciary Committee to consider some action looking to the relief of the General Assembly in judicial cases, either the appointment of a commission to hear and issue such cases, or the adoption of an overture to be sent down to the Presbyteries, or some other plan.

In regard to the first suggestion, the committee reported it unconstitutional, and the second inexpedient; which conclusions the report argued at some length, and further reported by a small majority that it was inexpedient to attempt any change.

Judge Fine submitted a minority report favouring an amendment in the constitution, and proposing an overture to be sent down to the Presbyteries, asking—Shall the constitution be so amended as to terminate all judicial cases originating in church sessions in the Synod, and all originating in Presbyteries, in the General Assembly?

When the subject came up for discussion, Dr. Wines moved a resolution declaring that so much of the report of the committee as pronounced the appointment of a commission by the Assembly, unconstitutional, be not approved. His argument in support of this resolution embraced the following points.

1. The General Assembly is a representative body, and does not act from powers original and primary. Its powers are not so extensive as those of the old Synod, which was a meeting of all the Presbyteries in one body. "The General Assembly is vested only with defined powers, which it cannot enlarge without the original constituencies—the Presbyteries."

This is a very common theory, but in our opinion an erroneous one, with respect to our constitution. All legitimate church courts act from inherent primary powers. Neither Session, Presbytery, Synod, nor Assembly, derives its powers from the constitution. The constitution is of the nature of a treaty, or compact between different portions of the Church, as to the way

in which their inherent powers may be exercised. If a Presbytery may ordain, or try a minister, what is to hinder a Synod or a General Assembly doing so? Nothing in the world but an agreement that they will not exercise these powers. All church councils representing the church are vested with all church power. A Presbytery may do all that a Session may do; a Synod can do all that a Presbytery or Session can do; and the General Assembly can do all that a Synod, Presbytery or Session can do—except so far as their hands are tied by a written agreement. Even a Presbytery can exercise its inherent powers only according to the prescriptions of the constitution. It is not the true theory of our government, therefore, that the General Assembly has only delegated powers. It has all church power, legislative, judicial and executive—though the exercise of these powers, as in the case of the Presbytery, is limited and guided by a written constitution; and therefore it is true that our Assembly, under the limitation of the constitution, has not the powers of the original Synod, of which it is the successor. Still the distinction here stated is one of importance. Much depends on the question, whether our constitution is a grant, or a limitation of powers.

2. The second point in Dr. Wines's argument is, that when the Assembly is constituted, its members, though chosen by the Presbyteries, &c., act as officers of the whole Church, and not as mere delegates or agents of their Presbyteries. The local appointment gives a title to the office of a member of the General Assembly; but it does not in any sense, limit or (so to speak) *localize* his functions or powers. His act, as a member of the General Assembly, is, in its influence and effect, the act of all the Church.

3. Fourteen commissioners, one-half at least being ministers, are a quorum, warranting the full and binding action of the body, in the exercise of all its functions and powers, with the same effect as if all the commissioners were present. It is not important to the validity of its acts, that its members should be delegates from different localities, nor that they should represent different Presbyteries or Synods. It is not important to such validity that there were originally a greater number of commissioners, and that the quorum is only those who remain

after others have left the Assembly. It is not important that there should be any elders, but only that at least one-half of the number be ministers. Hence, it is in the constitution of the Assembly, that its powers may all be exercised by a part of its members, such part being not less than fourteen. It cannot, therefore, be a violation in substance of the constitution, that a mere quorum should exercise its powers. Nor does it alter the case, whether there being but a bare quorum, arose from the fact that the other commissioners did not, from choice or necessity, originally join the meeting, or from the fact that they afterwards voluntarily left it.

4. It is competent, also, Moderator, for every General Assembly to make rules for its own government and the conduct of its business; and it can make such rules binding on itself as an Assembly, unless repealed by a majority of its whole number. This is a power inherent in all deliberative bodies, since it is a necessary check to the tyranny of majorities, and a necessary safeguard to the rights of minorities. Now, it is undoubtedly true, that no General Assembly can renounce any of its powers by any resolve, however positive, not to exercise them, and so bind itself from resuming them; since that would be simply resolving not to do what might be its duty; yet such a reason does not apply to rules requiring certain duties to be performed by a quorum of the body. Such a requirement would be but a legitimate and proper rule of business, and in no sense a renouncing of any duty.

5. If these positions be correct, it would be, in substance, quite within the power of any General Assembly to appoint a commission of fourteen or more, and to assign to it any special business, executory or ministerial in its character; and the act of this commission, fourteen being present, in the absence of all the other members of the Assembly, would be valid, since it would be the act, not of another body created by the Assembly and exercising merely delegated powers, but the act of the Assembly itself.

6. The only objection, on constitutional grounds, to this arrangement, as far as I can see, is the form of dissolving the Assembly. This, when performed by the Moderator, terminates its power of acting. But as the Assembly is not limited to

meeting once only, there can be no difficulty, at the close of its general business, to appoint certain business, consisting either of particular items or of particular classes of business, to be transacted by certain fourteen or more members, one-half at least always being ministers, and then to adjourn over the Assembly. The persons named would continue to be the Assembly, and, when its business was closed, the Moderator could then proceed to the form of dissolution. It is to be understood, as a matter of course, that any or all of the members of the Assembly would have the right to be present, deliberate, and vote in the commission.

7. I have spoken of assigning business, executive or ministerial, as that which might lawfully be done by such a commission. It may be urged that the mode of reasoning would warrant the commission in transacting all kinds of business, if the Assembly should choose to direct it so to do. Perhaps it would. But it would not be within a reasonable performance of duty by the body of the Assembly to make so wide a devolution of its powers, and therefore limited devolution alone should be thought of.

8. Every such plan as that which I have thus briefly sketched, is undoubtedly open to the observation, that by judicial and any other powers being confided to the large body of the Assembly, it is the fair understanding and meaning that they should be exercised by all the body, or, at least, by as many as can be convened. The observation is certainly weighty. But, on the other hand, the necessity requiring some such plan is still more weighty. The large body of the Assembly cannot continue together so long as to terminate every item, without the greatest inconvenience to its members and injury to the churches. Members, in a long session, must be continually leaving the body, and so reducing its number. And the question really is, whether the final residuum shall be an accidental or a selected quorum, and whether they shall be put to the inconvenience of an over-protracted meeting, or be permitted to enjoy the convenience of an adjourned meeting.

9. As one Assembly cannot make rules of business for

another, the plan would need to be renewed by the resolve of every General Assembly, acting for itself.

Judge Fine and Dr. Plumer opposed the adoption of Dr. Wines's resolution, and, on motion of Dr. Krebs, the whole subject was finally indefinitely postponed.

So far as we can judge from the reports of the debates, the objections to the appointment of a commission for judicial cases, were not urged with the plausibility and force with which they were presented last year by Chancellor Johns and Dr. McMasters. The great objection then urged was, that a court could not delegate its powers. What would be thought, it was asked, of the Supreme Court of the United States, if that venerable body should delegate its functions to a part of its members? The answer to this objection is, that there is no delegation of powers involved in the appointment of a commission. A quorum of a Presbytery, no matter how large the Presbytery may be, is the Presbytery; a quorum of a Synod is the Synod, and a quorum of the Assembly is the Assembly. In like manner, inasmuch as a commission must embrace at least a quorum of the appointing body, a commission of a Presbytery is the Presbytery, a commission of the Synod is the Synod, and a commission of the Assembly is the Assembly. A commission, therefore, is not of the nature of a committee with powers, but it is the appointing body itself, adjourned to meet at a certain time and place, for the transaction of a specific business—with the understanding expressed or implied, that while the whole body may convene, certain members are required to attend. When a candidate for the ministry is to be ordained, A B are appointed to take part in the exercises. It is understood that any member may be present, but in point of fact, few beyond those named are generally convened. They are the Presbytery, whether any other member is present or not; and they act as such. In many cases, they examine the candidate, they judge of his qualifications and orthodoxy, they decide whether he shall be ordained or not, and if the way be clear, they ordain him. Does any body cry out against this, as a delegation of powers? or against three or four men being trusted to exercise the functions of a body consisting it may be of eighty or a hundred members? In England, the House of

Lords is the court of ultimate appeal in judicial cases. When they have transacted their ordinary business, they adjourn to meet in their judicial capacity for the trial of causes, but it is with the understanding that none need attend but the law-Lords; and, in point of fact, few others ever do attend. What constitutional principle, then, forbids a Presbytery or Synod, when their ordinary business is transacted, adjourning to meet for the trial of a judicial case, with the understanding, that (as in the case of an ordination,) while the whole body may convene, certain specified members are obligated to attend? It may, however, be objected, that the Presbytery and Synods are permanent bodies, and the Assembly is an annual one, and is dissolved and not adjourned. The Assembly, however, may sit a whole year. It may sit a month, and then adjourn to meet at any time within the year it may see fit to appoint. We are, therefore, unable to see any constitutional objection to the appointment of a judicial commission. It is well known that our ecclesiastical courts have often appointed such bodies, and that the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland annually appoints a commission, to which all unfinished business is referred. It is said that this is because the session of that body is limited by law to ten days. This, however, does not apply to the Free Church. Besides, what difference does it make? If it is anti-presbyterial to act by a commission, the law of the State cannot make it Presbyterial. It is no presumption, therefore, to say that a mode of action which has been adopted for centuries by the most stringent and influential Presbyterian Church in the world, of its own free will, is not inconsistent with the principles of Presbyterianism.

It is, therefore, a mere question of expediency. Something must be done to relieve the Assembly of the pressure of judicial cases. To make appeals stop with the Synod, violates an essential principle of our system, and must tend to the dissolution of the Church. The appointment of a commission is a long tried and approved method of relief, and we hope it will be ultimately adopted, not only by the Assembly, but by Synods and Presbyteries.

It is said, that probably not more than forty members would attend a commission of the Assembly, and then we should have

a body not more than one-half as large as an ordinary Synod, acting as the supreme judicatory of the Church—with its two thousand ministers and two hundred thousand communicants. It is said, also, that if the decisions of such a body were not to be reviewed, its power would be alarming, and if reviewed, it would be of no use. It is further said, the Church would have no confidence in the judgments of such a body. It is evident, that these objections are addressed to the imagination, and not to the understanding. Fourteen members are a quorum of the Assembly, and may constitutionally act as the supreme judicatory of the Church. Seven members are a quorum of a Synod, and may act for the whole body. Three are a quorum of a Presbytery, even if it consists of an hundred members. The United States' Court consists of some eight or ten judges, and lays down the law for twenty millions of freemen. A dozen law-Lords make decisions affecting all the subjects of Great Britain. It is a mere chimera, that a commission would be a *monstrum horrendum*. Respect and confidence follow competency and fidelity, not numbers.

Complaint from the Synod of the Dutch Church.

Rev. Dr. Boardman presented certain documents which had been placed in his hands by the Rev. Dr. Lee, of the Reformed Dutch Church, relating to the action of the North River Presbytery in the reception of the Rev. Mr. Smuller, and the organization of a Presbyterian church at Kingston, New York, composed wholly of members of the Reformed Dutch Church, without dismissal. The General Synod of the Dutch Church consider this action as in conflict with the terms of correspondence between the General Assembly and this body. These papers were referred to the Committee to nominate delegates to corresponding bodies.

This subject was finally disposed of by the adoption, on the motion of the Rev. Mr. Gildersleeve, of the following resolutions, viz.

1. That though the Consistory of the Reformed Dutch Church may have been wrong in refusing dismissions to its members, yet this Assembly disapproves the action of North

River Presbytery in hastily organizing them into a Presbyterian church.

2. That though the Classis of Ulster may have done wrong in refusing the Rev. Mr. Smuller a dismission, yet the Assembly does not approve of the action of North River Presbytery in receiving him at that time.

3. That the Stated Clerk be directed to express to the General Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church, the deep regret of this General Assembly, that any cause of complaint should have arisen between the two bodies.

Church Extension and a Fifth Board.

The Board of Missions made a distinct report on the subject of Church Extension, of which the following is a brief abstract.

The balance of the Church Extension Fund, on the 1st of April, 1854, was \$6,332.17.

The receipts from April 1, 1854, to April 1, 1855, were, from individuals, \$1,669.24, and from churches, \$3,577.24; making the receipts \$5,246.48; which, added to the amount in hand on April 1, 1854, make a total of \$11,578.65. The appropriations paid from April 1, 1854, to April 1, 1855, amount to \$7,405.55, which leaves a balance in the Treasury, April 1, 1855, of \$4,173.10. There are, however, unpaid appropriations, amounting to \$5,840.00, which would more than consume this balance, and leave the Church Extension Fund in debt, \$1,666.90.

Appropriations have been made during the year to forty-six churches, scattered over twenty-four Synods, and within the bounds of thirty-seven Presbyteries.

Forty-nine churches have been finished during the year, and have received their respective appropriations.

For the purpose of comparison, we state, that the receipts for Church Extension from the 1st of April, 1853, to the 1st of April, 1854, were as follows:—From individuals, \$3,211.93, and from churches, \$3,086.16; making a total of \$6,298.09. From this it appears that the receipts this year were \$1,051.61 less than the year preceding. The number of churches which were finished last year, and which received their appropriations

was thirty-five; the number this year, was forty-nine, being fourteen more than the year previous.

As it may be desirable to know the gross amount that has been received from the commencement of the Church Extension Fund, we add the following statement. Cash received for Church Extension, from July 20, 1844, to April 1, 1855—from individuals, \$47,711.27, and from churches, \$20,832.79; making a total of \$68,544.06. The whole number of churches which have received appropriations during this period, is 382, and these are scattered over every section of our Church.

The importance of this subject, and the diversity of opinion in relation to the best method of carrying on this department of Christian benevolence, gave rise to the most protracted and able debate of the sessions of the Assembly. Several different plans were proposed.

First, the Rev. Dr. Backus, as Chairman of the Committee on Domestic Missions, moved the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, That in view of the peculiar emergencies of the case, and the increasing demand for aid in erecting churches in the new and destitute settlements of the country, some more vigorous effort than is now in operation, ought to be made by our Church at large, to supply this need.

Resolved, That in order to carry out the purpose of the foregoing resolution, there be annually elected by the General Assembly, as long as it shall be found necessary, a Committee of Church Extension, consisting of ministers and elders, to superintend the business of collecting, appropriating and disbursing the necessary funds, with power to appoint a Corresponding Secretary and a Treasurer.

Resolved, That the Committee of Church Election be located at the city of .

In support of these resolutions, Dr. Backus presented the case as it came before the Committee, and the reasons which induced them to propose the appointment of a Committee, rather than a Board. They decided first, that the object was important, and one of peculiar importance at this time. 2. They believed the manner for carrying it out, as reported, the one most desired by the friends of the measure, and they had

voted for it. If they had thought a Board would be more desirable they would have voted for it. They had chosen the name of a Committee instead of a Board, for the reason that it was a temporary body, and something for a peculiar present necessity—something which the next general Assembly might or might not repeat, or might continue for a series of years and then discontinue.

2d. Others were in favour of establishing a fifth Board, and therefore moved that the report be recommitted with instructions to that effect. After a long debate that motion was lost by a vote of 102 to 106; “a large portion of the warmest friends of the Boards voting against the measure for a new Board.”

3d. Dr. B. M. Smith, of Virginia, and Mr. Beach of Mississippi, avowed themselves in favour of referring the whole subject of Church Extension to the several Synods.

4th. Dr. Boardman was in favour of a transfer of the existing committee of church extension, connected with the Board of Missions, to St. Louis, and introduced a resolution to instruct the Board to make that transfer. This motion was laid on the table by a vote of 113 to 83.

5th. Dr. Thornwell preferred a transfer of the Board of Missions to some other place than Philadelphia, and therefore moved a series of resolutions to that effect. This motion failed.

6th. Rev. Mr. Pelan moved the following as an amendment to the second resolution proposed by the Committee:—“*Resolved*, That in order to carry out the purposes of the foregoing resolution, there be elected by the General Assembly, as long as it shall be found necessary, a Committee of Church Election consisting of ministers and elders, one-third to be elected for one year, one-third for two years and one-third for three years, to superintend the business of collecting, appropriating and disbursing the necessary funds, with power to appoint a secretary and treasurer.” This motion prevailed by a vote of 134 to 57. The blanks as to the number of the committee were filled by 12 ministers and 12 elders, and St. Louis was selected as the location of the Committee.

We are able to present only an imperfect outline of the de-

bate on this whole subject. Dr. Plumer's remarks in favour of a fifth Board are reported as follows :

“The question has met the very kind of opposition, and from the very quarter, which he had predicted; and he was sorry to see it come from such quarters as it does. More than once he had been inclined to say, ‘Et tu, Brute!’ Let us remove the mists gathered about the subject. It has been said that building churches is not fit work for Christ's Church. And yet there was a sweet singer of Israel, who, after all his Psalms and noble works, had yet one great work to do which God would not permit him to do; yet God approved highly his intention. It was the building a noble temple to the God of Israel. God is pleased with this work of building churches when it is necessary. And he believed, if the first church in New York was burned down, and the congregation should put up a log house, God would be displeased with it. Look at what Haggai said to the Jews when God's house lay waste, and they dwelled in ceiled houses. Look at Ezra's time, when, under the great revival, every four hundred and seventy souls had a synagogue built for them; and as if that were not enough, synagogues were so built as to bring a synagogue within two miles of every man's dwelling. Building of churches, then, is an appropriate work for the Church of God. He was glad of the candour manifested in this discussion. One had called all the Boards *fungi*. He would look at the meaning. The word includes, according to Webster's Dictionary, ‘toadstools,’ ‘mushrooms,’ &c. Are our Boards toadstools? If they are, they are the prettiest toadstools I ever saw. Or does he mean that they are ‘proud flesh?’ for this also, the Dictionary says, is the meaning of *fungus*. He would show some of the fruit of one of the toadstools. Here were 20,000 copies of Dr. Alexander's tract on Justification. Excellent fruit this; and so through the whole catalogue of the Board of Publication. And there was another toadstool—the Board of Foreign Missions. He wished he could cause the army of missionaries to march in and around this building, and there should we see some of the noblest men in China, among our Indians, and throughout the world, marshalled together as the great labourers in the vineyard of the Lord. An excellent fruit! So might we say the

same of the other toadstools, the Boards of Education, and of Domestic Missions with its five hundred missionaries. He cared nothing for men's theories here, but for practical results. He would give some.

In 1843, a Board of Church Extension was moved, and next year was formed. And what have they done in eleven years? They have received and disbursed \$67,000. Where did this come from? \$47,000 came from a few private gentlemen; and from all the churches, about \$20,000. Is this sufficient? But we are told that last year the thing was got up on a grand scale. And what was the result? It was \$1300 less this year than last. He did not call this progress. None need be alarmed at the rashness of such progress. It was, indeed, following out the old proverb, "*Festina lente.*" Again, it has been openly stated, that by the decision of this question will be determined whether the Church is in favour of, or opposed to Boards. So it has been published, and so events have shown it, and so they will show it. Look at the arguments used before this House against a Board in this scheme. Let us now examine what is the difference between a Committee and a Board. The only difference is this. A Committee is a body appointed by the Assembly, whose term of office expires next year; whereas a Board is divided into classes. And for this reason you cannot kill the Board of Domestic Missions under three years. And it was this that saved us in our contest with the New-school, who at one time proposed men opposed to the Board; but even had they elected them, they would have been a minority, and three years must have rolled away before they could have succeeded in destroying the Board. Again, it had struck him as strange, that men opposed to centralization should oppose a Board, and yet vote for a Committee where the power was even more concentrated. But let us examine why Boards were constituted. He read from the Minutes of 1816, to show that the very object stated was to meet the fact, that the Standing Committee on Missions was not sufficiently energetic. They set aside even a *Standing* Committee after fourteen years' trial, to say nothing of a Committee from year to year. Now, the opinion of such men as Janeway, Green, Miller, and others, should have some weight in this House.

Then, too, add to this, that on this very subject the appointed Committee had been so inefficient as to fall off in one year \$1300. Again, it is said, the work of the Board is done. But look at the progressive necessities of our country. We need six hundred ministers for destitute places. Abandon our Board of Missions and how shall these be met?

Again, there is the flood of errors and of infidelity coming in upon us, and how shall we meet it without our Board of Publication? And are not the wants of a perishing world abroad as great as they ever were? How then are we to abandon our Foreign Board? Are the difficulties then the same or greater now than they ever were? How then can it be said, as has been said, that the Boards have fulfilled their work and may be laid aside? But it is said we cannot transfer our powers. Why not? Where is the harm? Did not Paul delegate powers to some to ordain elders and deacons in every city? There are some powers which we can delegate. It is objected that the Assembly ought to choose its Secretaries, and not the Board. But how can we in such an Assembly judge properly of men's qualifications? Often a man may make very eloquent speeches who yet would be most unfit, by an unhappy temperament, to fill the post of Secretary. And ought not the wishes, too, of the discreet men already Secretaries in our Foreign Board, for example, to be consulted if we were about to vote for a new Secretary in that Board? Besides, consider also that the public faith of the Church has been pledged for the perpetuity of these Boards. How so? They have been told to become incorporated; and dying men and women have bequeathed money to those Boards in trust. Shall we break our faith? Need we fear because the beginning is small in this new scheme? No—for look at the increase in the disbursements of our present Boards. Here is a Board of Publication that has this year distributed \$91,000, and yet the beginning of that Board was the transmission of \$100 each to Drs. Alexander and Miller, by a gentleman, asking one to write a tract on Justification, and the other on Presbyterianism. Such will be the increase of this Board if it is established. He loathed this constant irritation of our public officers. He would say, as Burke said of the British ministry, “if you will call these men up, and try and

execute them," the matter will at least be dignified; but as for this constant, underhand, stealthy stabbing of them, his soul loathed it. He hoped the House would listen to a full discussion of this important subject. "It is for the interest of the republic that there should be an end of strife." Let brethren say what their views are, and let us settle this question. With respect to the brethren about Philadelphia, who sympathize with certain persons opposed to the Boards so far as to vote with them, he would predict that the time would come when they and their concerns would go by the board. If Philadelphia turns against the Boards, the Church will turn against Philadelphia. He would say that the worthy and modest Secretary of the Board of Missions, who is here, is not opposed to separating the Church Extension work entirely from that Board. He mentioned this to show, that though the Board of Education seemed determined to throw its influence against a Board of Church Extension, the Board of Missions was not disposed to do so. It is remarkable too, that these brethren who are most zealous in pulling down, are very much at fault when it comes to building up. What do they propose? A Committee to go out every year, instead of a Board, and the Secretary to be elected by the Assembly. As to the election of a Secretary by the Assembly, there would be great difficulties. Suppose, for instance, that the Secretary of that Board should be taken from this world, and this Assembly should elect a successor. Suppose the person elected should decline, then your Board is without a Secretary for twelve months. The same thing might be repeated the next year, until five years would sometimes elapse before a Secretary could be secured.

As to the expense, that would be the same for a Board as for a Committee. Room-rent, salary, &c., would be the same, unless you get an inferior man; and on that principle you might be like the Irishman who got a stove which saved half the wood, and resolved to get two, that he might save all. Neither the word "Committee," nor "Board," is in the Scriptures; and if brethren insist on the *jus divinum* he did not know where they would get their authority, unless from that text, "The thing that thou hast received, that commit thou to faithful men." With the exception too, of the difficulty of break-

ing up a Board in a single year, as stated this morning, a Board and Committee are the same. And is the Church, by a vote, ready virtually to vote down Boards, when they have done so much for us? A New-school man, who started to St. Louis the other day, said he was for going into the lumber business too; it had so enriched the Old-school, and made them such a magnificent Church. The very things the New-school men fought against in 1837 and '38, they were now running after with all their might. We cannot abandon the Boards. We have need too, of a permanent organization for the West and Southwest, and not a mere temporary committee. Pittsburgh was once in the West; afterwards Cincinnati; then Louisville; and still later, St. Louis; but the centre of the United States is four hundred and sixty-nine miles further West. There are eight hundred miles of the most fertile land in the world west of the Mississippi yet to be occupied. We must have men who will, year after year, study this field. Moreover, who would accept a Secretaryship of a Committee for a single year? Our Presbyterian people love stability. But a sub-committee of the Board of Domestic Missions is proposed. This is an *imperium in imperio*—looking to Philadelphia for support, not of the Board of Missions, but under it. The Secretary of the Board of Missions is entirely willing that this work shall be taken out of her hands. It is said that by not organizing another Board, we shall get rid of another collection. But would it not be as annoying to give a collection to a Committee, as to a fifth Board? He wished it to be understood too, that if we are going on to make war on Boards, we must carry out the principle, and kill the Boards of our Theological Seminaries also.

As to the divine right of Presbyterianism, he believed the office of Presbyter was the highest in the Scriptures, and that ruling elders and deacons were of divine origin; but he did not believe that the word of God made a Committee a thing of divine or apostolic authority, any more than a Board. There was one thing in Presbyterianism which certainly is of divine right, viz., that the strong shall help the weak. Suppose you hand this matter over to the Synods; we shall have some of the Synods helping themselves, and not sending fifty cents a year

to help others. There is still another point in the divine right of Presbyterianism, "Remember the words of the Lord Jesus Christ, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive." He had not the slightest objection to the strict construction of the Constitution. The ground that the Assembly has no right to appoint Boards, is precisely the same taken by the New-school men in the Assembly of 1836, at Pittsburgh. If the Assembly is not to sit all the year round, it must appoint some party to do its work. What an area we have for church building! The State of Texas has territory enough to make forty-five such states as Massachusetts, and the State of California would make forty-five such States as New Hampshire. He was not usually in favour of summoning dead friends as arguments; but when he remembered how that noble man, John Breckinridge, fought and laboured for these Boards, he was astonished at some things he now heard and saw. If the spirit of that gifted man could now come back, and see us Old-school people striving to pull down these Boards, what would he think of us? Those who once laboured with us, might weep to see us endeavouring to overthrow what had been gained with so much difficulty, and at such sacrifices.

The Rev. Dr. Smith—This is a question of form, and the matter will doubtless be brought up again; yet why not proceed at once with the discussion? If we wish this manner and form, why not at once make it so? Still the main issues are really now before us under the motion to recommit. There are two chief considerations. I leave out altogether the place. One respects the making this matter of equal importance with the subjects of Missions and Education. The other respects the name. True, a name seems to be nothing, and yet you see that men feel there is a difference. Even Dr. Plumer has intimated that a *Committee* is *not* the same thing as a Board. Now he wished to know what there is in a Board of more dignity than in a Committee. Why make this distinction? Why offer such ground for cavil? He cared not himself which name you take, if no difference is intended. But when the ground is openly taken that there is a difference, he must resist the change. This is the way to open the door for giving colour to the arguments of those whom we have called cavillers; and in

reality to fasten on the Church a power outside of itself. He would sooner reject all our Boards. If, then, the words really mean the same, why argue for a change? and if not, then the whole matter is in a dangerous position. As to the intrinsic merits of the enterprise contemplated, there can be but one opinion; the only difference regards the *quo modo*. But he felt it his duty to present the view of his Presbytery. Our objections are, 1. We doubt very much, when the General Board or Committee is formed, whether it will be possible to bring before that Committee such grounds of action as shall enable them to act judiciously. To commission a minister for a certain field, and to build a church there, are two very different things. In one you can be easily and properly informed, though at a distance from the field; but not so in the other. Even a contiguous Presbytery may find it difficult to ascertain the necessity for having a house of worship erected. Even their recommendation then may be illusive. What different opinions are entertained respecting every railroad that is built as to the propriety of running in its present direction! Human nature is a very capricious thing; and we should be under the constant liability to make mistakes, and build when we ought not to build. Now suppose we commit the matter to *Synods*—mark, I do not say *Presbyteries*—for as to these the action would not be so generally judicious as the *Synods* would exercise. Now *Synods* would have the whole ground before them. Their area of supervision would be restricted. And if a *Synod* (like that of California) were weak, it could ask assistance from a neighbouring *Synod*. If the *Synods* should set the matter fairly before the *Presbyteries*, and ask from each such or such an amount of money, it would be supplied. By this plan we should avoid many expenses incidental to a Board, and which are necessary to set it a going. Many of our churches will be long in getting reached by the exhortations which will prove to them the necessity and dignity and importance of this enterprise. It will be long before our people will put the building up of brick and mortar on a level with the preaching of the gospel. If we appoint, then, such a Committee at St. Louis, let the matter still be attended to by the *Synods*, and let each of these *Synods* be directed to transmit to this committee their

surplus funds, to be used by this committee for the help of the feeble. Let us be careful how we proceed. I have no liking for the slow gait of the tortoise, any more than Dr. Plumer, and yet we know that sometimes the slow but steady tortoise at the last overcomes the nimble and careless hare.

Subsequently, when speaking of Mr. Pelan's proposition, Dr. Smith said:—The resolution now before us is the same as that rejected yesterday; or what is tantamount to the erection of a fifth Board. He could never see that a Board was so essentially different from a Committee. It had been strenuously maintained. But he could not think so. And in taking his position, he was obliged to take ground, as he before intimated, against his Presbytery. The only difference insisted upon, had been that a Board has powers beyond a Committee. Now, if it be intended by the present Committee to go beyond what it is appointed to do by the Assembly, he was opposed to it. He referred to the origin of the Boards of the Church. It had sprung from the custom of our old missionary associations, to assign the business to the hands of a Committee called a Board, from the use of the same term in civil life.

When the Assembly took up the subject, it adopted the same practice and nomenclature. At first the committees were yearly appointed. But in the time of our troubles it was deemed necessary, in order to save our plans of benevolence from destruction, to add this feature to make them more permanent. But he did not believe that our Assembly esteemed this an essential feature of their plan. Now, if this feature was necessary for the preservation of this committee, he would agree to it; but he did not conceive it to be, and as there was such a difference of opinion, he thought it unadvisable. Again, he believed that Corresponding Secretaries could as well be elected by the General Assembly as by the Board. He vindicated the patient faithfulness and laboriousness of the Boards of the Church. Their office was no sinecure. They spent hours of patient labour for the Church, and instead of being carped at, they deserved an annual vote of thanks from the Assembly. He was in favour, then, of having an annual committee, if we have a committee at all. His great object was,

not to build up Boards or to overthrow them. It was to build up the kingdom of Jesus Christ; and so long as our Boards did their work well, he always looked favourably on them.

The Rev. Mr. Coe—Resides in the Northwest, and was an eye-witness of the necessities of the case. He would make some remarks. 1. As to what they want; and 2. Why they want it. This is not a mere Northwestern measure. All the West and Southwest especially need the same relief. We want then a separate organization, such as shall draw out large and continued supplies to meet a large demand. We want only to be aided in part. We do not ask for the whole sum necessary for building. Often only a fourth part would be sufficient. We do not need splendid edifices. The Eastern brethren have a right to such, if they prefer them. Let them build them and glorify God. But we ask help to build plain structures, wherein to worship God. Why, then, do we want it? First—From the vastness of the field. In seven Synods of Iowa, Wisconsin, and three northern Presbyteries of Illinois, we have 350 organized churches. Here we need over a hundred houses, and, it is safe to say, that a hundred places more might easily be selected where they are necessary. We require then, this day, for this single field, \$30,000. Look, too, at the vast tide of emigration, and the progress of improvement, which demands energetic measures. The population that comes there often bring means with them, and demand and make improvements for themselves and families. There is St. Paul. Six years ago, it was a trading house; now it has over 6000 inhabitants, with churches and buildings that would not disgrace our Eastern cities. Look at our own progress as a Church. We have one hundred ministers, where, ten years ago, we had only nine, and nine Presbyteries where we had but one. In fact, no portion of our country is opening more rapidly than the Northwest. Different nations are gathering there. Norwegians, Hollanders, Swedes, are all here, and all need our help. He referred to his own church, which had begun in great feebleness, but received some assistance. It was then said, “We give you just two years to die in.” But what are the results? They had a beautiful building, an active church, and had given

more to Church Extension than they had ever received. He referred also to what the church at St. Paul was doing, showing the advantage of a building in making the church self-sustaining. Before the church was erected, hardly a hundred dollars could be obtained for the support of the ministry; but when the church was built, on the first day they were offered nine hundred dollars for the rent of the pews, and thus at once made the church self-sustaining. We have great difficulties. A main one is the want of the Presbyterian element to work upon. Another is the want of homogeneity in our population. In his own church he had Dutch, Scotch, Irish, Germans, Canadians, and a few representatives from every State in the Union. They had also all sorts of religions. Again, we have the liberality of others to contend with. We do not, indeed, object to this liberality. It is right. But we must keep pace with it, or we shall be outstripped. Ultraism also stands in our way, and error of doctrine. Yet it is true that the people prefer the preaching of sound doctrine when they can get it. We also are styled the pro-slavery Church; and this is used against us. We need aid to stem the tide of fanaticism and ultraism. The success, thus far, of those who have founded Presbyterianism there, should stimulate benevolence towards that field. One minister began his work there in such poverty, that he had not a change of clothes. Another aided in building the edifice with his own hands. And these were the beginnings of that spiritual edifice which is now growing into such beautiful proportions. Let us have all needful help.

Rev. Dr. Van Rensselaer said—Church Extension is an old Presbyterian scheme. So, indeed, have all the other schemes of Christian benevolence been. We had a mission among the Chickasaw Indians fifty years ago. At first this very Church Extension was derided, when proposed by us, by the very men who are now following our example. Let us not allow them to go beyond us. I am opposed to a new Board and a new Committee, and am rather for giving new energy to the old organization. We have had virtually the right plan in operation for the last eleven years. Let us bear in mind that, as to the thing itself, we are agreed; the only difference is as to the method of doing it. Our present plan should have new life put

into it. It is argued that it has done but little; but this does not prevent its being invigorated. So it was with the Board of Foreign Missions. For years it was inefficient; but at last it was vivified, and has become effective. The reason of the past inefficiency of the Committee of the Board, has been its location. Remove this to another field—say St. Louis—and it will be efficient. Dr. Van Rensselaer also recommended a simultaneous collection in all the churches, in behalf of the object. He objected strongly against a Committee of the Assembly, as now proposed. It would hamper all our Boards. It has been said that this would be merely temporary; but it will not be so. A Board would indeed be better than a Committee of the Assembly. But to a Board also there are two objections; one is, that in an already existing Committee of the Board is all that is necessary. 2. Because the cause is not sufficiently extensive to demand it, and it may excite opposition to all our Boards. The venerable Dr. Blythe, a pioneer, was opposed to this building of churches for others. He approved the plan of building for themselves, according to their ability, and improving the building as they grew and prospered. He repeated, that while he said not a word against church erection itself, he was opposed to both a Board and a Committee of the Assembly. He would abide by our old plan.

Many other brethren took part in the debate. Mr. Gladney urged the greater importance of sending out preachers than building houses.

Mr. S. R. Wilson declared himself opposed to all Boards. They were adopted, he said, by good men who were not yet fully freed from the Egyptian bondage of Congregationalism. He believed this work of Church Extension belonged to the missionary. He came from a city which contains at this day 200,000 inhabitants; and they had churches which some might object to on account of their costliness. But while there might be extravagance, yet this was a thing that could not be prevented; and, besides, those men who built these costly churches, were the very men who gave most to the destitute. Now, these churches had grown up from feeble beginnings;—first a log house, then a larger frame house, then a brick building, and so on, until the present point was attained. The

pioneer missionaries there had no idea of building first, and getting the people afterwards. He believed that this was the true plan. He was, therefore, opposed to any aid-scheme of the sort proposed. If we cannot succeed by our missionaries preaching the gospel, we cannot succeed with a Board or Committee located anywhere. Lastly, he thought that the true method was, to commit the whole matter to the Board of Domestic Missions; and let there issue thence some organized effort to gather contributions—an organization that shall reach in its influence, not our wealthy churches only, but all our churches, and especially the feeblest, so that every rill shall yield its quota, and swell the tide of energetic benevolence.

The Rev. Messrs. Robertson, McKee, Ewing, Candee, Steele, Krebs, Smith of Illinois, and others discussed the subject more or less at length. We cannot, however, find room for their remarks, as we are desirous of presenting at length the able speeches of Drs. Thornwell and Boardman, as far as they have been reported.

Dr. Thornwell said the representations made by the brethren of the Northwest had produced a deep impression on his mind. They had his warm sympathies. The time in this discussion had not been wasted; for the Assembly had been able thus to see the practical operation of our system in various parts. We thus feel that we are one. Indeed, during the discussion, he had even envied the opportunity of some of the brethren of the great Western field to do good. He wished it to be stated at the outset, that these brethren had his warm sympathies in their labours and their difficulties. This was necessary, in order that what he said might not be misunderstood. On the subject before the Assembly, there are two points to be considered. First, granting that there is a necessity of something being done, shall it be done by a Board? And next, shall any thing at all be done? And on this the whole merits of the case rest. First then, shall there be a Board or a Committee appointed? He was clearly of the opinion that there should not be a Board. He was not opposed to the end which our Boards are designed to achieve. Yet, as a true Presbyterian, believing that our system is of divine origin, he could not consent to anything extraneous to the system. Never, never would he, or

could he, as a Christian, object to the great work of evangelizing the world. But we may differ as to the plan. He wished to correct a mistake. The Assembly have noticed the great variety of opinions expressed here on this subject. A report is brought in recommending a Committee, and immediately a motion is made to recommit, with instructions to recommend a Board. Now, why is this? It had been said it was not on the grounds of the essential merits of the two plans, but because the establishment of a Committee is a point on which those may rally who are opposed to all Boards, and as affording an opening wedge whereby at last to kill all the Boards.

Dr. Plumer rose to explain. His position was simply that those who opposed all Boards would vote for a Committee; and what he said had been sustained by the actual result.

Dr. Thornwell—The drift of the remark is the same, and he could not see why the vote for a Committee should be construed into an aim to overthrow the existing Boards of the Church. There is another mistake. He thought the friends of the measure should have rejoiced at the offer of a Committee of the Assembly, for in this way the disputed subject would have come before the Church, and the decision by the voice of the Church, between a Committee of the Board and a Committee of the Assembly, would have determined the triumph or defeat of the friends or opponents of Boards.

He was opposed to Boards. 1. Because the Church is made of God, the great organ for carrying forward the operations of Christ's kingdom. This needs no argument. It was this principle which had been urged against voluntary societies. Now shall we go back to this? What is a Board? It is not a Committee appointed by the Assembly. This is shown by the very opposition of the Board's friends to a Committee. The word refers literally to those who sit around a table, and it implies a power in certain persons to do of themselves a certain work of the Church. In them the General Assembly erects another power between itself and its work. It is the Assembly's vicar. The existing Boards have done indeed great good; he did not deny this. They were used originally to rouse and give form to the true spirit of activity, at a time when the feelings of the Church, as to her duty, were dormant. They were, at the time,

immensely important, but they have now accomplished their work, and may be laid aside for us to act in the proper organic way. It may be said, "*quod facit per alium facit per se.*" The Assembly does what the Board does. But so may this be said, if the Assembly should appoint as its agent the American Board of Foreign Missions.

But there are two other questions involved—1. Can the Assembly transfer its duties to another body? No—no man can tell the ground on which such transfer can be made. 2. It involves the whole question, as to the degree in which the Church possesses discretionary power. Some maintain that the Church has attained her maturity; that God has proposed only certain ends and left the means of attaining them to her own wisdom. She is simply a confidential agent of her Master. He says to her, You are no longer under Jewish bondage. You are in your maturity; use your light, and your decisions, as to the means, will be approved. He did not believe at all, in this wide discretionary power. The Church's duty is simply to do her Master's will, and that will is plainly laid down as to all particulars. The Church has no such discretionary power. There are indeed circumstances which she must regard; but even in these her path is determined by the rules laid down for her. We cannot, then, transfer our obligations as an Assembly to any other power.

Again: The Boards form a separating wall between the Church and her benevolent operations. Our system is one which supposes an interest in the Church's work to be felt in her every part. Everything that obstructs this flow of sympathy is to be discarded. How much more would every portion of the Church, every Synod, and every Presbytery, feel a hearty sympathy in these works of benevolence, if all were committed immediately to the Assembly? That is the heart and centre of the system, and the zeal here kindled passes out to the extremities of the whole body, and makes the whole body one in sympathy, and energy, and aim. Set aside then, this intermediate barrier.

But again: Do they not hinder the equal working of our system? Centralization of power is as much to be dreaded in Church as in State. How wrong then to centralize it in the

noblest work which the Church fulfils! Make the Committee as large as you please, and the power still concentrates towards a small centre. Is this consistent with our belief as to the parity of the ministry? The whole plan is unnatural; and had not these Boards been in time past the points around which Christian energy at first was rallied, our system would have thrown them off before. Again; we do not need them. Grant that none of the faults he had attributed to them were incidental to them. Still, we do not need them. In appointing Professors, even in appointing a pastor to a field, the matter is never left to a Board; and yet here are far more serious interests thus entrusted. All this shows that these are something extraneous to, and useless in our system. But it may be asked, Dispense with a Board, and what shall we do? The question is a serious one. He could not sympathize with the ridicule cast upon the building up of brick and mortar. How wonderfully had God, for years, been preparing houses for the apostles to preach in? These were the synagogues. It is then an important subsidiary work to the preaching of the gospel. Especially in the inclement Northwest, there seems to be an absolute necessity for such a work. Still, they are wrong in trying to get up a separate organization. For other Christians look at the preaching of the gospel as the great matter, and it will be destructive to separate this matter from the missionary work. Make it a matter of mere architecture, and you kill it. The matter belongs to the Board of Missions, whose object is to see that the gospel is preached, and to see that *all* things necessary to that work are supplied. He thought the remedy was simple. There might be difficulties; but so there were in anything. His remedy was to move the Board of Domestic Missions from Philadelphia to the West. Some thought the contributions of the East would be thus cut off. He could not think so. On the contrary, many would feel that an advantage to the missionary work had been gained, and would give even more joyfully than ever. What the Presbyterian Church most needs is confidence in its own system. He believed in the *jus divinum* of Presbyterianism. We have resources in our system unparalleled, for acting upon this great country. Check then the system of inorganic action, and for-

ward every effort towards vital organic action, and this will carry us forward in a career of triumph.

The Rev. Dr. Boardman said, there is an interest involved in this debate of as much greater importance than the cause of Church Extension, as four Boards are superior to one. A new theory of the Church has been virtually propounded in several of our judicatories, and some of our periodicals; and he thought it was high time the Presbyterian Church should understand where and what she is. If it be true that ecclesiastical Boards are in contravention of our Church polity, even though they were adopted in the time of a great conflict, the Church could not have been justified in resorting to them. To those gentlemen who now resist ecclesiastical Boards, he would say, "You had no right to rally under that banner for the mere purpose of defeating another party." No: the principle adopted, which has brought this Church to a pitch of prosperity, which has been attained in no other Church on which the sun shines, is not in contravention of our ecclesiastical polity, nor of the teachings of the Scriptures. He was heartily glad this question had come up. This discussion has grown out of that elaborate and eloquent speech to which we listened this morning, (Dr. Thornwell's), which lacked but one element. It was a chain, polished and bright, but not fastened at either end—not to the word of God on the one hand, nor to the Church on the other. He had listened to that speech, as to the beautiful and ingenious speculations of the great statesman of South Carolina. The doctrine of that speech was, that the principle of ecclesiastical Boards impeaches the organic structure of the Church of Christ; that she cannot, in any sense, delegate her work, but must literally do it herself. Knowing to whom he was listening, Dr. Boardman had waited in vain for the authority for these positions. Not one word had he heard, either from the Scriptures, or from our own Constitution. We may respect mere opinions from high sources; but in matters of such import as this, we must have something more than opinions.

In conceding the right of the Assembly to appoint a Committee, as the gentleman had done, the whole question had been given up. One party contends, indeed, that a Committee

differs essentially from a Board. But what is a Board? Suppose we determine, for the coming twelve months, to conduct our missionary operations by a Committee, can it not be so arranged that there shall be four classes, one to go out every three months; and would not that be a Board, and just as much a Board as if the classes went out in four successive years? If it be said that a Committee must not overrun a following Assembly, he would reply that the Committee on Psalmody, as well as others, had been in existence for years.

Again: a Committee will not at all answer the exigencies of the theory propounded by the gentleman from South Carolina. That theory is, that the Church herself must do her work *directly* and *immediately*. But does she do this when acting through a committee? No, sir. It is then the Church "acting by vicar"—acting according to the principle so much maligned here by a few. And must not a committee appoint its Secretary and its agents to carry out its trusts? Why, if this theory be taken literally, this work can only be done by the General Assembly itself, perambulating the whole Church. You must set the churches themselves to itinerating, or you cannot elude the point that it is done "by vicar."

But where is your authority for a Committee? He would not allow these brethren to stop short of their own principles. If you say, show us your authority for a Board, I say, show us your authority for a Committee. There is the Bible; give us the law and the testimony. Why, the very Constitution of the Church carries with it the power to carry out the ends for which it is designed, the identical things which her Founder has designed as objects of her institution. When you call upon the friends of the Boards to give a scriptural warrant for such organizations, we reply further, that we call upon you to show us scriptural warrant for your Theological Seminaries; for a minister occupying the post of an editor, or a professor's chair. It is not enough that you say their Presbyteries have permitted them to do it. Where did the Presbytery get its authority? We do not intend, when brethren begin to call for scriptural authority, that they should stop with the Boards. He apprehended that when that principle was applied to its full extent, it would upset something else than the Boards; it would turn a

great many gentlemen out of their places, and occasion such a running to and fro as has not often been seen. But, sir, who can fail to see the fallacy of all this? We have not yet returned to the Levitical code. We yet breathe the free, generous evangelical spirit of the New Testament. The whole theory of these gentlemen is at variance with what I regard the spirit of the gospel on this subject—a spirit which allows the work of Christ to be done as the hearts of Christ's people in their various circumstances may dictate. No man can show that the Church has the power to carry on her work, without assuming that the Church has certain powers to do her work which are not distinctly enunciated in the New Testament.

We are told, however, that this is a dangerous power; that the Boards are something growing up outside of the Church. No one could complain of the manner in which this subject has been brought up by that distinguished gentleman who has spoken here to-day; but there *is* reason to complain of the manner in which efforts have been made to spread the impression that the Boards were antagonistic to the Church, and to complain of the coarseness and vulgarity which has been displayed in some quarters.

So much is said as to the danger of centralization, and especially in Philadelphia, that, perhaps, some men or women, (with deference) think of Philadelphia as they think of a masked battery, or a covered mine, which may explode and blow everything to pieces. He would admit that there is power where there is a Board. But what will you do? Will you garotte gentlemen, because God has given them superior talents? Will you refrain from establishing a Theological Seminary at Danville, because the moment you put distinguished men there, you have made a point for centralization? Shall such a church as this, pervaded with such intelligence, yield to such miserable prejudices, and thus paralyze the implements you yourselves have formed?

These Boards are not powers outside the Church. They are the hands of the Church; they are appointed by the Church: they report to you; and you know they would not dare to go contrary to your will. No, sir, these Boards are a part of the Church, and to charge the contrary, is a false issue. If the

fundamental principles of the Boards are unsound, let this be shown.

He must say something about Philadelphia. This Church Extension scheme is not a Philadelphia scheme, as intimated by this writer. He himself had voted against it in the Assembly where it was adopted; and he doubted whether a single Philadelphia man had been in favour of it. The venerable Dr. Hoge of Ohio was the father of the scheme, and entitled to its glory or its shame. Philadelphia does not wish a fifth Board to be located there, if established. Dr. Boardman said he was in favour of a Committee to be located at St. Louis, under the Board of Missions, and their flings at Philadelphia were unjust and ungenerous. Philadelphia can take care of herself. She has nothing to ask. So far as she is connected with you, you have made her such. You have held your meetings there; you placed your Boards there. For the most part, Philadelphia ministers know but little more of what is done in the Boards, except in that they may be connected with. He learned most of what he knew about their action from the newspapers. Philadelphia pastors had too much to do in their own proper business, to be meddling with what did not belong to them.

He saw time was becoming increasingly precious, and members were anxious to return home. He reminded the members, however, of the resolution of the last Assembly. Some may object to this discussion of the abstract principle respecting our Boards. But the times demand it. It is discussed elsewhere, and doubts are engendered in the minds of our people by such efforts, as to the validity and scriptural soundness of our Church operations. We would again remind the Assembly how this principle was ramified through all our operations in the Church. But to come to the particular point at issue here. He thought the opposition manifested was an injustice to those who were pioneers in the preaching of the gospel. Why send men to make bricks, and not supply straw? It is unfair. It was unjust to draw a conclusion also against this scheme from the success of some who had, with great self-denial, succeeded in past time in building churches without aid. Had they been helped, they would have succeeded sooner. It is a poor policy to continue the plan. This plan had been published as a North-

west scheme. It is not so. We must go where the people go: and when the Southwest needed help, there would be as ready a response to them as to the Northwest. He would remind the South that the Northwest had always stood by them in their troubles. Away with this sectional spirit. It is the glory of the Presbyterian Church that it belongs to the whole country. Church Extension had now been before the public for eleven years. Many had aided it. It has received a cordial approval. Some propose to leave it to individual support. This is going back into Egypt. This will necessarily involve a fruitless waste of money. Adopt it, and at once there is a tide of men setting towards the same place, each to urge his own church's claim. What is the result? Often they do not pay their own expenses. He had himself supplied a number of ministers with money to return home. Adopt this method, and these applications would be in number as five to one, compared with other applications. Adopt this plan, and not a Sabbath will pass without an application to build, or to save a church from the hammer. Again: These plans are often very crude and ill-formed. He stated the case of one agent who had made collections for a church, and appropriated the money to himself. How are we always to know the men applying; or, if we know them, how are we to know whether the intentions are feasible? The result of all this is to discourage our people from giving. Again: Some say, leave the matter then to Presbyteries and Synods. But what will be the result? Say to them, Supply your own wants, and then give your surplus to aid the feeble ones, and what will be the result? Why, a very pleasant one for the strong Synods, but a very meagre one for the weaker. We are too selfish, and the result will be that the plan will fail. Another plan is to propose a distinct organization. This was Dr. Hoge's plan. Some propose a new Board; and others a Committee, subject to the Board of Missions. He was opposed to a new Board. It would involve more expense, and, besides, some concession is due to those who are in the opposition. It would also be a weapon in the hands of the opposers of Boards to strike at the present organization. The very best friends of Boards, too, are decidedly opposed to the formation of a fifth Board at this time. An independent Com-

mittee of the Assembly is the last plan—located at St. Louis. He believed this the true one. Some wished this to be under the Board of Domestic Missions, and spoke of church erection as a necessary part of the same work. But he thought that this would be only to cripple operations. Two such important features could not be attended to by the same head. Besides, a Western Committee, independent of the Board of Missions, and located at St. Louis, would secure the hearty co-operation of the West itself, and, indeed, he believed, of all parties. In conclusion, he deprecated the disturbance of our existing plans. The proverb, "Let well enough alone," is a wise one. All plans may have errors; but with all that may be said against our plan of Boards, it has proved to be the plan which has best fulfilled the mission of the Church in its present circumstances. And when a Church presents such an aspect of unity and progress as our own does in this country, it is the height of imprudence to disturb the peaceful working of the machinery. He hoped, therefore, that the opposing brethren may find the sentiment of the Church so strongly in favour of our present system as to waive the enforcement of their peculiar views. He admitted the abilities and excellent qualities of these brethren, but believed they were in a very small minority.

Rev. Dr. Thornwell rose with great reluctance; but the thorough canvass of his argument made yesterday rendered it necessary. He had no hesitation in engaging in the discussion, or to hear the views of others. If he knew himself, he had but one desire, and that was to know what was the will of God. He believed the discussion had been, thus far, so conducted as eventually to produce good. He was sorry for some things that had occurred; but he believed that the ridicule that had been thrown upon some expressions had been done in levity, rather than contempt. He also would have banished from this discussion what had been printed or rumoured elsewhere. One man at least had been placed in an invidious position. He would never regard otherwise than with reverence and respect, the man who had been the author of the Act and Testimony, and who had, under God, been the means of our deliverance. It was some such unfortunate allusion which alone had marred the Christian and manly argument of his opponent. He would now

proceed to the subject itself. The speech which followed his own, reminded him of the ancient contest between Æschines and Demosthenes. All, in reading those speeches, must be satisfied that Demosthenes gained his point, not by argument, but by popular appeal, and by throwing dust into the eyes. There is this difference, however—that Demosthenes addressed Athenian heathen, but Dr. Plumer had addressed a Presbyterian Christian Assembly. Demosthenes had gained his point, Dr. Plumer had not. As to the argument itself, it had brought up side issues, and did not meet his position. For example, Dr. Thornwell had distinctly admitted that God was pleased with building of houses for worship, and yet Dr. Plumer had argued as if he had opposed it. There is, however, this difference between the case of the temple and that of our churches: the former was a house for God, the latter was one for ourselves. When it was said of Christ, “The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up,” this was said as to the temple, and not of the synagogue.

Another error was the assignment of false causes. Dr. Plumer had spoken of the increase of the Board of Publication; and our increase has been great, though, indeed, less than it ought to be. But what is the cause of this increase? Are the Boards the cause? If this is so, then why was it that some other Boards were cast aside as the instrumentalities of the Church? The increase of benevolence is not owing to the form of these instrumentalities. It was the increase of light upon the duty and privileges of the Church that had been its cause. He would state also some facts illustrative of some of his positions. The principle on which we cast off voluntary societies was *not* that the Church had a right to appoint Boards, but that the Church, in her organic capacity, had a right to conduct the cause of missions. It was for *this* principle we cast off all voluntary societies. The Board question was *not* under debate. It was a question which lay back of this. It was, then, unfair to misrepresent the position of those who opposed Boards, as if they had assailed the principle which gave us our present standing as a Church. He was not to be frightened from his position. He held a great principle, which he believed to be founded in Scripture; and while he would sit at the feet of these breth-

ren, when they held forth great Scripture principles, he could not submit to him when that brother so adroitly evaded the real issue, as he had done in this case. He admired the openness and frankness of Dr. Boardman, but he had misstated the case. He had said that if we resist the principle of Boards, we must oppose all our present Boards. Now, this was a false inference. He believed that the Scriptures laid down a form, but also that the spirit was to be preferred to the form; and he would willingly sacrifice the latter to the former—just as in a similar case Christ had said, “I prefer mercy to sacrifice.” He believed our Church, for example, of divine appointment, and yet he would willingly worship with other evangelical denominations. He adhered to this principle so strongly, that, had no Boards at all existed, he would willingly have contributed to those of other denominations in existence. The spiritual obligation overrides all mere form. On this ground he had contributed, and would always contribute to our Boards:

Another mistake he would correct. Rev. Dr. Boardman had attempted to reduce his argument to an absurdity. Let us, he had said, adopt Dr. Thornwell’s principle, and we must do nothing at all for which we have not a definite rule. He saw no *reductio ad absurdum* here. He admitted the inference, for he stood firm upon the absolute sufficiency of the Scripture for faith and practice, and in everything he was directed by it, rejecting philosophy, expediency, and all worldly wisdom. He came now to the application, and he wished the Assembly to bear in mind the distinction between things commanded and things allowed—Christian doctrine and Christian liberty. Now, he maintained, that the Church of God has no power but what is ministerial. He denied that she was left at all to her own wisdom as a rule and guide. Dr. Boardman denies this; but it is the very doctrine of our Book. It was the doctrine of the Puritans. It was on this ground that they resisted liturgies, and rites, and commandments of men, urged on the principle of expediency. He did not argue this before, for he supposed it admitted. Now, the Church has power to appoint officers, because this is supposed in the obligation to do the work. If she, then, has the power to appoint a Board, it must be shown that she cannot possibly do this work herself.

Look, then, at the workings of the Boards themselves. They meet and appoint an Executive Committee and a Corresponding Secretary. Now, is this beyond the power of the General Assembly? Can they not appoint them? Some ask the difference between a Board and a Committee. The difference is plain. A Committee is a body to whom something is committed, whereas, a Board is a body with power to make committees, and thus do the work which it is the Assembly's duty to do. It is, then, unnecessary, and interrupts the healthful action of the Assembly. The objection, then, is not in the name, but in the difference of work performed by a Committee and a Board; and this is producing an evil which is extending to the very extremities of our land. He thought also that he could show distinctly that if this principle of the self-sufficiency of the Church be admitted, it could be proved that an outward revelation itself is unnecessary. A power equal to guide her own steps, was a power equal to enlighten her in the knowledge of divine things. This, however, he could not enlarge upon. He insisted upon the language used by our Moderator at the beginning of the Assembly, to resist innovations. Before closing, he would say a word upon the attempt to associate his positions with those of South Carolina politicians. It was a painful insinuation to him. He uttered a high eulogium upon the late Mr. Calhoun; but, said Dr. Thornwell, in all his great political views I was constrained to differ from him. As to one thing, however, he was glad; he was glad to be called an abstractionist. The abstractionist stands on principle, and it was one of the most eloquent passages of that great man's life, worthy of a great statesman, worthy of Calhoun himself, when he defended himself as an abstractionist. He could not be frightened by epithets. He had but one single rule, which was to preserve a conscience void of offence towards God and towards man, and to abide strictly by the principles of the word of God.

Rev. Mr. Cole—He had nothing to do with the Board question. This has been discussed sufficiently. But there was a practical question before us, and it must be settled to-day, or it will be passed over to another year. The great question is, what is to be done in Church Extension? He spoke for those

who stood with him in the Northwest, and he claimed the privilege of expressing their views as to the mode of meeting the present want. Shall we then have an organization independent of the Board of Missions, or subject to it? They were all finally of opinion that it must be independent. His reasons were, 1. There is no reason for thus subjecting it to the Board of Missions. Is it merely to shed the lustre of its name over it? Of what avail would this be? 2. Again: Confidence must be gained for the plan. But what confidence can a merely nominal connection give? In reality, however, the object is, that the Board should have a control over the Committee at St. Louis. He had several objections to this connection. 1. There was no such relationship between Missions and Church Election, as to require their union. It is said that preaching prepares the way for churches. But if this argument be good, our Board of Education may be dispensed with, for here, also is a relationship existing. Again, 2. The work of Missions and this work are too large to be put together. The report of the Board testifies this. 3. The connection will merely impart a galvanic life for a moment, and not a continued principle of working life. Already this matter has been trifled with long enough, under a similar connection. A subordinate position will never answer to make the plan energetic. Besides, in such a subordinate position it will always be exceedingly difficult to get a prominent and suitable man to be Secretary, and this is the sort of men that it needs—men who will be heard, and will command an influence. We need such a man as our worthy Moderator, whose influence is everywhere felt and respected. If we have not such a man at the head of the scheme, we may as well give it up. It is this, and not the removal of the Committee to St. Louis, that will effect the object. And especially is the removal useless where the Committee is to be controlled at a distance from its own place—controlled in Philadelphia. He did not join in the cry against the brethren in Philadelphia. They had done their work well. But what they needed was not the removal of the place of the Committee, but their organization under a separate head. Let them have this, or else abandon the whole subject for the present. He must also protest against the cry that the East

would protect themselves against being assailed by a set of beggars. They were not beggars in seeking aid from the East, but sought only the advancement of the cause of Christ in that great field of toil and sacrifice.

Dr. Van Rensselaer would make a single explanation. He disclaimed the language that the East never would suffer themselves to be assailed by a set of beggars. He would never use such language respecting his brethren. All he said was, that there must be some system. And this, he believed, all the pastors at the East would say. All he wished was to do something efficient. If a Board was attainable, he would be willing to vote for it. But the great point was to do something. He also corrected the assertion that he was opposed to Boards. It was untrue. Never before, in the nine years of his Secretaryship, had his motives been thus assailed.

Dr. Plumer explained. He had never assailed his brother's motives. He had pronounced him magnanimous. His language was, that he could conceive of no object which could influence the present Boards in opposing this new Board, except it was to gain a wider field for themselves by killing off this. But his personal knowledge of his brother would keep him from attributing such a motive to him. He had the same confidence as ever in him.

We have thus presented our readers with the fullest report our limits would admit, of this interesting debate. It will be perceived that the objections urged against the adoption of the report of the Committee were very various. Some, though only a few, objected to the whole scheme, on the ground that no special effort was demanded; that the work of building churches should be left to the people concerned; that all the Church had to do in the premises, was to send out missionaries. This view is so utterly opposed to the unity of the Church and the brotherhood of Christians, and to the plainest principles of expediency, that it found little or no countenance. Others objected to the report, because, while admitting the importance of the object contemplated, they did not approve of any new organization for its accomplishment. Others, again, preferred a new Board to a Committee, while others were opposed to all Boards.

The objections against Boards, so far as we can gather them from the discussion, are of two kinds. First, those of principle; secondly, those of expediency. As to the former class, it was urged that the Church has no discretionary power, but is tied up to the prescriptions of the Scriptures, not only as to the objects at which she is to aim, but also, as to the means of attaining them; secondly, that the Church cannot delegate her powers; and thirdly, that the centralization of power inseparable from the operation of Boards, is inconsistent with the parity of the clergy. All these objections, as well as those founded on views of expediency, were so fully answered in the course of the discussion, that it is unnecessary to dwell longer on the subject. It may be assumed, that this whole matter is set at rest. The ablest men in the Church, who have ever expressed their disapprobation of Boards, have done their best in argument, and have utterly failed; failed, not from the want of strength, but from the inherent weakness of their cause. Even a giant's arm is unable to give momentum to a feather. Nay, the more vigorous the throw, the less in such a case is the effect. That the Church on the one hand, is not a mere voluntary association, without a divine charter or prescribed constitution, and on the other, that she is not a mummy, incapable of voluntary motion, is, if not self-evident, at least practically admitted. Certain things are prescribed, and certain others are matters of discretion. The Church is required to train, license and ordain ministers; but the way in which this training shall be conducted, is left to her discretion. She is required to take charge of the poor, and of the sick, but how this duty of her deaconship shall be performed is nowhere enjoined. She is commanded to send her ministers to the ends of the earth, but how they are to be sustained, is a matter left to her wisdom. What authority have we from texts of Scripture for the number of our Synods—or for any Synod at all as distinct from a general council? For a long time, no body intervened between our Presbyteries and the Supreme Court of the Church. It became expedient to resolve that Synod into several, and to appoint an Assembly. To deny any discretion to the Church, is to condemn two-thirds of all the prescriptions of our Book. This is so obvious, that we do not

think the reports can have put us into full possession of the sentiments of the brethren who apparently assume this ground. The broad middle ground between license on the one hand, and worse than Judaic bondage and formalism on the other, has been occupied by our Church from the beginning; and we have no fear that she will at this late day be driven from it. As to the Church's having discretionary power, there can be no doubt. The only question is, whether the appointment of Boards falls within the limits of her freedom of action. As to this point, it is enough to remark, that no one has produced a semblance of argument to prove them to be unscriptural, except that they are not prescribed—they are not the Church courts mentioned in Scripture. But this argument, as we have seen, has no force, except in the denial of all discretionary power, or that any body can be created by the Church which is not enjoined in the word of God. The Church in Geneva had no Synod; the Presbyterians in America had for years no Assembly; those of France unite several churches under one session—the churches of a city being under a body composed of ministers and elders. If the principle in question be correct, then there can be no standing committees; no boards of directors, no faculties of learning, appointed by the Church. It is in short, impossible that the principle in question can be carried out; and, therefore, impossible it should be true. The fact is, certain officers have been ordained of God, certain principles of organization and government have been prescribed, certain objects have been set before her, and the Church left to employ these officers, and act under these principles at her discretion. She may combine her officers into many courts, or few; into Committees, Boards, or Faculties, as the necessities of the case demands. On this principle, our own Church and every Church on earth has ever acted.

The principle that the Church cannot delegate her powers, so far as it is true, has no bearing on the question at issue. The Church cannot so delegate her powers as to divest herself of their exercise; she cannot delegate them to any not of her own body, or not subject to her control; she cannot delegate them to those who are by the word of God incapable of exercising them. Thus she cannot delegate her power to ordain or

administer discipline, to the civil magistrate. She cannot delegate any of her functions to Pagans or Musselmans. But does this prove that she may not delegate certain of her executive powers to a portion of her own members? May not a Presbytery appoint a committee of its own body to install a pastor? May not a Synod appoint committees to review the records of Presbyteries? What then is to hinder a Presbytery, Synod, or Assembly, to appoint a number of ministers and elders to conduct the business of missions, education, publication, or church erection? There is nothing in any of these departments of labour which ministers and elders may not lawfully perform, and nothing in the powers delegated which may not lawfully be imparted to them.

A distinction was attempted between a Board and a Committee. A Committee, it was stated, is a body appointed to do a certain work; whereas a Board is a body to appoint a Committee to do the work and to superintend them in their work. But this is a figment. The Boards of Directors of our Theological Seminaries exercise immediately the functions committed to them. And, on the other hand, executive committees (as the Board of Publication, for example) resolve themselves into subordinate committees, and appoint secretaries, treasurers, agents, &c. There is no ground in principle or in fact for this distinction. It is a matter of mere expediency and detail, whether the body appointed be small or large, whether it be called a Committee or a Board. The Church surely is not to be held back or embarrassed in her onward course by such cobwebs as these.

We rejoice in these discussions. They must produce not only unity of views, but harmony of feeling. The evident sincerity of all parties to this debate; the courtesy and candour, as well as the eminent ability which characterized the speeches of Dr. Thornwell, make it evident that there is no element at work in our Church which is likely to disturb its peace or impede its progress.

Death of Dr. Lindsley.

The sessions of the late Assembly were marked by an incident of a very solemn and affecting nature. The venerable

Philip Lindsley, D. D., one of the commissioners, was in his seat at the early meetings of the body, in his ordinary health. One morning it was announced he had been seized with apoplexy, and was in a dying condition. After lingering a few days, he departed this life, on the 25th of May. In early life we enjoyed the instructions of this venerable man, and having ever since been honoured with his friendship, we desire to render our humble tribute to his fidelity, ability, and learning. The Assembly manifested the liveliest sympathy in his sufferings, attended his funeral in a body, and on the motion of the Rev. Dr. Jacobus, adopted the following minute, as expressing their sense of his worth and of his eminent services.

“Dr. Jacobus, from the committee appointed in regard to the death of the Rev. Philip Lindsley, offered the following minute, which was adopted:

“*Whereas*, It has pleased the Great Head of the Church to remove from his seat in this Assembly, our reverend father and beloved co-Presbyter, the Rev. Philip Lindsley, D. D.;

“This Assembly would record with deep emotion, this dealing of Divine Providence toward this body, and pray that it may be blessed to our admonition and spiritual edification. ‘The fathers, where are they, and the prophets—do they live for ever?’

“Our honoured and endeared father died in the midst of his children, in the circle of his early friends and fellow-citizens, and in the arms of his beloved Church. He was called, as he could have wished—in the midst of active labour—found at his post, and faithful to the last. From serving this General Assembly he was transferred, as we trust, to his blessed seat in ‘the General Assembly and Church of the firstborn, whose names are written in heaven.’ The suddenness made it to him only the more of a translation. ‘He walked with God, and he was not, for God took him.’ Full of years and full of labours, the accomplished scholar—the successful Educator—the eminent Professor—the able Ruler—the sound Divine—the beloved Disciple; it was allowed him, according to the willingness which he expressed only a few moments before the fatal stroke, to die here and now, in this city of his early friendships, among his children and brethren in the Lord.

“We were privileged to take sweet counsel here with him; and his fraternal and faithful words, up to the last in this body, leave his memory fresh and fragrant, as is fit. It is the pleasure of this Assembly to attend his mortal remains to the tomb, in confidence of his happy transition and of his glorious resurrection. Like the great patriarch, ‘after he had served his generation by the will of God, he fell asleep.’

“*Resolved*, That this Assembly do tender to the bereaved widow and family of the deceased their Christian sympathies and earnest prayers, and that the Stated Clerk be requested to furnish them with a copy of this action.”

The Assembly was dissolved with the usual formalities, and another appointed to meet in the city of New York, on the third Thursday of May, 1856.

SHORT NOTICES.

1. *Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels.* Part I. Remarks on Christianity and the Gospels, with particular reference to Strauss's Life of Jesus. Part II. Portions of an unfinished work. By Andrews Norton. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1855. pp. 309.
2. *A Translation of the Gospels, with Notes.* By Andrews Norton. Vol. I. The Text. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1855. pp. 443.
3. *A Translation of the Gospels, with Notes.* By Andrews Norton. Vol. II. Notes. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1855. pp. 565.

These volumes are so intimately related as to form one work. The first is an introduction to the translation, of which the notes contained in the third volume are intended as a justification. Professor Norton occupied an eminent position as a scholar and a divine, having no superior in the Unitarian community. He was distinguished not only for his learning and ability, but also for his firm faith in the supernatural origin of Christianity. He believed in miracles; he believed in an immediate revelation from God. He denied the sufficiency of human reason, and held that “the essential value of Christianity consists in its being a miraculous revelation of God,” and

that "if such a revelation has been made, the truths of religion rest on the witness of God himself." He believed that such a revelation had been made, that a genuine record of these divine communications is existent in the Gospels, and the divine origin of the truths therein contained was authenticated by miracles. As therefore against rationalists, as against the destructive historical criticism of the German school, and as against transcendentalists, he is a coadjutor whose valuable aid we gratefully acknowledge. The first of this series of elegant volumes is a satisfactory refutation of the mythical theory of Strauss as to the origin of the four gospels. It is an important contribution to historical criticism, and will be welcomed by the whole Christian community.

Of the Translation and Notes we cannot now speak with detail. The slight inspection we have as yet given to these volumes satisfies us, that the version was never intended by its author to be received as a translation. It is in many cases an expository paraphrase. Thus, as a single example, the word $\zeta\omega\eta$ in John i. 4, is rendered "the source of blessedness." The venerable simplicity of the authorized version is in so many cases unnecessarily departed from, that the reader will be apt to undervalue the excellencies of the translation. It may be used with advantage by the scholar, but it can never satisfy the general reader. The notes are in a few instances theological, but in general they are historical or exegetical. We cannot close this short notice without expressing our admiration of the elegance of these volumes, which is unsurpassed by any publication from the eminent firm to which the public is indebted for so many works rivalling the best productions of the English press.

The Acts of the Apostles; or, the History of the Church in the Apostolic Age. By M. Baumgarten, Doctor of Philosophy and Theology, and Professor in the University of Rostock. Translated from the German, by Rev. A. J. W. Morrisson, Curate of Little Wittenham, Berks; translator of Ritter's History of Philosophy, Guericke's Manual of Ecclesiastical Antiquities, &c. Vol. I. pp. 457. Vol. II. 459. Vol. III. 383. Edinburgh: T. & S. Clark, 38 George street. London: Seeley & Co. &c.

T. & S. Clark, of Edinburgh, have commenced the publication of a series of works under the title of "Clark's Foreign Library." The translation of the first volume of Hengstenberg's Christology formed the first of the series. These three volumes of Baumgarten are the second, third, and fourth in order. The first and second volumes of this work were translated by the Rev. Mr. Morrisson, the third by the Rev. Theodore Mayer, Hebrew Tutor in the New College, Edinburgh. During the current year the publishers expect to issue the second volume of the Christology, and Ullmann's History of the Re-

formers before the Reformation, translated by the Rev. Robert Menzies. This is an enterprise well worthy of the attention of those who feel an interest in the results of German authorship, but are not familiar with the language. We presume subscriptions to the series may be made through the Messrs. Robert Carter & Brothers, New York.

The Miscellaneous Works of the Rev. Matthew Henry; containing in addition to those heretofore published, numerous sermons and papers, now first printed from the original manuscripts; with Forty Sermons on what Christ is made to Believers. By Philip Henry. Funeral Sermons for Mr. and Mrs. Henry, by the Rev. Matthew Henry. Funeral Sermons on Mr. Matthew Henry, by W. Tong, John Reynolds, and Dr. Williams. In two Vols. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 285 Broadway, 1855. Large 8vo. pp. 1304.

The reputation of Matthew and Philip Henry is part of the heritage of the Church. Their names are known as far as the English language has extended. Readers, therefore, in all parts of the world, will be ready to receive with gratitude the numerous productions of their pens contained in these volumes.

The Select Works of the Rev. Thomas Watson; comprising his celebrated Body of Divinity, in a series of Lectures on the Shorter Catechism, and various Sermons and Treatises. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1855. Large 8vo. pp. 776.

The Rev. Thomas Watson was educated in Emmanuel College, Cambridge, became rector of St. Stephen's, Walbrook, London, in 1640, of which parish he remained the faithful pastor until ejected for non-conformity in 1662. His Body of Divinity, in 176 Sermons on the Shorter Catechism, did not appear until after his death. It was published in one vol. folio in 1692, and has since passed through a number of editions, both in England and Scotland. We recommend the work as an aid both to pastors and theological students.

The Christian Profession: A Series of Letters to a Friend, on the Nature, Duties, Necessity, Trials, and Supports of the Christian Profession. By Joseph Claybaugh, D. D. Cincinnati: Moore, Wilstach, Keys & Co. 1855. pp. 216.

This work is designed as a manual to be put into the hands of those who are about to make a profession of religion, and of church members. The title page indicates the subjects of which it treats, and the high standing of its author is a guaranty of the piety and wisdom of its counsels.

A Monograph on Mental Unsoundness. By Francis Wharton. Philadelphia: Kay & Brother, 17 and 19 South Fifth Street. 1855. pp. 228.

This treatise forms the first book of a work on Medical Jurisprudence by the author, in connection with Dr. Moreton Stille, of Philadelphia. Great labour and research have been expend-

ed on this volume. The subject is one of great practical importance. Theory here comes into contact with the rights, the property, and even the life of men. There is no subject on which instruction is more needed by the community. Courts and juries are at the mercy of any medical witness interested parties may summon. We have known the most monstrous doctrines as to mental unsoundness propounded in the courts of justice, and acted on by juries, even in opposition to the ruling of the bench. Criminals the most atrocious have been shielded from punishment on the plea of insanity, when they were never previously suspected of mental unsoundness, and when before and after they have been intrusted with the management of all their affairs. The public need protection from the influence of medical testimony, given under the stress of circumstances; and that protection is to be found in good measure, in the sound discussions of the whole subject *in thesis*, in such volumes as the present.

The Perseverance of the Saints. Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 265 Chestnut St., Philadelphia.

The arguments by which the doctrine of the saints' perseverance is sustained in this discourse, are "logical, scriptural, and convincing." Such is the judgment expressed by the editor in the advertisement prefixed to the sermon—a judgment which, we doubt not, a perusal of the volume will incline the reader to sustain.

The Book of Popery. A Manual for Protestants, descriptive of the Origin, Progress, Doctrines, Rites and Ceremonies of the Papal Church. By Ingram Cobbin, A. M., author of the Condensed Commentary. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, pp. 220.

This is a reprint, we believe, of a popular English work. The preface is dated, Camberwell, July 1840. Its design is to show the true character and unchanging nature of Popery.

The Bohemian Martyrs: or, Sketches of the Lives of John Huss and Jerome of Prague. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 265 Chestnut Street.

There is no better way of exhibiting the true nature of Popery than by a faithful history of its acts. This is much more effective than any amount of denunciation.

The Minister's Family. By Rev. W. M. Hetherington, LL.D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1855. pp. 304.

This is an instructive volume, having all the interest of fiction, with the sober truthfulness of fact.

The Signs of the Times: A Series of Eight Lectures. By N. L. Rice, D.D., Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church in St. Louis. St. Louis, Mo.: Keith & Woods. 1855. pp. 220.

These lectures, with one exception, were delivered in the
VOL. XXVII.—NO. III. 69

course of the regular ministrations of the author. The interest excited by their delivery led to their publication. The subjects selected, Romanism, Infidelity, the Millennium, &c., are such as at all times command public attention. There is, however, such a difference between popular discourses and permanent books, that it is seldom the one can be advantageously turned into the other. We think Dr. Rice would do himself, and the subjects of which he treats, more justice, if he would concentrate his efforts, and produce some work of more research and labour.

The Saints' Everlasting Rest. By Richard Baxter. Accurately collated with the various editions published in the Author's lifetime. With a Life of the Author, and introductory essay and original notes; besides, accurate translations of all the Latin notes contained in former editions. By the Rev. John Johnston Caruthers, Minister of Toxteth Park Chapel, Liverpool. With a fine Portrait. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1855.

Baxter's *Saints' Rest* is too precious in the sight of God's saints to require any specification of its excellencies from us. Owing, however, to its great length, and the many recondite trains of thought, not particularly edifying to common Christians, which swell its bulk, it has been circulated chiefly in abridgments. Many of these have pared the original down to the quick, and destroyed its proper identity. This edition re-produces it in its integrity. Many will be glad to procure this immortal work, as it came from the author's hand, who could by no means afford to purchase any full edition of his voluminous writings. It will, doubtless, in this form, be a means of blessing to many souls. The editor has enhanced its value, by the addition of a well-written biography, judiciously abridged from Orme. He has also added some valuable notes, and an introduction, in which, besides many other just remarks, we find the following, which indicates the most important defect in Baxter's writings.

"In his deeply-rooted antipathy to Antinomianism, he has not, perhaps, been sufficiently careful to distinguish betwixt the legitimate influence of the doctrine of free grace, and the abuse of the doctrine by such as would turn that doctrine into licentiousness. With all the light which Baxter has shed into the souls of Christians, on most of the topics of evangelical piety, he is often confused himself, and confuses his readers, on justification and its adjuncts."

History of the Holy Bible; from the Creation of the World to the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. By John Fleetwood, D. D. With numerous notes. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1855.

This is not a history of the origin, formation, and preserva-

tion of the Bible, but it is a collection of the historical facts contained in the Old Testament, put together in an orderly and continuous narrative. The chasm between the Old and New Testament is filled up with materials gathered from the usual sources. The volume shows that it lacks the advantages which recent philological and historical investigations furnish for the composition of such a work. Yet it is fitted to do important service in increasing the knowledge of ancient and sacred history, and of portions of the word of God, which are too widely neglected.

Preces Pauline; or, the Devotions of the Apostle Paul. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1855.

This volume notes the Apostle's recorded exercises of devotion, upon which the author presents comments and reflections relative to devotional and other Christian duties. As far as we have observed, his suggestions on these subjects are judicious and timely.

The Mind of Jesus. By the Author of "Morning and Night Watches," "The Words of Jesus," &c. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1855.

As none are Christians, except so far as they have the Spirit of Christ, so the study of his character furnishes to us the most powerful helps and incentives to the Christian life. The volume before us consists of a series of brief and fervent exhortations, in reference to the various Christian graces and virtues, founded upon the perfect manifestation of like virtues in our adorable Exemplar. It will be found profitable for admonition, correction, and consolation.

Philip Colville: A Covenanters' Story. By Grace Kennedy, author of "Anna Ross," "The Decision," &c. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1855.

The gifted authoress has the advantage of a subject for this story, which will never fail to interest the excellent of the earth. The friends of pure religion and genuine liberty will never be indifferent to the heroic deeds and sufferings of the Covenanters, for "the testimony of Jesus."

Memoirs of John Frederick Oberlin, Pastor of Waldback, in the Ban de la Roche. Compiled from authentic sources, chiefly French and German. With a Dedication and Translation. By the Rev. Luther Halsey. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1855.

The memory of the just is blessed. The name of Oberlin has become endeared to all the people of God. His zeal, fidelity, and wisdom, his unostentatious and successful labours in an obscure field, his devout and heavenly spirit, have made him a model well worthy of the study of young ministers and aspir-

ants for the sacred office. To this class, especially, we commend this volume, while it cannot but be useful to readers of every sort. It would be well for the Church, if it could now command the same degree of attention which it awakened on its first publication, more than twenty years ago.

Rich and Poor: and other Tracts for the Times. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, B. A., author of "Living or Dead," etc. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1855.

Mr. Ryle is one of the evangelical and thoroughly Calvinistic ministers of the Church of England. Although this volume consists of fervid and searching practical addresses to the heart and conscience, it still brings out the author's distinctive principles with fulness and emphasis. This is natural, not only because his special aim is to guard his readers against formalism and ritualism, but because these principles, whether explicitly stated or not, really underlie all genuine Christian literature. While the book is good as a whole, the chapter entitled, "What is the Church?" is of special interest. On the one hand, he says, "I see more for Episcopacy in the Bible than I do for any other form of church government. On the other, I loathe the idea of handing over the communions to which such men as Matthew Henry, and Doddridge, and Robert Hall, and McCheyne, and Chalmers belonged, to the uncovenanted mercies of God, or saying such men as these were not really and truly ordained. Hard language is sometimes used about them. People dare to talk of their not belonging to the Catholic Church, and of their being guilty of schism. I cannot for a moment hold such views." In order to support such a position, the author is obliged to inquire into the idea of the Church. He asserts, that in its essence, it is, in the words of the communion-service of the Prayer Book, "The mystical body of Christ, which is the blessed company of all faithful people." That it consists of the elect and sanctified, and them only, he shows to have been the doctrine of Ridley, Becon, Coverdale, Davenant, Jeremy Taylor, Hooker, Jackson, Usher, Leighton, Barrow, the burning and shining lights of his communion. Any other theory leads to High Church exclusiveness, by logical necessity. The author also traces the relations of the two theories of the Church to the Christian life: showing very clearly that, according to one, by becoming "a member of a great ecclesiastical corporation," "all its privileges and immunities are your own;" according to the other, "religion is eminently a *personal business* between yourself and Christ." This cannot be gainsayed, either in the light of logic or of history.

Sketches of the Presbyterian Church; Containing a brief Summary of Arguments in favour of its Primitive and Apostolic Character, and a View of its Principles, Order, and History; designed especially for the Youth of the Church. By the Rev. J. E. Rockwell. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

Mr. Rockwell says that his "design has been to supply, as far as possible, a want which has been greatly felt, of some suitable history of the Presbyterian Church, to be placed especially in the hands of our youth." We think the want here mentioned a real one. The author appears to have done his work well. We wish for it a wide circulation.

Adam and Christ; or, the Doctrine of Representation stated and explained. By E. C. Wines, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

Seldom do we find so much good theology in so short a compass. The doctrine so ably stated and explained in this tract, is plainly taught in the Scriptures; it is widely and violently assailed, even by many who accept the other doctrines of grace; but it is fundamental to any logical, consistent, and defensible system of evangelical theology. Wherever this element has been eliminated from the current faith, the enervating process has seldom stopped here. With the back-bone broken, the whole body of truth is disjointed and enfeebled, and one part after another gives away, almost without resistance, before the attacks of rationalism.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

W. A. Van Hengel, Interpretation of Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Part II. 8vo. pp. 169-351. 1 th. 8 ngr.

A. Bisping, Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles of the Apostle Paul. Vol. I. Part 2d. Containing the Exposition of the first Epistle to the Corinthians. 8vo. pp. 304.

A. G. Hoelemann, The Beginning of the Gospel of John, modelled after that of Genesis. 8vo. pp. 76. $\frac{1}{2}$ th. The author maintains that all the ideas of the first 13 verses of John's Gospel are best explained in connection with their typical parallel in the Old Testament. He denies utterly that the notion of the Logos was borrowed from the Alexandrine philosophy.

D. Erdmann, *The Argument, Connection, and Design of the first Epistle of John.* 8vo. pp. 220. 1 $\frac{1}{6}$ th.

P. F. Verschraege, (Rom. Cath.) *Clear and Simple Exposition of the Apocalypse of St. John the Apostle, applied to the principal events of the universal Church, and of the history of empires down to our own times; with some plausible conjectures respecting the future, from the Scriptures, the fathers, and other Catholic interpreters.* Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 539. 2 $\frac{1}{3}$ th.

The most Remarkable Messianic Prophecies, in the original and in the Latin of the Vulgate; with a Hebrew Lexicon. By F. Schiml. 8vo. pp. 78. 18 ngr.

G. F. Oehler, *The Main Features (Grundzüge) of the Wisdom of the Old Testament.* 4to. pp. 32. $\frac{1}{3}$ th. This, like an essay from the same author, published some time since, on the doctrine of immortality under the former dispensation, is designed as a contribution to Old Testament theology.

Commentaries upon Esther, Ruth, and the Lamentations. By Rabbi Menachem ben Chelbo, R. Tobia ben Eliezer, R. Josef Kara, R. Samuel ben Meir, and an anonymous author. Published for the first time, by A. Jellinck. 8vo. pp. 51. $\frac{1}{3}$ th.

Rabbi Simon ben Zernach Duran, *Magen Aboth.* A Commentary upon *Pirke Aboth.* From the Leghorn edition of 1762. 8vo. pp. 196. 2 th.

Zunz, *The Synagogue Poetry of the Middle Ages.* 8vo. pp. 491. 3 $\frac{1}{8}$ th. The author is well-known from other contributions to Jewish literature before, particularly his *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden.* A historical review of the religious poetry of the Jews is here given, together with about 200 specimens of 150 different poets in a German translation.

Testamentum novum tetraglotton: containing the original Greek, the Latin Vulgate, the German of Luther, and the authorized English translation: edited by C. G. Theile and R. Stier. 8vo. pp. 1060. 3 th. This is the same with the *Triglott Testament*, before published, the English version occupying the column devoted to critical notes upon the German text. The text of each language can also be had separately.

C. Tischendorf, *What Light is thrown by the Acta Pilati upon the judgment of Pilate, in the case of Christ?* 8vo. pp. 31. $\frac{1}{2}$ th. An essay read on assuming the Presidency of the Exegetical Society of Leipsic, as the successor of Theile, recently deceased, who had held that office for upwards of thirty years. Tischendorf thinks that the agreement of the *Acta Pilati* with the canonical gospels is such as to warrant us in

attaching a measure of credibility to its independent statements, and it is the aim of this essay to point out the particulars in which it may be regarded as supplementing the narrative of our Lord's trial and condemnation, given by the Evangelists. Tischendorf is continuing his researches in apocryphal literature; he expects to publish soon the Apocryphal Revelations, which, as the Gospels and Acts have already been edited by him, will, in a manner, complete the cycle.

H. Ernesti, *The Origin of Sin*, according to the Pauline system of doctrine, with special reference to the modern theories upon that subject. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 280. 1 th. Contains an examination of the theory of the origin of sin from matter, in the light of the Pauline doctrine.

C. Holsten, *The Meaning of the word σαρκίς in the New Testament*. I. Its meaning in the writings of Paul. 4to. pp. 44. 12 ngr.

H. Laemmer, *The Doctrine of Clemens Alexandrinus concerning the Logos*. 8vo. pp. 108. $\frac{2}{3}$ th.

R. A. Lipsius, *A Disquisition upon the first Epistle of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians*. 8vo. pp. 188. 1 th.

Ewald is writing a history of the Apostolic Age, as a sequel to his *History of Israel*, which has been continued to the death of Christ.

C. Hase has written a published letter, 8vo. pp. 108, to F. C. Baur, entitled *The Tübingen School*, controverting the views of the latter upon the authorship of the Apostle John's writings; upon Ebionism and Paulinism, and upon the periods of Church History: to which Baur has replied.

Quite a number of publications have appeared, both from Romanists and Protestants, upon the Immaculate Conception; some of which are very elaborate.

C. J. Hefele, *The History of Councils: to be completed in five volumes*. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 827. 2 th. 18 ngr.

A. J. Weidenbach, *Calendarium historico-christianum medii et novi aevi*. 4to. pp. 284. 3 th. 8 ngr. This contains chronological and historical tables for calculating the dates of documents, and determining the Christian festivals of the middle ages and of modern times, together with a list of the Cardinals and Episcopal Sees of the Catholic Church in the 13th century.

J. Köstlin, *The Essence of the Church according to the doctrine and history of the New Testament; with special reference to the controversy between Protestants and Catholics*. 8vo. pp. 128. 20 sgr.

A. von Kremer, *Topography of Damascus*. 4to. pp. 37.

T. Tobler, Contribution to the Medical Topography of Jerusalem. 8vo. pp. 67. $\frac{1}{3}$ th.

W. Roeder, The Swiss Reformer, Ulrich Zwingle, his friends and opponents. 8vo. pp. 504. 1 th. 15 sgr.

The second volume has been published of Eichhorn's Life of Stanislaus Hosius, containing his labours as Cardinal. 8vo. pp. 571. $2\frac{1}{2}$ th.

The History of the Founding of Johannegeorgenstadt. 8vo. pp. xxiv and 68. By F. Francke. This was published on the occasion of the bi-centenary celebration of the origin of the place. It recounts the fortunes of the mountain towns in the north of Bohemia during the bloody counter-reformation of the Emperor Ferdinand II., in the years 1620-1629, which finally, upon the refusal of Ferdinand III. to extend the provisions of the peace of Westphalia over his territories, resulted in the migration of 39 families from the town of Platten, to one of the mountains of Saxony, where they founded a new habitation, naming it after John George, the then ruling Saxon prince.

W. Giesebrecht, History of the Period of the German Emperors. Vol. I. Part 1. 8vo. pp. 321. 1 th. 10 sgr. This work is to be completed in 3 volumes. This first part extends to the first expedition of Otto I. to Italy; the remainder of the volume will carry the history down to the death of Henry II.

W. Arnold, Constitutional History of the German Free Cities. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 444 and 502. 5 th. 10 sgr. This treats of the history of Cologne, Mentz, Worms, Spires, Strasburg, Basle, and Regensburg, making that of Worms the basis, both because there was a rich fund of materials there unused, and because its freedom was attained earlier than that of the others.

J. Krebs, in his German History for Schools and Families, undertakes to justify the decision of the Romish Court, in the case of Galileo, by saying that they merely sentenced his doctrine to the realm of hypothesis, *to which it at that time belonged.*

Several new essays have recently appeared, upon the criticism of the great German epic of the Middle Ages, the Nibelunge Notes. The question concerns the comparative value of the texts furnished by the three principal manuscripts, and the truth of the theory propounded by Lachmann, that it is composed of 20 poems, each divisible into heptads, and which are still distinguishable, but which have been variously extended and interpolated, until the whole assumed its present form.

