THE

BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

PRINCETON REVIEW.

EDITED BY

CHARLES HODGE, D. D.

JULY, 1861.

PHILADELPHIA:

PUBLISHED BY

PETER WALKER, 821 CHESTNUT STREET.

AND SOLD BY

CROSBY, NICHOLS & CO., BOSTON; R. CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK;
WILLIAM S. & ALFRED MARTIEN, PHILADELPHIA;
JOHN D. THORPE, CINCINNATI, OHIO;
AND TRÜBNER & CO. LONDON.

CONTENTS OF No. III.

July, 1861.

* This title has been misprinted in the heading of the article.

THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1861.

No. III.

Article I.—*The Kingdom of Christ.**

The art and mystery of our religious life consists in the exercise of faith. The faith which is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen, has, by its nature, a claim to supreme authority in man, and always tends, like the conscience among the moral faculties, towards entire predominance. It proposes, as the most excellent of possible attainments on earth, that we shall walk by faith and not by sight, and becomes in us the power and the desire to live as seeing Him who is invisible.

It is the chief design of the things that are seen to help us in conceiving and enjoying the things that are not seen. Our Lord Jesus Christ appeared in the flesh to aid us in realizing that he lives in the Spirit. The imaginative powers which blend themselves so readily with our religious faith, are stimulated to conceive more vividly what is behind a visible veil, than what is described as in its nature invisible. The mercy-seat in the Jewish tabernacle, which was veiled from the people,

* The following article is an enlarged form of the discourse of the Rev. Dr. Yeomans, at the opening of the late General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia.

was more of a reality to them while thus associated with that visible veil, than if described to them as a thing which from its nature could not be seen. We have a clearer conception of the invisible vapour when we have just seen its visible image in the cloud. The disciples, at the ascension of the Lord, still looked steadfastly towards heaven as he went up, and after the cloud had received him out of their sight. The quickening image of their Lord, with which they had been so long familiar, and which had now vanished from before their open eyes, was leaving in them the living conception of the invisible Spirit which his earthly form had represented.

On this principle we may explain in part the great power of our Lord's discourse on the invisible world. He stands before his people, the living, earthly image of what is not seen. Not only has he the lively and unwavering consciousness of truth, in speaking of the kingdom of life he represents; but he embodies in himself its power and glory. Appearing as he did in this world, in the form of a servant, in full sympathy with the earthly experience of humanity, undergoing the miseries of this life, the wrath of God, and the cursed death of the cross, yet claiming to be a king, and in the act of administering his kingdom, as if its powers were in the world invisible, and its visible motions before the eyes of men, he had but one presumption to save his course from being, not an enigma or a mystery only, but an absurdity. It was the presumption that he was the Son of God, revealing in himself the perfection of God, and the Son of man, revealing in himself the perfection of man; that his character and teachings presented to men the system of universal and eternal righteousness and truth; that his life on earth, with all the doctrines it involved, all the interests it upheld, all the powers it exerted, and all the movements it originated, was a part of the great system of Divine operation to which all earthly things belong—one of the representative and guiding movements of the universal scheme.

Hence, with the same freedom with which he spoke of having come down from heaven, he spoke also of administering, while *in* the world, a kingdom which was not of this world. All who saw and heard him must have observed that he was conversant with things visible and things invisible, with equal familiarity,

and at the same time. And as he so evidently ruled worldly phenomena by direct and immediate control of their invisible powers, he invites the earnest and rational endeavour of the human race to conceive and define the relation between them, by the help of his revelations. It is one of those mysteries which thought converses with better than language, and faith better than logic. All the scriptural ideas of the things not seen partake largely of the experience of faith; that general state of the soul which the Saviour calls "doing the will of God," in order to "know the doctrine." It is only by a living and loving communion of faith among the disciples of Christ that they can establish a clear view of these high themes that shall be common to them all, and unite them in the same mind and in the same judgment.

The Saviour was accused before Pilate of having spoken treasonable words against the Roman government, and of saying that he himself is Christ, a king. That he is a king he does not deny. But his defence relates to the nature of his kingdom. He pleads that his kingdom, as to its principles, its tendencies, and its aims, did not interfere with the rights or powers of the civil ruler. The defence prevails with Pilate. It satisfies him that Jesus was innocent of all design against the government; that nothing asserted or implied in his claims was of any treasonable import, and that all the bearing of his doctrine and his course of life upon the empire would tend rather to preserve than to subvert its order and prosperity. "My kingdom is not of this world."

The value of this defence depended on the ideas it involved respecting this world, the kingdom of Christ, and their relation to one another. And these same ideas, clearly conceived and steadily preserved under the influence of Christian faith, are important to the universal and perpetual edification of the church.

1. The most general idea of this world in Scripture is that of the visible system of earthly things with the invisible forces or laws which immediately govern them. It is limited to the human race, when conceived as the world which God will judge; and to the ungodly portion, when viewed as the world for which the Saviour does not pray. It varies, also, to represent

the corrupting influence opposed to the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit, as when Jesus says, "I have overcome the world." It thus comes to represent the spirit of the natural man as distinguished from the regenerating Spirit of Christ, which dwells in his people. In this, its most usual import in the New Testament, this world is conceived as an organized antagonist of God, with a leader or prince of its own, a nature essentially alien from righteousness, which is not subject to the law of God, neither, indeed, can be. Whatever is friendly to it is enmity against God. The people of God are called out of it. Its enmity is to be overcome, its tendencies reversed, its results destroyed as the works of the devil.

It thus appears in hostility to Christ and his kingdom. "The world cannot hate you, but me it hateth; because I testify that the works thereof are evil. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, and I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." The idea of enmity is more obscure, when the Saviour prays, for instance, not that the Father would take them out of the world; and says, "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world; that the world may know that thou hast sent me." And it thus shades off into greater obscurity in our text—"My kingdom is not of this world;" but it does not wholly disappear, for even Pilate must have caught a glimpse of evil in the world into which Jesus must come to bear witness unto the truth.

However closely this world is joined to things invisible, it is yet this world, and not that; and is conceived as here, and not there; appears as living and moving in a sphere of its own, where its power is claimed to be supreme, and might be admitted to be so; not essentially evil, yet the sphere where all evil belongs, so far as it is manifest to men on earth. For the essential evil in the world is in man; and thus this world as evil, signifies only the invisible spirit of man. There it initiates all its motions in the world, unfolds all its phenomena, propagates all its progeny. There is the shrine of the god of this world, the court of its prince, the fortress of its strength. From that it is to be dislodged, and the entire evacuation of

that stronghold of sin by the powers of darkness will finish the regeneration of the world.

Man, therefore, considered in his natural state, and controlled by the forces of nature in distinction from those of the renewing Spirit, is the essential element of this world—man, considered also as holding dominion over many important changes of visible things. The words did not convey all this idea to Pilate, but they served the Saviour's purpose with Pilate, and were not spoken for him only, but for all people.

2. The kingdom of Christ, in contrast with this world, is a sphere in which Christ rules; where his reign is viewed, not merely as prospective, but as actual, and in full force. "Thou sayest that I am a king." This seeming concession does not admit the charge of the Jews against him. Their meaning and his were wide as the poles apart. But the admission opens into a glorious and blessed mystery. Not a king in prospect merely, but at the moment in possession of his throne, and all its prerogatives; not then suspended from any right of royalty, or really obstructed in any exercise of sovereignty he chose to employ, he was doing his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth. He never was, and never will be more truly king than when he made himself of no reputation among men. Never was his majesty more resplendent and adorable to spiritual eyes than in his servant form, and the temptation and infirmity of his earthly condition. Never was his crown more brilliant, and honoured with a more ardent and unfeigned devotion, than while the head that wore it had not where to rest. Never was his power more active, or effective in controlling rebellion in his dominions, than in that dark hour when he was reached and smitten by wicked hands, and crushed under the shame and anguish of the cross. And when was victory so complete, so manifest and irreversible, as when he rose from the grave, because he could not be holden of it, as the dawn of that glorious morning calmly and silently rose, because it could not be holden of the night. "Thou sayest that I am a king;" but knowest thou what sort of king I am; and that thou couldest have no power against me except it were given thee from above? "I am a king;" and he

expresses his claim, and his full possession of dominion over the realm of created things. It takes in this world itself.

But the kingdom is not the mere realm of earthly phenomena. Whether Cæsar is a legitimate sovereign or a usurper, whether he reigns in righteousness or in iniquity, whether he seeks the good of his people or his own glory, is the question he has not come now to decide. His coming is not as one of the natural phenomena of the world to disturb and displace other phenomena; applying superficial correctives to outward disorders, though with the whole system of earthly things he is unavoidably concerned, and holds over it entire control. This satisfies Pilate. It was enough for the law he was to administer that Jesus did not claim a worldly jurisdiction within the dominions of Cæsar; that he raised no political questions; that he would not be a judge or a divider among men, and had nothing to say of the right or the wrong of the civil power. All these matters will come before him in their time and form. All possessors and claimants of inheritance, all holders of empire, have their accounts to settle with him, and will receive due attention from him in due time. Let Cæsar finish his reign, and let his subjects render unto him the things that are his. Let alleged injustice keep the inheritance, or let this world right its own wrong; let the adulteress be stoned, where the law requires it, or go unpunished as the powers may decide. He comes not to interpose in the outward details of human action, to watch and regulate motions of sin. The period for such tampering with human depravity is past. The dead ought still to be buried as ever; but let the dead bury them, and in their own way. There is no more legislation for degenerates. Christ comes not into the world with a policy of mere restraint, or regulation for sin, or a proposal to reform one or another particular abuse. If he purges the temple, it is not to restore the building from outward defilement, or profanation, but to enforce spiritual truth and duty. He sets no watchmen there, and his end is gained, though as soon as he is gone the traffickers were back again. He had a word for worldly ears on prayer, and the duty and the means of maintaining it; and his gestures among the seats and tables of the money-changers would impress his

word on the memory, if they did not write on the heart. Thus plain it is that the kingdom in which Christ is really ruling is something distinct from this world. We see that, while moving in the midst of visible things, his thoughts are in another region. His kingdom, therefore, should be conceived as the system of created powers, lying deeper among the things not seen than even those invisible causes which immediately govern the changes of the material creation. This world—a series of changing forms, a scroll to be rolled together, a panorama moving by silent unseen powers before the eye of sense—is all to pass away. The kingdom of Christ will still abide. It is the great world of reality, as distinct from this world which is appearance only. It is the world of truth as compared with all that is frail and false. This is the broad sense of the terms, as used in our text; and wherever that kingdom is spoken of in Scripture, as the kingdom of God and the kingdom of heaven, though restricted by its connection to some particular earthly phase in which it may reveal itself under one covenant or another, it still does not anywhere disclaim this comprehensive character.

Consider, then, this great defence of our Lord. Could any human mind have conceived it, but that which was dwelling with the Spirit of God in him. Would any mere man have ventured to use it, except one who "had a devil and was mad." "I am a king; a visible embodiment of eternal authority and power. Yet in appearance so weak that thou hast power to crucify me, and power to release me. Of my chosen followers, one is a devil, and has betrayed me; another is a liar, and has denied me; and the rest have forsaken me and fled. But I have truth to testify, and if thou art of the truth, thou wilt hear my words." To all this, so considerately spoken before a heathen magistrate, is to be added what he said more freely before the Jewish council; I am the Christ, the Son of God; and hereafter ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.

3. The two ideas of the world and the kingdom of Christ, thus distinguished from one another, are still to be taken together in a mutual connection which is indissoluble and vital. The relations of the kingdom of Christ to this world, are sug-

gested by his appearing in the world to conduct an important part of his administration; by the truth he testified for the world concerning his kingdom; by the character and appointed service of his followers in the world; by his view of the connection of his kingdom with the course of earthly change; and by his assurance of its universal manifestation in the earth.

(1.) Why is the king on the earth, on the business of a kingdom which is not of this world?

He did not originate here, like the kings of this world. He was not born to grow up like them to the inheritance of their empire. He was born, not that he might become a king, but because he was a king. He held his throne before he appeared on the earth, and before the world was. And the concerns of his administration brought him hither. This is not indeed the seat of his government, the centre from which his authority radiates, the sphere in which his sceptre holds immediate sway. His throne has not its pillars amidst the natural, and superficial powers of this world. It is not built on this vapour, and therefore cannot be shaken, though the earth be removed, and the mountains be cast into the depths of the sea. He comes into this world of commotion from a kingdom which cannot be moved. This was his word for Pilate and for all men. Heathen as Pilate is, with enough of the dim light of heathenism to understand that there are things not seen, but not enough of gospel light to perceive "what is truth" concerning them, anxious and bewildered from what he sees and hears, he still discerns clearly these two things: That Jesus meditated nothing against the civil government, and might be justly and safely released; and that this King and this kingdom were matters of too grave and solemn import to be hastily and rashly dealt with. His own prudence, and the dream of his wife, admonished him to take the safer side. He pleads with the accusers to forbear and consent to the release. He washes his hands of the innocent blood before the multitude. And though he compromises his manliness at last, through fear of the Jews, he proves the deep hold of that defence of Jesus on his mind. That kingdom which was not of this world had an import for him. The visible presence of the king whom he knew not, brought with it a special and peculiar activity of the power of the king-

dom where its words were spoken, and where its works were done. Distinguish it as we may from this world, its Sovereign is here conducting its affairs. His personal presence on earth changes none of his relations, signifies no enlargement of his sphere of operation, but shows him to men as he is employed in his administration when not seen among them. He appears as in his own realm, on ground over which his power is exercised in fact and by right; in territory where his reign can no more be resisted or disputed, than in the heaven from which he comes. His kingdom is not of this world, but this world is of his kingdom. He has come from the invisible seat of his government; from the centre to one of the extremities; an extremity which derives from the centre all its life and power. He comes, with a fulness of grace and truth, to restore what had here been lost; to recover to loyalty those who had revolted. With all things delivered unto him by his Father, he takes a manifest place amidst the superficial changes of this border, this shadowy outline of his kingdom, with all the unsearchable and glorious prerogatives of his invisible throne. In presence and manner he appears as not on alien ground, but in his own dominions; moving amidst phenomena brought forth by the principles and powers in the heavenly places over which he immediately rules.

(2.) He indicates the relation of his kingdom to this world by his testimony concerning the truth: "My kingdom is not of this world; but to this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I might bear witness unto the truth." Apart from the import of his testimony concerning his affairs, there is great significance in the fact, that a kingdom which is not of this world, but belongs essentially among the things which are not seen and eternal, should demand the attention of mankind to a statement of its principles and aims; that he who comes in the fulness of grace for men to accept, should also appear in the fulness of truth for men to know; and truth, which men must know in order to be saved. A voice goes before him—Hear ye him. And whosoever will not hear this prophet shall be cut off from among his people. He comes with a claim to attention, founded in his own nature—the nature of the truth he testifies, and the nature of

man. He makes it life for men to receive his testimony, and death for them to reject it. If he had not spoken, they had not had sin. He demands reverence for the authority with which he communicates truth; he claims gratitude and love for his kindness in this testimony; for his compassion towards them as victims of fatal delusion amidst the false and the vain; as those who are themselves a lie, and deceived to their ruin by the father of lies. His kingdom has power with men through knowledge. Its invitations hold upon the living spirit of truth in men; those inmost affinities which make the earnest soul revolt against delusion, and dread to be misled by falsehood. Its authority presupposes a genial and happy submission in the creature, whose true freedom is found in knowing and obeying the truth. And it works like the test of a refiner's fire—proving, by its acceptance or rejection, who are of the truth; who will give heed to the law written in their hearts, and who will stupidly yield to the law of sin which is in their members.

Have men no concern with such a witness? His kingdom is not of this world; and this may quiet Cæsar's fear for his political rights. It does not concern itself directly with the existing relations of earthly phenomena to one another. But does this deprive Cæsar, or any one else, of all valuable interest in that kingdom, or relieve him from all concern about it? True, it is not of this world; but what if this world is of it? What if Cæsar, in the full security of his throne, and the unruffled peace of his realm, should perceive it rising into power within him and around him, like an atmosphere of righteousness and truth? For this his witness-bearing is like the light from the east, that shineth even unto the west; and no eyes can be wholly closed against it.

It is also significant, that the King himself is the witness, suggesting what sort of king he is, and the manner of his administration; teaching men what they have to repent of—that while he was always among them, they knew him not. For his being in the world, and his coming, are not the same thing. The one is a universal and perpetual fact, to be recognized or ignored by all men—"the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." The other, a visible appear-

ance to his own, to be rejected by them, or received and presented through them to the world—a fact local and temporary. He comes from heaven, where he dwelt from eternity with the Father. He shows himself as a model of the heavenly life. He makes it a part of his kingly administration to reveal himself with his fulness of the Godhead, and his self-sacrificing love for sinners. While truly a king, to subdue his people, to rule and defend them, and to restrain and conquer both his and their enemies, he is the light of his people, and the light of the world. He must come as the revelation of the character and will of God for our salvation. He must be set forth as the only Mediator between God and man, to propitiate and to intercede; and must illustrate before his people the fact and the manner of his mediation. Were he like other kings, he might maintain his sway over this portion of his dominions without being known; but in his appointed modes of exercising his kingly power, he becomes also the prophet and the priest of his people. His teaching, his atonement, his intercession, are all royal; all sovereign executions of his will, in his one relation as head of his kingdom. For his kingdom is a kingdom of life. He rules as a living power—a power of life. Were his kingdom only an outward organization, administered by laws and forces not of itself, his ruling office would not include such spiritual functions as he now performs; and there would be no call for his personal appearance as a witness for the truth. The needful knowledge of his kingdom would come in the natural way. In the course of his providence, he executes his will among men in a way which requires, in many matters, no knowledge at all; and in others, only such as they can learn by experience and observation. But the full spiritual development of the powers of his kingdom includes the discernment and enjoyment of the truth concerning himself and the heavenly world. Of this truth he only can testify. It is he alone who can reveal the fact, that he was from eternity with God, and can bear witness of that eternal existence, as of that which he doth know, and which he hath seen.

Israel was now to know the spiritual bread on which the fathers fed in the wilderness, and the spiritual rock that followed them, from which they drank the flowing water. All

coming generations of believers were now to know who it was that the saints of old believed and trusted, though he was not personally revealed; and they are to keep this testimony ever before them, in the increasing light of the advancing ages, that they may know whom they themselves believe. "I said, Behold me, behold me! to them that asked not after me." And now that mighty power which thus broke forth in prophecy, and which had so long been working redemption, unseen and unknown, comes out into open view—showing itself in the person of a King, the head and embodiment of a kingdom of life. He bears witness of the truth by engraving his own spiritual likeness on the face of the world. The Lord our righteousness is now revealed. The propitiation for the sins of the world is now set forth.

Hence the spirit of the gospel becomes the Spirit of wisdom and of understanding in the knowledge of him. Believers in Christ not only know that there is such a person as Christ; they know Christ himself. They not only know that there is life; they know the life. "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." "The life was manifest, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." We then hear that same Spirit of the gospel from within, exclaiming, "I count all things but loss, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I suffer the loss of all things, . . . that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection. . . . I pray that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge, and in all judgment." Thus comes forth to the full knowledge of men, that power which had been working among them for ages. They know what it has done; they feel what it is doing now; they know what to expect of it in time to come. And we receive this knowledge as a revelation of the mystery of the world. All that he testifies concerning his kingdom, as being not of this world, as really concerns this world, as though the two were one. He comes as from the bosom of the world, when he appears upon it; and shows himself as the quickening Spirit of all living creatures, but manifest only in the conscious intelligence of man. He is

the King who can say, "My kingdom is not of this world;" and yet can also say, "My kingdom is within you." It is the glory of Christ, at the head of his kingdom, that he filleth all things.

He rules his kingdom as a system of living power flowing entirely from himself. He is the fountain of its being. Its essence is the offspring of his own nature. Its powers represent his energy; its motions his will. Its outward organization is the form of its appearance in the world, put on for its temporal purposes, as the earthly body for the temporal purposes of the soul. He himself, as the man Jesus, is the perfect manifestation of the life of his kingdom; all other forms of the spiritual life, which have appeared in the world, are but approximations towards his model. From the first generation downwards he moved with undeviating step towards this full appearance, allowing his motions to be seen more clearly at the successive stages of his progress, by the spirit of faith and of pious hope and trust, and of prophecy; and giving that spirit of faith and hope and prophecy, not only as a faculty of sight to discern his motion, but as a fruit of the motion itself, the dawn of the morning radiating from the rising Sun of Righteousness itself. It is all along the Spirit of grace and truth, to be testified in due time; not of the world, yet now vitally in it. Though rising amidst the natural laws of the earthly, it is not a development from them. So when it appeared in person, that person was under the law, and yet a power above it; born of the natural, yet himself spiritual seed of the woman, yet Son of God; descendant of the first Adam, yet before him in time, above him in rank, and his Maker; having given life already to the world, and now appearing that he may give it more abundantly. He testifies of the true life of man, as the brilliant, ruddy countenance of health testifies of the life within.

(3.) He indicates the relation of this world to his kingdom by the character and position of his servants. He designates a few at first to illustrate his truth and power by their character and their service. Here is a manifest and glowing point of vital connection. These men are penetrated and inwardly moulded by that Spirit which had formed the higher traits of his own person. They have been with him in the regeneration;

in the mighty reinforcement of the spiritual power in men, signalized by his coming in the flesh. They are raised to the summit of spiritual observation. With a small mental stature, and few natural gifts, they have a clear and settled discernment of the mystery of God in Christ; the mystery so long hidden from the wise and prudent, and now revealed unto babes. With their conception of Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God, they sat on the twelve thrones of the world, and their judgment became the law of mankind.

His testimony thus took effect on them. It was not through flesh and blood that they had their knowledge, but by the Father in heaven. That mustard seed is planted for a new harvest of knowledge in the world. It has not yet a deep strong root among the human faculties. It has not yet the branches in which the fowls of heaven could lodge. But it is planted and must grow. This is a great step of progress never to be retraced. It was by a long course that that point was reached; and by a long course in the future must the new principle reach its place in human affairs.

Thus the kingdom of Christ, which is not of this world, is preparing to be known hereafter as the leading power in the progress of mankind. From its place at the foundation of all the departments of human life, it works upward and outward through them, to enforce them all with their true health and vigour. When sought as the first and chief good, it brings all other things along with it. Its vital circulation pervades all the interests of men. Seek first the kingdom of God. As a principle within the soul of man, the living imperishable substance of order and glory for the world, now to be known and honoured in its work; it is ever looking and moving, from amidst the sin, the sorrow, and the tumult of the human spirit towards an era of perfect purity and peace on earth.

This new but obscure appearance of the kingdom of Christ in the field of human history, does not seem like the rising of an institution now introduced, to share with other institutions in shaping the destiny of man. It seems rather like a primeval principle; and not even beginning with the beginning of the world, but existing before it, and holding upon the material forms of this temporal system by the ties of life. We find it

taking into its living circle the earthly bodies of the saints, uniting them by spiritual bonds to Christ, consecrating them as temples of the Holy Ghost, regenerating them by the present indwelling of the resurrection power, and making them instruments of righteousness, to be offered as a living sacrifice to God. We discern here a spiritual affinity, even for the material world. The spirit of man, in its living union and communion with the Spirit of God, and as an actual partaker of the Divine nature, lives itself into a material organization, and holds it as part of itself, a sharer in its present discipline and character, and joint heir to its future glory. So comprehensive is the relation of the kingdom of Christ to this world; so thoroughly does it pervade the constitution of the earthly system, planting and blending its heavenly energies amidst gross corporeal forms, subjecting itself to their laws of present change, till the time arrives to refine them out of the earthly, and present them in the image of the heavenly; to change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself. This kingdom, with all its appearance of an institution over men, is still essentially a principle within them, revealing its earthly relations in the doctrine, the character, and the service of the first disciples of Christ.

The subjects of this kingdom thus in this world, are to continue in it; a peculiar sort of self-perpetuating body, with powers and rights indwelling and inviolable. One generation goeth, and another cometh; a stream of being; yet such a stream that the new generation rises out of the old. The generations live one continuous life, which rises as from a fountain in the kingdom of Christ. We trace it in this earthly sphere, not as in space, but as the hidden substance of an organizing energy, hid with Christ in God, yet wearing, under earthly laws, and as to its local and temporal phenomena, the yoke of a rigid obedience. And yet, like the Prince of life himself in his subjection to those laws, it is greater than they, and binds them to its own service. However feeble in appearance in the first disciples of our Lord, yet with the living power of Christ for its support, how surely must it advance with the course of human generations.

In this light observe those humble disciples of Christ, demoralized, dispersed, and powerless as they are in their leader's extremity; and, are these the men to revolutionize the world, and take the kingdom? The church looks always at this wonder with awe and adoration. The man Jesus, a forsaken, despised and unresisting captive, with death before him, had presumed through life the universal prevalence of his doctrine; and now, when all seems over with him, still holds that calm presumption clear and firm as ever. "Fear not, little flock," he would still say, "it is the Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." Conscious as ever of the power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as the Father had given him; and having just consoled his disciples with the assurance that he had overcome the world, he surrenders himself to a shameful death, and his followers to discouragement and dispersion. Are these men, Leader and followers, the light of the world; the depository of invincible truth and power for all mankind. The world must always ask such questions concerning a kingdom whose power it has no rule to measure, and whose foundations it has no line to explore.

When these men were sifted as wheat, and all the perishable integuments of their life were blown away, there might be left but the smallest grain. And this again is the wonder and the glory. It was as a spark of life in embers. The living word in them shone forth even into their own consciousness, with only a flickering conviction; while on the eye of the world it did not then even glimmer. That new gift of the Holy Spirit, the root and ground in them of the new order of things, like a small seed in the soil, seems almost undistinguishable from the dust around it; but it goes down to the place of its future root in the inner man. There is the position from which it is to command the world. From thence it opens upward, like the tree with its commanding and fruitful branches, into congenial and convenient institutions in which the ordinances of Christ and the social sentiments of human nature harmonize and coöperate to promote its growth and fruitfulness. The Spirit takes up the flesh, and pervades it with its heavenly life. This mystery is now revealed; the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things

by Jesus Christ: To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in the heavenly places, might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God.

Those first followers of Christ, in their very depression and infirmity, were a great power in the world. The treachery, fickleness, and timidity revealed in their first trial, were signs, indeed, of their own weakness, but would illustrate the strength of Christ in their victory. As Christ in his death, so Peter, and all the timid and faltering eleven, conquered when they fell. While they yielded to temptation, there was a heart within that could feel the look of Christ, and put forth a recovering power. Even in the body of death there was a latent sensibility to the power of life through the spirit now given them. With their weakness there were now united the elements of strength. They receive and appropriate the supply of whatever they lacked in themselves. Had they been of this world, they could not have risen above their infirmity; for nothing can overcome the laws of its own nature; but the spirit now in them is the Spirit of their Lord, the power by which he rules. For it to live is to reign. "As I live, ye shall live." It looks steadfastly to the subduing of all things unto itself, as the rising sun towards the meridian. We see how it speaks and acts the sovereign, even in the deepest humiliation. It carries itself in the posture, not of hope which may fail, but of conscious power to realize in this world what is already fact in the other.

This security resides in the seat of its power. The position of the kingdom of Christ in relation to this world is that of actual and supreme control. It does not stand before men to assert its right and authority; but the real understanding of its right and power comes to men rather as an inward consciousness than as an outward fact of knowledge. Men are willing in the day of its power. They know the doctrine who do the will. The power of this kingdom does not begin by being known. It is known by its work. It corrects the tree in the root. It purifies the stream at the fountain. Its victories are not determined on the field of phenomenon, but in the secret chamber of principle and power. The empire of Cæsar, as a worldly fact, rests on the sand of visible change. Viewed as

one of the successive states of the field it occupies, it is one of the masses of the sand itself, and with the shifting sands it must shift with the rest. The power which upholds the whole is behind the scene. The scene of actual conflict between pope and emperor is not the point where the victorious power of Christ is first applied; nor do the questions there raised touch his power of control or the fact of his actual dominion. Such visible conflicts are but the motions of the earthly substance suspended in the great solution of the kingdom of Christ, in which the particles, by their own laws and the law of the spirit of life in which they move, are floating towards their places in the vast clear crystal of the finished world.

4. The mutual relation of this world and the kingdom of Christ is indicated by the progress of the world.

By the progressive movement of the world, we mean what everybody recognizes as the course of change which connects the beginning of the world with its end; a course of change proceeding by laws which bind the end to the beginning by a divine decree, and which determine, by indwelling power, the place and office of every member of the system, of every event in the course, and of every item in the result.

The kingdom is the Lord's. The various and ever-varying phases of the stream of earthly life, are visible delineations of his power and will. History grows. The course of worldly change is a growth; an unfolding of the properties and laws of things. The perpetual creations of the world are from the workings of a system which proceeds by its indwelling tendencies, and are like the growth of a living organism. All are the workmanship of God. He moves the heavenly bodies in their orbits, by properties residing in them, and with a uniformity and precision which could not be exceeded if they were instinct with an intelligent and perfect life. He paints the lily with the inimitable pencil of a vegetable law co-working with the laws of light. He prints, on the face of the world, a history of his working in the human race, by the laws of life in man combined with the law of his own Spirit. It is all an earthly painting by living forces, which in this way, and in no other, become known to us. The history of this world is the self-registering activity of the unseen powers of the kingdom of

Christ; and time a transient portraiture of eternity; mournfully confused and defaced indeed, but always nearer its time for appearing in full divine glory. Here the unsearchable and universal laws, the infinite, enact themselves in part for the temporary instruction and government of men. But how little of their glory can be set in our inch of space and our hand-breadth of time! Enough is known, however, to illustrate the universal sway of the kingdom of Christ, even over the changes of visible things. It is only in a qualified or figurative sense that we can ever speak of anything as out of its bounds. It has no outside. The sin against it, whether of angels or of men, is not an invasion from without, but a rebellion within. Different as the apparent course of individuals may be, and awfully and eternally different as may be the results to individuals under his reign, that reign is still absolute, actual, and universal. And by close inspection we see it where we might not expect. In forms of human thought, in moral judgments, in the outward relations and practices of men, their methods of culture, their social organizations, their laws, their institutions, all the types and all the degrees of their civilization, you discern somewhat, in the character and experience of all, which bears the marks of his spiritual workmanship, though often but dimly discernible. The hand of Christ is everywhere manifest.

All real improvement in the condition and prospects of man arises from the kingdom of Christ, and begins of course in the heart. Either make the tree good and its fruit good, or else make the tree corrupt and its fruit corrupt. Men well know the great labour, and the small gain, of efforts towards reform where there is no internal work. Wherever mere suasion or discipline results in good—if in natural goodness—it is from principles which were in the man before, and which waited, like seed in the soil, to be wakened and brought forth to life; if in spiritual righteousness, it is by quickening the seed of the word already in the heart. Culture developes nature, but never changes it. The life of Christ must first be implanted in the soul, and then the reward of faithful and prudent spiritual culture, however slow, is sure. The kingdom of spiritual life, like that of nature, has its appointed times. Men must watch for its coming. All who would profit by its progress must have

their eyes in the direction of its motion; forgetting all behind, and pressing forward. Good men, at the opposite extremes of conservatism and progressiveness, may equally need admonition; the one against presuming that the goal is reached; the other, against rash haste to reach it.

The people of God have such things as these to remember: that they have a rebellious nature; that they are under correction; that they are grafted with the spirit of new obedience; that this must grow by the laws of their nature, while it must rule by its own. The ancient Israel could hardly live except alternately at opposite extremes: either indolently longing to return and remain in Egypt, or, under the impulse of a sudden awakening, rushing up the hill against the Canaanite, to be driven back with shame and loss; all to show that the law of the kingdom required the forty years training till Israel should be ripe for the conquest, and the iniquity of the Amorites should be full.

In the order of creation, that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural. As God first formed the body of Adam, and then breathed into it the breath of life which made the man a living soul, so he is constantly forming the natural for the spiritual through successive generations; and we are witnessing the process of breathing into this natural body of collective man—the breath of the new and spiritual life. If any are pleased with the geological hints that the six days of the original creation were vast periods of creative activity in finishing the order and the beauty of the natural world, they may discern a like demiurgic period ever since going on in bringing forth the new creation. Long, oh how long, even according to our biblical reckoning of six thousand years, has the world been waiting on the gradual inbreathing of the Spirit of God into this body of sin, and the bringing forth of the fruits of that life in a redeemed and glorious church on earth. And yet, it is not slackness concerning his promise as some men count slackness. It is the progress of the Eternal One, with whom one day is as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day.

The power of the new creation works under the law of the old. The nature of man, as made at first, is the foundation of

the new superstructure—the web of the new fabric. The spiritual life is given to the natural man to be his. The whole new formation is a growth of the spiritual and the natural together under the laws of the natural. The spiritual life is given by virtue of the covenant; and with it are appointed means for bringing it forth in the forms of righteousness and peace. In this progressive work in individuals, and in generations of men, it is our part to conform in thought, in word, and in deed. Reason should form an orderly conception of it. The heart may delight in it as an incitement to grateful adoration. The whole man should work together with it in promoting purity and peace in the earth. But chiefly does the new creature conform to this advancing work with lively expectation and desire; looking for and hasting unto the coming perfection. This is the natural posture of the spiritual man in this world. As the child lives towards manhood, so he looks towards it; and his expectation looking is from the nature of his life. Man, whether as an individual or as a race, lives not for what he is, but for what he is to be. It doth not yet appear what he shall be; but his inmost desire is to be what he is not now. All the living motions of the soul are towards the kingdom of God and his righteousness; and the prayer that is foremost on the lips is: Thy kingdom come.

The whole earthly system has a vital sympathy with this expectation of regenerate man. The entire world has a predestined consummation, and that belongs with the complete salvation of man. All has come into being from the kingdom of Christ, and for it. The invisible, refined substance of the material creation can be joined with spirit, and partake of its perfection and its glory. The lower forms of the old creation have no consciousness, indeed, and cannot enjoy or adore; but they can minister, and this power of a subordinate ministry is but another name for a tendency towards the goal of human perfectibility. This idea the apostle Paul gives to the church. His great induction from the facts of redemption to the law of universal sympathy with the redeemed in the material world has this broad ground. The one Spirit of Christ, which applies the purchased redemption in the souls and bodies of the saints, is equally the natural power of the world, and fits his working

in the one to his working in the other, using natural material for spiritual blessings, and making all things work together for his spiritual purpose. This is the Apostle's view. The Omnipresent Spirit, who pervades all things, carries those same powers and tendencies with him throughout, makes them manifest where the conditions allow, and where the conditions do not allow their open manifestation warrants and encourages our faith in their existence. By this faith we understand that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain, together with the new creature in Christ, waiting for and tending towards the manifestation of the sons of God. The Spirit in the whole creation is conscious of its own yearnings, though the senseless world is not. All things have not consciousness; all cannot enjoy or adore; but all can minister. This whole world has a predestined consummation, coinciding with the redemption of the church. And its tendencies or yearnings agree with its destiny. For all is full of that Omnipresent Spirit which is renewing man. As the ground was cursed in the sin of man, it shall be blessed in his redemption. It looks and waits for that blessing. And thus while the spirit in the children of God prays, Thy kingdom come, the same spirit in the whole creation silently responds, Thy kingdom come.

We can trace in the scriptures and in the history of the church, the perfect mutual concurrence of the natural and the spiritual. Nature and grace work together. Every subject of the kingdom of grace is an instance. Born into the natural world, he draws his first breath amidst redeeming powers which act upon him according to the covenant under which he lives. If a heathen, he begins his natural existence under those obscure and feeble spiritual influences which are attended by no law, as a schoolmaster, to lead the man to Christ, and no Gospel revelations to bring forth in the soul the clear light of life and immortality. He has only those silent and almost imperceptible motions of the spirit with which the world under the covenant of grace with Adam, was left, without oracles and ordinances, every man to walk in his own ways; motions which, except in a few illustrious cases, seem wholly lost amidst the universal and unrestrained corruption. If a Jew before the coming of Christ, he begins his existence in the midst of that pervading

spiritual influence which belongs to the covenant of grace with Abraham and his seed; and in connection with which the whole course of Providence is modified by peculiar revelations and ordinances. If born under the Christian covenant, he comes into the midst of that pervading spiritual influence which is peculiar to the dispensation of grace through Christ as the revealed Mediator of the better covenant, and which tends to produce faith in Jesus Christ, and the knowledge of him. And in all these cases the laws of nature and the laws of grace cooperate. Under the new covenant the divine method is given in full; and there we learn that the natural and the spiritual are to be subject to one and the same treatment, and to be brought up together. The training of the whole man is to be the nurture and admonition of the Lord. The earliest unfolding of the personal character must be under Christian teaching and practice; with the use of ordinances which signify and presuppose the spiritual state, and seal the blessing of the Lord upon it, in the increase of faith and love and peace; with gifts, interests, and obligations, which relate directly to the coming of the kingdom of Christ, the use of its nurture, the attainment of its righteousness, and the hope of its glory. The arms of covenant grace in Christ receive the individual whom nature brings into being. The Spirit of grace sanctifies the family which nature rears. The promise of spiritual blessing to the family becomes the sum of all blessings; the law of spiritual culture in the family the basis of all culture. The powers of nature and those of grace are expected to concur and blend with one another, under the gospel discipline, and the flesh and the spirit are alike to gain their chief end by seeking the kingdom of God and his righteousness.

In this long formative period of the new creation, as it employs the meditative reason of the church, we see the kingdom of Christ rising gradually through the sin and darkness of the human spirit, and awakening aspirations everywhere which humanity itself does not understand till guided by the scriptures of divine inspiration. In covenant after covenant, the spirit of the kingdom appears in increasing glory, till in Jesus Christ, it stands with the genuine form and face of immortality. The spirit of these covenants is not stationary, but progressive. It

advances through all the covenants, from one to the other, as a series; and it advances also under each, according to the conditions. There is a religious development discernible along the ages of heathenism. Under the Jewish covenant we see an obvious contrast between the religious development of a Samson and that of a Gamaliel. And under the new and better covenant of Christ we have no difficulty in observing a progressive operation of the Spirit, producing the forms of individual character and the social and civil relations of successive ages, according to the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, and the complicated and diverse conditions of the people.

The Bible, indeed, records the decree, the declaration of the divine will, that these things shall be so. Hath he said, and shall he not do it? But while we read the recorded decree, we see also a vast and orderly system of providential agencies, each one with this decree impressed, as a law of life, on the essence of its constitution. And at the invisible basis of the system lie those heavenly powers which constitute the original subjects of the kingdom of Christ. Thus what we read as ordained by will, we observe as necessitated by the nature of things. "God executeth his decrees in the works of creation and providence." The decree that water shall flow in rivers is executed, amongst other means by atmospheric laws, the gravity of water, and the configuration of the surface of the earth. Following the luminous and unfading lines of analogy into the unseen world, we perceive, by a rational exercise of faith in the holy scriptures, the exquisite, invisible filaments, the spiritual embodiments, and active representatives of the heavenly forces, which guide the falling sparrow and arrange the hairs of our head. For the aggregate experience of each of the "little ones" of Christ in this world, we have, in the other, an angel, a corresponding personal aggregate of heavenly powers, which always beholds the face of the Father in heaven. Thus the kingdom of Christ has a personal ministering spirit for each of its earthly subjects, maintaining the vital and inviolable communion, through a created medium, between every member of his body in the world, and the infinite depths of his eternal life. Every earthly phenomenon has its body of heavenly principles as the invisible residence of the laws which govern it. And this

innumerable multitude of principalities and powers, with all their high intelligence, and their pure and ardent love, constitute, under Christ, the prime ministry of his kingdom, next to his throne, to execute his pleasure in conducting the progress of the world. "Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire."

The divine Spirit breathes in the saints the petition, Thy kingdom come. He is the indwelling, almighty, omnipresent efficient in the kingdom of Christ. And the breathing of this prayer is a part of his progressive operation. It shows that, in relation to this world, his workis not stationary. It belongs with that universal motion in the world by which the old is continually giving place to the new. And it proves that, in this process as a whole, the worse is continually giving place to the better. In the eye of Christian faith all change is progress. Whether the new is always felt to be in itself the better or not, it may always be taken by faith as a step towards the better. Evil is not suddenly supplanted by the absolutely good. It is mixed with good for gradual transmutation or distinction. Fruits of sin become the cure of sin, and even acquire somewhat of a relative righteousness. How many motions of human nature which do not originate in the law of righteousness, become convergent towards it, join in living affinity with it, partake of its character, and illustrate its power. How many things are to be disapproved as evil in their source and their nature, yet treated as relatively good; evil, when compared with that perfect state of man which all should look for and strive to attain; good, as steps toward the better. Thus the moral sense of the church adapts itself to the transition state. The Spirit works this adaptation. We accept from Christ the moral maxims belonging to the perfection of mankind, but confess the necessity of failing to carry them out, except in such way and measure as Providence shall determine. And what Providence determines respecting our treatment even of real evils, we consider relatively good, because best for the time. We thus rightly condemn in theory what we rightly justify in fact. And here we must meet the highest and most difficult questions connected with this process of recovery from sin.

Happily for the Christian, he needs no philosophical theory

to maintain his sense of sin; so little does this depend on intellectual conditions, and so little can mere reasoning do to produce or to destroy it. He feels right concerning sin, while confessing, with sorrow, that it defiles all the heart and all the conduct of all men. That feeling, in itself, he could not improve by any theoretical view. Still we must have a rational adjustment of the subject. Sin, as to its nature and relations, is no less matter of thought than of feeling. In this world of acknowledged and mournful evil, where the people of God in all their generations must unite in the prayer, Thy kingdom come, what shall we say and do while the kingdom is coming? How shall we think and act respecting things confessedly against the perfect law of righteousness, yet in the providence of God unavoidable? We believe that the kingdom of Christ has all the evil of the world under treatment, and that the greater our trouble, the stronger the proof that the evil is deeply rooted, and that the remedies are taking effect. We know that the perfect law requires perfect love; and that all human relations and works which do not arise from perfect love to God and man, are unrighteous, and must cease. But what shall we do while men do not love? This is the plainly spoken form of our great economic problem for church and state. Which is the best way of living in sin? Since perfect obedience is not to be presumed, how may we suffer least without it? What is our true theoretical relation to things known and acknowledged to be contrary to the perfect law of righteousness? Where is our line of *relative* rectitude in things not absolutely right? That there is a rational position for the church in this matter we cannot doubt;—a position which involves no evasion, employs no sophistry, and rests on no questionable presumption.

On such points as the following all enlightened Christians are clear and decided:—

1. The perfect standard of righteousness presented in the precepts and example of Christ is intended for important practical effect in the church at all times, but to be fully realized only in the perfect moral state of the world. This perfect moral standard, as a part of the appointed and common means of religious discipline, is peculiar to the Gospel. Our Lord claimed openly to raise the standard of righteousness above

that of the ancient covenant as apprehended and applied by the people. The church has now before her, as the prize of her high calling, the law of absolute perfection. By this her members must measure their shortcomings, and cultivate that repentance which needeth not to be repented of. They must never count themselves to have apprehended, but press always towards the mark; and all the great and unavoidable infirmity which, by the perfect law, they detect in themselves and others, together with all its fruits in the relations and works of man, they must, with all the heart, habitually and utterly condemn and deplore.

2. Governments, institutions, and usages, which owe their origin to moral imperfection, and which cannot be at once reformed, are to be so used as to favour reformation, and thus to aid the progress of the kingdom of Christ. Such use of recognized and lamented evils, while it does not change their inherent character as the offspring of sin, discharges the obligation of the law of righteousness for the time. We are acquitted of responsibility and are approved for wisdom, when we discern and condemn the evil, and use it for good; when we judge the particular and local wrong by its connection with the general disorder of the world, and treat it with remedies adapted to the all-pervading malady. And it is in general found to be the law of our progress, that such a treatment of evil, and we mean by evil whatever is contrary to the perfect law of righteousness, uses up the evil itself, turning the whole to good account for correction, removing it in the right time and in the right way, for the highest good of all concerned who are seeking the kingdom of God.

To illustrate the right and profitable use of things which proceed from the unrighteousness of men: The oath cometh of evil. Because all men are liars, the oath, with its awakening appeal to the sense of God, its suggestion of the sacredness of truth, and its legal penalty for perjury, becomes a needful security against falsehood and infidelity to the public good. The Saviour declares his prohibition, "Swear not at all," to remind his people of the evil occasion for the oath, and of the perfect law of truth which is to prevail; while yet by his providence, he points all people to the oath, or an equivalent affirmation, as

convenient for the present necessity. False witnesses must be constrained by solemn appeals to conscience, and put in fear of legal pains, till men rise above the need of the oath, and are ruled by the love of truth. The oath cometh only of evil, but is a means of good.

And whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts which war in your members? They are not to exist in the coming perfection of the world. The foremost feature of the age of righteousness is to be the beating of the swords into ploughshares, and the spears into pruning-hooks, and the nations learning war no more. And yet how largely is the history of the world's advancement the history of war. How prominent, universal, and constant, has been the agency of war in the divine administration of human affairs. How few have been the steps taken by Providence, in the social progress of mankind, without the hostile mutual encounter of nations. What other measure has been so common or so effectual for punishing and correcting human sin, and forwarding the race in its appointed course of improvement. The Prince of peace himself recognized its destined instrumentality in the new form of his redeeming work. "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I am not come to send peace, but a sword." The fact is, that the vindication of war is always found in the providential alternative of war or something worse. And yet, even with men whose thoughts have all been formed in familiarity with the deeply-rooted and unavoidable necessities of the sinful world, it has never stood below the chief of evils, or been less denounced than the most malignant and horrible of the progeny of sin. As a sign of its decline, we hear its necessity more and more denied, and witness the increase of conscientious and hopeful endeavours to abolish it. Alas, that nations under the clearest gospel light have not yet learned to live without it. But still undoubtedly the world is outgrowing war. The sword has had its day. The hand that now draws it hesitates at the rebuke of the heart, and must offer its apology to the moral sense of mankind. The course of change in this respect, however tardy, is ceaseless and irresistible. It does not depend on specific measures arising from the impulse of narrow views, or any extreme or unseasonable scruples of a

sect, or any association to uphold an abstraction relating to peace, and to make the evils of war an isolated specialty. It proceeds by the general, all-pervading motion of the kingdom of Christ. It is from that law of progress in the world which brings all things in their time. It is from the same Spirit of God which formerly directed war while denouncing it and promising the reign of peace. Here is one of the inevitable contradictions of the progressive conflict between righteousness and sin. We justify war as called for by evil, and condemn it because it cometh of evil. Every war of the world has been against war. The warrior himself has learned to say, We fight for peace. Thus in the same words we justify war and condemn it. We meet unavoidable evil, and use it for good; coworking with Providence to make the sin of men commend the righteousness of God; while at the same time we acknowledge the sin as the sin of our nature of which we all are partakers, and plead the guilt with penitence and humiliation before God. Meanwhile, they who take the sword must perish by the sword. They must abide the terrible arbitrament. How long, O Lord, how long, must the sword continue to devour!

In relation to all the fruits of human iniquity which, by the laws of Providence are visited upon us, here is the patience and consolation of the saints: They are all for our profit, that we may learn the ways of Him who is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working, and that we may be partakers of his holiness. Let the oath be for us a discipline for veracity, war a discipline for peace, bondage a discipline for freedom; every evil of our earthly condition a discipline for the opposite good. For the kingdom of Christ is coming, in which truth, peace, and freedom—every virtue and every blessing, shall be universal. Bear ye, therefore, one another's burdens and infirmities in peace and love and hope.

3. All enlightened Christians also clearly and decidedly agree, that amidst the necessary evils of this transition state of the world, the church must be guided by the united suggestions of the Spirit of Christ within her, and of the course of Providence. We have no positive divine statutes to mark our course. The Hebrews had this help. Institutions and usages which rose from sin, and which violated fundamental laws of human

life, were regulated among them by divine precepts. It is not so with us. In the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, we are to deal with the sins of the world according to the teachings of Providence and the spirit of wisdom which we have from Christ. The motions of this spirit, though they do not originate in the course of nature, still run upon the track of Providence. And with the Spirit of Christ in us, and the ordinances of the Gospel to quicken and sustain its operation, we are set forth on the highway of providence to conduct our difficult and delicate affairs towards the goal of the expected perfection. Wherein we succeed we have great gain. We realize a relative good from what is not good in itself. We overcome evil by a proper use. Wherein we fail, we take the consequences of our failure, however painful; only with the hope that we may learn from our sorrows, what we failed to learn without them. And thus in our failure we are under discipline for good.

4. We agree furthermore that it is always in season for brethren to reprove one another for every shortcoming, in fervent, brotherly, and universal love; for all evil affections and the words and deeds which proceed from them. The followers of Christ, with his standard of perfect righteousness before them, must try themselves always by that test, applying the refiner's fire to all their principles, all their relations, and all their works. They must condemn, as coming of evil, all things which they cannot conceive to coexist with perfect love and the perfect culture of all mankind. Against all things which proceed from and are fostered by the natural imperfections of humanity, Christians must ever be ready to give and to suffer the word of exhortation. All these imperfections are to recede before the progress of universal light and love; and the conception of that perfect state of the world which the precepts and the Spirit of Christ will form, should occupy the mind and keep alive the hope of the whole Christian brotherhood. Every fruit of human infirmity, of whatever form, should draw their unanimous attention to its sinful source, and move them to united humiliation and trustful fidelity in following the divine method of redemption. Their subdued and penitent fellowship in infirmity will enliven their fellowship of love and hope. It will reconcile them to one another, and all things to them.

Every form of evil will be a relative good. Their own unity of the Spirit will harmonize the world in their interest, and the river of their peace will multiply and distribute the riches of grace through all this vale of tears. Whatever is peculiar in the evils to be overcome by the church in this country, presents a peculiar call to our Christian people for mutual forbearance, faithful exhortation, and the wisest and most diligent and unanimous endeavour to make the working out of our salvation most effectual for the salvation of the world.

5. All intelligent Christians well know the danger of attaching too great importance to abstract and theoretical disputes. The zeal of controversy sometimes blinds the parties to the real interests at stake, and forces to opposite and irreconcilable extremes those who would otherwise perfectly agree as to the things they ought to do. How much of our present distraction has arisen from the persistent indulgence of abstract and unprofitable disputation, we should do well to consider. How much has the useless, angry, exasperating warfare of words hindered useful action! Practical difficulties are greatly reduced by a simple and earnest submission to the course of Providence, under the guidance of which, with the concurrent teaching of the scriptures, Christians are to *consider one another*, to provoke to love and to good works. The infirmity of speculation has nowhere else been so disastrous to human welfare as in a blind and presumptuous obtrusion against the manifest will of Providence; binding society by theories deduced from narrow and arbitrary observation of the facts and laws of the world. Adventurous and self-confident speculation is permitted to go quite too far in disturbing the practical harmony of Christians. The church, with all her diversities of thought, is one in seeking the coming of the kingdom of Christ. She is one in the assured faith that it is coming. Her members believe, with one heart, that, with the resistless and steady approach of that kingdom, the world is working out its salvation. They wait and labour to present the world to Christ, as his inheritance, by reconciling it with their aim and their progress towards the perfect righteousness. They find themselves encompassed with infirmity, each with his own and with that of others, and interwoven with evil as by the fibres of one living system. The

evils which break out upon the surface displease the moral taste as fruit of sin, and reveal the nature of their source. All feel that they are one in condemning, for this evil, and in being condemned. But all understand alike that the world, as a whole, and as a part of the kingdom of Christ, is changing for the better, and is preparing to become a pure mirror of his glory. And while all sincerely wish to do the most for the coming of the kingdom, perhaps they would help amelioration more by doing a little with love and peace, than much with hatred and strife. Sure as the church advances in the divine art of peace, while all her members will more and more agree as to what they ought to do, all will more and more content themselves with doing what they can agree to do. Perhaps even error in this latter direction would just now be the safer error for our church and our country.

The kingdom of Christ hath dominion over sin;—the sin of all the world. The church on earth, as the leading part of the earthly manifestation of the kingdom of Christ, hath dominion over sin;—the remaining sin of her living members. The child of God, truly begotten to the living hope of heaven, hath dominion over sin;—the sin of his heart, and its fruit in word and deed. The universal system of created reigning powers which constitute the essential principles of the kingdom of Christ, are victorious by their nature over evil, as light over darkness. We are witnessing the gradual progress of this power in the world. If sin reigned in the world, it would reign to universal and eternal death. But we see grace, from its very introduction, reigning through righteousness unto eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. The kingdom of Christ has held a victorious power in the world from the beginning, and though not seen as yet in the actual reduction of all things into entire conformity to its laws, yet is it always recognized as conquering and to conquer all things in its time. Throughout this sublime and ever accelarating process, the reign of the gracious power is real, and reveals itself in the modification of the outworking sin, and in turning it to the account of righteousness. The sin of the world, which appears in ever-varying forms through successive generations, feels always this victorious power, and shows some mark of it upon itself—some pre-

monition of the coming defeat. The forms of evil are ever changing, as truth and right are more recognized among them. And in their time they disappear. The disciples of Christ can comfort and encourage one another with this truth. But woe to those who shut their eyes and hearts against the rising power of this kingdom, who disregard the work of God, and forfeit the higher benefits of its progress. Woe, woe, to those whose principles, interests, and powers, whose whole heart and life, are so interwoven with the sin of the world that the destruction of the sin must involve the destruction of themselves.

Let the servants of God survey this adorable movement. Its progress along the ages seems slow as men count progress; and to us who look only on the outward appearance, it seems, in some periods, even doubtful; but viewed from the beginning hitherto, how manifest and glorious; crowding the whole period of recorded time with its significant and fruitful events! Is it not a progress? The Spirit of Christ in his kingdom is ever pressing towards the mark. Even in the greatest obliquity and delinquency of the church, we see this steady uplooking. Strange, indeed, at times appears her departure from the true course of her advancement, as the stream of her life winds along the providential slopes of the world; but though with leagues of motion she make but a furlong of progress, she still makes real progress, and is never found again where she was.

Our required conformity to the ways of God in the progress of the kingdom of Christ will appear in this: That our eye be ever on the perfect standard of righteousness presented in the precepts and example of Christ; that we always press towards that standard; and that we make the best possible use of the providential arrangements of the world, in promoting our own progress and that of our fellow-men. In this honest and earnest endeavour the followers of Christ cannot seriously disagree. By their unity of the Spirit they may understand the providence of God essentially alike. Whereunto they have already attained they will walk by the same rule, they will mind the same thing; and in whatever they may differ, the Lord will reveal to them the way of duty. He will teach them how that which really cometh of evil may have its temporary place and use in the progress of his kingdom; and how the church, as her

light and power increase, becomes wiser and more successful in applying the evils of the world to her advantage. Her Redeemer liveth. Her redeeming power is a living power. It dwells in the depths of the Infinite and the Eternal, comes forth in the spirit of regenerate man, to whom the dominion of the world is given by the original decree; like the Son of God in the flesh, it lives itself into the natural system of the world through man as its head; becomes the alterative of its constitution, the regulating, guiding spirit of its progress, the essence of its righteousness and truth, its life, its hope, and its salvation.

5. This kingdom of living power, the kingdom of powers which are not seen and eternal, in its vital union with the things that are seen and temporal, secures the final consummation of the world. There is no real wisdom, nor counsel, nor power, against it. Its conquest of the world is not uncertain, because it is future. Its decisive movements are fully revealed to faith, and many of them have long been open to sight. Its heavenly heraldry is on the wing with the everlasting gospel for all people. The voice which whispered in the private ear on the isle of Patmos, has become the sound of the trumpet on every mountain; "Behold, I create all things new." The new Jerusalem is coming gradually forth from God out of heaven, about to present, as it were, to the eyes of men, the new heaven and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. Hereafter ye shall *see* the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven. The King will be manifest. He will appear to the ordinary mental vision of men. It will not require an ecstasy of faith, like that of the dying Stephen, or a rapture, like that of Paul, to enable men to see him. The saints will no longer need to be transported, or raised out of the sphere of sensible things, and as it were out of the body, to perceive the Lord in his real power and glory. He will come in the clouds of heaven. All the forms of earthly phenomena will be manifestations of him. He will appear without sin unto salvation. His revelations of himself, even under the conditions of time and space, will be no more distorted and perverted by the carnal apprehensions and ungodly tendencies of the natural man. The spiritual sense of the church will be clear, lively, and predominant, and will discern the personal presence and

glory of Christ, as shadowed forth to the ordinary intuition of faith in the regular course of visible changes in the world. So reason discerns the invisible presence of vegetable life through the verdure and the flowers of spring. The exaltation of Christ, an unchangeable and eternal reality of that invisible kingdom which is coming in this world, is thus to be realized in the distinct and joyful apprehension of the church, and to be represented in the things that are seen as the perfect and acknowledged glory of the earth.

The progress and consummation of the work of redemption by Christ, as accomplished in the coming of his kingdom, are conducted, and to be finished by the Spirit of peace. Whatever of strife and violence arises in the process, is due to the law of carnal mind, and not to the law of the Spirit. The carnal mind is emnity against God; and where it is allowed a prominent share in the principles of human action, it is only turbulent and contentious. When duly subjected to the law of Christ, though it may give plain and humiliating proof of its existence and its hatefulness, it gradually surrenders to the subduing and assimilating power of the kingdom, and allows itself to be gradually created anew in the image of God. But where it causes discord and strife, it is allowed a predominance which is not a legitimate condition of the work of redemption. The law of redemption requires, not indeed that the principle of evil in the heart of man shall be at the first annihilated, but that it shall not reign; that from the first it shall be under the reigning power of grace and peace. On this condition, the warfare between the flesh and the Spirit will not break out into social violence, but will be confined to the individual bosom; and even there, by watchful and faithful self-discipline, the way of life, under grace, is emphatically the way of peace for man. And the life of the Spirit, according to the laws of the kingdom of Christ, though not without trials, is still the only life of true peace. The promise of the highest prosperity is to those who seek first the kingdom of God; and this law of peace and prosperity is expressly enjoined on all the followers of Christ as the condition of their highest happiness, and most sure and rapid progress towards perfection.

For ourselves, we have evidently not attained to the Lord's

righteous and peaceful way of judging and correcting the evils with which we have to deal, and through which he is dealing with us in this merciful process of correction. The work of this world's renovation, by the coming of the kingdom of Christ, is the putting off the old man and the putting on of the new, in the individual, in the church, and in the state; and through the whole, there is a way of sure and uniform prosperity. Amidst all the undeniable and grievous evils of our fallen state, there is a course for us in which the way of righteousness shall be peace, and the effect of righteousness, quietness, and assurance for ever. The processes of natural life go on by perpetual decay and renewal, and in these, unless the healthful law of life is violated, no blood is ever drawn by the shedding of the old and the putting on of the new. And so in this highest form of life on earth, the life of Christ in his people, whose whole earthly course is a putting off and a putting on by growth, is there not a healthful law—the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus—which makes us free from the law of sin and death? The individual believer has it as the art of his holy living, so to subject his whole being to the power of his faith and the law of the Spirit of life, that being justified, that is, delivered from the reigning and condemning power of sin, he may have lively and abiding peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. The church, as a body, has it as a beneficent part of her earthly discipline, so to deal with all the evils by which she is beset, as to maintain a victorious power over them, and not to give them the victory over herself. This is a discipline worthy of her calling; eminently worthy of the Spirit of Christ which is in her. O for that wisdom which is from above, which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy. This inestimable gift of Christ, the Wisdom of God, is freely offered. It is surely to be given. If we do not receive it, there shall be those on earth who will. The kingdom of Wisdom is coming; and that adorable, divine perfection which governs and adorns the kingdom, and is the most glorious secret of its power, will become the preëminent endowment of the church, and be known on earth and in heaven as the manifold wisdom of God. Even so come, Lord Jesus, come quickly.

Art. II.—*Knowledge, Faith, and Feeling, in their Mutual Relations.*

The reciprocal relations of faith and knowledge, and of both with love, or the various phases of Christian affection and feeling, have been subjects of frequent discussion and earnest controversy. The famous formulas, *crede ut intelligas*, and its responsive *intellige ut credas*, reveal the attitude of medieval polemics, and show us for what the Anselms and Abelards waged a war, terminated by no enduring peace, but ever and anon revived. It is doubtless true that much of this controversy has been mere logomachy. But it has not been always or mainly so. And even if it were, this does not divest the subject of interest or importance. In the lightest view of the case, it is worth while to ascertain the precise point of misunderstanding; wherein lay the mistaken interpretation or application of terms, in order to prevent the repetition of useless conflicts. But generally in controversies which in one sense are word-fights, in another sense, the words themselves are things. They, at least, represent misconceptions of the real issue entertained by one or both the parties to the conflict; and none the less so, even if it shall turn out, in the end, upon the removal of these misconceptions, that the disputants are essentially agreed. The very nature of the subjects concerned renders the chief questions which arise regarding them momentous. Knowledge, Faith, Love—these lie at the very sources of life, and constitute the very essence of salvation. Their mutual relations cannot be misconceived without begetting a corresponding misconception of the nature of the things themselves. These questions are various. They run into and shape some of the highest issues in doctrinal, and practical, experimental, and casuistical theology. They figure largely in some of the great theological questions of the present time—both those which originate in transcendental sources, and those which come of the effort to solve the great problems of theology in the alembic of a plainer and coarser philosophy. All this will more fully and distinctly appear as we proceed, and will, we trust, prove the discussion on which we propose

to enter both needful and opportune. In its nature it must be largely psychological as well as scriptural, being in that region where theology interlocks with metaphysics and psychology. For knowledge, faith, love, are psychical states.

The first necessity in approaching this subject, is to clear up the issues involved by precise statements and definitions; or if we cannot do this at the threshold, to pursue our inquiries till we reach this result. When this is accomplished, it settles forthwith disputes that have caused interminable strife. Thus, for example, the counter-maxims already alluded to, which to the eye and ear are directly contradictory, and, of course, mutually destructive, are both consistent and true, if intelligence be differently understood, or rather, understood under different relations, in the two cases. *Intellige ut credas* is certainly true, if by intelligence be meant, first, an apprehension of what we believe, and, secondly, of the reasons or evidences on which we believe it. But it is not true if by intelligence be meant not merely a knowledge of what we believe and why we believe it, but, in addition, a comprehension of the object, truth, or proposition believed, in itself, or its points of contact and conciliation with other related truths. If this last were requisite to belief, the circle of our legitimate beliefs would be immensely narrowed—attenuated to almost nothing. *Omnia exeunt in mysterium.* When we go beyond the evidence *that* things are, to that which explains *why* and *how* they are, there is indeed range for an illimitable enlargement of our knowledge, which is at once profitable and delightful. But it must all at length terminate in what is insoluble. Let us analyze and compare the elements of vegetable, animal, or spiritual being, as far as we may. We may thus vastly and usefully augment our knowledge. But we soon reach the end of our sounding line, where our utmost power of analysis is exhausted; and we can say only *that* things are so, but not *how* or *why* they are so.

On the other hand, *crede ut intelligas* is true, if reference be had to the kind of knowledge last named, the comprehension of what we believe; mistaken and delusive, because absurd and impossible, if reference be had to the sorts of knowledge previously specified—the apprehension of the thing believed,

and of the evidence on which we believe it. For it is plain that it is impossible to believe that of which we have no apprehension, and for the existence of which we see no evidence, probable or conclusive. Or if it were possible so to believe, such faith would be undeniable treason to our moral and intellectual nature. To speak of believing that of which we have no conception, and no show of evidence, is simply solecistical. It is only conceivable as a kind of mental suicide. But it is possible to believe upon sufficient evidence what we can apprehend, but cannot comprehend; or what involves elements or relations that we can neither understand nor explain. And not only so. There are many things of which the belief is a prerequisite and preparation for such an understanding or comprehension as we have now brought to view. The child must take upon trust, on the testimony of his parents and teachers, what he will understand as he tests or realizes its nature in experience. He is taught that industry, economy, education, and culture, are every way salutary and beneficial. He takes this upon trust. As he proceeds to realize these virtues in practice, he learns not only that, but how and why they are thus advantageous. He is taught the rules of grammar or arithmetic. He first adopts them on the authority of others. As he proceeds to practice according to them, he discerns more and more of their rationale.* As regards reli-

* In this sense the following from Hamilton is just and in point:

"I must, therefore, beg that you will, for the present, hypothetically believe —believe upon authority—what you cannot now adequately understand; but this only to the end that you may not hereafter be under the necessity of taking any conclusion upon trust. Nor is this temporary exaction of credit peculiar to philosophical education. In the order of nature belief always precedes knowledge—it is the condition of instruction. The child (as observed by Aristotle) must believe in order to learn."—*Sir W. Hamilton's Lectures on Metaphysics.* Pp. 31, 32.

In a like spirit Coleridge castigates the contrary temper in the following caustic phrase:—"Instead of storing the memory during the period when the memory is the predominant faculty, with facts for the after-exercise of the judgment; and instead of awakening by the noblest models the fond and unmixed LOVE and ADMIRATION, which is the natural and graceful temper of early youth; *these* nurselings of improved pedagogy are taught to dispute and decide; to suspect all but their own and their lecturer's wisdom; and to hold nothing sacred from contempt but their own contemptible arrogance."—*Biographia Literaria,* Chap. i.

gion, the precept, "believe in order to understand," is, in the sense now under consideration, still more emphatically true. We must believe in order to experience, or experimentally understand, the power of faith. Who can understand how the "joy and peace in believing" arise, otherwise than by first believing? Who can "taste that the Lord is gracious," without first believing in his grace? We learn how Christ "is the power of God and the wisdom of God" unto salvation, by trusting the testimony of God that he is such, and casting ourselves on him accordingly. We can only "know the things that are freely given us of God," in their true beauty and excellency, as we first accept and appropriate them by faith. There is a high sense in which we can know what Christianity is only by trying it. Says Christ, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." This is all the more so, as faith realizes the fulfilment of the promise of Divine illumination. "What man is he that feareth the Lord? Him shall he teach in the way that he shall choose." "The meek will he guide in judgment." Christ says, "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls." This clearly implies that the true way to learn the lessons which he teaches, and obtain a serene and satisfying insight into Divine things, is to take his teachings entirely upon trust, and subjugate to them our own minds, with all their conflicting judgments and predilections. So much is confirmed by all experience. Faith in Christ is the preliminary condition of all true insight into the saving power of his cross. While it is impossible, indeed, to believe on him without some apprehension of his person and offices, and without evidence that "God hath set him forth to declare his righteousness," it is also impossible, in the highest sense, "to know in whom we have believed," without first believing on him. As faith is the "evidence of things not seen," the "victory that overcometh the world," as it "worketh by love," and "purifieth the heart," so without faith it is impossible adequately to know those things which are dependent or consequent upon faith. That word "which works energeti-

cally in them that believe," will of course be understood by them as it cannot be by unbelievers.

Thus, in showing that the supposed contradiction between these two aphorisms is one of sound and not of sense; and that each is true with reference to different aspects of our intelligence, we have made some progress towards clearing up our main inquiry;—the relation of knowledge to faith. Knowledge in one degree or kind precedes and conditions faith. In another, it is preceded and conditioned by faith.

But it is obvious, that a thorough survey of this subject requires a determination of the psychological nature of knowledge and faith, and of their points of similitude and difference. For when the Scriptures speak of faith, knowledge, and love, they refer to certain recognized states of consciousness. Else they would be unmeaning.

This opens the following inquiries: 1. What is knowledge? 2. Is faith a form of knowledge, or a mere feeling? If the former, how does it differ from other modes of knowing? If it be a feeling, how does it differ from other modes of feeling? And whichever it may be, how is it related to previous and subsequent knowledge and feeling?

As to knowledge, it denotes a state of mind, in one sense, nearly or quite simple and irreducible; almost incapable of being made plainer by any definition. Still something may be said in this behalf. It is, like feeling, an act of mind or state of consciousness. This gives us its genus. Its differentia is, that, unlike feeling, it carries the mind to some determinate object, within or without us, beyond itself—*i. e.*, beyond such mere act or state of consciousness. Thus, if I know anything, it is some object beyond the mere act of knowing. If I feel either pleasure or pain, such pleasure or pain consists in the feeling itself. All feeling, as that of touch or taste, which carries the mind to the object touched or tasted, involves an element of cognition beside. This does not differ from Hamilton's statement, "by knowledge is understood the mere possession of truths." This possession, however, may be twofold; either the actual apprehension of them in present consciousness, or the possession of them among the latent treasures of memory, in such wise that they are ready to be evoked into conscious-

ness as occasion may require. Another definition or rather synonym of knowledge is judgment. All knowledge involves a judgment, either primitive or logical. As has often been remarked by psychologists, judgment enters into every act of cognition, and, in a less rigid sense, of all consciousness, which is that property of every mental exercise or state by which we know that it occurs. Now we cannot know, without judging that the thing known is, and that its contradictory is not. That which is known indeed, may be only the mental act itself —*i. e.*, it may be mere feeling. Still, if known, it is judged to exist. Logical judgment differs from this primitive judgment which enters into every act of mind, not in its essential nature, but in being more complex and artificial—*i. e.*, the affirmation of the agreement or disagreement of two conceptions, one of which, at least, is formed by abstraction and generalization.

"Our judgments, according to Aristotle, are either problematical, assertive, or demonstrable; or, in other words, the results of Opinion, of Belief, or of Science.

"The problematical judgment is neither subjectively nor objectively true, that is, it is neither held with entire certainty by the thinking subject, nor can we show that it truly represents the object about which we judge. It is a mere opinion. It may, however, be the expression of our presentiment of certainty; and what was held as a mere opinion before proof, may afterwards be proved to demonstration. Great discoveries are problems at first, and the examination of them leads to a conviction of their truth, as it has done to the abandonment of many false opinions. In other subjects, we cannot, from the nature of the case, advance beyond mere opinion. Whenever we judge about variable things, as the future actions of men, the best course of conduct for ourselves under doubtful circumstances, historical facts about which there is doubtful testimony, we can but form a problematical judgment, and must admit the probability of error at the moment of making our decision.

"The assertive judgment is one of which we are fully persuaded ourselves, but cannot give grounds for our belief, that shall compel men in general to coincide with us. It is, therefore, subjectively, but not objectively, certain. It commends

itself to our moral nature, and in so far as other men are of the same disposition, they will accept it likewise.

"The demonstrative judgment is both subjectively and objectively true. It may either be certain in itself, as a mathematical axiom is, or capable of proof by means of other judgments, as the theorems of mathematics and the laws of physical science."—*Thompson's Laws of Thought*, pp. 280–1.*

In regard to this, it may be observed at the threshold, that it is clear, and that under the second head it accurately describes a large part, at least, of the phenomena which we are wont to class under faith or belief. Nor does it conflict with, for it includes a very common definition of faith, viz. that it is assent to a proposition upon the testimony of others; and that Christian faith is the acceptance of the declarations of the Bible upon the testimony of God its author. We mean to say, as will yet more fully be shown, that so far as belief in general, and Christian faith in particular, have the character thus ascribed to them, they do not contradict but coincide with the definition of belief under consideration. The only difference is, that this definition is somewhat broader, including not only such convictions as are produced by the testimony of other persons, but some likewise begotten by certain other kinds of proof. And if the matter be narrowly scanned, it may be questioned if we do not need this breadth of definition in order to provide for all the phenomena connected with religious belief and Christian faith. For, 1. The foundation of the theist's belief—surely that of the heathen theist as distinguished from the atheist—is not testimony but the works of nature. Rom. ii. 20. 2. While belief in the divinity of the Bible, or Christianity, is, as will more fully appear, assent to the testimony of God, evinced by various proofs, external and internal, to be his testimony, yet the preliminary condition of such assent is a sufficiently fair appreciation of these proofs, that it is God who speaks in the Holy Word. All experience confirms the declaration of Christ, that they who "hate the light" of these proofs can "refuse to

* Hamilton states the distinction more tersely but less completely, thus:—"A proposition is called *Assertory* when it enounces what is known as actual; *Problematic* when it enounces what is known as possible; *Apodictic* or *Demonstrative* when it enounces what is known as necessary."—*Logic*, p. 183.

come" to it; *i. e.*, it is not of such a nature as can compel their belief. Nor are these evidences, especially the internal, all of the nature of testimony by other persons. 3. Although saving faith is begotten by the "witness of the Spirit," unveiling the beauty and glory of divine things, yet the psychological experience in the case is not of hearing or recognizing the testimony of another, but of a spiritual intuition or beholding of the "glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." To this unbelievers or those in a different moral state are blind. But of this more, as we proceed.

It is further to be observed that in this, as in other similar cases, instances often occur in which it is difficult to make a rigid application of these distinctions and definitions. All classifications of phenomena in every department, physical and metaphysical, encounter instances so dubious, in which the characteristics of one class so shade off into those of another, that it is difficult to assign them to either species. If we compare the most perfect crystalline inorganic formations with the lowest lichens, or the sensitive plant among vegetables, with the polyp among animals, the bearing of this remark will be manifest. There are mental judgments which, to one man are essentially apodictic, which he is compelled to believe, whatever be his disposition, but which cannot be forced upon the belief of others. To others they, if accepted, are matters of faith. They will accept or reject them according to their disposition, confidence in testimony, &c. Such is the fact in regard to our own states of consciousness, our inward thoughts, pains, and pleasures. Such is the fact in regard to any sensible object or phenomenon which any observers have witnessed, but which has vanished, so that they cannot bring it within the sense-perception of others, or evince it to them by anything more decisive than their own testimony, which these others may believe or disbelieve—*e. g.*, the miracles of Christ and his apostles. On the other hand, whatever can be brought under the cognizance of the senses; all intuitive, self-evident, and necessary truths, mathematical, metaphysical, and moral; all necessary and unquestionable deductions from these, like the theorems of mathematics or the demonstrated laws of nature, are known by demonstrative judgments; which

compel the assent of all sane minds that can be made to understand them and their proofs. If there are any judgments more compulsory than belief proper, and independent of the disposition of the mind, these are of that order. Again, although in loose popular usage, *belief* is sometimes used in the sense of *opinion*, which is undoubtedly an uncertain or problematical judgment of its holder, yet it means more than this, even a full persuasion, when employed with anything like philosophical or theological accuracy. We shall yet inquire more fully how far all this harmonizes with the scriptural presentation of faith in its psychological aspects. But it is very clear that, according to this view, knowledge constitutes its root and essence, and furnishes its ground and limits.

Meanwhile, we will bring to view another analysis of the relations of faith and knowledge, offered by an author of deservedly high repute. Says McCosh:

"Philosophers have drawn the distinction between presentative and representative knowledge. In the former, the object is present at the time,—we perceive it, we feel it, we are conscious of it as now and here and under our inspection. In representative knowledge, there is an object now present representing an absent object. Thus, I may have an image or conception of Venice, with its decaying beauty, and this is now present and under the eye of consciousness; but it represents something absent and distant, of the existence of which I am at the same time convinced. When I was actually in Venice, and gazed on its churches and palaces rising out of the waters, there would be no propriety in saying that I believed in the existence of the city,—the correct phrase is, that I know it to exist. I know too that at this moment I have an idea of Venice; but as Venice itself is not before me, the proper expression of my conviction is, that I believe in its existence. According to this account we are said to know ourselves, and the objects presented to the senses and the representations (always, however, as presentations) in the mind, but to believe in the objects which we have seen in time past, but which are not now present, and in objects which we have never seen, and very specially in objects which we can never fully know, such as an Infinite God. The mind seems to begin not with faith, but with cognition. It sets out

with the knowledge of an external object presented to it, and with a knowledge of self contemplating that object. I cannot then agree with those who maintain that faith—I mean natural faith—must precede knowledge. I hold that knowledge, psychologically considered, appears first, and then faith."—*Intuitions of the Mind*, pp. 197–8.

This theory agrees with the preceding in making a faith a form of knowledge. It roots and grounds it in knowledge, and limits it by knowledge. It also supplements that theory by making faith a knowledge of absent objects. But some of our representative knowledge, *i.e.*, our knowledge of absent objects, may be not only as sure to ourselves but as capable of demonstration to others as that of present objects. To go no further, if we take the self-evident axioms, and necessary deductions from them, of mathematics, logic, metaphysics, morals, and the established laws of physical science, are they not sure, and capable of being so put, as to enforce the assent of all sane minds that can be made to understand them and their proofs? That no two straight lines can enclose a space, that the angle in a semicircle is a right angle, are not these demonstratively true of all straight lines and semicircles, whether now present to us or not—all past, present, future, and possible straight lines? That every event must have a cause, that time and space are illimitable, that acts of ingratitude are base, and of self-sacrifice for the public good laudable, all these predicates are judged by an irresistible mental necessity, to be true of their respective subjects, although those subjects are just as necessarily absent from us. The author's criterion is therefore too broad. It includes other judgments besides beliefs. If there be any certain knowledge which is not distinctively belief, the foregoing judgments are surely of that character. And what less can be said of the great astronomical laws, and the eclipses thence predicted, for those who understand them and their grounds? Doubtless this view was suggested by the scriptural representations which contrast faith with vision, and will be presently considered. That the Bible represents saving faith as pertaining to objects not of themselves immediately present to sense, or evident to reason, is conceded. But whether it represents all knowledge of

objects not immediately present to the mind as faith, is another question.

Another theory of faith which has been widely prevalent, resolves it into mere feeling, unreasoning, if not antagonistic to reason. This is the theory of mystics and transcendentalists, or of those who are both at once, as well as of other philosophers and religionists. Kant sought to escape from the self-annihilating contradictions into which, with prodigious subtlety, he conducted the speculative reason, in the practical reason or conscience, which compelled faith in what, to the speculative intellect, were contradictions and absurdities. The sufficient refutation of this view is, that faith in contradictions and absurdities is impossible. We may, indeed, be convinced that what appears to us contradictory is not so, because God affirms its truth. This may assure us that there is some solution or removal of the seeming contradiction unknown to us. As illustrations we have the Trinity and Incarnation. Either of these may seem to involve contradictions to one who tries to explicate them, before he has mastered the definitions and distinctions which clear them, not of mystery, but of absurdity. But the reverent Christian who sees them manifestly taught in the Bible, will not, therefore, like the Socinian, reject them. He will, on the contrary, believe that some solution, which he has not yet discovered, will clear the contradiction.

As a consequence of this theory of the great father of modern German transcendentalism, the prevailing doctrine of the more orthodox of that school has been, that faith is a mere sentiment or feeling. They transfer it from the cognitive to the emotional department of the mind. "Jacobi admitted, far too readily, to Kant and Fichte, that speculation and philosophy led to scepticism, but he fell back on faith, (*Glaube*,) or sentiment, (*Gefühl*,) which he represented as a revelation, (*Offenbarung*.")* This favourite opinion of mystics and mystico-transcendentalists, has figured largely among all that class of dreamy pantheistic divines of whom Schleiermacher is the chief representative, and who substitute a "god-consciousness," for the objective knowledge of the

* McCosh on Intuitions, page 200.

One living and true God. Among philosophers none have more positively and determinately resolved belief or faith into pure feeling than Sir William Hamilton, who in many respects was far enough from Transcendentalism. He says:

"Knowledge and belief differ, not only in degree, but in kind. Knowledge is certainty founded on intuition. Belief is a certainty founded on feeling. The one is perspicuous and objective. The other is obscure and subjective." "In common language the word *belief* is often used to denote an inferior degree of certainty. We may, however, be equally certain of what we believe as of what we know; and it has, not without ground, been maintained by many philosophers, that the certainty of all knowledge is, in its ultimate analysis, resolved into a certainty of belief." *Lectures on Logic*, p. 383.

While these representations define belief or faith to be mere feeling, and resolve all our knowledge into this belief, *i. e.* into such mere feeling, it must be confessed that Hamilton elsewhere explains away this doctrine, and, either purposely or inadvertently, annihilates it. Thus, a little further on, he says:

"But, on the other hand, the manifestation of this belief necessarily involves knowledge; for we cannot believe without some consciousness or knowledge of the belief, and consequently without some consciousness or knowledge of the object of the belief. Now the immediate consciousness of an object is called an *intuition*—an *insight*. It is thus impossible to separate belief and knowledge—feeling and intuition. They each suppose the other." *Id.* p. 385.

This proves belief to be a cognitive act, not a mere sentiment or feeling,—nay, not of necessity to involve any exercise of sensibility. Whether it excites feeling, is determined by the nature of its object. Does this address the esthetic or sensitive faculty? If we believe that the durability of wood is proportioned to the slowness of its growth, how far will such a belief stir the sensibilities? On the other hand, much less does all knowledge, as distinguished from belief, originate in feeling, or cause, or in any manner imply feeling. What feeling originates or is caused by the

truth that five times five are twenty-five, or that the whole is greater than a part? Withal, feeling does not necessarily imply a knowledge or a consciousness of anything beside itself, and of the conscious subject of it. The like contradiction of first founding faith on knowledge, and then tracing knowledge back to faith as its root, appears in the following passage. He says very truly: "We are not compelled by a blind impulse to believe in an external world, as in an unknown something: on the contrary, *we believe it to exist only because we are immediately cognizant of it as existing.*" But then, contrariwise, he goes on as follows: "If asked, indeed, how we know that we know it?—how we know that what we apprehend in sensible perception is, as consciousness assures us, an object external, extended, and numerically different from the conscious subject? how we know that this object is not a mere mode of mind illusively presented to us as a mode of matter?—then, indeed, we must reply that we do not, in propriety, *know* that what we are compelled to perceive as not-self is not a perception of self, and that we can only, on reflection, *believe* such to be the case, in reliance on the original necessity of so believing imposed on us by our nature." *Hamilton's Reid*, p. 750. This again founds knowledge on belief, i. e. as defined by the author, on feeling.

In another place Hamilton appears to present the germ of McCosh's theory. "Properly speaking, however, we know only the actual and present, and all real knowledge is an immediate knowledge. What is said to be mediately known, is in truth not known to be, but only believed to be; for its existence is only an inference resting on the belief, that the mental modification truly represents what is itself beyond the sphere of knowledge." *Lectures on Metaphysics*, p. 152.

Notwithstanding such inconsistencies and contradictions, there can be no doubt that his characteristic and professed doctrine was that belief is a feeling, and that knowledge has its root in such feeling. And it is equally clear that he has himself unwittingly furnished the decisive refutation of this theory. He has shown that belief without knowledge for its ground, and in some sense limit, is an impossibility. It is obvious that Hamilton, and the writers he represents,

were betrayed into this error in two ways. First, all our knowledge originates in the intuition of self-evident objects, facts, or truths, which are seen in their own light, and cannot be established by any outside proof or discursive reasonings. If then we inquire on what ground we accept this self-evidence as genuine, of course we cannot validate it by any extraneous proof. One answer is, we know it to be so; another, we feel it to be so. The former is obviously the true one. We cognize self-evident truths by an act of intuitive insight. It is primarily a cognitive, not a mere sensitive act. So Hamilton is obliged to confess. "We believe it (the external object) to exist because we are immediately cognizant of it as existing." Nevertheless he forthwith advances the contrary, which is his real characteristic doctrine. Accordingly, in answering the question, how do we know the self-evidence of intuitive truths to be genuine? he says it is because we feel it to be so. He says:

"But what is given as an ultimate and incomprehensible principle of knowledge is given as a fact, the existence of which we must admit, but the reasons of whose existence we cannot know, we cannot understand. But such an admission as it is not a knowledge must be a belief; and thus it is that, according to Aristotle, all our knowledge is, in its root, a blind, a passive faith; in other words, a feeling." *Lectures on Logic*, p. 384.

The mistake here lies in resolving intuitive knowledge into feeling. That is none the less a cognition which is an intuition. On the contrary, intuition, as it is the ultimate, is also, in some aspects, the highest form of cognition. The Divine omniscience is one eternal all-inclusive intuition. Indeed, the absurdity of resolving all faith into mere blind, passive feeling, and all knowledge into such faith, is too evident to require argument.

The second reason why Hamilton resolved faith into feeling, is found in his doctrine, that the Infinite and Unconditioned cannot be made objects of finite thought or apprehension. Hence, if brought before the human mind at all, it must be by faith, and, in consistency, this faith must be a feeling, not a cognition. After teaching us that "the knowledge of

nothing is the principle or result of all true philosophy," it is, of course, only consistent to tell us, that "by a wonderful revelation we are thus, in our very inability to conceive aught above the relative and finite, inspired with a belief in the existence of something unconditioned, beyond the sphere of all comprehensible reality." It is obvious that this faith must be a feeling. For it is required to supplement our cognitive impotency; our "inability to conceive aught above the relative and finite." This theory has been rigidly applied to Christian doctrine by his accomplished editor and disciple, Mr. Mansell. He thus gets rid of the difficulties of Christianity, by arguing its object-matter to be beyond the reach of human thought or knowledge, and handing the whole over to faith. We do not propose to add to the comments on this work, which we offered in the article on *Reason and Faith*, in our No. for October, 1860. But as this theory supposes faith or belief to consist in feeling, we shall, in refuting the latter, incidentally refute the former.

While this philosophical theory is quite accordant with the views of mystics and fanatics who found religion in mere feeling, impulse, alleged inspiration, or other subjective feelings, unrestrained by any objective revelation, and often, by the fundamental laws of human intelligence, it is as clearly inconsistent with an intelligent scriptural faith. There is, however, a metaphysical analysis of saving as distinguished from historical faith, which has been somewhat current in this country, containing a similar element and tending to the same issue. We refer to that theory which makes love, added to historical or mere speculative faith, the cause of saving faith, instead of making saving faith the root of love. This would seem to resolve all that is peculiar to saving faith into mere blind feeling or affection, instead of making Christian feeling the fruit of the believing reception of the truth which excites it. According to this, love works by faith, not faith by love. This theory has not usually been associated with mystical or fanatical tendencies. It is rather born of the notion that all moral states lie exclusively in the will or feelings, to the exclusion of the cognitive powers. Consequently, as faith is a moral state, it must be remanded exclusively to the will or sensibility. The

truth is, however, that the mind is one and indivisible. All its faculties, intellective, sensitive, and voluntary, partake of its depravity and its rectitude. The feelings are evoked by the views of the intellect; and they in turn determine the choices of the will. The mind and conscience may be defiled as well as the feelings and will. In things moral and spiritual the cognitive, sensitive, and optative faculties are all mutually implicated. To call good evil, or evil good, to refuse to believe the gospel, to esteem the preaching of the cross foolishness, incur the severest condemnation. "To behold the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," to "know the things that are freely given us of God," is the effect of divine illumination and saving grace.

As we have observed, this theory has affinities rather with a superficial metaphysical scheme than with mysticism or fanaticism. It is, of course, in favour with that rationalistic or pelagianizing school, which maintains the plenary ability of the unregenerate for self-conversion, and therefore seats all moral character in a self-determining will. It is not, however, confined to these. It has been held by many quite orthodox divines.

One great objection to it lies in the fact, that it deranges the whole order and method of preaching the gospel. Supposing faith to be the consequent of love, it hinders or prevents the free offer of the gospel to sinners as such. It implies that no one has a warrant to trust Christ till he finds love, repentance, right feeling of some sort in his soul. It does not permit him to come as a sinner destitute of all goodness, and "believe on him that justifieth the ungodly" that his faith may be counted for righteousness.—Rom. iv. 5. He cannot come to Christ to be saved, till he finds evidence that he is in a state of salvation. This enthrals him under the spirit of bondage, and deprives him of the spirit of adoption, the glorious liberty of the sons of God. Great injury has arisen from this style of preaching, which withholds from famishing souls and wounded spirits so much of what makes the gospel the "power of God unto salvation." Many are thus held for years crushed and paralyzed under a yoke of bondage, who should be rejoicing in the liberty wherewith Christ maketh free:—buoyant, glad, thrifty Christians. Of course, faith is inseparable from love, and love from

faith. They are contemporaneous. But they have a natural order with reference to each other. The sun and its radiance are contemporaneous. But there is an order. This order is inverted and the whole matter confused and deranged, if we say the radiance is the antecedent or cause of the sun, or the stream of the fountain. The immediate and simultaneous effect of receiving Christ by faith is, reconciliation, peace, love, joy, hope, all the fruits of the Spirit. We go to Christ, in short, that we may have life. We do not first get life in order to have a warrant to go to Christ. These things may be judged, by some of greater, by others, of less moment. But by those of most profound and joyous piety, and by the most competent guides of distressed and inquiring souls, they have been counted of cardinal interest and importance. Thus alone can the believing sinner make his own those precious lines:

> "Just as I am—without one plea,
> But that thy blood was shed for me,
> And that thou bidd'st me come to thee,
> I come, O Lamb of God, I come."

The foregoing analysis brings us to the definition of faith as a generic psychological state, which makes it an assertory judgment, *i. e.*, subjectively, but not objectively certain; certain to the believer, but not capable of having its certainty so demonstrated as to compel the assent of others of a different disposition, or in a different moral state. It lies midway between a mere opinion or problematical judgment, which is often styled an inferior belief, and an apodictic judgment which can be so demonstrated as to compel the assent of all who have not abnegated their own intellects. The specific difference which constitutes different sorts of faith, is found in the distinctive objects which it embraces. Thus religious faith is that which believes religious truths, including at least faith in one or more superior beings, on whom we are dependent, and to whom we are amenable. Christian faith is belief of the truths of Christianity as these are contained in the books of the Old and New Testament; more specifically, it is obedience to the command "Believe the gospel;" Mark i. 15: more definitely still, "Believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God;" Acts viii. 37: and still fur-

ther developed, it is "faith of the Son of God, who loved us and gave himself for us." Gal. ii. 20.

But in each and all of these and other scriptural representations of it, it has the attributes of an assertory judgment, as already defined. It is a judgment which the believer knows to be true for himself, and for others similarly disposed, but which he cannot so demonstrate as to compel the assent of those whose tastes, passions, and sympathies are averse to it. That this is the nature of scriptural faith, psychologically considered, and of each higher as distinguished from each lower grade of it, appears from the following considerations.

1. It is commanded on pain of eternal perdition. This implies, first, that the truths which we are commanded to believe are supported by evidence which must convince every candid mind, and be discerned by every spiritually enlightened eye, *i. e.* by every mind freed from the bedimming vapours of sinful passion. If this belief is commanded on such pains and penalties, then the evidence is such as to render man inexcusable for not exercising it. It implies, secondly, that this evidence is such that men may be culpably blind to it, and fail to recognize or appreciate it;—that it depends on their moral state whether they will duly note and be governed by it. On these grounds, the evidence of moral and religious truth is called moral evidence, else why is belief in it commanded? Is it a fit matter of command, to believe that we exist, or that we think and feel and will, or that other men exist, or that an equilateral triangle is equiangular?

2. It is explicitly taught that this conviction or belief of Christian truth depends on our moral state. "Those who will do the will of God shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." "If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost, in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. ii. 14. "He that believeth on Him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already,

because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men have loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved." John iii. 18, 19, 20.

3. Faith is the gift of God. It is a scriptural object of prayer that God would increase our faith, help our unbelief, and open the eyes of our understanding to discern wondrous things out of his law. Now the gracious work of the Spirit in the soul of man does not consist in imparting new faculties within, or objective truths without us; but in changing the interior moral state of the soul, so that it goes forth in new views, feelings, and purposes, towards the objects revealed to it in God's word.

4. The contrast between faith and sight, presented 2 Cor. v. 7; Heb. xi. 1, and elsewhere, points to the same conclusion. These passages have been interpreted by some to lend countenance to a theory already noticed, that faith denotes the conviction we have, in every instance, of things absent, knowledge, of things present to the mind. We have already shown that this distinction does not universally hold. We think that in these passages sight is used for our natural faculty of demonstrative or unquestionable knowledge, whether through sense or reason.* It is thus contrasted with what is made known to us exclusively by the testimony of God, and becomes reality to us when we believe that testimony, and only as we believe it. Faith receives that as true, on the testimony of God, of which unaided sense and reason cannot discern either that it is, or how it is. So faith is to the believer the "ἔλεγχος"

* It is proper to add, that while this passage asserts one great property of faith, it is not intended as a formal and exhaustive definition of it. It asserts that faith is the "ἔλεγχος of things not seen." This is one property of it, but whether of it alone, or its only property, is not said. So hope is elsewhere declared to respect things which we see not. But it is not said that hope alone does this.

"Unde etiam apparet, longi falli eos, qui justam fidei definitionem hic poni existinant; Neque enim hic de tota fidei natura disserit Apostolus, sed partem elegit suo instituto congruentem, nempe quod patientia semper conjuncta sit."—*Calvin's Commentary on Heb.* xi. 1.

of things not demonstrable by sense or reason. But while this testimony "is sure to all the seed," it is just that which men, "after their hardness and impenitent heart," often fail to apprehend, as to its author, its import, its infallibility, its obligation, its application. By sin and unbelief their "eyes are holden that they should not see him." They are "slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken." "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." It is "believing God" that constitutes the formal quality of scriptural faith. "By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, being moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house." Faith here is crediting the testimony of God in regard to matters beyond the reach of sense or reason. "These all died in the faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them." Here faith is simply believing on the strength of the Divine promises, what otherwise must have been unknown, while others, in a different moral state, were not "persuaded of them." On the other hand, faith may be aided by sense and reason in believing, what others favoured with like testimony may reject. Christ said to Thomas, "Because thou hast seen me thou hast believed; blessed are they which have not seen me and believed." John xx. 29. Such passages show that "sight," in one sense of it, is involved in faith. Faith sees *what* things are believed in, although it "sees them afar off." It sees the evidence on which we believe them, whether that evidence be addressed to the senses, as in the case of Thomas, and the beholders of miracles; or to the reason purely, as where the matter and manner of the word or testimony bears a Divine imprint, and an evidence of Divinity more unmistakeable than the "heavens which declare his glory." There is a sense in which what is believed must be seen, that is, apprehended, even if, in another aspect, it be invisible. "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead." Rom. i. 20. "By faith he forsook Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king: for he endured, *as seeing him who is invisible.*" Heb. xi. 27. We "look at

things not seen." 2 Cor. iv. 18. Thus faith has its roots in knowledge. It always implies knowledge. In a certain sense, it cannot go beyond cognition. Even if what is believed be invisible, it must still in some sort be brought within the sphere of vision, *i. e.*, of conception, so far as it is an object of possible belief. The same is also true of the evidence which induces belief in its existence. And this evidence is such that while it avails to produce a judgment subjectively sure to the believer, it cannot be so set forth, as, like a theorem in mathematics, or a law of physics, or an object of sense, to constrain the assent of those morally indisposed to receive it.*

This view of faith as an assertory judgment, is still more decisively borne out in reference to that evangelical and saving faith, which is the first motion and constant spring of spiritual life in the soul. The faith of the theist as against the atheist, is an assertory judgment; because that there are atheists unconvinced by the evidence of the being of God, we have as strong proof as that there are men who hold other fundamental errors. The same is true of faith in the Bible

* "*Inevidentia* quæ tribuitur fidei non excludit omnem notitiam, sed tantum eam, quæ nititur medio scientifico, id est, sensu aut evidente ratione a natura rei petita. Dicitur *habitus inevidens* non ad negationem omnis notitiæ, sed ad remotionem notitiæ, quæ fit per rationem philosophicam, cum nitatur testimonio et auctoritate loquentis. Excludit ergo notitiam luminis naturalis, non supernaturalis revelationis; Excludit scientiam philosophia dictum, quæ opponitur opinioni, sed non populariter, ut opponitur ignorantiæ."—*Turrettin, De Voc. et Fide*, Quæst. IX. In the same chapter he offers five reasons to prove "in fide includi notitiam."

The foregoing clearly limits the "sight" which the Scripture contrasts with faith, to that knowledge or insight which comes by sense and reason, while faith obtains its light from supernatural testimony and revelation. And it places faith midway between mere opinion on the one hand, and scientifically demonstrable judgments on the other. In a like spirit, he says, (Quæst. VIII. 6,) "Ut vero Philosophi tres gradus perfectionis in assensu observant, *firmitatem* scilicet, *certitudinem*, et *evidentiam;* Firmitas, ut sit sine haesitatione, certitudo, ut certo et solido nitatur fundamento. Evidentia, ut non nitatur testimonio alieno, sed vel ex sensu vel ratione probatur, ut in scientia; fidei assensus habet quidem firmitatem, et certitudinem, quia Verbo divino et infallibili nititur, sed non evidentiam, quia nititur testimonio, non ratione, quod Apostolus notat, Heb. xi. 1." Here faith is a firm and well grounded persuasion, founded on Divine testimony, and midway between an opinion and an apodictic judgment.

as contrasted with infidelity. The same is true of those who believing the Bible to be from God, discern and believe the essential truths declared in it, as against rationalists and sceptics, who eviscerate it of its vital contents, and make shipwreck of the faith of God's elect. But saving faith, as distinguished from the faith of devils; living, in contrast to a dead faith, is eminently an assertory judgment. This faith by which the just live, arises from discerning the Divine excellency, beauty, glory, of the word and truth of God, and especially of the person and offices of Christ as our Saviour. "God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." Thus the soul beholds and delights in that infinite beauty and comeliness of Christ, which are hidden from the unbeliever. This is that spiritual discernment, that esthetic apprehension, which cognizes far more important points than all mere speculative orthodoxy without it. Mere orthodox belief, though unspeakably important, without this, is but dry bones without the living flesh, body without soul. This spiritual discernment of the things that are freely given us of God, commands the heart, and enlists the affections. Here we reach the point of sure contact between the cognitive and emotional—those moral esthetic apprehensions which always enlist and determine the feelings; which taste that the Lord is gracious. This shows how it is that "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness." True faith at once brings the heart to Christ, to embrace, trust, love, and serve him. So faith purifies the heart, while it overcomes the world. This fact that saving faith is such a belief as instantaneously begets right feeling, has undoubtedly betrayed some, who have not carefully examined the matter, into the two theories which we have already considered, either that faith is the fruit of love, or that it consists in mere blind feeling. That it underlies and immediately gives rise to true Christian love and right feeling is undeniable. That it results from them would imply the reversal of the normal order of mental exercises, as shown by experience and by scriptural representations. We will not, however, expatiate on this point beyond

what we have already advanced. We merely signalize the fact, that by this analysis, saving faith, not only as far as it agrees with, but as distinguished from other kinds and grades of faith, is an assertory judgment, sure to the believer on the surest possible grounds, as

> "He sees what wisdom, power, and love,
> Shine in our dying Lord,"

while he cannot compel the assent of those who have a "vail upon their hearts," which blinds them to all this,—all in Christ which attracts the heart to him as chief among ten thousand and altogether lovely, is to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness.*

To this it may be objected, that faith is represented in the Scripture as a thing of degrees; that they speak of a weak, a strong, an assured faith; consequently that there is a faith short of an inward certainty of the things believed in. We answer, first, that still the characteristic of normal faith, as shown by the scriptural writers, is certainty as to the things believed. "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him." 2 Tim. i. 12. "I am persuaded that neither angels, &c." Rom. ix. "For we know that if our earthly house of this

* "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee: Wherefore I repent and abhor myself in dust and ashes." Job xlii. 5, 6.

Many theologians correctly designate the effect of this spiritual illumination as a spiritual taste, who yet produce more or less confusion from an imperfect analysis of the nature of taste. They sometimes represent it as primarily a faculty of feeling, and then of a peculiar cognition begotten by that feeling; whereas, it is a faculty of that peculiar sort of cognition which always awakens correspondent feeling. Hence they sometimes describe it as a sensitive faculty. It is such, but not exclusively. But they do not discourse upon it long without implying, or distinctly articulating the view which we have presented. Thus, Edwards often describes it as a "sense or taste of the moral beauty of divine things, so that no knowledge can be called spiritual any further than it arises from, and has this in it." But, consistently or not, he soon tells us that it "primarily and most essentially lies in beholding the holy beauty of divine things." It is "the sense of the heart wherein the mind not only speculates and beholds, but relishes and feels." *Treatise on Religious Affections*, Book IV. These latter representations are sufficiently accurate and explicit.

tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." 2 Cor. v. 1. "But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." 1 John ii. 20.* Secondly, that in us which weakens this certain belief of divine things is not faith, but unbelief antagonizing with it, and impeding its exercise. "Lord, I believe, help thou mine unbelief." Mark ix. 24. Any uncertainty of faith, therefore, is the effect of remaining unbelief hindering or smothering its normal exercise. Hence, thirdly, a distinction must be taken between the principle of faith and its exercises. It is a well established truth that gracious principles may and do often exist whose normal and well-developed exercises are temporarily checked or repressed. Fourthly, faith may grow as knowledge increases, bringing either new objects to view, or fuller apprehensions of those already known, or new proofs, or stronger views of evidences which were before sufficiently decisive to free the mind of all incertitude. And, finally, a distinction is to be taken between the objects which faith embraces and trusts, and the believer's consciousness of his own good estate. This he often fails of through a misguided reflex introspection. He may be, and often is, sure of the all-sufficient efficacy of Christ's grace, blood, and righteousness, and of the truth of God in the promises and offers of it. He may truly cast himself upon it; and yet he may be more or less uncertain whether he has thus really and truly believed. Now the former, *i. e.* sure belief of the truth and promise of God in his word, is faith. Conviction of his own good estate, faith in the genuineness of his own faith, is another and consequential thing, the result of a reflex process which the true believer is often slow and long in reaching; especially if he be under spiritual guides who, in these matters, are, as so often happens, "unskilful in the word of righteousness."

* "By this faith, a Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the word, for the authority of God speaking therein." *Confession of Faith*, Chap. xiv. 2.

"Our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth, and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness, by and with the word, in our hearts." *Id.* i. 5.

From the foregoing discussion it appears,

1. That belief in general is a judgment of the mind, differing from opinion in being subjectively certain to the believer, and from demonstrative judgments, in being incapable of such proof as to compel the assent of minds not similarly disposed.

2. That belief is a cognitive act founded in knowledge, and dependent upon it for its being and extent.

3. That Christian faith, in its various grades and kinds, differs from other beliefs, in the nature of the objects believed, and the evidence on which they are believed,—the former being the truth of God, the latter the testimony of God. It cannot outrun the objects presented to the mind for belief, or the evidence by which it apprehends them to be proved. "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?" Rom. x. 14.

4. Hence that theory which maintains that God, as infinite, absolute, and first cause, can in no sense be brought within the mind's thought or conception, and must therefore be remanded to faith, is untenable. Such faith is a psychological impossibility. It is impossible to believe that of which we can form no conception. We may believe what is incomprehensible, but not what is self-contradictory. But when we believe the incomprehensible, we conceive of it as such, and as presenting a somewhat knowable as a base of the incomprehensible.

5. Therefore Christian faith as a cognitive act requires an external, objective, authoritative revelation, which shall furnish it the requisite objects, guidance, and limitation.

6. No mere feelings or intuitions, or other inward states, constitute a revelation. Whatever in religion is not conformed to the external word of God, is spurious. We must prove all things, and hold fast that which is good. "To the law and the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isaiah viii. 20.

7. Therefore spiritual illumination is not a revelation of new truths, but an enlightening of the eyes of the mind to discern the divine truth, beauty, and glory of what is revealed in Scripture. By that word all claims to spiritual light, inspiration, by special intuition, exaltation, or endowments of any sort, are to be tested. "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God." 1 John iii. 1. "If there come any

unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not in your house, neither bid him God speed." 2 John 10.

8. No error can be more profound than that of intuitionalists, rationalists, transcendentalists, and mystics, who place doctrine, or, as they sometimes name it, dogma, in opposition to spirit. That spirit alone is a Christian spirit, which believes, loves, and obeys the "doctrine of Christ," which is according to godliness. They alone build upon a rock who hear Christ's words and do them. All others build upon the sand and will reel to destruction. His sheep hear his voice and no other. A stranger they will not follow.

ART. III.—*The Subjects of Baptism.*

THE mode of baptism was considered in a former article. The object aimed at was to present the subject in a clear and simple light, which might render it perfectly plain to the common reader. How far this end has been reached, must be left of course for others to judge. The question now to occupy our attention is, who are the proper subjects of baptism?

It is universally admitted that this rite may be properly administered to adult believers, if they have not been previously baptized. On this point, therefore, as there is no difference of opinion, we shall consume no time with discussion. But are believers the only persons to whom it may be administered? To this our Baptist brethren reply in the affirmative; we, on the other hand, with the great mass of Christendom, in the negative. We believe that the infants of such as are members of the visible church are to be baptized, the Lord having made it both their privilege and their duty to consecrate their offspring to him in the use of this ordinance. In defence and confirmation of this belief, the most of what we desire to say may be appropriately arranged under three distinct arguments, each having force in itself, and when combined, forming an arch that cannot be broken or swept away by our opponents. They

are not new indeed, but are not the less worthy of our regard on that account. To consider how these ancient pillars stand, and how they are related together in the temple of truth, will reassure those who already agree with us in the general view of the subject, and perhaps tend to convince those from whom we differ.

I. The first to which we ask the attention of the reader is this. In the original constitution of the church, the covenant into which God entered with his people included their children. The external mark or seal of the covenant was applied to them. And until it can be shown that this covenant has been abrogated, or that the children of the faithful have been excluded from its provisions, they are and must be entitled to the same privilege still. The mere lapse of time, or change of circumstances, or substitution of one seal for another, does not affect them. They stand still just where they orginally stood, unless excluded.

The church may be compared to a company chartered with certain rights and privileges. If, in the lapse of time, without revoking the charter, or disbanding the company, any modifications should be made, such as substituting a new for an old seal, changing the field of operations, readjusting the officers, or the like, this of course would only affect the company to the extent of these alterations and what they necessarily imply. All original rights and privileges remain, unless withdrawn or changed by subsequent legislation. Whatever might or might not be done at the first, would be still lawful or unlawful unless prohibited or permitted under the modification. The correctness of this statement as to all mere human organizations will not be questioned. No one will affirm that an organized company loses or gains anything by a modification of its charter, except what is expressly stated or necessarily implied in the action taken. Whatever is not thus affected, remains as it was.

Now we maintain that the same is true in regard to the church. All her rights, privileges, and duties, as expressed under the old dispensation are still in force, unless they have been cancelled under the new. The children of his people were embraced in the covenant at first. That covenant has never

been abrogated. They have never been excluded. Therefore they are embraced in it still and are entitled to its seal.

It will be perceived just here, that everything depends, as to the force of this argument, on the view that is to be taken of the Christian church. If it be an entirely new and independent organization, then of course there is no connection between it and the old charter, and the argument just stated has no force; but if it be only a perpetuation of the original church of God, under a somewhat modified form, then the argument is relevant and unanswerable. It will be necessary, therefore, to examine this point before we proceed. Is the Christian church an entirely new organization, or is it only a modified continuance of the one church of God? We maintain the latter—the identity of the church, just as we maintain that the boy and the man are the same person, though the form, age, and circumstances, may have changed. Our anti-pedobaptist brethren maintain the former, *i. e.*, that the church is not the same, but a new organization, succeeding the former indeed, but not a perpetuation of it. This entire separation of the New from the Old has been sometimes carried so far as to deny that the Scriptures of the Old Testament are a part of our rule of faith. They may contain what is good, true, and even profitable, in history, doctrine, and biography, but the New Testament alone is our rule of faith. We have no more connection with the Old Testament, as a law, than we have with the old colonial constitutions and laws under which our ancestors lived before we became independent States. This seems to be a necessary conclusion from their theory of the church, and is of itself sufficient to shock our Christian sensibilities. Argument on such a topic is scarcely needed, but yet it will be proper to notice some of the many considerations which go to establish the identity of the church under both dispensations.

(*a*) The promises and prophecies of the Scriptures cover the whole period of the church's existence, and in their spirit, letter, and scope, evidently contemplate but one and the same body. They begin with the church in its earliest days, and run on into its later and more enlarged development, implying continuance, prosperity, growth, but utterly forbidding the idea that the church then existing was to be supplanted by

another. "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you from among your brethren; him shall ye hear." "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains . . . . and all nations shall flow unto it." "Arise, shine," says the prophet to Zion, in anticipation of her coming glory—"Arise, shine: for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. . . . . The Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. . . . . Then shalt thou see and flow together, and be enlarged; because the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee." Quotations of this character might be multiplied almost indefinitely, were it necessary. These are simply sufficient to show that the one church of old was not to be supplanted, but enlarged, and made to embrace the Gentile world. The pious Jews so understood them, and therefore looked forward with exultant anticipations to their fulfilment. The church since has ever regarded them as in part fulfilled in her enlargement, and as indicating a blessed legacy yet to be received.

(*b*) As a counterpart to this argument, it is observable, also, that the formal, didactic, and argumentative statements of the New Testament clearly teach the same thing, *i. e.*, the identity of the church under both dispensations. It is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." The Gentiles are "fellow-heirs and of the *same* body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel." To believers it is said, "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Through Christ, both Jew and Gentile have access by one Spirit unto the Father, and are, therefore, equally fellow-citizens and of the household of God. Eph. ii. 18. 19. The olive tree originally planted is the same. The old and decayed branches may have been broken off, and new branches from the wild olive grafted in, but the tree is the same. This illustrative argument of the Apostle is utterly inapplicable and unmeaning, if the church has not been preserved. The same is true also of the representation that Christ now occupies the throne of David. Where were

the truth or relevancy of this representation, if the throne of David had perished? The New Testament, therefore, clearly teaches the same on this point, the identity of the church, as the promises and prophecies of the Old. These considerations mutually illustrate and confirm each other, and would fully establish our position, if nothing more could be said.

(*c*) The actual history of the Christian church in its first developments, is in entire accordance with these teachings of the Old and New Testament. The uniform tenor of the prophetic announcements was, that Zion should live and be enlarged; that David should never want a successor to sit upon his throne. The unvarying testimony of the apostles is that it did live, is receiving its promised enlargement, and is now under the dominion of Christ on the throne of David. Now with all this the facts of her early history perfectly agree. Of whom was the early Christian church composed? Of believing Jews unquestionably. They held the Jewish Scriptures, received the Messiah long before promised to the Jewish church, and claimed all the promises made to Zion as their legacy. "They which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." The apostles were all Jews. For a considerable time they "preached the gospel to none but the Jews only." By Divine direction they opened the door to the Gentiles, and then went among them, preaching the gospel long before made known to Abraham. Can it be that by receiving Christ and preaching him to others, they thereby separated themselves from the church of God, and forfeited their interest in the promises? Certainly not. This was the very thing which united them to, and kept them in the one living church of God. "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

(*d*) In addition to all these facts and teachings, the identity of the church may be established in another way. The object of worship is the same—the living and true God. But all who worship him acceptably, in any age, place, or country, must have the same religion and belong to the same church; for what is the church but the company of those who worship the true God. The way of life, also, is the same under both dispensations, to wit: by faith in Jesus Christ. "Behold, I lay

in Zion, for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious stone—he that believeth shall not make haste." This was "the gospel preached before unto Abraham." Christ was the glory, beauty, and strength of the old dispensation as well as the new. Its types, ceremonies, and shadows, pointed to him, and were so understood by the faithful. "Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it." "They all drank of that rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ." Ancient believers, therefore, were as truly Christians, though not called by that name, as we are at the present day. But can that be a different or new church, which lives by the faith of a common Saviour?

And still farther; there was, and is, the same entire dependence on the power of the Holy Ghost under each. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit," is equally the law of both. And then the nature of life communicated is also the same—a life of love to God and man. The sum of spirituality under each is "to love the Lord our God with all our heart, and mind, and strength, and our neighbour as ourselves." Thus, in every respect they are one—one object of worship, one Mediator between God and man, one Spirit of life and power, and one inward disposition belonging to all.

Let the reader now review, for a moment, what has been advanced in proof of the identity of the church. It is established, by the uniform tenor of the promises and prophecies of Scripture, by the constant teachings of the apostles, by the actual occurrences in the early history of the Christian church, and by the perfect *oneness* of the two dispensations as to the object of worship, the way of life through Christ, dependence on the Holy Ghost, and the internal spirit or disposition of the people. The church of God is unquestionably but one and the same under both dispensations. That church, in its original constitution, included the seed of the righteous. They are still entitled to this privilege, unless it can be shown that they have been excluded. We insist, therefore, that those who deny this right are bound to show by what authority they exclude them. They were once included. By what authority are they shut out? The burden of proof must, in all fairness, rest upon our opponents, and not on us. They, indeed, demand of us a

"thus saith the Lord" for receiving the children of believers into the church. We, on the other hand, ask for equally explicit testimony for their exclusion. Until this is produced, we contend that direct testimony on our side for receiving them, is not necessary or even to be expected. Why should there be any testimony or command on such a matter, when for centuries the practice of the church had been uniform in this respect? The privileges of the seed of the righteous continue of course, unless prohibited. Where is the prohibition? This our opponents are bound to produce. This we are confident they can never do. . . . . They tell us, indeed, that there is no explicit mention of infant baptism in the New Testament; but the obvious reply is, silence, if it be admitted, does not exclude them. There is no repetition of the fourth commandment in the new dispensation, but this does not abrogate the law of the Sabbath. The old regulation is still in force. There is no mention of female communion in the New Testament; but this does not exclude them from the Lord's table. They ate the passover, and were members of the church under the former economy; and of course are entitled to the corresponding privileges under the latter, unless forbidden. Authority for admitting them, therefore, is not required, but for excluding. Until this is produced, their privileges are unabridged of course. There was apparently no occasion for commanding it; but everything indicates that they did commune, though it is neither enjoined nor expressly mentioned. Precisely so in regard to infant members. They were received under the original charter. They had always been included. There was no occasion, therefore, for enjoining their admission; but at the same time every incidental allusion (as we shall see presently) shows that they were received with their parents. More authority than this we certainly do not need, and in the circumstances could scarcely expect. They take their place of course, like females at the communion table, unless prohibited. The very silence of Scripture, therefore, is significant for our views and practice. If it had been intended to exclude females from the Christian passover, or to abrogate the fourth commandment, these points would have been mentioned. Nothing being said about them, and the *practice* of the apostles being clear, these ancient

usages remain unaltered. If it had been intended to deprive children of their status in the church, it would have been stated. Nothing being said about it, they of course stand unaffected within the pale of the covenant, and entitled to its seal.

But infant membership, it is sometimes said, was a part of the Mosiac ritual, and therefore passed away when that was abrogated. We reply by an utter denial of the premise assumed. Infant membership was not a part of the Mosaic ritual. It was held and taught in the family of Abraham, where the church is generally supposed to have been organized, at least four hundred years before the times of Moses. "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant; to be a God unto thee and unto thy seed after thee." . . . . "This is my covenant which ye shall keep, between me and you, and thy seed after thee: Every man child among you shall be circumcised." Gen. xvii. 7, 10. Here is the law of infant membership given long before Moses appeared. The abrogation of his ritual, therefore, enacted as it was at a subsequent period, can have no effect on the original covenant. An unbiassed judgment alone would assure us of this; but we have also the testimony of inspiration directly to the point. "The covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." Gal. iii. 17. The old charter still remains unaffected by the ceremonial law.

A reply very similar to this, may be made to the allegation that the Jewish church was a secular organization, and hence the fact that children belonged to it does not prove that they belong also to the Christian church, which is a spiritual body. We answer, that the Jewish church, though it had a civil and ceremonial code given by the hand of Moses, yet was also a spiritual body, and had an existence embracing children long before their civil laws were enacted. It was organized in the family of Abraham four hundred years before Moses. The ceremonial law was an appendage, given for a specific purpose, to wit, that the Jews might be kept distinct from all other nations until the coming of Christ. After his appearance the necessity for a separate national existence ceased, and therefore the

national ritual with all its types and shadows was set aside; but without affecting in the least the original covenant made with Abraham. This still remains to him and to his seed, as truly as on the day it was first formed. This covenant is yet in existence, and lies at the very foundation of the visible church. Believers now are the children of faithful Abraham, and the covenant and the promise is to them and their seed as truly as at the first, notwithstanding the law of Moses, as to some of its requirements, has been annulled.

Such then is the first, and we may say the main, argument for admitting the children of believers to a place in the visible church. It was done by Divine appointment in the original organization of the church in the family of Abraham. The constitution of the church in this respect has never been changed. The privilege of children has not been withdrawn, nor the duty of parents revoked. The seed of the righteous, therefore, are still entitled to a place in the visible kingdom. The only escape from this argument is by denying the identity of the church under both dispensations. But this, as we have shown, cannot be maintained. The church of God is one—one family of children—one brotherhood of believers, in every age and country, whatever external modifications may have been made. Unless the children of pious parents have been debarred, therefore, they are yet within the household.

Before proceeding to the next argument in support of our practice, we propose to submit two or three preliminary considerations which are pertinent just here. It is an unquestionable fact, that the church originally embraced the faithful and their seed. The covenant embraced both. The seal was applied to each. Now (*a*) if a change so important and radical as the exclusion of one-half the membership was made by our Saviour and the apostles, it would at least be reasonable to suppose that some distinct mention of it would be made. Otherwise how would their intention be known? But no such intimation is given. On the other hand, as we shall see presently, intimations of a directly opposite nature are abundant, showing that the same order was to continue. Is this possible upon the theory that they intended to forbid infant membership? Again (*b*) If they had introduced such a change in the constitution of

the church, it is in the highest degree improbable that it would have been unnoticed both by friends and foes. The Jews prized their covenant relation to Abraham very highly. They were, moreover, peculiarly sensitive as to every departure from their laws and customs. Would they not have noticed this, supposing it to have been made? Or, if they had been silent, would not the disciples of Christ themselves have asked for some explanation? The children of the faithful have heretofore belonged to the church; are they now to be excluded? They have hitherto stood in a peculiar relation to God; are they now to be put on an equality with the children of the heathen? That some allusion to the change, supposing it to have been made, should not be found, either from friend or foe, is utterly incredible. And yet not a word is on record from either, implying even that any change was made in this respect. On the other hand, much is found implying the continuance of the old order. How is it possible to reconcile this with the Baptist theory?

But farther, (*c*) If no change were contemplated in the constitution of the church—if the privileges of believers were to continue in this respect, just as they always had been, then all that we would reasonably expect in the way of authority would be, not an express injunction to incorporate their seed with themselves into the church, (for this were unnecessary, the thing was already understood and practised,) but an occasional or incidental allusion to it as an existing usage. And this is precisely what we do find, as we shall now proceed to show. No notice of a change; no question or complaint from any quarter implying it, but various allusions and statements which clearly show its continuance.

II. Some of these are now to be presented as a second argument in favour of our practice. Take, in the first place, the declaration of the apostle Peter to his brethren the Jews. "For the promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off." As Jews, they had been accustomed to associate their offspring with themselves in all the privileges and blessings of the church. Now if they were to be deprived of this privilege when they became Christians, it is certainly very strange that the old covenant relation should be thus

referred to. Repent and be baptized, . . . for the covenant is to you and to your children. Is it possible that such an inducement would have been mentioned, if their children were to be, by the faith of the parents in accepting Christ, cut off from the church? We think not. It may be, indeed, that the language we have quoted is not to be considered as enjoining infant baptism, but to our apprehension it is utterly at war with the idea, that the offspring of believers are in a less favoured condition under the new than under the old dispensation. It goes on the presumption that the covenant of God with his people is unchanged in this respect. This intimation is given, too, almost at the very commencement of the Christian dispensation, when, if an entirely new order was to be instituted, a very different intimation would seem to have been called for. Instead of being left to infer the continued status of their children, they should have been told distinctly that henceforth they were not to wear the seal of the covenant.

Take, in the next place, the important passage in 1 Cor. vii. 14. "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband: else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." In what sense are the children "holy" when there is one believing parent? Not inherently, certainly, for this is not true of them by nature when both parents are pious. It must refer to the covenant or church relation in which such children are placed, and was no doubt intended to solve a practical difficulty that arose very early in the church. They seem to have been at a loss what to do when only one parent was pious—a difficulty, by the way, which never could have arisen if the children were to be left out any how, even if both parents were believers. In this perplexity the apostle says, that the faith of one parent is sufficient to guaranty their covenant standing. They are not to be excluded. "On the maturest and most impartial consideration of this passage," says Doddridge, "I must judge it to refer to infant baptism. Nothing can be more apparent than that the word *holy* signifies persons who might be admitted to partake of the distinguishing rites of God's people." "I cannot but conclude, after long attention to the subject," says Scott, "that the

baptism of the infant offspring of believers is here evidently referred to as at that time customary in the churches." No other interpretation of this passage with which we have met, is at all plausible. Olshausen, who denies its reference to infant baptism, finds the benefit arising to the unbelieving partner to lie "in the highly important idea, that a relative sanctification can be effected merely by contact with those who possess it. There is," he says, "in those who are closely united with believers, without fully yielding to their power, a certain resistance always to be conceived; the mighty power of Christ unites itself with the better part in them, and elevates it to a certain degree." And in the holiness or cleanness, represented as belonging to the children where one parent is pious, he finds only "a destination for conversion, and a means of facilitating this, unquestionably included. This is the blessing of pious ancestors." Shade of Abraham! And yet even he admits that "in the thought which the apostle here expresses, lies the full authorization of the church to institute this rite of infant baptism." "What pertains to the children of Christians in virtue of their birth, is affirmed to them in baptism, to be really and fully imparted to them at their confirmation or spiritual baptism."

Another allusion of a less definite nature, is found in the familiar words of our Saviour. "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God," or of heaven. The kingdom here referred to is the church. Children had been brought into it from the first. If they were henceforward to be excluded, this is certainly a strange declaration. Instead of an implied continuance of their right, we might have expected an explicit denial of it. We cannot but believe that this would have been given, if he had intended to cut them off from their covenant relation. An appropriate occasion certainly was here afforded for promulgating the new order. So far is he from issuing it, however, that he seems to sanction the old usage. In this manner the pious generally have understood his words; and have joyfully consecrated their offspring to him, in the fond hope that they will be watched as lambs of his fold, and received at last

into the kingdom above. Have they been feeding on delusion?

These are some of the principal allusions, going to show that as under the old so under the new dispensation, the children of believers are embraced in the covenant, and have a right to its seal. The Saviour says they belong to the kingdom. The apostle affirms that the promise includes them. And, in a case where they were at some loss what to think or to do, instructions are given which recognize their standing. We submit that these allusions, in the absence of everything of a contrary nature, and in connection with the former practice of the church, ought to have great weight in deciding the matter. It is to our mind inconceivable that these implied sanctions should have been given, if the seed of the righteous were to be no longer admitted to a standing in the visible kingdom. This conviction, too, is greatly strengthened by the remaining argument, which we now propose to state, viz.

III. The practice of the early Christians seems clearly to have coincided with the interpretation we have given them, and with the ancient usage of God's people. The evidence of this is found in the family or household baptisms recorded in the New Testament. Of these, four are mentioned distinctly, *i. e.*, the families of Cornelius, Lydia, Stephanas, and the jailor; and four others are referred to in a way which renders their baptism highly probable—the household of Crispus, Onesiphorus, Aristobulus, and Narcissus. In such a number of families it is highly improbable that all would be found without children. Take eight or even four families promiscuously in any community or age, and the probabilities are almost a thousand to one that children will be found in some of them. That there were none in any of these, it is next to impossible to believe. But if there were, they were baptized as well as the parents.

The way, too, in which one of these family baptisms is mentioned is worthy of remark, as tending to show a prevailing custom. "And when she was baptized and her household," as though the baptism of the family were as much a

matter of course as of the parent or head. This is the more significant also, when we remember that under the old dispensation, whenever a parent professed the true religion, a proselyte, for example, the initiatory ordinance was applied to his family as well as to himself. He and his were circumcised, and thus publicly consecrated to God by the seal of his covenant. Allusion to this ceremony would have been very natural in just such language as is here employed in regard to Lydia. And when he was circumcised and his family—and when she was baptized and her household—the one as naturally following conversion as the other. Nothing could be more artless than this allusion. The evidence thus afforded is scarcely less strong and satisfactory than if it had been directly affirmed, that according to the tenor of the covenant, and the common practice of the apostles, she and her household were received into the church by the same ordinance, and upon her individual faith. This and the other cases mentioned, are to be regarded only as samples of what was common in that day. The mere passing allusion to them is unaccountable on any other theory.

It might be shown that the early history of the church confirms the conclusion to which we are brought by these arguments. But we prefer to lay before our readers at present only the scriptural view of the subject. This can be understood and appreciated by all who are capable of reasoning. If this be accepted, nothing more is needed. If in this we have failed, we should not wish to be sustained by uninspired history. The main positions that have been taken are, in the first place, that the children of believers were included in the covenant, belonged to the church, and received the initiatory ordinance in the original organization of God's house —that that constitution has not been abrogated—that it is the law of the church still. They are, therefore, yet included in the covenant, and of course the rite of initiation belongs to them still. If they are shut out, the authority for so doing must be brought by those who exclude them. This they can never do. But, in the next place, instead of waiting for them to prove their exclusion, we have shown that various declara-

tions imply very clearly the continuance of this usage under the gospel. And then, in the third place, the practice of the church seems to have been founded upon it.

As observed at the beginning, each of these arguments has independent weight, but when combined, they strengthen each other immeasurably. Like circumstantial evidence, they confirm each other. God placed the children of believers within his church at the first. They belong to it still, unless they have been excluded. This alone were enough. We might sit down here, and wait for our opponents to produce a "thus saith the Lord" for excluding them. But we go farther, and show that their continued covenant relation is taught by Christ and his apostles. This, in the absence of everything to the contrary, gives additional strength to the former conclusion. And then, to make the demonstration complete, we have shown that the practice of the apostles also, as well as their didactic teaching, is favourable to infant baptism. Believing parents in those days brought their children as naturally as themselves to receive this ordinance. What are we, then, that we should forbid it to be done at the present time? To our apprehension the privilege and duty are scarcely less clear than they were in regard to circumcision.

Several of the most common arguments against the views we hold have already been answered. There is no command to baptize children. But silence does not exclude them. An injunction was not necessary. The former practice of the church and the example of the apostles gave all requisite information and authority. A prohibition would have been requisite to exclude them, and would doubtless have been given if they were to be deprived of their former standing. Infant membership was a part of the Mosaic ritual, and terminated with its abrogation. We deny the assertion *in toto*. Infant membership was instituted in the family of Abraham, and, as to origin or continuance, had nothing to do with Moses. But the Jewish church was a secular organization, and membership in it cannot imply the same in the Christian church, which is a spiritual body. We reply, that the church of old existed before, and independent of, the national organization; and was

then as truly a spiritual body as now. The Jewish economy was only a temporary device, for a specific purpose, enacted long after the church's existence, and terminated without affecting the covenant.

One or two other objections require to be noticed before we close. The conditions of baptism, it is said, are repentance and faith. Only those who can perform these conditions are proper subjects of the ordinance. Children cannot repent and believe, therefore they are not to be baptized. Our reply to this is three-fold. (*a*) The same process of reasoning will exclude them from heaven as well as from the church. Repentance and faith are the conditions of salvation as plainly as of baptism. "Testifying repentance towards God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," was the sum of Paul's preaching. "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." "He that believeth not, shall be damned." But children cannot repent and believe, therefore they cannot be saved. The argument proves too much, and is therefore good for nothing. (*b*) The terms prescribed have respect to adults. They prove nothing in either case as to children. This is the belief of all as to their salvation, should they die in infancy. Why is it not equally true as to their baptism? (*c*) Under the old dispensation, faith and submission to God were required of proselytes. Their infant offspring were not capable of performing these acts; yet they were received on the authority of the covenant, and the seal applied. Why should not the same course be pursued under the new?

But it is said, What good does baptism do them? No little merriment is sometimes made at the expense of pedo-baptists under cover of this inquiry. The sprinkling of unconscious babes is sneered at as the height of folly. (*a*) The same might have been said, perhaps was said, by some, of circumcision. What sense or profit is there in subjecting them to a painful ceremony? Nay, but O man! who art thou that repliest against God? What are we, that we should accuse God of folly? To know that he requires it, should be enough for us. This is our first reply. (*b*) And another is, that our inability to discover the utility of the ordinance, does not prove it to be without

value. The water may have no cleansing efficacy of itself—we have never dreamed that it has. But still, the religious use of it in the way prescribed, may be valuable. If it be done in obedient love to God, consecrating therewith our children to him, who can say, that through it, and through the training it implies, an unspeakable blessing may not descend upon all the parties concerned—parents, children, the church, and the world. It is a remarkable fact that the church of God has lived and descended from age to age very much through the families of the righteous. Who can say how much the consecration of their offspring to God may have contributed to their welfare, the comfort of their parents, the prosperity of Zion, and the good of the world? We are convinced that the observance of this ordinance has been an incalculable blessing, and that to banish the usage from the church would be injurious in the extreme. With all the solemn considerations and advantages by which it is enforced, we are yet too prone, alas, to neglect the proper training of our children, and they to neglect their high interests and obligations. What would be the result if it were banished from the church? But on this we cannot enlarge at present. The practical bearing and value of the ordinance may, perhaps, be discussed at another time. For the present, we rest with having established the continued privilege of regarding our children as with us in the ark, and of consecrating them to our covenant-keeping God. At every stage of the argument we have been more and more convinced that our usage is scriptural, and that in the conscientious observance of it we have every reason to expect the Divine blessing.

ART. IV.—*The Rise of the Dutch Republic, a History.* By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY. Three vols. New York: Harper and Brothers.

History of the United Netherlands; from the death of William the Silent to the Synod of Dort, &c. By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY, LL.D., D. C. L. Two vols. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1861.

IN these two works, which in substance are really one, there is bound up a most valuable chapter of ecclesiastical history. Deeply as the question of the Reformation agitated all the nations of Western Europe, to no other was it of such political importance as to the Dutch Republic, which not only derived its existence therefrom, but whose Constitution depended upon the liberality of Reformed doctrines. Hollanders had no original intention to break off their allegiance. They clung to it, indeed, almost beyond reason, after every plea for it had been prostrated again and again. And when finally compelled into the attitude of a separate nation, they shrunk from the task of governing themselves, even by a king from among themselves. A people of more tenacious loyalty it is difficult to find. Had they been granted freedom to worship God according to their reading of his word, they would have laid down their arms without hesitation; and peace they might have had at any time, by simply surrendering their faith. It was on this issue that the war was waged. The Hollanders held their religion dearer than life, and Philip would tolerate no creed but the Roman Catholic. He would consent to lay his finest provinces in desolation, and consign his loyal subjects to wholesale slaughter, rather than permit them to think on the subject of religion otherwise than he did himself. The prolonged war, of which the narrative is here presented, was mainly one for freedom of conscience—a great religious warfare, resulting in the establishment of a nation.

Prussia also owed her national existence to the Reformation, but after a very different manner. To secularize the property of an ecclesiastical order, and change the grand-master into a temporal sovereign, was a different kind of initiation from that

of a people wresting their religious liberties out of the hands of an unwilling despot.

As in England and Scotland, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, so in Holland, the leading motives of all great movements sprung out of religion, and belonged to the conflict between the mediæval church and the Reformation—allied as the former was with political despotism, and the latter with freedom. To write the modern history of those nations, requires some experience of religious motives. A man who has never felt the power of religion in his own soul, must necessarily misapprehend the action of pious men. And when pious men are the leaders of a religious people, the measures of government will be moved by springs which, to an irreligious man, are a perfect mystery. He will not only fail to know, he will also impute such motives as are within the range of his knowledge, of course in many cases diametrically opposite to the true. The attempt of such a man as Hume to write the history of England, must be shallow in the very worst sense of shallowness. An easy and graceful diction, however admirable in itself, is a poor compensation for the exclusion or perversion of all the most valuable truths pertaining to the subject. It is deeply to be regretted, that Macaulay has also come short in this respect. The serious blemish in his otherwise great work, is the lack of a religious sense. Macaulay occasionally belittles his work by imputing petty and ridiculously inadequate motives, to fill the place of such as he could not understand.

Here we are happy to say, that Motley rises to the measure of his subject. Whatever his own experience in this matter may be, he estimates duly, and traces justly to its historic effects, the working of Christian piety. Without disqualifying himself to appreciate the merits of the zealous and honest Roman Catholic, he enters into genial sympathy with the pious patriots of Holland. He is impartial; but not one of those who, in order to balance the account between good and ill, are ready to conjure up the fairest excuses for a villain, and leave a corresponding amount of slander attaching to a good man, making it appear, as well as possible, that after all, the difference between them is not very great. His impartiality seems to be that of stating the truth honestly, as he finds it, of both the

good and evil, without any attempt to excuse the one or detract from the other. Nor does he shrink from a full exposure of certain mixed characters, whom in some respects he evidently admires. In the case, for example, of Alexander of Parma, while setting forth his heroism, military talent, and fidelity to his king, no effort is made to palliate either the cruelty or duplicity which have branded him with infamy.

An agreeable feature of the historian is his heartiness. There is no assumption of that air of lofty indifference, which some affect as dignity. It is clear that he loves his subject and its patriot heroes; and his success extends also to this, that he makes his readers love them too.

To the Presbyterian church these volumes are of especial interest. Heroic as much of her history has been, there is no part of it which exhibits a more exalted moral heroism than that which belongs to Holland. Under this head the historian himself remarks, that "The Lutheranism of Germany and the Calvinism of France had each its share in producing the Netherlands revolt; but a mistake is perhaps often made in estimating the relative proportion of these several influences. The Reformation first entered the provinces, not through the Augsburg, but the Huguenot gate. The fiery field-preachers from the South of France first inflamed the excitable hearts of the kindred population of the South-western Netherlands." "The Batavians, slower to be moved, but more steadfast, retained the impulse, which they received from the same source, which was already agitating their 'Welsh' compatriots." "Without undervaluing the influence of the German churches, and particularly of the garrison-preaching of the German military chaplains in the Netherlands, it may be safely asserted, that the early reformers of the provinces were mainly Huguenot in their belief. The Dutch church became, accordingly, not Lutheran, but Calvinistic." In another place, touching the general character of his subject, he says, that "it was a great episode—the longest, the darkest, the bloodiest, the most important episode in the history of the religious Reformation in Europe." His work is mainly concerned with those acts whereby the King of Spain goaded into insurrection, and

finally lost that small but most valuable group of dependencies.

The story is one of no common interest. The popular intelligence and prevailing licentiousness of the wealthy Netherlands, before the voice of the Reformation reached them, the fearful chastisement inflicted upon all, the ruin wrought upon the States which submitted to reject the Reformation, the fiery trial through which the Reformed had to pass, and the machinations of intolerance, falsehood, and almost unparalleled cruelty, persisted in for the length of a generation, whereby the king of Spain strove to reduce his refractory provinces, and succeeded in laying waste all that he did not alienate, with the exploits of military skill and daring exhibited on both sides, and the triumph over all of a sagacious and Christian statesmanship, go to form a chapter of history which, for the intensity of the feeling it excites, and the wealth of its moral instruction, has few equals in any age.

When Philip the Second ascended the throne of Spain, he put himself at the head of the mightiest monarchy then in the world. His dominions took hold on both hemispheres. In Europe they comprehended Spain, Naples, Sicily, the Milanese, Franche Compte, and the Netherlands; in Africa, Tunis, Oran, and various other places on the coast of Barbary, the Cape Verde Islands, and the Canaries; in Asia, the Philippines and the Spice islands; and the New World was almost entirely his own—the West Indies, Mexico, Central America, and Peru, in actual possession, and the recognized claim to all the still undiscovered regions of both North and South America. It was an empire upon which, for the first time, it could be said that the sun never set, and whose boundaries no exploration had yet determined.

Not less majestic was the magnitude of his alliances. Spain was the champion of the Papacy, and, though not always at peace with the Pope, the unswerving ally of that system which then ruled the consciences of three-fourths of civilized mankind. The sceptre of the German empire was laid down by Philip's father only to be handed over to his uncle. And a few months before he had become the husband of the queen of

England, and thereby titular king of the first of Protestant powers.

What benign and world-pervading influences might have been wielded in such circumstances by a wise and good man. The whole reign of Philip was a demonstration of the helplessness of a mean and narrow spirit, and its proclivity to mischief, though favoured with all the extraneous resources which fortune can confer. His incompetence as a ruler was manifested in the attempt to govern all his dominions on the same principle and method, and by his own single hand. What to a more comprehensive mind would have presented almost insuperable difficulties, and rendered the calling in of the coöperation of others imperative, was to him plain and easy. His ideas ran in a narrow channel, and were greatly simplified by obstinacy. It was only for him to order what he thought should be done, for his officers to carry out his orders, and for his people to obey. The whole process was simple and elementary, like arrangements on diagrams with puppets. Unfortunately some of the puppets were occasionally found to have a will of their own, and thereby to disarrange and spoil the whole play. For Mexico and Peru, where Spanish arms had destroyed all order save that effected by force, the method may have answered sufficiently well; even in Spain and Italy its effects, falling in, as they did, with other long standing evils of the same kind, were not so readily exposed nor felt as such by those on whom they pressed; but in the Netherlands, where some degree of liberty and liberal culture had previously belonged to the masses, such irrational despotism was resented as a grievous burden. The conflict which arose thereupon between an intelligent, spirited, and wealthy people, on the one hand, and the obstinacy of an inflexible and narrow-minded despot on the other, intensified on both sides by religious motives, and sustained by vast resources, was one which no man then living was to see the end of.

Inhabiting a country which needed to be continually defended against the incursions of the sea, the people of the Netherlands were from earliest times constrained to the exercise of watchfulness and industry. Much of their land was a conquest from the waters, which could be retained only by ever

active care in use of the means by which it was first acquired. Energy and enterprising industry were thus largely developed in the people by the very soil on which they lived. And as its extent was, after all, but scanty, and its capacity for agriculture limited, the devices of manufactures and commerce had to be added, in order to maintain its increasing population. To this end the waters, with which they had to contend for soil to stand on, were found an invaluable auxiliary. Its bays, rivers, and estuaries, became alive with commerce, the towns and villages upon the coast grew to large and prosperous cities, permeated with the streams of business, while their workshops resounded with the voice of prosperous industry. Canals and highways carried the activity to the inland towns, which naturally acquired most eminence in production. Ghent, Brussels, and Mechlin, were built up by their manufactures, as much as Antwerp and Amsterdam by the extent of their commerce.

The intellectual quickening usually connected with such pursuits, manifested itself not only in the schools, but also, and even more remarkably, in the associations of mechanics formed for their literary improvement. During the fifteenth century societies or guilds of rhetoric were formed, in greater or less number, in all the principal cities of the Netherlands. In these societies mechanics amused their leisure, and improved their minds with literary exercises of various kinds, poetical as well as rhetorical, with dramatic and musical exhibitions, theatrical processions, and other more or less intellectual recreations. Many of those effusions, perhaps most of them, may have been lacking in the requisites of good taste, and may not have merited the praise of lofty genius; it is not more than might be said of the great mass of literature as produced by their more learned contemporaries; they were, at least, exercises which went to train, refine, and liberalize the minds which pursued them.

A people whose amusements were of such a character, and whose business led to compare opinions from various quarters, were already prepared to recognize the necessity of a reform in the church, and to accept it with zeal when proposed. By the writings of Erasmus and others of their scholars, they were

still further, about the beginning of the sixteenth century, instructed to the same end. And attempts had originated among themselves before the successful movement which put Luther at its head. Perhaps in no other country of Europe did the evils of a corrupt church exhibit themselves more conspicuously in the morals of the people. Activity of intellect gave the greater prominence and enormity to profligacy. Intemperance, and the vices which usually attend thereupon, were lamentably prevalent. Popular intelligence recognized and may have condemned the evil; but mere intelligence was helpless to remove it. That was properly the work of the church. But the corrupt church, instead of so doing, lent its countenance and support to iniquity, by the example of its ecclesiastics, and the sale of indulgences, as well as by many other means less direct, but hardly less effective.

Accordingly, scarcely was the voice of the Great Reformation heard in Germany, when it was accepted by large numbers in the Netherlands. The system of doctrines, however, as already intimated, most generally adopted, was that which receives its name from the great Reformer of Geneva. Presbyterianism was early and heartily welcomed, especially in the states which afterwards became the United Netherlands.

Charles V. strenuously laboured to suppress the Reformation in all his dominions. His failure in Germany perhaps embittered his efforts within the provinces more completely under his control. As early as 1523, Henry Voes, and John Esch, sealed their testimony to the Reformation with their blood. The Council of Brabant was made a tribunal for the suppression of heresy, and the storm of persecution began. Thousands were put to death, or fled their native land. The emperor, however, was a man of worldly caution, and there was a boundary between zeal and expediency, between faith to the Pope, and the interests of his own exchequer, which he was too wise to disregard. Utterly without remorse as respecting human suffering, he was too sensitive to interfere seriously with the industry from which so large a portion of his revenue was drawn.

In 1556, Charles V. abdicated in favour of his son Philip. No relief was thereby furnished the oppressed Protestants.

Philip accepted his father's despotism and religious intolerance, without the capacity to comprehend his statesmanship. Attempting to rule his vast empire by his own single will, and to be everything in himself, everything in his hands narrowed down to the calibre of his own mean capacity, and bore the stamp of his own merciless bigotry. His father had chastised the Netherlands with whips, he was to chastise them with scorpions. Although among the smaller dependencies of his throne, those states were by far the wealthiest, and, if properly governed, were capable of rendering a revenue greater than all that was drawn annually from the mines of Mexico and Peru. Bloody as were the persecutions which had already raged for some years, they had not seriously impaired that stream of wealth which flowed through the great commercial veins of the Low Countries. "Within the little circle which enclosed the seventeen provinces, are 208 walled cities, many of them among the most stately in christendom, 150 chartered towns, 6,300 villages, besides numerous other more inconsiderable hamlets; the whole guarded by a belt of sixty fortresses of surpassing strength."

In the government of this valuable possession, whatever designs Philip may originally have had, were all soon swallowed up in one, namely, that of crushing out the Reformation, and compelling a uniform compliance with Rome. The simplicity of his method was of a piece with his purpose. It was all to be effected by the enginery of the Inquisition, and the force of Spanish arms. A Spaniard himself, he had no sympathy with the Netherlanders, and no apprehension of their character or motives. At the end of a few years he removed his residence from Brussels to Madrid, whence he never returned.

The states were first put under the vice-royalty of his sister Margaret, Dutchess of Parma. Her council consisted of the state and privy councils, and the council of finance, previously established by the emperor. In these councils were some of the men destined to act prominent parts on both sides of the conflict which ensued. Especially might be mentioned the Bishop of Arras, the Prince William of Orange, and Count Egmont. The last the most brilliant defender of the king's

interest, and doomed to be one of the most illustrious victims of his cruelty; the other two, leaders for a time of the opposing parties. The bishop, afterwards Cardinal Granvelle, by means of a direct and secret correspondence with the king, soon built up for himself an almost absolute authority in the council, and carried out the edicts of persecution with unrelenting energy. Philip's darling engine, the Inquisition, was set up, and all the enormities which had extinguished the Reformation in Spain, were repeated and multiplied in the Netherlands.

William of Orange, at that time a zealous Roman Catholic, was shocked by the cruelties perpetrated in the name of the government which he served. Nor was it only that he revolted from such a method of resisting religious convictions, and felt for his suffering countrymen, but also because he was fully aware that it was of determinate purpose to utterly destroy Protestantism within the king's dominions. When residing, as a hostage, at the court of France, he had made that discovery which was to decide the bearing of all his life afterwards. "While hunting with the king in the forest of Vincennes, the Prince and Henry found themselves alone together, and separated from the rest of the company. The French monarch's mind was full of the great scheme which had just secretly been formed by Philip and himself, to extirpate Protestantism by a general extirpation of Protestants. Philip had been most anxious to conclude the public treaty with France, that he might be the sooner able to negotiate that secret convention, by which he and his Most Christian Majesty were solemnly to bind themselves to massacre all the converts to the new religion in France and the Netherlands. This conspiracy of the two kings against their subjects was the matter nearest the hearts of both. The Duke of Alva, a fellow-hostage with William of Orange, was the plenipotentiary to conduct this more important arrangement. The French monarch, somewhat imprudently imagining that the prince was also a party to the plot, opened the whole subject to him without reserve. He complained of the constantly increasing numbers of sectaries in his kingdom, and protested that his conscience would never be easy, nor his state secure, until his realm should be delivered of 'that accursed vermin.' A civil revolution, under pretext of a reli-

gious reformation, was his constant apprehension, particularly since so many notable persons in the realm, and even princes of the blood, were already tainted with heresy. Nevertheless, with the favour of Heaven, and the assistance of his son and brother Philip, he hoped soon to be master of the rebels. The king then proceeded, with cynical minuteness, to lay before his discreet companion the particulars of the royal plot, and the manner in which all heretics, whether high or humble, were to be discovered and massacred at the most convenient season. For the furtherance of the scheme in the Netherlands, it was understood that the Spanish regiments would be exceedingly efficient. The prince, although horror-struck and indignant at the royal revelations, held his peace and kept his countenance. The king was not aware that in opening this delicate negotiation to Alva's colleague and Philip's plenipotentiary, he had given a warning of inestimable value to the man who had been born to resist the machinations of Philip and of Alva. William of Orange earned the surname of 'the Silent,' from the manner in which he received these communications of Henry, without revealing to the monarch, by word or look, the enormous blunder which he had committed. His purpose was fixed from that hour. A few days afterwards he obtained permission to visit the Netherlands, where he took measures to excite, with all his influence, the strongest and most general opposition to the continued presence of the Spanish troops—of which forces, much against his own will, he had been, in conjunction with Egmont, appointed chief. He already felt, in his own language, that 'an Inquisition for the Netherlands had been resolved upon, more cruel than that of Spain, since it would need but to look askance at an image, to be cast into the flames.' Although having, as yet, no spark of religious sympathy for the Reformers, he could not, he said, 'but feel compassion for so many virtuous men and women, thus devoted to massacre;' and he determined to save them if he could." At the council board, therefore, although he could not stay the measures of persecution, he penetrated their whole depth, and patiently awaited the occasion to defeat or restrain them.

Aware of the duplicity of Philip's character, and the inconsistency between his professions and his real designs, the Prince

of Orange found it necessary to institute the most cautious and thorough methods of inspection. At an early period in his patriotic career he adopted "that system of espionage upon Philip by which the champion of his country was so long able to circumvent its despot. The king left letters carefully locked in his desk at night, and unseen hands had forwarded copies of them to William of Orange before the morning. He left memoranda in his pockets on retiring to bed, and exact transcripts of those papers found their way, likewise, ere he rose, to the same watchman in the Netherlands. No doubt that an inclination for political intrigue was a prominent characteristic of the Prince, and a blemish upon the purity of his moral nature. Yet the dissimulating policy of his age he had mastered, only that he might accomplish the noblest purposes to which a great and good man can devote his life—the protection of the liberty and the religion of a whole people against foreign tyranny."

On the rest of the continent, from various causes, the conflict of the Reformation was for a time suspended. It was transferred to the Netherlands, there to rage for the rest of the century. There the power of the greatest monarchy in the world was to be put forth to compel the peasants and mechanics of a small country into conformity with the religion of Rome, or to extinguish their resistance in blood. The edict of 1550, which Philip re-enacted immediately after his accession, was designed to extirpate heresy and leave no escape for its adherents. A few extracts will be necessary to give a just idea of its severity.

"No one," it ordered, "shall print, write, copy, keep, conceal, sell, buy, or give, in churches, streets, or other places, any book or writing made by Martin Luther, John Ecolampadius, Ulrich Zwinglius, Martin Bucer, John Calvin, or other heretics reprobated by the Holy Church, ... nor break or otherwise injure the images of the Holy Virgin, or canonized saints, ... nor in his house hold conventicles or illegal gatherings, or be present at any such, in which the adherents of the above-mentioned heretics teach, baptize, and form conspiracies against the Holy Church and the general welfare. . . . . Moreover, we forbid," continues the edict in the name of the

sovereign, "all lay persons to converse or dispute concerning the Holy Scriptures, openly or secretly, especially on any doubtful or difficult matter, or to read, teach, or expound the Scriptures, unless they have duly studied theology, and been approved by some renowned university, ... or to preach secretly or openly, or to entertain any of the opinions of the above-mentioned heretics, ... on pain, should any one be found to have contravened any of the points above-mentioned, as perturbators of our state and of the general quiet, to be punished in the following manner." From the array of penalties annexed we copy one or two specimens: "Such perturbators of the general quiet are to be executed, to wit: the men with the sword, and the women to be burned alive, if they *do not* persist in their errors; if they do persist in them, then they are to be executed with fire; all their property, in both cases, being confiscated to the crown." Again, "We forbid all persons to lodge, entertain, furnish with food, fire, or clothing, or otherwise to favour any one holden, or notoriously suspected of being a heretic; . . . . and any one failing to denounce any such, we ordain, shall be liable to the above-mentioned punishments." And further, "That if any person, being not convicted of heresy or error, but greatly suspected thereof, and therefore condemned by the spiritual judge to abjure such heresy, or by the secular magistrate to make public fine and reparation, shall again become suspected or tainted with heresy—although it should not appear that he has contravened or violated any of our above-mentioned commands—nevertheless, we do will and ordain that such person shall be considered as relapsed, and as such be punished with loss of life and property, without any hope of moderation or mitigation of the above-mentioned penalties."

The edict, from which these quotations are extracts, was to be perpetual, "and, according to one of its clauses, was to be published for ever, once in every six months, in every city and village of the Netherlands." Under its sanctions the administration of the Duchess Margaret carried forward the work of conversion to Roman Catholicism with unrelenting zeal. The Cardinal Granvelle and the inquisitor Titelmann coöperated to the disregard equally of decency and humanity. It had

been "settled beyond peradventure that there was to be no compromise with heresy. The king had willed it. The theologians had advised it. The Duchess had proclaimed it. It was supposed that without the axe, the fire, and the rack, the Roman Catholic religion would be extinguished, and that the whole population of the Netherlands would embrace the reformed faith."

Persecution, however, even with such claims, and sustained by such authorities, did not run a course entirely smooth. A people previously accustomed to some degree of freedom could not succumb without a struggle. The progress of intolerance and the multitude of executions awaked both fear and indignation. "Nothing was talked of but the edicts and the inquisition. Nothing else entered into the minds of men. In the streets, in the shops, in the taverns, in the fields, at market, at church, at funerals, at weddings; in the noble's castle, at the farmer's fireside, in the mechanic's garret, upon the merchant's exchange, there was but one perpetual subject of shuddering conversation. It was better, men began to whisper to each other, to die at once than to live in perpetual slavery. It was better to fall with arms in hand than to be tortured and butchered by the inquisition. Who could expect to contend with such a foe in the dark?"

Notwithstanding their sufferings, the Netherlanders evinced their patience, or their sense of the power to be resisted, by the length of time to which they endured. Not until five years after the establishment of the inquisition among them did they initiate any organization of resistance. It was in the early part of the year 1566, that a few leading nobles set on foot a project of compromise, according to which they and all who subsequently "signed the document pledged themselves to oppose the inquisition, and to defend each other against all the consequences of such a resistance." "It was not so much a religious as a political league, and the language used was such that patriotic Roman Catholics could subscribe to it as honestly as Protestants, and was chiefly addressed against the foreign influence by which the country was exclusively ruled, and against the inquisition. It was a league of boisterous and imprudent nobles, and effected little except as an initiatory

step. The spies of Philip easily obtained knowledge of all their sayings and doings, and transmitted the record of them to Madrid. A more powerful and sagacious intellect, who had long been quietly biding his time, now saw it drawing near, and made his disposals with a view to a more decided, a broader and more enduring combination.

In the meanwhile, an insolent term applied to certain petitioners by a member of the council, was taken up and adopted as the watchword of resistance. "The Beggars" of the Netherlands became the most honourable epithet—the Shibboleth of patriotism. The word passed from mouth to mouth, and became itself a means of organization which no inquisition could follow nor detect in all its operations. The tide of popular indignation swelled so high that Cardinal Granvelle had to be withdrawn. The resignation of the Dutchess of Parma followed, but not before the arrival of her successor, the Duke of Alva, whose name was to be associated with enormities still more horrible.

Under the command of Alva, and as the executioners of his will, an army of ten thousand picked veterans was marched into the country. It was the purpose of Philip to make short work and thorough with his heretical subjects. By one sweeping sentence the whole population of the country were condemned to death, and thereby, even those against whom no charge could be proved, consigned to the mercy of their governor. "From this universal doom only a few persons, specially named, were excepted. A proclamation of the king, dated ten days later, confirmed this decree of the inquisition, and ordered it to be carried into instant execution, without regard to age, sex, or condition. This is probably the most concise death-warrant that was ever framed. Three millions of people, men, women, and children, were sentenced to the scaffold in three lines." "It was hardly the purpose of government to compel the absolute completion of the wholesale plan in all its length and breadth, yet in the horrible times upon which they had fallen, the Netherlanders might be excused for believing that no measure was too monstrous to be fulfilled. At any rate, it was certain that when all were

condemned, any might at a moment's warning be carried to the scaffold."

A council of corresponding character was formed by Alva in the beginning of his administration, which from its summary despatch of such business, and the number of executions ordered by it, was commonly spoken of as the "Blood Council." "Alva, in a single letter to Philip, coolly estimated the number of executions which were to take place immediately after the expiration of holy week, *at eight hundred heads.*"

Rapacity had perhaps as much to do with these acts as bigotry. "Alva was bent upon proving himself as accomplished a financier as he was indisputably a consummate commander, and he had promised his master an annual income of 500,000 ducats from the confiscations which were to accompany the executions." "It was necessary that the blood torrent should flow through the Netherlands, in order that the promised golden river, a yard deep, according to his vaunt, should begin to irrigate the thirsty soil of Spain." Consequently "the greatest crime was to be rich, and one which could be expiated by no virtues, however signal." "Many a citizen convicted of a hundred thousand florins, and of no other crime, saw himself suddenly tied to a horse's tail, with his hands fastened behind him, and so dragged to the gallows. But although wealth was an unpardonable sin, poverty proved rarely a protection." In these times, when the principles of the gospel more widely and deeply pervade society, it is difficult to credit the cruelties which were thus inflicted upon a loyal and unoffending people. "It is a wearisome and odious task," adds the historian, "to ransack the mouldy records of three centuries ago, in order to reproduce the obscure names of the thousands who were thus sacrificed. The dead have buried their dead and are forgotten. It is likewise hardly necessary to state, that the proceedings were all *ex parte*, and that an information was almost inevitably followed by a death-warrant." "Innocence was, in reality, impossible, according to the rules which had been laid down regarding treason. The practice was in accordance with the precept, and persons were daily executed with senseless pretexts, which was worse than execution with no pretexts at all. Thus Peter of Amster-

dam was beheaded, because at one of the tumults in that city, he had persuaded a rioter *not to fire* upon a magistrate. This was taken as sufficient proof that he was a man in authority among the rebels, and he was accordingly put to death. Madame Juriaen who, in 1566, had struck with her slipper a little wooden image of the Virgin, together with her maid-servant, who had witnessed without denouncing the crime, were both drowned by the hangman in a hogshead placed on the scaffold."

"The whole country became a charnel-house; the death-bell tolled hourly in every village; not a family but was called to mourn for its dearest relatives, while the survivors stalked listlessly about, the ghosts of their former selves, among the wrecks of their former homes. The spirit of the nation, within a few months after the arrival of Alva, seemed hopelessly broken. The blood of its best and bravest had already stained the scaffold; the men to whom it had been accustomed to look for guidance and protection, were dead, in prison, or in exile. Submission had ceased to be of any avail; flight was impossible, and the spirit of vengeance had alighted at every fireside. The mourners went daily about the streets, for there was hardly a house which had not been made desolate. The scaffold, the gallows, the funeral-piles, which had been sufficient in ordinary times, furnished now an entirely inadequate machinery for the incessant executions. Columns and stakes in every street, the door-posts of private houses, the fences in the fields, were laden with human carcases, strangled, burned, beheaded. The orchards in the country bore on many a tree the hideous fruit of human bodies.

"Thus the Netherlands were crushed, and but for the stringency of the tyranny which had now closed their gates, would have been depopulated. The grass began to grow in the streets of those cities which had recently nourished so many artisans. In all those great manufacturing and industrial marts, where the tide of human life had throbbed so vigorously, there now reigned the silence and darkness of midnight."

In the beginning of this almost unparalleled reign of terror, the Prince of Orange had withdrawn into Germany. Forewarned of the king's designs, he resisted every means employed

to induce him to trust himself to the royal clemency. In the meanwhile his mind was passing through that most important change whereby he became, not merely by compassion, but from the convictions of the understanding and belief of the heart, the friend of the suffering cause. The form of doctrine which he adopted was Calvinism; his policy the broadest liberality—freedom of conscience alike to Roman Catholic and Reformed.

He now saw that the time had come for organized resistance to an unendurable oppression, and put himself at its head. With great exertions he succeeded in raising an army in Germany, with which he marched to the assistance of his suffering countrymen. His brother, Louis of Nassau, raised another in the northern States. They were doomed to encounter a long course of adversity, arrayed as they were with hastily raised levies, against the military skill of Alva and the firmness of long-experienced veterans. Both brothers were defeated. But resistance had now been set on foot, and an understanding established among the friends of the cause.

On the other side, instead of conciliation, measures of more stringent oppression were adopted. The weight of an enormous taxation was added to the cruelties of the inquisition. Roman Catholics and Protestants alike were driven to desperation. If even obedience to royal authority was not to protect them, what motive remained for loyalty? The new imposts would ruin them in a commercial point of view; to resist was to bring their necks to the block. What could now be lost by rebellion? Their only hope lay in an effective organization—a great national effort to defend themselves from the tyranny which they still imputed only to their governor. Their purpose was not to revolt from Philip, but to have Alva removed from power.

From the side of France, where the Huguenot influence was strong, and where it was reasonably expected that policy would have led to such a measure, coöperation was solicited. The application was met with favour. An army, under Coligny, was to sustain a movement from Germany and the internal action of the Netherland patriots. In full reliance upon this coöperation, the Prince of Orange raised a new army, with

which he again entered the country. His progress was entirely successful, and Alva seemed to be completely in his power. But disappointment fell upon him more deadly than before. The terrible day of St. Bartholomew broke the Huguenot influence in France, and paralyzed the Protestant world with horror. The Prince, unsustained from France, was unable to maintain his ground. "It has pleased God," he said, "to take away every hope which we could have founded upon man; the King (of France) has published that the massacre was by his orders, and has forbidden all his subjects, upon pain of death, to assist me; he has, moreover, sent succour to Alva. Had it not been for this, we had been masters of the Duke, and should have made him capitulate at pleasure."

"Yet even in this hour of distress and defeat, the Prince seemed more heroic than many a conqueror in his day of triumph. With all his hopes blasted, with the whole fabric of his country's fortunes shattered by the colossal crime of his royal ally, he never lost his confidence in himself nor his unfaltering trust in God. All the cities which, but a few weeks before, had so eagerly raised his standard now fell off at once. He went to Holland, the only province which remained true, and which still looked up to him as its saviour, but he went thither expecting and prepared to perish. 'There will I make my sepulchre,' was his simple and sublime expression in a private letter to his brother."

Brabant and Flanders, the whole of the southern Netherlands, submitted to the royal yoke. But the northern States of Holland and Zealand prolonged their resistance. In that quarter, the work of Alva was no longer that of governing, but of conquering. Cities whose loyalty his own cruelty and oppression had alienated, were now to be besieged and taken. With well-disciplined troops, his arms were at first successful over the untrained valour of peasants and artisans. But the inhuman treatment inflicted upon every city which capitulated taught lessons of endurance, and led to the discipline of valour in the most effective school. The enormities perpetrated in Mons and Mechlin were repeated in Zutphen, and Naarden, and Haarlem; but while the southern and Celtic population were thereby bowed to the yoke, the hardier kinsmen of the

Saxon in the north were only maddened to more desperate resistance.

After a long and obstinate defence Haarlem fell; but it was the turning-point of the war in the north. For the first time the Spaniards found themselves face to face with their equals in firmness and order as well as valour. Only famine decided in their favour. The check received by the Spaniards was as humiliating as the encouragement to the patriots was great; and in the next conflict, at the siege of Alkmaar, victory declared for the liberal side. The besiegers were compelled to retire before the valour of the inhabitants and the waters of the ocean, admitted as an ally against their human foe. The subsequent career of Alva was one of declining authority and departing fortune. In 1573 he obtained permission to retire, which he ignominiously did between two days. His successor Requesseus attempted to carry forward the work of reducing the alienated States; but the fortune of the last days of Alva also attended him.

The relief and raising of the siege of Leyden, one of the most heroic achievements on record, confirmed the independent attitude of Holland. The death of Requesseus and the subsequent abandonment of Zierickzee did a similar service for Zealand.

Meanwhile, the parsimony of the king had left his soldiers unpaid. The consequence of this, together with the late failures, was a mutiny of the army. The instrument of despotism now turned against its master, and, taking the reins into its own hand, seized upon peaceful towns for the sake of plunder. Among these depredations the most awful was their sack of Antwerp, known long afterwards as the "Spanish fury," in which that city was completely plundered, almost laid waste, and more people butchered than in Paris on the day of St. Bartholomew. All went to warn the now independent States against any steps towards reconciliation with Spain. "In Holland and Zealand there was a warm and nearly universal adhesion to the reformed religion, a passionate attachment to the ancient political liberties." "On the other hand, in most of the other provinces, the Roman Catholic religion" was regaining its ascendency. Attempts were made by the Prince

of Orange to unite all the seventeen States in a Confederacy independently of difference in religion, and on the basis of a true liberty of conscience; but the people were not yet advanced to the degree of his liberality. The brief administration of the brilliant and unfortunate Don John hastened the degeneracy of the Spanish cause, and afforded occasion for these attempts at internal harmony; but the results were only partial or temporary. At the close of that administration the Netherlands had really become two countries. The States to the north of the Scheldt adhered to the national cause; those to the south yielded the victory and made their submission to Spain. When Alexander of Parma came to power, only a few cities south of the great estuaries held for independence. To the reduction of these he immediately addressed himself. His most dangerous opponent was William of Orange, who never resigned his labours to extend union and independence to his whole country. Alexander and his master made no scruple of getting rid of him by any means. A reward was offered to any one who should murder him. After some failures in the attempt, that end was finally accomplished, and William the Silent fell by the hand of an assassin acting under the proclamation of the king of Spain. The miscreant was arrested and executed in Holland, but the reward was paid to his nearest of kin.

Upon the death of the Prince of Orange, all hopeful efforts for the union of the States came to an end. Under his leadership the Dutch Republic had taken its place as an independent nation, but the southern States had bowed their necks to the yoke, and were already suffering therefrom the stagnation of all business, and prostration of national energy, drained of their means, and their enterprise destroyed.

It is at this point that Dr. Motley's first work closes. The second continues the history of the United Provinces, in their labours to defend themselves against Spanish aggressions, and to establish a government for themselves. It opens with a view of the condition of Europe at that day, from which we extract the following specimen of the author's style of historical portraiture.

"A small, dull, elderly, imperfectly educated, patient,

plodding invalid, with white hair, and protruding under-jaw, and dreary visage, was sitting day after day, seldom speaking, never smiling, seven or eight hours out of every twenty-four, at a writing-table covered with heaps of interminable despatches, in a cabinet far away beyond the seas and mountains, in the very heart of Spain. A clerk or two, noiselessly opening and shutting the door, from time to time, fetching fresh bundles of letters, and taking away others—all written and composed by secretaries or high functionaries—and all to be scrawled over in the margin by the diligent old man, in a big schoolboy's hand and style—if ever schoolboy, even in the sixteenth century, could write so illegibly, or express himself so awkwardly; couriers in the court-yard arriving from or departing for the uttermost parts of the earth—Asia, Africa, America, Europe—to fetch and carry those interminable epistles, which contained the irresponsible commands of this one individual, and were freighted with the doom and destiny of countless millions of the world's inhabitants—such was the system of government against which the Netherlands had protested and revolted. It was a system under which their fields had been made desolate, their cities burned and pillaged, their men hanged, burned, drowned, or hacked to pieces; their women subjected to every outrage; and to an end to which they had been devoting their treasure and their blood for nearly the length of one generation. It was a system, too, which, among other results, had just brought about the death of the foremost statesman of Europe, and had nearly effected simultaneously the murder of the most eminent sovereign in the world. The industrious Philip, safe and tranquil in the depths of the Escorial, saying his prayers three times a day with exemplary regularity, had just sent three bullets through the body of William the Silent, at his dining-room door in Delft. 'Had it only been done two years earlier,' observed the patient old man, 'much trouble might have been spared me; but 'tis better late than never.' Sir Edward Stafford, English envoy at Paris, wrote to his government, so soon as the news of the murder reached him, that according to his information out of the Spanish minister's own house, 'the same practice that had been executed upon the Prince of Orange,

there were practisers more than two or three about to execute upon her Majesty, and that within two months.'

"Invisible as the Grand Lama of Thibet, clothed with power as extensive and absolute as had ever been wielded by the most imperial Cæsar, Philip the Prudent, as he grew older and feebler in mind and body, seemed to become more gluttonous of work, more ambitious to extend his sceptre over lands which he had never seen or dreamed of seeing, more fixed in his determination to annihilate that monster Protestantism, which it had been the business of his life to combat; more eager to put to death every human creature, whether anointed monarch or humble artizan, that defended heresy, or opposed his progress to universal empire.

"If this enormous power, this fabulous labour had been wielded or performed with a beneficent intention; if the man, who seriously regarded himself as the owner of a third of the globe, with the inhabitants thereof, had attempted to deal with those extensive estates, inherited from his ancestors, with the honest intention of a thrifty landlord, an intelligent slave-owner, it would have yet been possible for a little longer to smile at the delusion, and endure the practice.

"But there was another old man, who lived in another palace, in another remote land, who, in his capacity of representative of Saint Peter, claimed to dispose of all the kingdoms of the earth—and had been willing to bestow them upon the man who would go down and worship him. Philip stood enfeoffed, by Divine decree, of all America, the East Indies, the whole Spanish Peninsula, the better portion of Italy, the seventeen Netherlands, and many other possessions, far and near; and he contemplated annexing to this extensive property the kingdoms of France, of England, and Ireland. The Holy League, maintained by the sword of Guise, the Pope's ban, Spanish ducats, Italian condottieri, and German mercenaries, was to exterminate heresy, and establish the Spanish dominion in France. The same machinery, aided by the pistol or poniard of the assassin, was to substitute for English Protestantism and England's queen, the Roman Catholic religion and a foreign sovereign."

"The Netherland revolt had, therefore assumed world-wide

proportions. Had it been merely the rebellion of provinces against a sovereign, the importance of the struggle would have been more local and temporary. But the period was one in which the geographical land-marks of countries were almost removed. The dividing line ran through every state, city, and almost every family. There was a country which believed in the absolute power of the church to dictate the relations between man and his Maker, and to utterly exterminate all who disputed that position. There was another country which protested against that doctrine, and claimed, theoretically or practically, a liberty of conscience. The territory of these countries was mapped out by no visible lines, but the inhabitants of each, whether resident in France, Germany, England, or Flanders, recognized a relationship which took its root in deeper differences than those of race or language. It was not entirely a question of doctrine or dogma. A large portion of the world had become tired of the antiquated delusion of a papal supremacy over every land, and had recorded its determination, once for all, to have done with it. The transition to freedom of conscience became a necessary step, sooner or later to be taken. To establish the principle of toleration for all religions was an inevitable consequence of the Dutch revolt; although, thus far, perhaps only one conspicuous man, in advance of his age, had boldly announced that doctrine, and had died it its defence."

The necessities now imposed upon the independent States were twofold, that of defending their borders against foreign aggression, and that of establishing a government for themselves. The more difficult to meet was the latter. A republican organization had not yet been conceived of by them as either desirable or practicable. As long as the Prince of Orange lived, they relied upon him. He, it is true, refused to be their king, but they threw themselves upon his advice and his efforts on their behalf, as much as if he had consented. By his death they were for a time struck almost helpless. Few in number, and of scanty resources, they did not entertain the hope of standing by themselves, or of managing successfully their own affairs. It was their wish to receive the protection of a monarch from some

quarter. Application was made to France, but at the court of the feeble Henry III. the machinations of Spain succeeded in defeating their hopes. When they offered the sovereignty of their country to Elizabeth of England, they met a ruder rebuff from the obstinate refusal of the queen herself. Their cause was, however, so obviously that of England also, that she could not withhold from them assistance. It was given in both troops and money. But the parsimony with which the latter was furnished, interfered seriously with the efficiency of the former. Indirectly was the greater benefit conferred. Hollanders were constrained and provoked to rely upon their own resources, while the vanity and mismanagement of the Earl of Leicester roused against him a party which laid the foundation of a genuine native government. Notwithstanding, the cause received very substantial support at the hands of many brave Englishmen, and the coöperation of the two nations was thereby secured, at a juncture when it was of vital importance to both.

A project was on foot, concocted by Alexander of Parma and his master, to put forth the utmost might of Spain in an effort, by which both England and Holland were to be overwhelmed at a blow. It was to be matured in secresy. From the preparations, which could not be concealed, the attention of the victims was to be diverted, and their suspicions allayed by whatever device might answer the purpose, irrespective of reality and truth. To this end, proposals of peace with Spain were secretly addressed to Elizabeth, and succeeded in distracting her attention from the Netherlands, and in making her chary of rendering them aid. Happily for both nations the discriminating Walsingham penetrated the secret correspondence in which his royal mistress and the Lord Treasurer Burghley were engaged. He also saw through the system of falsehood by which they had been deceived, and led almost to the verge of ruin. The brave naval guardians of the English coast were forewarned in time.

A vast navy had been prepared in several harbours on the coast of Spain. The Duke of Parma stood ready to coöperate from Belgium, with a large and well-trained army. The town of Sluys he had taken, and its harbour and estuary had put

in order, to subserve the purpose of the stupendous design. The invincible Armada, as the fleet was called, was to sail to the coast of the Netherlands, and there, in addition to its own vast outfit of troops, to receive Alexander and his army, then to strike across the channel and land the whole upon the shores of England, where it was expected that the queen, lulled with the story of peace, would be taken by surprise, and Alexander would conquer the country at a blow, and establish the dominion of Philip and the inquisition. The subjugation of Holland would follow beyond a doubt.

The invincible Armada, its magnitude, its magnificent array, the hopes and fears entertained of it, the series of battles, protracted through ten days, in which the mariners of England, under the command of Howard, Drake, Frobisher, and others, the founders of British naval dominion, defended the shores of their native land against it, the disasters which it encountered, the storms which finally shattered it helpless in the northern sea, are familiar to all, but though often repeated, have never been recounted in more animated narrative than that of Dr. Motley.

The Duke of Parma never joined the armament. Notwithstanding his masterly preparations, he could not bring his army to the sea. The sailors of Holland nobly coöperated with those of England, and while the latter harassed the Armada to death, the former so completely blockaded Parma in his estuaries, that he could do nothing but gnaw his heart for vexation.

The might of the autocrat had received a blow where he had intended to inflict one—a blow not less fatal to Spanish supremacy than Salamis and Platæa were to that of Persia. England and Holland were not only saved, they were put in a position of national importance which they had never occupied before. And under the constraint of the necessities of the conflict, the "new Dutch Republic was thoroughly organized."

Events which in the main are already the possession of history, have received large additional elucidation from the work before us. The whole order and sequence of facts, but especially the motives and movements of the principal actors,

are set in a new and fuller light from manuscript documents, not hitherto employed in the service of history. As it now stands, the work closes with the state of things which issued from the defeat of the Armada, the consequent discomfiture of the designs of Parma against Holland, the revival of the Huguenots under Henry of Navarre, and the death of Henry III., which opened up the way of the Huguenot leader to the throne of France. It is thus complete within itself, although extending to only the first two acts of that protracted drama, which cannot be said to have closed before the peace of Westphalia. Most ardently will every reader wish that the hand, which has executed these scenes so well, may retain its cunning to perform a similar service for those which remain.

Among the valuable lessons of history, it has often been taught, but seldom so well as here, that oppression is not an evidence of power, but rather of incapacity to rule. If to quell the spirit of a nation and to hold them in sullen and stagnant obedience were enough, then it might answer to have merely a strong arm; but if the true aim of government is to promote national well-being, in confidence, industry, enterprise, and wealth, the best proof of capacity is the administration of even-handed justice, with firm, but such gentle and equable pressure, as to be felt less in the punishment of evil doers than in the protection of those who do well. Tyranny is the coarse method of incompetence—the refuge of a mind devoid of the adequate resources. A tyrant may be a man of talent in other respects, but a genius for government he has not.

Too long has the Christian world yielded to a pseudo-charity, which grants even to the bitterest persecutor an honest belief in the creed which he defends. Bigotry is not so much a zeal for religion as a form of intense selfishness. A persecutor for religion's sake must certainly conceive that the objects of his wrath may be made to surrender their hopes of heaven by fear of suffering or loss of property, and can have no apprehension of that love of God and tenacity of doctrine, which is ready to give up every earthly gratification and even life itself therefor. Such a character is not one to make any sacrifice on his own part, for the religion under colour of which

he tramples on the rights of others; nor would it be inconsistent for him, in view of greater emolument, to forego his zeal and betray the faith which he professed to defend. None ever more directly aimed his blows at one religion, or offered his devotions more scrupulously according to the rubric of another than did Philip the Second; yet even he could enter into secret negotiation with the princes of the empire, and pledge himself, "if they would confer the crown upon him, that he would withdraw the Spaniards from the Netherlands; that he would tolerate in those provinces the exercise of the Reformed religion; that he would recognize their union with the rest of the German empire, and their consequent claim to the benefits of the Passau treaty; that he would restore the Prince of Orange 'and all his accomplices' to their former possessions, dignities, and conditions; and that he would cause to be observed, throughout every realm incorporated with the empire, all the edicts and ordinances which had been constructed to secure religious freedom in Germany. In brief, Philip was willing, in case the crown of Charlemagne should be promised him, to undo the work of his life, to reinstate the arch-rebel, whom he had hunted and proscribed, and to bow before that Reformation whose disciples he had so long burned and butchered. So much extent and no more had that religious conviction by which he had for years had the effrontery to excuse the enormities practised in the Netherlands."

That is a narrow policy which seeks to establish uniformity of opinion throughout a nation, or to create in the popular mind an uncomplaining and unaspiring content. To superficial view it appears the perfection of society to have everybody contented with his present condition, and it has much to recommend it, but a nation consisting of nothing but unaspiring contented subjects would scarcely be worthy of history. Individual aspiration and effort toward better things is doubtless attended with many evils, but it is the very genius of national activity, usefulness, and progress. The conflict of opinions and of parties, though troublesome to the ruler, is a real good, when compared with the insipid quiet of submission, which is always the aim of the tyrant. The former is the battle of life, the latter the inactivity of death. Never

was this more strikingly illustrated than in the contrast between the States which Philip succeeded in reducing to obedience, and those which maintained their independence. In the latter, though the war still continued which had been raging for a quarter of a century, "population was increasing, property rapidly advancing in value, labour in active demand. Famine was impossible to a State which commanded the ocean. No corn grew in Holland and Zealand, but their ports were the granary of the world. The fisheries were a mine of wealth almost equal to the famous Potosi, with which the commercial world was then ringing. Their commerce with the Baltic nations was enormous. In one month eight hundred vessels left their havens for the eastern ports alone." They also carried on a profitable trade with the Spanish colonies in spite of the revolutionary war. "There were more ships and sailors at that moment in Holland and Zealand than in the whole kingdom of England." The inland towns advanced as steadily as those on the coast. "The woollen manufacture, the tapestry, the embroideries of Gelderland, and Friesland, and Overyssel, were becoming as famous as had been those of Tournay, Ypres, Brussels, and Valenciennes. The emigration from the obedient provinces and from other countries was very great," and "new houses, new streets, new towns, were rising every day."

On the other hand, in the obedient provinces, all was now in peace and quiet. No jarring elements of reform nor troublesome aspirations for liberty remained. The will of the king was absolute. All was now his own. But the value of the possession was gone. "The Scheldt, which, till recently, had been the chief mercantile river in the world, had become as barren as if its fountains had suddenly dried up." "Antwerp was imprisoned and paralyzed. Its docks and basins where 2500 ships had once been counted, were empty, grass was growing in its streets, its industrious population had vanished, and the Jesuits had returned in swarms. And the same spectacle was presented by Ghent, Bruges, Valenciennes, Tournay, and those other fair cities, which had once been types of vigorous industry and tumultuous life." "Commerce, manufactures, agriculture, were dying lingering deaths. The

thrifty farms, orchards, and gardens, which had been a proverb and wonder of industry, were becoming wildernesses."

So much, at least, of the democratic element is indispensable to national prosperity, that the enterprise of the industrial classes shall be more or less free to take its own course, and conscience shall be unconstrained. In these lie the springs of social well-being. Obedience even to an autocrat may not be inconsistent therewith, if the autocrat listens to the popular wants instead of attempting to silence them; but no greater calamity could befall a people under any form of government than that of having the aspirations of its working classes extinguished. Strength runs in the veins of labour. Without enterprise among those who work, and freedom to pursue it and enjoy its gains, the social system must perish for lack of root. And bad as the world is, that part of it which leads the march of civilization, will always value most highly the freedom of access to God in the manner of his own appointment. However worldly men may fail to perceive the fact, and godless rulers go on to disregard it, the Divine law of liberty revealed in the gospel is the spirit of dominion in the modern world, and no weapon formed against it can prosper.

ART. V.—*Annals of the American Pulpit*, (Methodist.) By WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, D. D. Volume VII. New York: R. Carter & Brothers, 1859.

WHEN the first two volumes of this work appeared, we were delighted to find that it was to be published serially. The task which Dr. Sprague had undertaken seemed to be so immense, that, though we knew he was a man of no ordinary powers, we had serious fears of his being able to complete it, unless he should reach four-score, and retain his mental and physical force unabated. We are both surprised and gratified, when we think of the rapidity with which these stately volumes have followed each other; and all the more, when we consider

the important charge which the author fills, the rare diligence with which the various duties connected with it are discharged, and the other productions of his affluent and graceful pen. His many friends, we are sure, will join us in cordially congratulating him on the appearance of the volume before us, which, in any point of view, will compare with those which have preceded it, and in our earnest desire and prayer that he may be spared to complete these Annals of the American Pulpit.

We cannot help feeling peculiar satisfaction when we reflect that a work so truly national in character, and so thoroughly catholic in spirit, was planned, and thus far has been so successfully executed by a minister of our own church. Dr. Sprague has indeed laid all the branches of the evangelical church of our country under great obligations, by his record of the lives and labours of the noble men who have adorned their pulpits, and are now gone to their reward and rest; but he has a special claim on the grateful regards of his own, by this important addition to our Christian biographical literature.

Our previous notices of the earlier volumes of the Annals, will have made our readers sufficiently acquainted with their plan. We need, therefore, only to say, that it is continued in the portion of them now before us, except on one point to which the author himself adverts in the Preface. "The work," he says, "is not limited to the Methodist Episcopal Church, but includes a representation from the three most prominent bodies that have successively seceded from it." In adopting this rule, the author we think has acted wisely, and we beg to add, that we rather regret that it could not have been applied to the Congregational and Presbyterian parts of the series.

The number of Memoirs in this volume is one hundred and eighty-one, while the letters, illustrative and commemorative, appended to them, amount to two hundred and fifty-eight. Of course, most of those who have contributed their reminiscences are members of the Methodist church, and among them are very many of the most eminent living (or lately living) ornaments of the denomination, viz. Bishops Morris, Janes,

Baker, Kavanagh, Andrews; Doctors Bangs, Deems, Holdich, J. T. Peck, G. Peck, McClintock, Clark, Luckey, Sargent, and Stockton. There are no less than ten letters from the pen of that exemplary Christian patriot and judge, who for so many years adorned the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States, and who has recently gone to his rest, the late Hon. John McLean of Ohio. The large number of his contributions shows how lively an interest he took in the success of this enterprise, and how ready he was, even amid his engrossing and responsible public duties, to help it forward. But the list of those who, in this way, lent it their aid, also includes the names of honored brethren belonging to other sections of the church, among whom are Drs. Mathews, Bethune, Murray, J. N. Campbell, Pinney, Bates, Hall, and Ludlow. Of these, too, as of their Methodist co-labourers, there is occasion to say, "some are fallen asleep."

With reference to the subjects of the Memoirs, it is hardly necessary to state that the catalogue of them contains all the most illustrious names to be found in the annals of American Methodism; not a few of them being the names of men who have done honour to our common Christianity; men of whom any church might well be proud, or we should rather say, profoundly grateful for the gifts and grace of God in them. The list begins with Phillip Embury, and ends with J. N. Maffit, and it includes the names of nearly if not quite all the pioneers of Methodism, all the departed bishops of the church, all its renowned orators, and a great many less known worthies, whose memory has been happily and deservedly rescued from oblivion. Indeed, as we have gone through these Annals, the well-known lines of Gray have been repeatedly called to mind, as we have read the brief histories of men, whose names we had never heard of, but who, if the accounts given of them by those who were well acquainted with them were to be relied upon, might fitly be called children of genius, as well as ministers of God.

Two of them occur to us, who were contemporaries, one of them a Carolinian, the other a New Englander, both of them refined Christian gentlemen as well as preachers, and both of them subjected to personal outrages which now seem almost

incredible. The first was George Dougherty. He was once asked to preach by the Rev. Dr. Flinn, one of the most eminent Presbyterian ministers of his day in Charleston. Courtesy had obliged him to tender the invitation to his Methodist brother, who was a total stranger to him, and he had a good deal of misgiving as to the result, for Mr. Dougherty was a person of most unpromising visage, tall, lean, awkward, and clothed in very mean apparel. When he began his sermon, Dr. Flinn fixed his eyes upon the floor so that he might not see the ungainly form in the pulpit, but, "in fifteen minutes," said he, "I found myself not only straightened into an erect posture, but absolutely enchained by a burst of eloquence, a mellow blaze of rich thought, as rare as it was overwhelming; and to this day my recollection of George Dougherty places him in the very front rank of American preachers. He filled my ideal of an able minister of the New Testament." This is high praise, by a competent and unprejudiced judge. And yet this man, endowed with gifts and graces so rare, was attacked by a mob in the city of Charleston, and was kept "under the pump" so long as to endanger his life, simply because he was a Methodist preacher. His ministerial career was as brief as it was brilliant—from 1798 to 1807.

The other was Elijah Robinson Sabine, whose ministry, extending from 1799 to 1818, was exercised in eastern New England. Two years of it were spent in Boston, and while there, such men as Dr. Eckley, and his colleague Mr. Huntington of the Old South, Dr. Lathrop of the Old North, Dr. Baldwin of the Baptist, maintained with him the most intimate relations, and held him in the highest esteem. Unlike his southern brother, Mr. Sabine was physically a person of commanding presence, but of a temper gentle, sensitive, high-toned. On the score of personal indignity, however, though their fields of labour were so wide apart, their experience was similar. Mr. Sabine was once felled to the floor with the butt-end of a whip while preaching; at another time he was waylaid; at another he was surrounded by a rabble, blowing horns and trumpets; at another he was silenced by drum and fife; and at another was prevented from performing his service by the shouts and epithets of a raging mob. It should be observed that none of

these disgraceful scenes occurred in Boston. It is strange that such barbarians could have been found in any part of New England. The person so roughly handled was not a half-crazy or eccentric fanatic, nor a rude enthusiast, but a refined scholar, and a preacher of consummate eloquence.

As many of our readers probably have an imperfect knowledge of the wide field from which Dr. Sprague has gathered the materials of his interesting volume, a hasty survey of its history and internal condition may not prove displeasing to them. It is a question still undecided whether the first Methodist church in America was founded by Mr. Embury at New York in 1766, or by Mr. Strawbridge in Maryland in 1764. Some favour one date, some the other. Whichever be adopted, the first century of American Methodism is not yet completed, and yet, at the present moment, there is not a State within the Union which does not contain numerous Methodist societies; nay, it would be difficult to name a single considerable town which has not one or more of them. This is a marvellous growth, especially when we take into account the obstacles that impeded it during its earlier stages, and the fact that it has been so entirely indigenous. During the period reaching from 1764 to 1776, Methodism appears to have gained considerable strength in some of the southern colonies. But when the tie which had bound them to Britain was violently sundered, and the war of the Revolution was seen to be inevitable, the most zealous and efficient evangelists of the new sect were seriously crippled by suspicion of their toryism. With few exceptions, they were Englishmen; most of them abandoned the field and returned to England; and even those who, like Asbury, sympathized with the colonies, and stood their ground, being nonjurors, *i. e.*, unwilling formally to renounce their allegiance to the king, were repeatedly arrested and imprisoned. Mr. Wesley's *Calm Address to the American Colonies*,* in which he maintained the absolute right of Parliament to tax the colonies, with or without their consent, was well fitted to deepen the popular feeling against his societies; and if his influence over them had been as great in political as in religious matters, the

* Miscellaneous Works, iii. 130.

subsequent fortunes of American Methodism might have been widely different from what they were.

On the other hand, this growth has been mainly indigenous, unlike that of the German and Scottish churches; for example, it has never been materially quickened by emigration. England was the only country from whence it could receive nutriment in this mode; and Wesleyanism was working its way there, in the face of bitter opposition, just as Methodism was advancing in America, and among classes of people little inclined to quit the land of their birth.

Two years after the war of the Revolution had closed, 1784–5, the number of ministers was eighty-three, and of members about fifteen thousand. Up to this time, the Methodist preachers had been considered merely as lay-preachers, with no authority to administer ordinances. Their congregations were societies, rather than churches, and their members were consequently dependent upon ministers of other communions for the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper. In England, the inconvenience resulting from this state of things was of small account, as the "Societies" were in a certain sense pendicles of the Established church, of which Mr. Wesley was a member. But in this country it was very different, after the recognition of our Independence. It then became perfectly evident that Methodism must assume the form and functions of a church, or come to a speedy end. An earnest appeal was accordingly made to Mr. Wesley, and after some demur on his part, on the 2d of September, 1784, he consecrated Dr. Thomas Coke, a presbyter of the church of England, as Superintendent of the American Societies, and ordained Messrs. Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vesey as elders. These three brethren he sent to America, with instructions to organize the societies into a church after a model framed by himself. Soon after their arrival, 25th of December, 1784, a Conference was held at Baltimore, by which the plan of Mr. Wesley was unanimously adopted—Dr. Coke was recognized as superintendent; Mr. Asbury was elected to the same office; twelve other preachers were ordained as deacons and elders, and three to the order of deacon only. Mr. Wesley had also sent an abridged form of the Book of Common Prayer,

including twenty-five Articles of Religion, and various Rules, suited to a new church, all of which were adopted by the Conference. This, therefore, may be regarded as the date of the organization of the Methodist church in the United States. It went forth to its "work"—to use a Methodist word—with all the fresh, hopeful energy of youth, and speedily it began to gather large numbers into its fellowship.

The first General Conference was held at Baltimore in November, 1792, and its proceedings occasioned the first schism in the newly organized denomination. At the head of the secession was James O'Kelly, a presiding elder in Virginia, the ground of it being the dissatisfaction felt by himself and others with the absolute power of the bishops in stationing the preachers. This schism appears to have been confined to certain parts of Virginia and North Carolina, and never gained much strength. The party gradually dwindled, and ultimately ceased to exist.

The next division in the ranks of American Methodism occurred in 1830. It grew out of the question of lay representation, in what we would call the judicatories of the church, which began to be warmly discussed about the year 1824. During the ensuing six years, vigorous efforts were made by a considerable number of individuals, some of whom were among the most prominent in the body, to bring about what they deemed to be a fundamental reform in the polity of the church, *i. e.*, to give the lay membership their due weight in her Local and other Conferences. The dispute waxed so earnest, that the leaders in this movement were expelled from the main body, and, in conjunction with others who seceded from it, established a new society, under the name of the *Methodist Protestant Church*. No change was made in the doctrinal articles, as held by the old church, nor in the form of government, except the abolition of the episcopacy, and the introduction of the lay element into the General and Quarterly Conferences. It began in 1830 with eighty-three ministers and about five thousand members; in 1858 there were two thousand stationed ministers, twelve hundred churches, and ninety thousand members.

Another secession occurred in 1843, which took the name of the *Methodist Wesleyan Connection*. It was caused by

differences of opinion respecting church government, slavery, and total abstinence from intoxicating drinks. The new body was organized at a General Convention of dissatisfied Methodists, held at Utica, N. Y., in May, 1843. All who buy or sell men and women as slaves, or who claim that it is right so to do, all who make, buy and sell, or use, or knowingly aid others in the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, except for mechanical or medicinal purposes, are excluded from church fellowship. This body is the most democratic section of Methodism, each church having power to act for itself, while its several Conferences consist of an equal number of ministers and laymen. In 1858 there were three hundred preachers, and twenty thousand members, reported as in the connection. It has also two colleges under its control, viz., Michigan Union College, and the Illinois Institute.*

The Methodist Episcopal Church, in 1845, was split into two grand sections, one of which has been since, and is now known as the Methodist Episcopal Church *South*. Of course, the sole cause of this division was slavery. The immediate occasion of it was the passage, by the General Conference of that year, of some moderate resolutions designed to keep the episcopacy free of slavery. Up to this time no bishop had held slaves, though some of them were Southern by birth and residence. In 1844 the fact that one of the bishops, the Rev. Dr. Andrew, of Georgia, had become by marriage the owner of slaves, was brought to the notice of the General Conference, and after a protracted debate, it was resolved that he should desist from exercising the functions of his office so long as he was thus connected with slavery. The result of this action, as already intimated, was that thirteen of the Annual Conferences in the South and South-west, withdrew and formed a new organization under the name of the *Methodist Episcopal Church South*.

Previous to this division, the Methodist Episcopal Church had seven bishops, forty Conferences, four thousand and four hundred and seventy-nine travelling preachers, eight thousand

* There is a striking analogy between the history of Methodism and that of Scottish Presbyterianism. Both have been split into parties strongly opposed to each other. Both are very familiar with secession, but the cause of these divisions have been simply points of discipline, and not articles of doctrine.

and one hundred local preachers, and one million, one hundred and thirty-nine thousand, five hundred and eighty members. In 1860, it had six bishops, fifty-one Annual Conferences, six thousand nine hundred and eighty-seven travelling preachers, eight thousand one hundred and eight local preachers, nine thousand seven hundred and fifty-four churches, and nine hundred and ninety-four thousand, four hundred and forty-seven members.

The Southern church now numbers twenty-four Annual Conferences, two thousand six hundred and sixty-seven travelling preachers, including six bishops; over five thousand local preachers, and seven hundred and twenty thousand members, white, negro, and Indian.

The government of both branches of the Methodist church is, as the name indicates, Episcopal, and as many of our readers are unfamiliar with its several parts, we append a summary account of it, derived from the Historical Introduction prefixed to this volume. The *Society* consists of all the church members in a particular locality. The *Class* originally contained twelve persons, but now is often much larger. It is under the care of a *Class-leader*, who meets with it once a week for religious purposes, and who also gathers what each individual is willing to give for the support of the church. The *Stewards* have charge of the fund collected for the maintenance of the ministry and the poor, and disburse it according as the Discipline directs. The *Trustees* hold the real estate and the church edifice, and are elected by the people in such manner as the statutes of the States, or the Discipline provide. *Exhorters* are licensed by the Quarterly Meeting, and are authorized to hold meetings for exhortation and prayer. A *Local Preacher* usually follows some secular calling, and preaches without compensation, except when filling the place of the *Travelling Preacher*, who is devoted to the work of the ministry, and is supported, like any other pastor, by the people. A *Supernumerary Preacher* is one disabled for effective service, but who still has an appointment, and labours according to his ability. A *Superannuated Preacher* is one disabled by feeble health, or by old age, from effective duty. A *Deacon* is ordained by a bishop, and has authority

to preach, baptize, and assist the Elder or Travelling Preacher in administering the Lord's Supper, and to perform the rite of marriage. A *Presiding Elder* is appointed by the Bishop, and has charge of a district containing several circuits and stations. It is his duty to visit each of these circuits once a quarter, to preach, and to preside in the Quarterly Conference, which is composed of all the Preachers, Local and Travelling, the Exhorters, Stewards, and Class-leaders of his district. A *Bishop* is elected by the General Conference, and is consecrated to office by three Bishops, or by one Bishop and two or more Elders, or if there be no Bishop living, by any three Elders designated for the service. He, however, has no defined diocese, but travels through "the work" at large, superintends the affairs of the church, temporal and spiritual, presides in the Annual Conferences, ordains such persons as may be elected by these Conferences to the order of Deacons or Elders, and appoints the Preachers to their respective charges. For his official conduct he is responsible to the General Conference alone. A *Leader's Meeting* consists of the Class-leaders and the Stewards of a circuit, and is presided over by the Preacher in charge. Here the weekly collections of the classes are paid to the Stewards, inquiry is made into the state of the classes, the sick, the poor, and delinquents are reported. A *Quarterly-Meeting Conference* is composed of all the Local and Travelling Preachers, Exhorters, Stewards, and Class-leaders, within a given district. It is presided over by the Presiding Elder; Exhorters and Local Preachers are licensed by it; and suitable persons are nominated by it to the office of Deacon or Elder. It also hears appeals of individual church members from the decisions of committees by whom they have been tried for any delinquency. The *Annual Conference* consists of all the Travelling Preachers, Deacons, and Elders, within a State or other large territory. It examines, each year, into the character of the Travelling Preacher; admits or continues on trial applicants to be received into the travelling connection; hears appeals of Local Preachers, and names those who are to be ordained Elders and Deacons. It, therefore, has original jurisdiction over all its members, and may try, acquit, suspend,

or expel him, according to the Discipline. The *General Conference* is a delegated body, its members being chosen by the Annual Conferences. It is the highest judicatory of the church, and meets once in four years.

Such then is the interior economy of the field—if we may use the expression—over which the author of this volume has travelled, undeterred by its immensity, and the manifold difficulties incident to his enterprise, that he might garner and preserve the fast-decaying memorials of the sainted dead. As we have before intimated, he has succeeded in saving from forgetfulness the names of a great multitude of faithful heralds of the cross, the story of whose toils, and sufferings, unquenchable zeal, unwearied labours, and singular success, may well be read and pondered by those who are reaping a rich harvest from the seed sown by them. For our Methodist brethren this volume will, of course, have a special interest, as it has a special claim upon their regards; but it abounds with incidents pregnant with lessons which may be profitably studied by ministers of every name, who would learn how to "endure hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ." The first generation of Methodist ministers was composed of men, any one of whom almost might be taken as an example of some of the noblest qualities of the evangelist. Bishop Asbury, for instance, was an Englishman by birth and education. If he had followed the example of most of his fellow-labourers when the Revolution began, he would unquestionably have become a Wesleyan of mark and influence in his native land. But he resolved to stay in the struggling Colonies, and watch over the infant societies, at the certain cost of great trials and sacrifices. At one of the gloomiest periods of our national history, 1785–7, he projected a literary institution in Maryland; but which, after having been twice burnt to the ground, was abandoned, the disheartened Asbury mournfully exclaiming, "I feel convinced that our call is not to build colleges."

For forty-five years, this indefatigable pioneer of Methodism may be said to have lived in the saddle and the pulpit. In 1812, when seventy-one years old, he presided over nine Conferences, was present at ten camp-meetings, travelled six thousand miles, preaching almost daily, although his physical

system was so feeble, often so utterly prostrated, that his friends were compelled to lift him into and out of his carriage. His last sermon was preached from Rom. ix. 28, on Sunday the 24th of March, 1816; and seven days afterward he entered into rest. He was never married, and in his journal, 26th of January, 1804, he thus explains how it happened: "If I should die in celibacy, which I think quite probable, I give the following reasons for what can scarcely be my choice: At twenty-one I travelled, and at twenty-six I came to America. Thus far I had reasons enough for a single life. At thirty-nine I was ordained Superintendent Bishop in America. Among the duties imposed upon me by my office, was that of travelling extensively; and I could hardly find a woman with grace enough to enable her to live but one week out of fifty-two with her husband. Besides, what right has any man to take advantage of the affections of a woman, make her his wife, and by a voluntary absence, subvert the whole order of the married state, by separating those whom neither God nor nature permit long to be put asunder?" From the reminiscences of those who knew Bishop Asbury, it appears that he was a man for whom domestic life would have had peculiar charms; yet for the sake of "the work," he denied himself these, in every form in which he might have enjoyed them.

But the man who strikes us as the most remarkable among the pioneers of American Methodism, is Dr. Thomas Coke—a name second only to that of the venerable founder of the denomination. "He was," says Mr. Thacher, "one of the finest models of the Christian gentleman whom I remember ever to have met with. His voice was melody itself, and his whole manner was bland and attractive." Coke, like Wesley, was a scholar of Oxford, an ordained clergyman of the church of England, and for several years prior to his connection with the Wesleyan movement, he had ministered at her altars as curate of Petherton. He came to America in 1784, with a commission from Mr. Wesley to organize the societies in this country into a distinct and independent body. He was unanimously accepted as General Superintendent; and having accomplished the immediate design of his mission, he made an extensive tour through the United States, and, in conjunction with his col-

league, Mr. Asbury, he laid the foundation of the first Methodist College that was ever established in this or any other land. As an Englishman, he naturally felt a warm sympathy for those unfortunate colonists, whose adherence to the royal cause had obliged them to seek new homes in the inhospitable regions of Nova Scotia; and under the influence of this feeling he returned to England, with a special view to awaken an interest on their behalf. Having secured three missionaries, in October 1786, he embarked for Nova Scotia, in a ship commanded by a captain who proved to be a very brutal fellow; and after encountering a succession of terrific gales, which drove them far from their course, they landed on the Island of Antigua. Brought thus providentially to the West Indies, Coke at once addressed himself to an inspection of the field which had been so unexpectedly opened to him, and spent many months in going from island to island. He reached Charleston, South Carolina, the 28th of February, 1787; and after a short stay in that city, where he had excited some animosity against himself, during his previous visit, by his free opinions regarding slavery, but which, in the interval, seems to have died away, he travelled northward to Philadelphia, preached his farewell sermon, and set sail for England, in the hope of meeting the British Conference, which he was happily enabled to do.

The limits of this article will not allow us to follow Bishop Coke through the perpetual journeyings, by land and sea, which occupied the remainder of his busy life. If not incessantly in motion, he was constantly at work, "stooping to the very drudgery of charity, and gratuitously pleading the cause of a perishing world from door to door." He made eighteen passages across the Atlantic, and at last, when he had finished his course, he found a grave in the middle of the Indian ocean. In 1805, he called upon a Miss Smith, of Bristol, a lady of large fortune and eminent piety, and asked from her a donation for the cause of missions. She not only gave him her money, but her hand. They were married in April of that year, but even domestic life could not charm him into inactivity. His heart seems to have been specially set upon carrying the gospel to regions where Christ had not been preached, and, in the words of Adam Clark, "the convulsive effort which ter-

minated his days, was a missionary exertion to carry the gospel to the heathen." In 1814, though in his sixty-ninth year, he planned a mission to India, to be established by himself and seven brethren who had volunteered to accompany him, and generously offered to bear the whole expense of their outfit, amounting to £6000. The company sailed from Portsmouth, but the venerable evangelist entered into his rest before the voyage was ended. He died suddenly at sea, May 3, 1814, and, as we have before said, his grave is in the middle of the Indian ocean. It is proper for us to add, that Dr. Coke's pen was as active as his tongue. He was, in fact, a voluminous author; and we wonder how a man living such a life could write so much and write so well.

Asbury and Coke are historical names, known and honoured far beyond the limits of the sect which they did so much to establish; but there are others that might also be styled historical, although their fame has been confined within the bounds of their own denomination. In Methodist circles, the names of Freeborn Garretson, Jesse Lee, Ezekiel Cooper, William McKendree, Enoch George, and other departed worthies are "familar as household words," and richly do they deserve to be thus embalmed for their labours of love. We would gladly draw upon the Annals for incidents illustrative of their personal characters, of the fields they cultivated, and their various achievements, but we must quit the tempting theme.

The origin and progress of Wesleyan Methodism form the staple of one of the most remarkable chapters in the history of the church since the Reformation. They illustrate and confirm the doctrine of Divine Providence as we hold it, but which many of our Methodist brethren are hardly willing to accept, viz., God's powerful preserving and governing all his creatures, and all their actions. The half-dozen Oxonians who used to meet in Lincoln College for prayer and conference, and whose methodical piety rendered them "a peculiar people" in the University, little dreamed of the immense harvest that should grow from the handful of corn planted by themselves on the top of the mountain, in the arctic zone of Oxford. If they could have anticipated that they were preparing the way for the birth of a new sect, it is quite probable

that their prejudices as Anglican churchmen would have been greatly shocked, and that they would have promptly abandoned those methods of religious culture and of active benevolence which contained the seeds of schism. But, as usual, God led them by a way which they knew not, the outgate of which they could not see. They originated a religious movement which some of them afterwards would have gladly stopped, but this was beyond the power of man to accomplish, for the hand of the Lord was in it.

At the time when the new sect was born, the Reformed church in nearly all her branches, in Europe and America, had sunk into a state of great spiritual deadness. The intense excitement in regard to religious matters awakened by the Reformation, and perpetuated in England by the struggles of the Puritan and the Nonconformist for freedom of conscience and purity of worship, was succeeded by, if it did not itself produce, a sort of reaction not unlike the ennui that follows some extraordinary physical or mental exertion. Such undoubtedly was the case of the British churches. In the Church of Scotland those influences were at work which culminated in the dreary reign of Moderatism. Among the fifteen or eighteen thousand clergymen of the English establishment, Mr. Romaine, of London, a contemporary of the Wesleys, declared that, at the beginning of his ministry, he could not count twenty faithful preachers of the gospel. The parsons Trulliber and Jolter of fiction were in truth the representatives of multitudes who in that age ministered at the altars of the Anglican church. Episcopalians themselves, Tractarians even, have confessed that the spiritual condition of that church during the greater part of the eighteenth century was fearful. Indeed one of the most dismal pictures of the period that we remember to have seen, will be found in one of the Tracts for the Times. Among the Dissenters, too, there were signs of spiritual declension. The once glorious Presbyterian church of England had not only lost her ancient fervor, but opened her doors for the admission of the deadly heresy which denies the Lord that bought us.

No man knew better than Mr. Wesley himself how profound was the ignorance, how deep was the moral degradation, of the

masses of the English people, and how intense was the hatred which dignitaries and curates, lords and squires, with few exceptions, felt for the gospel of Christ and for living religion. There was not a county in England which he did not visit, bearing the glad tidings of redemption; and there was not a county in which he did not encounter the heathenism of the lower classes, and the hatred of the higher. But nothing could induce him to set up the standard of schism, or to become a seceder from the Church of England, into whose holy orders he had been admitted. The earnest desire of his heart was to maintain his loyalty to her, while he was attempting to accomplish a work to which he was sure his Lord had called him, but which she either would not or could not perform. Mr. Wesley was too keen witted not to perceive and appreciate the opportunity afforded of becoming the founder of a new denomination. He had in a preëminent degree the very gifts that qualify a man for such an enterprise. He did ultimately occupy that position; but we deem it due to him to say, that it was rather forced upon him than sought by him. If the Lavingtons, Warburtons, Hurds, Lowths, and other occupants of the Episcopal bench, had comprehended the wants of their times, and had reciprocated the spirit which Mr. Wesley evinced to his dying day, how different had been the subsequent history of Methodism and of the Church of England. But instead of sympathy, he met only the most determined hostility; while he was striving with all his might to keep his "societies" within the bosom and under the guardianship of his mother church, her lordly dignitaries were labouring pertinaciously to drive him and them from her pale. And so Wesleyan Methodism became, what it is now, one of the recognized churches of evangelical Christendom.

Though its origin is comparatively so recent, it has long been one of the most numerous and powerful of Protestant denominations. To what cause is this surprising growth to be ascribed? In one view the question admits of an easy answer. It is the Lord's doing. He had a great work to accomplish—the work of reviving a declining church; of rousing professing Christians from the spiritual lethargy into which they had sunk; of conveying life and grace to the thousands of heathen

within the limits of Christendom; and he called and qualified the instruments needed to attain these ends. But the inquiry may still be made into the special means and agencies by which these ends were effected. In other words, What gave to Methodism its peculiar power? What was it that enabled Wesley, Asbury, Coke, Lee, McKendree, and their compeers, to win such glorious spiritual triumphs?

Our Methodist friends doubtless will say, that this result is to be attributed to their emancipation, or their freedom from the trammels of Calvinism. We have reason to believe that not a few of those good old Methodist preachers, who are now with the saints made perfect, were very much given—much more, we think, than most of those who are now prosecuting their "work"—to denouncing certain "horrible dogmas of the Presbyterian Confession," such as election, perseverance of the saints, irresistible grace, &c. They gloried in their Arminianism. But for all that, we make bold to affirm that the spiritual power which their ministry unquestionably possessed, was derived from the earnestness, the plainness, the unction with which they proclaimed the essential doctrines of that very Calvinism which they so frequently and vigorously vituperated. Man's ruin by the fall; his native depravity and alienation from God; his absolute need of a Saviour, and utter inability to save himself; the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit; justification, not by works, but by faith alone in the blood and righteousness of Jesus; the free offer of salvation to every human being, without money and without price; the necessity of holiness, not to merit heaven, but to become meet for it—these articles constituted the very burden of their preaching. And in every really Calvinistic pulpit that ever existed, or is now to be found on the face of the earth, these are the precious truths that have been and are preached every Sabbath-day. We honour and love the Methodist church for the tenacity with which her ministers, from the days of Wesley until now, have held fast to these essential elements of the faith once delivered to the saints—the faith for which Calvin contended so earnestly; the faith which thousands of Calvinists have confessed on the scaffold and at the stake; but the faith which Arminians, properly so called, in Holland, Germany,

England, America, have reprobated and rejected as dishonouring alike to God and to man. And those articles which our Methodist friends have so often and so heartily denounced, but which, when they attempt to state them, they rather disfigure than describe, are only the logical consequences of the very doctrines which they and we hold and preach in common.

They call themselves Arminians; but it is perfectly obvious that their theology differs as widely from that of Limborch, and Whitby, and Warburton, and all the recognised Arminian divines of Holland and of England, as it does from Calvinism. They differ widely and radically in principles and in results; whereas, when we hear the gospel preached by a Methodist, we feel that it is the very same to which we love to listen, and are accustomed to hear as Presbyterians. And when we read the records of Methodist religious experience, we meet with essentially the same type of piety as that which is fashioned under Presbyterian preaching—the same love, faith, and hope—and often the confession of the very truth which, when stated in a dogmatic form, was the object of the strongest antipathy. Indeed, we have been often half-amused as well as delighted, to notice the inconsistency between the prayers of many a worthy Methodist, or the account of his experience at the love-feast—his self-renunciation, his magnifying the riches of Divine grace, his confidence in God for the future—and his speculative theology.

But besides the truth proclaimed, the kind and character of the men who proclaimed it should be taken into account, when considering the causes of the rapid spread of Methodism. Untrained in the schools, they could say, "That which we have seen and heard, declare we." Most of them were taken from the people; they were in sympathy with the people; they comprehended their modes of thinking; and therefore their sermons, though not constructed according to the rules of art, though often wanting in tastefulness and order, proved themselves to be true and effective *conciones ad populum*. A successor of Sir Isaac Newton, Dean Milner, himself one of the greatest preachers of his day in Cambridge, described them as of "the slapdash sort of sermons," and enthusiastically added, "it is the sort that does all the good." They were not dissertations,

nor essays; they never attempted grand argumentation, refined analysis, nor metaphysical speculation; but were the utterances of hearts which had felt the agony of conviction, and the bliss of forgiveness; which had been shaken with terror by the awful thunders of Sinai, and had been melted into penitence and love beneath the cross, by the sight of a Saviour who had given himself for them. The necessities of the "work" were urgent; the Macedonian cries which reached the ears of Mr. Wesley were many, as well as loud; and he evinced his rare talent for handling bodies of men, to use a military phrase, by the methods he used to obtain co-workers. If a convert had graces and gifts fitting him for public service, he very soon found a sphere within which to exercise them. The latent abilities of the "societies" were developed, and devoted to the "work." Such has been the wise policy of the Methodist church. She has turned to good account the spiritual and natural endowments of her members, as class-leaders, exhorters, or local preachers. She has encouraged her gifted laymen to "speak unto the people;" but she at the same time subjects them to suitable tests, and controls them by the rules of discipline. Hence, in her early days, whenever a society was formed, most if not all of those who composed it, like the scattered Christians of Jerusalem, in one way or another did the work of evangelists; and no wonder, therefore, that in her early annals we find the names of so many men who, though they never enjoyed the culture of the schools, rose to be truly mighty and successful preachers.

Our exhausted space forbids our discussing, as fully as we could wish, that distinctive institution of Methodism, viz., its itinerant ministry. This much, however, we may say, that considering the kind of work to which Mr. Wesley felt that he was called, and the character of the instruments he was obliged to employ, he showed great practical wisdom when he provided for his societies an itinerant, rather than a fixed pastorate. We are inclined to believe that its itinerancy has been one of the chief means of keeping the Methodist church so free of those speculative tendencies which have revealed themselves, more or less, in other prominent denominations; and we are persuaded

also, that some of the peculiar traits of Methodist piety are to be ascribed to this cause. Under a pastorate changed every two years, it seems to us unreasonable to look for the staid and sober type of Christian character, for a church not content with the *disjecta membra* of the faith, but demanding the systematic exposition of the books of Scripture and of the doctrines founded on them; we should rather expect to find Christians, not indeed ignorant or indifferent to gospel truth, but fond of excitement, and, provided the masses around them are roused to seek religion, indisposed to criticise severely the means by which the result is produced.

We will only add that the Methodist movement deserves to be studied, not only as one of the great events of the past century, but because its history may suggest hints as to the best method of dealing with some of those problems which are now forcing themselves upon the attention of the church. Within the most Christian parts of Christendom "there remaineth yet much land to be possessed;" there are huge masses of heathenism to be reclaimed. How can they be reached? Under the pressure of this question, Presbyterian Scotland, of late years, has lent her sanction to agencies which her Bostons, Erskines, and Browns, would have rejected, as against the "good order of Christ's house." Only a year ago the General Assembly of the Free Church formally recognised the Episcopalian and layman Brownlow North as an evangelist. Radcliff, Grant, Winter, Hammond, and others baptized with the same spirit, men taken from the highest and lowest ranks of society, though unordained by the laying on of hands of prelate or Presbytery, are welcomed to pulpits of almost every name, that they may tell to listening thousands what God hath done for their souls. It is a sign of the times, and it behooves us to ask, whereunto this thing shall grow? The careful perusal of the volume before us may help us to give the right answer to the question.

Art. VI.—*The General Assembly.*

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States met in Philadelphia, May 16, 1861, and was opened with a sermon by John W. Yeomans, D. D., Moderator of the last Assembly, on John xviii. 36, "My kingdom is not of this world." After the completion of the roll, John C. Backus, D. D., was chosen Moderator, and the Rev. D. J. Waller, Temporary Clerk.

The following order for attending upon the anniversary reports of the several Theological Seminaries and Boards of the Church was proposed by Dr. Schenck, and adopted, viz.

Resolved, That it be the order of the day for to-morrow, (Friday,) at 10 o'clock, to receive reports from the several Boards and Theological Seminaries, and that it be the order of the day for Saturday, at 10 o'clock, to hear the report of the Board of Church Extension; for Monday next, at the same hour, to hear the report of the Standing Committee on the Board of Education; Tuesday, the Board of Publication; Wednesday, the Board of Domestic Missions, and Thursday, Foreign Missions.

Resolved, That the evenings of the several days on which the above reports from the Standing Committees are received, be set apart to devotional exercises, interspersed with short addresses, having reference to the work of the particular Board that day reported on.

After many motions and much voting upon the subject, the hours of meeting and adjournment were fixed as follows:—A. M., from nine to one o'clock; and P. M., from four to six o'clock.

Overture from the Board of Foreign Missions.

The Committee on Bills and Overtures reported an inquiry from the Board of Foreign Missions, whether the word *baptizo*, in the versions of the Scriptures made by our missionaries, should be translated or transferred? The answer adopted by the Assembly was, that, in all cases where it is practicable, the

word should be transferred. In coming to this conclusion, the Assembly was, no doubt, influenced partly by long-established usage. In the English, Latin Vulgate, and most other versions, the Greek word has been transferred. To our ears, *to baptize* is as familiar an expression as *to wash*, or *to immerse*. Another obvious consideration which influenced the Assembly is, that no translation could be acceptable to all denominations of Christians. The Baptists would not consent to have βαπτίζω rendered by a word signifying *to wash;* and others could not allow it to be translated by a word which means only *to immerse*. Besides, baptism is not simply a washing nor simply an immersion; it is a sacred and peculiar rite, and should have its own appropriate designation.

What is the legitimate operation of the motion "To lay upon the table?"

The Rev. Dr. Spring moved that a special committee be appointed, to report whether it was wise and expedient for this Assembly to make any expression of attachment to the American Union and to the Constitution and Government; and if so, what that expression should be. The Rev. Mr. Hoyt moved to lay the resolution on the table. A vote was taken, and the Moderator pronounced it carried. A division was called for, and the vote was taken by rising, which resulted—122 for laying on the table, to 102 against it. So the motion was lost. Some members then called for the yeas and nays. The Moderator decided that as the vote had already been taken and announced, the call for the yeas and nays was out of order. To meet this difficulty, Mr. Clarke, of Detroit, moved to take up the motion just laid on the table, and on that motion he called for the yeas and nays. This gave rise to the question of order: Can a motion or paper laid on the table by a vote of the house, be taken from the table without a motion to reconsider? This question was not immediately decided by the Moderator, and gave rise to some debate. On the one hand, it was contended by Dr. Spring, Hovey K. Clarke, Esq., Mr. Walter Lowrie, Judge Allen, Mr. Waller, and others, that the design and effect of the motion to lay on the table was simply to dispose of a subject for the present, to be called up at any time at the will of the house. On the other hand, it was con-

tended that the design of the motion is to make a final disposition of the matter; that it is equivalent to a refusal to consider it, and, consequently, that no question thus disposed of could be again called up, except on a motion to reconsider, sustained by a two-thirds vote. It was admitted on both sides that every deliberative body must have the power of protecting itself from the discussion of unnecessary or unsuitable questions. The only point of difference was, how this should be done. In some bodies this object is attained by the motion, Shall the subject be entertained? This question being taken without debate, if decided in the negative, ends the matter. This, as was admitted, is not our usage. The only way to get rid of an improper subject, according to one view, is to move its indefinite postponement, and then on that motion call for the previous question, which must be taken without debate. We admit that such is the method often adopted in other deliberative bodies, but we deny that it is either in accordance with our usage or with our rules. Our book says, "Motions to lay on the table, to take up business, and to adjourn, and to call the previous question, shall be put without debate." This proves, at least, that the motion to lay on the table is designed to dispose of a subject without debate. The only question is, whether this disposition of the matter is final, unless by a motion to reconsider. To determine this, we quote the next rule, which says, "When a question is under debate, no motion shall be received, unless to adjourn, to lay on the table, to postpone indefinitely, to postpone to a day certain, to commit, or to amend; which several motions shall have precedence in the order in which they are herein arranged." If when a subject is introduced the house is ready for its consideration, it becomes the subject of debate. If deemed important, and the time is not suitable for its discussion, it is postponed, and made the order of the day for a certain day and hour. If it is a proper subject for discussion, and yet, in the view of any member or members, decidedly objectionable, the proper motion is, that it be indefinitely postponed. This does not preclude debate. If a proper subject for consideration, and not of special importance, and the house is not ready for its discus-

sion, it is placed on the docket, subject to be called up at any time.

But what is to be done, if the topic introduced be deemed altogether unsuitable, or one which the house does not wish to debate? It is obviously necessary that there should be some method by which deliberative assemblies can protect themselves from the introduction of improper subjects of debate. Suppose a member should propose that the General Assembly would appoint a committee to test the merits of rifle-cannon, or to petition Congress to re-open the slave trade. On the motion to indefinitely postpone, every member would have the right to speak once. How can the matter be at once and finally disposed of without debate? Only, according to our usage, by a motion to lay on the table. It is said, indeed, that this can be attained by moving the previous question, on the motion of indefinite postponement. But, in the first place, this is not the way adopted in our courts. The previous question is never moved except when a subject has been long under debate, and the original question has got encumbered with various amendments. Under these circumstances, the house becoming weary, a call is made for the previous question. If that call is sustained, it not only stops further debate, but cuts off all amendments, and brings the house to a direct vote on the original motion. In the second place, the very nature of the previous question, as it is prescribed in our book, shows that it was not designed to get rid of improper subjects without debate. The book says, "The previous question shall be in this form: Shall the main question be now put? And when demanded by a majority of the house, shall be put without debate; and until it is decided, shall preclude all amendments and further debate on the main question. If the previous question be decided in the affirmative, the main question shall be put without debate; if in the negative, the debate may proceed."

In the present case, Dr. Spring moved the appointment of a committee on the national crisis. Had any one moved the indefinite postponement of that motion, and called the previous question, the vote would not have been on the motion to postpone indefinitely, but on Dr. Spring's motion for a committee. "Shall the *main* question be now put?" can only mean, shall

Dr. Spring's motion be now put. That was the *main* question. The house may indeed thus vote a matter down. But there is a great difference between rejecting a proposition, and refusing even to consider it. And for this latter purpose there must be some regular provision. Another consideration on this subject is, that if a motion laid on the table can be called up at any time by a vote of the majority, then there is no difference between laying on the table and placing on the docket. In our courts, when the house is not prepared at the time to consider a subject, it is by vote placed on the docket, from which it can at any time be called up. This is a perfectly familiar fact. To lay on the table, and to place on the docket, are not one and the same thing; there is, however, no difference between them, if a proposition laid on the table can be called up by a vote of the majority. It was indeed said, that the house is obliged to dispose of everything placed on the docket, whereas it is not bound to act on subjects laid on the table. Even if this were true, it is not a difference sufficient to call for two specifically different modes of action. It is not, however, correct. The docket is simply a memorandum to prevent items of business being passed over. The house may act or not act on the several items as it sees fit. After this matter had been debated for some time, the Moderator decided that Dr. Spring's motion could not be taken from the table, unless a motion to reconsider the vote placing it there should be moved and seconded by members voting with the majority, and be sustained by two-thirds of the house. This ended the matter.

Church Extension.

Dr. Monfort presented the Report of this Board, and the Rev. Mr. Coe, Secretary of the Board, spoke as follows:

"The command of an ancient general to his army, marching through a desert, was, 'Keep the wells open.' He saw that his host must perish, and every oasis in that waste disappear, if the drifting sands were permitted to fill and choke its fountains. Regarding the local churches of our land as the wells that gather and pour forth the waters of salvation for its inhabitants, the providential voice of the great Captain

of Israel seems at this time to say to his people, 'Keep the wells open.' They are now in peculiar danger of being closed. Amid the dust of the mighty conflict that fills our land, every interest of the church may be buried. Your heralds of the cross to foreign lands, your home-missionary reapers, your students girding on the armour of light, your colporteurs scattering the printed pages of truth, your ministers, driven by age or disease to drop the sickle, are all likely to be overlooked amid the tread of armies and the confused noise of war. But none of these departments of your work are more likely to be neglected than your church extension enterprise—the enterprise that seeks to throw the sheltering sanctuary over your houseless churches—your unprotected wells of salvation. Not a few seem to think that all church building will now cease, and that, for a time at least, no more aid need be given in the erection of houses of worship. While it is probably true that comparatively few sanctuaries will be begun in these troublous times, it is also true that the number of applications to your Board is nearly up to the usual average; and that one hundred requests for aid, calling for almost $40,000, are now on file, awaiting the receipt of means to meet them. We have the names of nearly seven hundred churches in our connection who have no sanctuary, and, one by one, these churches, with those annually added to our roll, are coming to the point where they must build or die. Hence, for years past, about two hundred church buildings have been annually begun in our midst. Hence, too, we have constantly many church edifices in such a stage of progress that a pause will entail almost entire loss of what has been done, and many others so nearly completed that a small amount of aid will fit them for occupancy. We must now, also, have at least two hundred and fifty churches greatly oppressed with debt. Some of these debts can remain; but some are due to enemies, who will gladly foreclose them; some of them to poor men, whose families will suffer if they remain unpaid; and some to insolvent estates already in the clutches of the sheriff. There are brethren in this Assembly whose sanctuaries may be sold away from them before they return to their homes. In not a few instances, the honour of religion, as well as the life of the

churches, is at stake. Shall we not prove the fellowship of the saints in this hour of need? Shall we not bear the burdens of our sinking brethren, and so fulfil the law of love? The highest patriotism, too, now bids us keep our wells of salvation flowing. We have fallen on times in which the basest as well as the noblest passions of men are stirred to the uttermost. It must be the mission of the church to cherish all that is true, and right, and lawful, and loving, and to repress all that is bad, malignant, and vindictive. If she cast not the healing salt of grace into the bitter fountains that gush so fiercely on every side, barrenness and death must overspread our heritage. If, as far as in her lieth, she follow not the things that make for righteous peace, she will be found wanting in this time of trial. If she suffer her destitute flocks to scatter and disband; if she sets adrift her labourers in her wastes, she must cover herself with the shame of one that fainteth in the day of adversity. Small, indeed, must be the strength of our church if she cannot sustain her benevolent enterprises in their present proportions. One cent a month from every communicant in our connection will keep the treasury of your Board of Church Extension as full as ever it has been. Four cents a week from every member of our body will carry on all your Boards with undiminished resources. Is there a poor widow, or a child in our Sabbath-schools, that by diligent self-denial could not give this? Brethren, we have left the luxury of doing good too much to our rich churches and to our rich men. God seems to be crippling many of these, that all may learn their responsibility and share the blessing. The question, whether your Board can go forward with your work, is resolving itself into the simple question, whether our ministers and ruling elders will give every member the opportunity and the earnest invitation to put a hand to the burdens now grown too heavy for the few who have hitherto borne them."

Dr. Musgrave would not have risen but for his desire to make a remark or two, in relation to the enterprise of church extension. His experience in connection with the Board (of Domestic Missions,) which he had served so many years, impressed deeply upon his mind the very great importance of

providing houses of worship for our congregations, especially in missionary fields. He was persuaded that, if the brethren could look at this church building enterprise from the standpoint which he had long occupied, they would be convinced that it was true economy, even in regard to other Boards of the church.

Secondly, Very much of the missionary funds of the Domestic Board is absorbed in sustaining missions which would soon be self-sustaining if they had suitable churches. Many enterprises that promise, at first, great success, are abandoned for want of houses of worship, whereas, if they had houses, they would not only be sustained, but would be able to support themselves.

Thirdly, We are constantly called upon in the Board of Domestic Missions to *continue* or to *increase* appropriations, because the people were burdened with church debts. Either the want of edifices, or the burden of debt on those who have houses, is the great cause of continued demands on the Domestic Board. The very *best method of economizing* the missionary funds is to build houses. Build houses, and they will find occupants who will rent pews and sustain the missionaries.

Dr. Musgrave suggested that it was usual to vote on the reports as wholes, and showed the propriety of it. He moved that, in the case of this Board, the report of the Committee be adopted as a whole, which was done; and the election to fill vacancies was made the order of the day for Tuesday at 10 o'clock.

Disabled and Aged Ministers' Fund.

Dr. Musgrave moved that the Rev. Joseph H. Jones, D. D., who has been acting under appointment of the Trustees of the General Assembly, be heard in regard to the matter of the fund for aged and infirm ministers, and the widows and orphans of ministers.

Leave was granted, and Dr. Jones read a report of the receipts and expenditures by the treasurer of this fund, and of the principles on which the fund was managed. He explained the manner in which the judicious dispensation of this fund

was guarded and secured. He mentioned (without names) several touching cases illustrative of the great importance of this lovely and necessary charity. He described the condition of many of the individuals and families, giving (anonymously) the statistics of the beneficiaries, and of their circumstances. The whole report, and the facts and statements of Dr. Jones, made a profound impression upon the Assembly in regard to this most important duty of the church. He read a number of letters from persons who had been assisted, all of which tended to deepen the impression made by the report. He stated that the Trustees had been pained by the indifference of the churches to this interesting object; that only 241 churches out of the 3541 churches of our body had responded to this call for aid. The report expresses the belief that the method adopted by the General Assembly for managing this important object is the *simplest*, *cheapest*, most *efficient* and convenient.

Rev. Mr. Mehaffey moved a committee, in response to this subject, similar to those appointed upon other subjects of the church's efforts. Adopted.

Board of Education.

The Rev. Dr. W. C. Mathews, from the Committee to which was referred the report of the Board of Education, made a report.

The report being under consideration,

The Rev. Dr. Chester, Secretary of the Board, began his remarks with an eloquent and impressive tribute to the late Corresponding Secretary, the Rev. Dr. Van Rensselaer. He spoke of his lovely, well-balanced, and unique Christian character; of his singular devotion to *all* the interests of the Presbyterian church; of his self-sacrificing toils and liberal benefactions; of his large-hearted zeal for all the interests of Zion; of the breadth of his views, and the devotion of his aims, and the liberality of his hand in every wise scheme of Christian philanthropy. He dwelt touchingly upon the intimacy and sweetness of their private fellowship as ministers, friends, and officers of the Board; and upon the peculiar zeal and efficiency of that lovely and beloved man in the great cause that

claimed the efforts of the Board of Education. Dr. Chester, in regard to the present condition of the Board, said that they had gotten through the year without borrowing any money—the first time in twenty years that the thing had been done. The Board had never violated a pledge to any of our young candidates. The hand of Breckinridge had written upon their banner this resolve of faithfulness to pledges, and it had never been broken. He spoke of the difficulties surrounding this Board. It was the least popular of the Boards. Their task was peculiarly delicate and difficult. The young men had to be *tried;* sometimes they did not stand the test, and had to be dropped; and difficulties inseparable from such an enterprise had to be encountered in performing their mission. The Board was little else than a machine in the hands of the Presbyteries. To the Presbyteries it pertained to select and recommend candidates; and if errors were committed by the Presbyteries, the blame of all such blunders was laid by popular voice upon the Board, who really have no control over the matter. He urged upon the Presbyteries the importance of renewed care and firmness in watching over the moral and spiritual character and condition of the candidates under their care; and urged that the Board, with all the diligence they could, with their present force, exercise, could not keep themselves minutely informed of these things. No candidate ought to be recommended except after the most thorough, searching, and honest examination; and perpetual vigilance over the growth in grace, and in every other element of ministerial character, ought to be exercised. The Board had power to dismiss only in such cases as the Assembly had prescribed; and they could only reach the facts upon which they could act through the reports of teachers and professors. He called attention to the fact that the Board was left with an empty treasury, and urged immediate efforts to replenish it. He spoke of the amazing and lamentable apathy of the churches in regard to this great enterprise; detailed the large number of churches that did nothing; appealed touchingly and earnestly to the heart and conscience of the people of God in behalf of the candidates—many of them ministers' sons, some orphans,

all poor—who must suffer unless the churches come up to the help of the Board.

Dr. Chester spoke of the efforts of the Board to aid colleges and seminaries, and detailed the success of the Board. He said one *good work* in which the Board had been successful was in killing colleges. He meant diminishing the *number*, and increasing the efficiency of colleges. They had been instrumental in inducing some colleges to cease operations, and to join in supporting others, which he deemed a great gain. He called attention to the fact that in this college enterprise such caution had been exercised by the Board, that not a dollar had been lost. He urged universal attention on the part of the churches, and said that if every church that was able would give ten dollars each, the funds would be abundant.

Hon. Judge Ewing inquired why it was that some of the candidates never reported to the Board, and yet were supported by the Board?

Dr. Chester replied that the Board, by the rules prescribed to them by the Assembly, depended upon the Presbyteries to say how long aid should be continued to the candidate, and depended upon the surveillance of the Presbyteries, the Board needing only to be informed, by the teacher's report, that the candidate was still pursuing study.

Judge Ewing would recommend that no money be paid to candidates, unless upon yearly requisition by the Presbytery.

Rev. Mr. Waller moved the re-commitment of the seventh resolution, (the one making two Co-ordinate Secretaries,) with instructions to inquire and report whether the business of the Board could not be carried on with one Secretary.

Dr. Mathews hoped the motion would not carry, alleging that it was made under a misapprehension. He said the Committee recommended nothing concerning that matter, but left it discretionary with the Board.

Rev. Mr. Farquhar asked Dr. Chester if there was no way of discharging a young man from the aid of the Board, except through the Presbytery.

Dr. Chester replied, that for certain causes, well ascertained, a candidate might be dropped by the Board; but in all cases

affecting character the Board referred it to the Presbytery, and in all cases the Presbytery was informed of the proceedings in the case.

Rev. Dr. Wines inquired whether the Board did not sometimes recommend that the name of an accused candidate be stricken from the list?

Dr. Chester replied, that the Board had no power of discipline, but always referred the case to the Presbytery; but in cases where the Assembly authorized the Board to drop a candidate, it was done; but when character was involved, it was always referred to his Presbytery.

Dr. Wines explained his reasons for inquiring, and said that the faculty of Washington College (of which he was once a Professor) had exercised great care to inspect the conduct of candidates of the Board under their tuition, and that the faculty of a college had better opportunities of knowing the *status* of young men.

Dr. Chester expressed gratitude to boards of teachers who had aided in such supervision; but insisted that no supervision could supersede the necessity of constant vigilance and faithfulness on the part of Presbyteries.

Rev. Dr. Edwards wished to say a word upon Mr. Waller's motion, if before the house. He said that he hoped it would not be deemed discourteous to the committee to recommit. The circumstances of the Board have greatly changed since last year. The beloved Secretary (Van Rensselaer) had been taken from us. During his incumbency the expenses of the Board were not materially increased by the fact that there were two Secretaries. Now the case is changed. An additional Secretary will be an additional expense. He explained the present condition of the Board, and he moved an amendment to Mr. Waller's motion, which the mover accepted, viz., that the committee be instructed to revise the Constitution and By-laws of the Board of Education, and report what alterations may be needed. A division of the question was called, and both parts of the resolution were passed.

Dr. Mathews offered an additional resolution, to be part of the report, appointing the last Thursday of February next as a day of prayer for colleges, schools, and for the youth of the

church; and that a collection in aid of the College Fund of the Board be that day made.

The report of the committee was then read by sections, and adopted.

Board of Publication.

Rev. Dr. McPhail, from the committee to whom was referred the Report of the Board of Publication, made a report, closing with a nomination to fill vacancies in the Board. The report was accepted.

Rev. Dr. Schenck, Secretary of the Board, addressed the Assembly. He said that as the report was before the Assembly, and a religious meeting in regard to its interests would be held to-night, he deemed it unnecessary to dwell long upon them now. He would touch upon but a few points. The history of the Board for the last year was one of mingled light and shade, prosperity and adversity, hopefulness and trials. Four of the members had departed—all valuable men. But in the death of Mr. William S. Martien, the Board, the church, and the community had lost a most valuable member, whose uprightness, piety, and public spirit, while he lived, made him much missed and deeply deplored now that he was dead. We have lost, too, Joseph P. Engles, a man of great eminence in all the qualifications of usefulness, as a Christian and a citizen. To both of these gentlemen he paid an affectionate and eloquent tribute. Of Mr. Engles he spoke as a man not only of devoted business energy in the service of the Board, but also as a man of great learning in general science, and especially in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew literature. He spoke of the operations of the Board during the past year, which, but for the blighting reverse of the times, would have been twenty to thirty per cent. in advance of former years. It gave him great satisfaction to report so vast an amount of valuable and precious religious truth scattered over this broad land by the agency of this Board. He recited facts showing that not only our own people, but other denominations welcomed with peculiar favour the works published by this Board. The books of the Board advance our religious views, even where our preachers could not go. He spoke of the gratifying success of the *Sabbath-School Visitor*—that its circulation had increased,

and the apparent interest in it was much greater. He called attention to the Distribution Fund, and exhibited the rich blessings which this fund, small as it is, had spread over the land, among the poor churches and mission Sabbath-schools. Vast good had been done in this way. He would that thousands who had means might hear him plead for contributions to sustain a work which shed such light and such blessings, especially in the darker corners, where other means of grace were not abundant. He called attention to the Colportage system. The number of colporteurs is greater by forty, than ever before, and a much larger amount of labour, as will appear by the Annual Report, has been done. He dwelt upon the great value of this arm of the Board's service. The fund for this enterprise was rapidly increased during the early part of the year, but fell off during the latter part, owing to the times; still it is six hundred dollars in advance of last year. He mentioned as a gratifying fact, that more churches have contributed during the last than any former year; but he still lamented that so many churches did nothing. He made an earnest appeal to the ministers and ruling elders, to bring up their churches and Presbyteries to more general and efficient coöperation. He concluded with an urgent request that this good cause should receive a greater amount and a deeper fervency of prayer by all the ministers and people of God. While Christians pray for the living ministry, he feared they too much neglected to pray for these silent yet mighty preachers. The page, like the preacher, will be unblessed without the Spirit of God, and prayer must invoke that Spirit.

The discussion of the recommendations of the committee approving of the operations of this Board, and commending its "economy and efficiency," gave rise to a debate, protracted, through many interruptions, until near the close of the sessions of the Assembly. Dr. Edwards, Dr. Musgrave, and Mr. Waller, were the prominent speakers in opposition to the plans of the Board. Their objections were principally the following. 1. It was urged that the Board or its officers refused to make a full and fair exhibit of their affairs. We do not know, it was said, what its capital, what its assets, what its net profits, what its expenses are. This is a business concern, and

must be conducted on business principles, and be able to stand the application of those principles. The Assembly was entitled to be informed on all the points above indicated, and the refusal or neglect of the executive committee to communicate this information, was made a serious ground of complaint. 2. The next objection was, that the Board was not economical in the conduct of its business. Under this charge there were numerous specifications adduced in its support. The salary of the Corresponding Secretary was said to be too large; a salary of $1000 was given to a treasurer, and $700 or $1000 to a book-keeper, when one man could easily perform the duties of both offices; the colportage department was said to be extravagantly conducted, a business of $41,000 cost $3000 in salaries alone; and as proof of general want of economy, it was said, that while the sales for the last year were about $91,000 the expenses were $17,000, or more than nineteen per cent. It was further charged that more was paid for printing than was proper, because the same work could be done by responsible houses at less price; fifteen cents a token, it was said, might be saved on the printing. 3. The efficiency of the Board was also impugned; their business might be enlarged, and their sales increased; the price of their books should be reduced; depositories could then be established elsewhere than in Philadelphia. Instead of this, the Board went on, year by year, adding to their capital, instead of using their profits to the reduction of their expenses and increase of their operations. 4. Another objection was, that the Board was too intimately allied with the *Presbyterian*. Two editors of that paper are members of the executive committee, a brother of another was lately an officer, and a brother-in-law, by marriage, also. The printer of the *Presbyterian*, moreover, was the printer of the Board. "It was a nice little family affair." The printing, instead of being given out for competition, was almost entirely in the hands of one favoured house, the printers, and, in large part, the proprietors of the *Presbyterian*.

The reader can well understand what impression such charges, urged by able and earnest men, must make on the Assembly and on the public. They were, however, satisfac-

torily met by Dr. Schenck, Secretary of the Board, and by Dr. McPhail, chairman of the committee to whom the report of the Board had been referred. 1. As to the charge of concealment, it was answered that every information desired by any member of the church was cheerfully afforded at the office, when requested. In reply to the question by Dr. Hall, whether Dr. Edwards had ever been refused any information which he sought, Dr. Schenck answered, emphatically, Never. In the second place, the Assembly annually appointed a committee to which was referred the Report of the Board. All the books, accounts, vouchers, and exhibits of expenses, &c., were placed in the hands of the committee, and they had free access to all the sources of information they could desire. In the third place, these books, containing all the minutes and accounts, were annually produced and laid upon the table of the Assembly, open to the inspection of the members. What greater publicity than this could be desired? These details were not published to the world, because this was an unusual course in such institutions, and, in the judgment of practical men, would be injurious to the business of the Board. If, however, the Assembly thought otherwise, the Board sought no concealment, and was willing to publish everything directed. 2. As to the charge of want of economy, the objection had reference, first, to the amount paid in salaries; and, secondly, to the mode of conducting the business operations of the Board. As to the salary of the Secretary, it was shown that it was not greater than the average salaries of ministers living in our large cities, nor more than was required to meet the necessary wants of a man with a family. If the salary was reduced, the office could be held by no man who was not either rich or a bachelor. Because the average salary of our ministers is not more than eight hundred dollars, that does not prove that a man could live in Philadelphia, where he must pay five hundred dollars for a house. It was objected that a thousand dollars are paid annually to the treasurer. This officer, however, is under bonds to the amount of fifteen thousand dollars. A thousand dollars was a small per centage to pay for the safe custody of the funds of the institution, and the responsibility and services attached to the office. It was said that the salary

of twelve hundred dollars for the editor was exorbitant, as his chief duty was to read proof-sheets, which service could be secured for three hundred. To this it was answered, that the editor paid six hundred dollars a year out of his salary for the reading of proofs, which was, after all, the least responsible part of his duties. He has to read piles of manuscripts, and sit in judgment on their merits; he has to examine the current religious literature of the day, and select suitable books for publication; his office calls for the exercise of taste, judgment, piety, and wisdom. These are qualities not found in every man, and their services are cheaply secured at the six hundred dollars which remains of the salary of the editor.

As to the want of economy in the mode of conducting the business of the Board, Dr. McPhail forcibly remarked, that it was founded on the assumption that the Board was a money-making concern. It was no such thing. It was primarily and preëminently a benevolent institution. It was not designed to publish popular books, the sale of which would yield large profits, but to send abroad books which ordinary publishing-houses would not print. It must often publish books at a loss. It is to be remembered, too, that the capital of the Board is not so much cash, but consists largely in stereotype plates, and books on hand. Much of this is of necessity dead capital. It cannot be turned into money or rendered profitable, and yet it answers the end for which the Board was instituted. Thousands of dollars are thus invested in the plates for Calvin's Institutes, Calvin's Letters, the Assembly's Digest, and other such costly works, which were never published with a view to profit, but to supply the churches with important works which could not otherwise be obtained. It was further shown, that the objection was founded on wrong estimates; that instead of the expenses amounting to nineteen, or even, as some said, to forty or fifty per cent. on the business done, they were really not more than from eight to ten, or thirteen per cent. A comparison was made in this respect between the operations of the Board and those of other similar institutions, altogether in favour of the former. The Secretary also exhibited to the Assembly books published by different societies, and showed that the copies issued by the Board were at once the cheapest

and the best. As to the want of efficiency of the Board, and the complaint that they went on adding to their capital, instead of enlarging their operations, it was answered, that in this matter they were obeying the instructions of the Assembly, which required them to add six per cent. annually to their capital. In this way it had been increased from thirty-seven thousand dollars to about two hundred and forty thousand. Whenever the amount reached was considered adequate, the Board was ready to take all the profits and employ them to the reduction of expenses. The objection that the Board was too intimately related to the *Presbyterian*, was met by the statement that no one connected with that paper had ever sought or obtained any advantage from the operations of the Board. All the printing and binding was done by contract. If most of the printing was done by the printer and publisher of the *Presbyterian*, it was only because he did the work on more advantageous terms than it could be elsewhere performed; no cheaper or more favourable offers from responsible houses had ever been declined.

This discussion resulted in the entire vindication of the Board, as the Assembly adopted the report of the committee commending its "economy and efficiency" by an overwhelming majority. We doubt not the church will sanction this decision. A Board which has raised its capital from forty to two hundred and forty thousand dollars; which pays all its bills at the end of every month; which does not owe a cent; whose publications are among the cheapest and the best in the market, deserves the confidence and support of the whole church. It was said by one of the speakers, that the Boards breathed more freely whenever the Assembly adjourned. "This," Dr. McPhail remarked, "is as true as holy writ. They have been so accustomed to this annual castigation, and holding up to the public even their private personal affairs, that it is no wonder that they experience a sensation of relief when the rasping is over." It appears to us that these painful discussions about our Boards, arise in good measure from a misapprehension of the relation between them and the Assembly. The Boards are created by the Assembly, are dependent upon it, and responsible to it for all their acts. But it does not

follow that the Assembly itself is to conduct the work assigned to the Boards. What are the Boards for? What is the use of any such organizations, if the Assembly is to come into immediate contact with the executive committees, and examine all their contracts, all their appointments, all their expenditures? This is a work a body of three hundred men sitting annually for a fortnight, first in one place and then in another, and having the care of all the churches, is utterly incompetent to perform. Congress and the executive government are elected by the people, are dependent upon them, and responsible to their constituents. But this does not prove that the people *en masse* must actually administer the government. Neither does it prove that they can authoritatively decide upon the propriety of every appointment, or the wisdom of every measure. This is not their function. It is one which it is impossible they should perform. Our government is not and cannot be a pure democracy. It is a representative republic. It is a government in which the people act through agents, chosen by themselves, and dependent on them for the continuance of their powers. They may discuss in the public papers, and in other ways, the measures of the government, to enlighten the public mind, and if dissatisfied with the conduct of their rulers they can displace them. The will of the people must prevail. It is so in our ecclesiastical government. The Assembly does not, and cannot itself conduct the work of foreign missions, of education, and publication, or of theological training. It elects and appoints Boards, with certain limited powers, to exercise these several functions. These Boards are created by the Assembly, derive all their powers from that source, are responsible for their action, and dependent for their existence on the will of the body. But the Assembly does not itself do the work, nor can it properly sit in judgment on its details. It must confide in the agents of their own selection. The propriety of any act of the Boards, the wisdom, efficiency, or economy, of their measures, are fair subjects of discussion in the church journals; and if the conviction is produced that the affairs of any Board are unwisely or improperly conducted, its members can be displaced and others substituted. It is, however, plainly impossible that a body constituted as is our

Assembly, and sitting only for two weeks in a year, can itself investigate the details of all these complicated operations. It appoints committees to examine the reports of the Boards; to these committees every facility of examination is afforded, so that if there is anything calling for a change, it may be effected.

As this is the normal and only possible relation of the Assembly to the Boards, so it is, in point of fact, the principle on which the Assembly is accustomed to act. The Assembly appoints directors over our theological seminaries. Those directors are entrusted with the supervision of the professors and the examination of the students. They make their annual reports to the Assembly, and the Assembly confide in their representations. It does not take the work out of the hands of the directors, and arraign one professor for incompetency, another for neglect of duty, and another for false doctrine. It must trust to the directors as its own appointed supervisors. So also we appoint committees to examine the synodical records, and approve them on the report of those committees, in the majority of cases without further investigation. If anything amiss is detected, it is reported to the house, and the matter is discussed and decided. We do not hear members asserting their right to examine these records, each for himself, and calling up every vote of the Synod for revision, and declaring that they cannot in conscience vote to approve its minutes until they have investigated the propriety of every such vote. This would effectually clog the wheels of our system. The course pursued of late in the Assembly must destroy our Boards. It is, at least, precisely the course originally adopted by those who aimed at their destruction. We well remember, years ago, in the infancy of the Board of Missions, when its report was presented to the house, and a committee was appointed for its examination, which recommended that it be approved, a distinguished leader of the New-school party—a party opposed to ecclesiastical Boards—made a very pious speech against it. He claimed his right as a member of the Assembly, to exercise his own judgment on all the acts of the Board. He put himself upon his conscience, and declared that he could not in good faith vote to approve of the report,

until he had examined into the qualifications of every missionary appointed, and his fitness for the field assigned him; into the wisdom of the means adopted for raising money; into all the expenditures of the Board, &c. As this was an impossible work, he designed thereby to show that the Assembly could not conduct missionary operations, but must leave that work to voluntary societies. It is very possible that the gentleman referred to was sincere in all this. In the posture in which his mind then was, it is possible that his conscience did require all this previous examination, before he could give a vote of approval. He had, however, only a few days before voted to approve and adopt the report of the American Home Missionary Society, without examining one of its many hundred appointments.

We do not question the motives or good faith of our own brethren, who claim that their conscience forbids their approving the acts of our Boards, without satisfying themselves that they deserve approbation; but we are persuaded that the principle on which they act must work the destruction of the Boards. We are no less persuaded that these brethren do not carry out their principle. They do not examine the gas, the coal, the stationery bills of the several Boards, and bring them up before the Assembly, to have that venerable body discuss the price of gas or coal, and the different modes in which it can be most economically purchased or employed. Neither do they refuse to vote to approve the records of a Synod, until they have examined all its acts.

There is another serious evil to be considered. The Secretaries of our Boards have duties to perform which require high qualifications. Suitable men cannot be induced to assume those duties, if they are to be subjected to annual scrutiny into their private affairs. The executive committees, who are the responsible agents, and the members of the Boards themselves, give their time and labour gratuitously. How long will reliable men be found to fill these positions, if their social and family relations are to be annually brought up and discussed before the Assembly, or their motives brought into question? It is evident, we think, that no one of our Boards can stand many such discussions as that through which some of them had to pass in

the last Assembly; and we do not see how public confidence in them is to be sustained under such repeated criminations. These discussions, we doubt not, have done great injury not only to the church, but to the cause of religion. We are not pleading for independence, or for irresponsible action. We are in favour of public discussion, and of rigid responsibility; but we are persuaded that the floor of the Assembly is not the place for such discussions, and that all due responsibility can be secured by demanding full reports, and the exhibition of all records and accounts to the examination of the committees appointed by the house. If those committees report anything amiss, it can be further examined into. But such personal criminations, and inquisitorial investigations of a man's personal expenses and modes of living, and social relations, cannot be sustained by men competent to the work which the church needs to have performed.

Board of Domestic Missions.

The Rev. Mr. Donaldson presented the following paper in reference to the Report of the Board of Domestic Missions, which, after protracted discussion, was adopted by a vote of 94 to 68.

1. The General Assembly approve the Report, and desire it to be published.

2. The Assembly gratefully acknowledge the disposing grace of God, who has enabled those who conduct the operations of the Board to increase the number of missionaries 106 over that of the preceding year; making the whole number in commission 707, resulting in the organization of 52 churches, affording the means of grace to 1239, and bringing into the communion 2429; also 1689 admitted by letter.

3. While the Assembly learn with deep regret that many of our churches still fail to come up to the help of the Lord in this great department of his work, it is gratifying to find that the delinquents are diminishing in number; that 117 more have contributed during the past than in any preceding year, the entire number contributing through this Board being now 1822; and from this chief source of reliance under God

the contributions have exceeded those of the preceding year about $8120.

4. The Assembly is still further gratified that, in accordance with its recommendations of former years, the French, Welsh, and Germans in our land, as also the coloured population of the South, have had the gospel preached to them more extensively by our self-denying missionaries, most of whom practice itinerancy to some extent, sixty being wholly employed in this toilsome service.

5. The Assembly notice with special satisfaction that during the last quarter of the past year, when it was feared that the salaries of the missionaries must be so reduced as to occasion painful embarrassments, in answer to a special appeal by the Secretaries to the missionary churches, they promised to supplement what the embarrassed Board were constrained to withhold. Thus, it is hoped, the apprehended evil will be averted, and the missionaries will continue to receive their promised support.

6. Though the Board, under the supposed *animus* of the Assembly of 1859, and under the impulse of its new modification, resulting from that Assembly, may perhaps have expanded its operations with undue haste, the Assembly is reluctant to take any backward step in the way of diminishing either the number of missionaries or the amount of their meagre but well-merited support; and therefore it urges upon all the churches so to enlarge their contributions as that the Board may again be enabled to meet all its engagements, and also to have on hand a needful working balance at the close of each year.

7. The Assembly does not deem it expedient at this time, either to retract its prohibition of last year against granting certificates of honorary membership, to entitle donors to take a place as members of the Board, nor to abolish the Western Executive Committee, as overtured by the Presbytery of Cedar.

Respecting the Memorials from the Synod of Pittsburg and the Central Presbytery of Philadelphia, on the subject of the Co-ordinate Secretaryship, which was assigned to your committee, they beg leave to report that—

1. They find it impracticable to "investigate" "the measures" which "are alleged" to have been employed "by certain members of the Board to bring about the creation of this office," further than by the committee's conference with the officers of the Board, and consultation of their books, and by the discussions of the Assembly.

2. In view of the wide-spread disaffection with this office, as involving a needless expenditure of precious funds, and still more, in view of the severe pecuniary pressure of the present time, not likely soon to pass away, the Board should at once abolish the office, and employ but one Secretary.

3. They are fully persuaded that there is such dissatisfaction prevailing throughout large portions of the church in regard to this feature in the organization of the Board, that confidence and cordial coöperation can only be restored by the Board passing by, at its election in June next, both the existing Secretaries, and selecting a new man to fill the place.

The two principal points about which diversity of opinion existed in reference to this Board, were, 1. The policy of expansion, as it was called, or the demand for the enlargement of the operations of the Board. The one party insisting that its expenditures and obligations during the past years were as great as its resources would warrant; and the other contending that if the Board went forward and increased the number of its missionaries, and the amount of their salaries, the church would not fail to contribute the requisite funds. Two years ago the Assembly at Indianapolis made such a change in the organization of the Board as to secure the triumph of the friends of expansion. At the present Assembly, it was contended that the result had been, that the Board was virtually bankrupt. The other point of difference was, whether there should be one or two Corresponding Secretaries; the friends of expansion insisting upon two, and the other party maintaining that one only was needed. With these questions of principle a good deal of personal feeling, and many complaints of unkindness and unfairness, were mixed up, which gave the debate on this subject a very painful character. The decision of the Assembly, although decidedly in favour of the cautious

policy of which Dr. Musgrave was the advocate, was designed to be conciliatory, and hopes were entertained that all contention on this subject might cease, and the friends of the Board be able to act harmoniously in its support.

Board of Foreign Missions.

Rev. Dr. Dickinson, from the Committee on the Report of the Board of Foreign Missions, presented the report of that Committee. The report was accepted; and the election to fill vacancies in the Board made the order of the day immediately after the other elections.

On motion to adopt the report,

Hon. Secretary Lowrie made a very interesting and impressive historical statement of the rise and progress of this work in our branch of the church. He said his object was simply to give a succinct and clear view of the present *status* of the work, so that the Assembly might have a distinct knowledge thereof. He came not here to exhort the Assembly, but to give them facts. He read a syllabus of the present force now in the missionary field, and their distribution, as follows:

Brief statement of the Missions.

1. *Indian Tribes.*—20 stations, 15 ministers, 3 native ministers, 14 male teachers, 48 female teachers, 8 native teachers, 2179 communicants, 237 boys boarding scholars, 225 girls boarding scholars, 246 boys and girls day scholars.

2. *Africa.*—11 stations, 12 ministers, 5 male teachers, 7 female teachers, 6 native teachers, 250 communicants, 74 boarding-school boys, 33 boarding-school girls, 125 day-school boys, 10 day-school girls.

3. *India.*—15 stations, 23 ministers, 3 native ministers, 2 native teachers, 21 female teachers, 48 native assistants, 259 communicants, 16 boys in boarding-schools, 49 girls in boarding-schools, 3265 boys in day-schools, 145 girls in day-schools.

4. *Siam.*—2 stations, 6 ministers, 5 female teachers, 1 native assistant, 8 communicants, 31 boarding scholars.

5. *China and Chinese in California.*—4 stations and 3 substations, 13 ministers, 3 male teachers, 15 female teachers,

17 native assistants, 161 communicants, 30 boys boarding scholars, 30 girls boarding scholars, 128 day scholars, of whom 58 are girls.

6. *Japan, South America, and the Jews.*—6 ministers, 1 school of 20 scholars in Bogota.

7. *Papal Europe.*—Funds remitted $6210.

Aggregate.—75 ministers, 6 native ministers, 25 male teachers, 105 female teachers, 80 native assistants, 2857 communicants, 388 boys in boarding-schools, 337 girls in boarding-schools, 3586 boys in day schools, 333 girls in day schools.

After reading this epitome, Mr. Lowrie said, that in carrying forward this extensive agency it was a work of faith—faith in God—faith in the agencies—and the missionaries must have confidence in all. Now, to start with this year we have twenty-eight dollars. If we had in our safe $185,000, the work would be simplified; but we have it not. It must come from you and from the churches. Our trust is in God, and our reliance upon his people. He detailed the manner in which the estimates are made each year: first by the missionaries at the several stations, for a year in advance; these are reviewed, modified, and adopted by the Board, and for this the Executive Committee become responsible. The Trustees of the Board are *legally* bound to honour the drafts of the missionaries; this is by the law of the State of New York. The Trustees are personally responsible. They would be left as poor as their Master was, without a place to lay his head, if the churches should leave them to meet but a few of these drafts. It is both a work of faith and of dollars and cents. He read one of the estimates (that from Ningpo,) to show with what care and economy these estimates are made. He showed that this Board, above all others, must be punctual in meeting their engagements, or our dear brethren must be left destitute and suffering in distant foreign lands. There they cannot turn their hands to something else for a livelihood. They must suffer or be sustained. Shall they who have gone out on the faith of the church's Head, and the pledge of the church to sustain them, be left to suffer? He read the list of estimates, and of the large abatements made by the Executive Committee, so as to reduce expenses. He proceeded to show that of our

3500 churches only 1500 had paid anything to this Board, leaving 2000 which had not given one cent to this object; and yet in these churches were more than 500 ministers, either as pastors or stated supplies. How can it be that our brethren are so indifferent to their Master's cause?

He alluded to the once united, but now divided, state of the country, and showed the unhappy influence which this division might have upon this cause. He said that the South had contributed liberally; many of God's dear people who loved this cause lived in the South. But what they might be able to do, and what they might be willing to do, we cannot tell. This is a cause of great embarrassment. He dwelt with much earnestness, and was moved to tears as he did so, upon the fact, that whilst many well educated and faithful men were willing and waiting to go, and while the heathen natives were perishing by millions, here were sixty thousand communicants, with many ministers among them, who stood coldly by, and did not give one cent to this cause. He went into statistics of the past and the present, and most feelingly pressed the claims of this cause. He then presented a resumé of the missionaries returned, and of those ready and desirous to go. He detailed the pressing need for labourers at several fields; mentioned suitable labourers that were anxious to go, but means were wanting. Here in the Assembly were men who were anxious to go back, two of them the best scholars in the Punjabi language in the world. Brother Mackey from Corisco, the brother from China, eminent for scholarship, were anxious to return; but means were wanting. He spoke of the necessity of employing female missionaries, and of the great value and efficiency of Christian women in this work. Satan seemed especially to hate woman, and loved to degrade her where he had sway. He illustrated the value of the example set by woman's Christian elevation upon heathen sentiment. He pressed the importance of the *power of littles*, and the importance of drawing out universally the small contributions of the people. He regretted the necessity of going into so many small details, but he wished the Assembly to have the facts—upon these facts they could reason without his help, and could ponder and feel them.

Mr. Moderator, said he, we see the flag of our country flying

at every point. I have no objection to this, for I love that flag, always did love it; but there is another and a more glorious standard—the banner of the Cross! Let that advance to victory; let us rally around it; let us bear it forward; let us look to it; let us remember that the throng around the throne behold it too! There Herron, and Edgar, and Murray, and the beloved Van Rensselaer—the many great and venerated dead of the last year—are gathered with those who have gone before; and with those that from Africa, and India, and China, have met them there. They all behold that broad flag, and expect us, and the Master expects us, to stand by it, and bear it onward!

Great interest was expressed in every part of the house in this great cause, and numerous pledges were given to increased efforts in sustaining the Board under the embarrassments necessarily arising from the unhappy state of the country. The almost certainty that the thirty or forty thousand dollars usually contributed by the Southern churches to our foreign missionary operations, must, for the coming year at least, fail to reach the treasury of the Board, imposes the obligation on the other portions of our church to double their contributions.

Have non-communicants the right to vote in the election of a pastor?

This subject was brought up by the Judicial Committee, who reported a complaint of the Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, against a decision of the Synod of Kentucky. That Synod had decided that none but persons in full communion with the church, had the right to a voice in the choice of a pastor. The committee reported in favour of sustaining this complaint, on the ground that the decision of the Synod is contrary to our constitution, Form of Government, chap. xv., § 4. In that section it is said, that the pastor is to be chosen by "the electors of the congregation;" and from the class of electors, those only are excluded who, first, refuse to submit to the censures of the church, regularly administered; and, secondly, those who do not contribute to its necessary expenses. Dr. Yeomans, Dr. Anderson, Judge Ewing, and Mr. Clark (ruling elders,) spoke in support of the recommendation of the committee;

Mr. Ogden, Mr. Watts, Mr. Miller (ruling elder,) Mr. Reaser, and others, spoke warmly against the complaint, and in favour of the action of the Synod. The debate on this important subject was interrupted by the all-engrossing discussion on the state of the country; and the matter was finally referred to the next Assembly.

It is certainly remarkable that this should be, at this late period, an open question. Our church has existed as an organized body in this country more than one hundred and fifty years. During that time there have been many thousand elections for pastors; and yet the General Assembly are divided in opinion as to who have the elective franchise! In nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand of these elections, non-communicants have voted, without their right being called into question. It is now proposed to deny that right. This can only be accounted for by the adoption of some new theory, or by the increasing prevalence or development of a theory already more or less consciously adopted. The argument on this subject is very simple. The election of a pastor is a function of the church. Only members of the church have the right to exercise that function. Non-communicants are not members of the church; therefore non-communicants have no right to participate in such election. This argument, simple as it appears, is fallacious. It is true that the choice of a pastor is a prerogative of the church. It is true that only members of the church are entitled to exercise that prerogative. But it is not true that non-communicants are not members of the church; nor is it true, as the argument seems to take for granted, that the right of election is inseparable from church-membership. The mode in which pastors shall be chosen is a matter of compact or law, whether common or statute.

The President of the United States is not chosen by the people, but by electors chosen for that purpose. In the Dutch Reformed church, the pastor is chosen by the great consistory, which includes the elders and those who in that congregation have held the office of an elder. In the Congregational church, he is chosen (so far as the church is concerned) by the male members of the church. With us, as a matter of fact, he is chosen by the stated members of the congregation who consti-

tute the body to which he ministers, and who contribute to his support. It cannot be denied that this has been our general usage from the beginning. If this usage is to be changed, if a most important privilege is to be taken away from so large a part of our people, it must be on grounds of overwhelming necessity. The plan has worked well. It has not corrupted the church. It has not filled our pulpits with unsuitable or unfaithful ministers. In some few cases it may have frustrated the wishes of the better part of our congregations. But such occasional evils are incident to any possible mode of election. It is not the practical working of the system, it is a theory which is made the ground of opposition, and the pretext for revolution. Much horror was expressed that "the wicked," "the world," "the outsiders," should have a voice in the control of the church. The election of a pastor is a spiritual function, and therefore to be exercised only by the spiritual. It is a sacred prerogative of the church, and therefore to be exercised only by members of the church. All this assumes that the church consists only of communicants. But this is the peculiar doctrine of Baptists and other independents or congregationalists. It is not the doctrine of Presbyterians or of Protestants generally. It is indeed admitted that the true church, the body of Christ on earth, in whom he dwells by his Spirit, consists, not indeed of communicants as such, but of the truly regenerated children of God, just as true Christians are the true (as distinguished from the professed) worshippers and followers of Christ. Thus the apostle says, "He is not a Jew who is one outwardly. But he is a Jew who is one inwardly; whose circumcision is of the heart, and by the Spirit." This, however, does not prove that none but regenerated Jews were to be recognised as Jews, nor allowed to exercise the religious and covenant privileges belonging to the ancient church. This distinction between the church visible and invisible, the true and the empirical, is fundamental and vital. It is recognized in the symbols of every Protestant church. While therefore we maintain, as against Romanists, that the true church on earth consists exclusively of the true people of God; we as Presbyterians insist no less strenuously, as against the Baptists and Brownists, that the visible church,

those whom we are bound to recognise as within its pale, includes all those who profess the true religion, together with their children. And by professing the true religion, is not to be understood, professing regeneration and coming to the Lord's table; but as knowing the truth of Christianity, and submitting to the government and discipline of the church. The visible church, therefore, does not consist exclusively of the regenerated, nor of those who profess to be regenerated, nor of those whom church officers may pronounce to be thus renewed by the Holy Ghost, but of all who have been baptized and have not renounced their baptismal covenant, or been formally excommunicated. Those who are in this sense members of the visible church, have not, however, all the same privileges. Their rights as members depend upon their qualifications for the proper exercise of those rights. The male members have some privileges which the female members have not. Adults can do what minors or infants are not allowed to do. It does not follow, from the church membership of infants, that they may be admitted to the Lord's table; nor does it follow, from the church membership of adults, that they have all the qualifications for full communion, any more than that they have the qualifications for the eldership, or for the ministry. They may, however, have the qualifications of electors. The whole theory, therefore, that the visible church consists, (so far as adults are concerned,) exclusively of those who have been admitted to the Lord's table, is anti-Presbyterian and anti-Scriptural; and, consequently, the inference drawn from that theory that communicants alone are entitled to vote for pastors, is as much opposed to the doctrine, as it is to the practice of the church. The exclusion of all but communicants from the exercise of the elective franchise, is not only contrary to our doctrine and usage, it is also eminently unjust and unreasonable. A father of a family is allowed to choose what secular teacher he pleases for his children; is he to have no voice in the far more important matter of the selection of their religious teacher? He is expected and bound to contribute to the support of such teachers; must he submit to have them chosen exclusively by other men? This would obviously be inconsistent with our whole civil and ecclesiastical system. There is no real danger in this course

to the purity of the church. The choice of the congregation is limited to men who have been trained and licensed under the supervision of the Presbytery. The Presbytery has at all times a veto on the choice; and, after the election, the minister is still accountable for his doctrine and conduct, not to the people, but to the Presbytery. No improper man, therefore, can be installed pastor of a congregation without the connivance of the Presbytery, and ultimately of the Synod and of the General Assembly. So obviously just and reasonable is it that those who support the minister and sit under his instruction, should have a voice in his election, that even in New England, where the church is assumed to consist only of communicants, non-communicants are allowed to vote. The pastor is there chosen, first by the church, and then by the parish, or congregation. Both must concur to make the election valid. And in many of our States the right to vote for the minister is secured by the civil law, and cannot be denied without making the election legally invalid. We cannot doubt, therefore, that Dr. Breckinridge will be sustained in his efforts to preserve the rights of the people, and to maintain the true theory of our constitution, by the great majority of our church.

The State of the Country.

The debate on this subject, in its character and consequences, was one of the most memorable in the history of our church. The country was engaged in civil war; the South and the North stood arrayed in hostile camps; Presbyterians were in arms against Presbyterians; the public mind was agitated to its lowest depths; no man could be unaffected; no man could stand neutral; silence was a declaration of hostility. Under these circumstances the General Assembly was called upon to take sides. This had been an easy and obvious duty, if all Presbyterians represented in the Assembly, and whose organ it was, had been of one mind on the subject. But alas! this was not so. Our church was as much divided as the country. It was the case of a mother who was called upon to take part for one child against another. It was in vain she urged that both were her children; that it was not her province to decide the point in dispute between them. She might have her own

opinion on the subject, but God had not made her a judge or divider in such matters. This plea availed nothing. She was in the hands of the more powerful of the two, and speak she must. It will be admitted that the Assembly was in trying circumstances—more trying, perhaps, than any in which it had ever before been placed. Public sentiment, both in and out of the church, was almost overwhelming in favour of an open declaration of loyalty to the Constitution and the Federal Government. The eyes of the whole country were converged on the house in which the Assembly sat. The secular press was clamorous for an open avowal of allegiance. Threatening murmurs against clerical traitors were heard on every hand. Those who resisted the action of the Assembly were denounced in the streets as secessionists, as pro-slavery, as trucklers to the South, as traitors to their country. The scourge of public indignation was lifted over their heads. It was threatened that the people would desert a church by thousands which hesitated to speak out in such a time as this. The yeas and nays were called on every possible occasion, in order that every man should be held responsible for his vote. The Assembly has had severe conflicts in her past history, but none analogous to this. When the public mind seemed to be set in favour of voluntary societies, those who stood up for ecclesiastical Boards had the support not only of a large party in the church, but of their own convictions. When the rage for new measures and new doctrine seized upon the people, those who opposed them were firmly convinced that those measures were unscriptural and those doctrines false. When zeal for temperance became a fanaticism, and every man was denounced as a transgressor who did not vote the use of intoxicating liquor a sin, and when the fell spirit of abolitionism had rent almost every other church in the land, still those who withstood these extravagances had no sympathy with them. But in the present case it was far different. Those who resisted the action of the Assembly were themselves filled with the spirit which animated the public mind. They too were loyal to the Constitution and the Federal Government. They regarded the war which had been declared against the Union, as one of the most unjustifiable and wicked upon record. They looked with exulting admiration on the rising of a whole people in defence not

so much of their secular interests, as of an idea and of a sacred right. They felt the glow of the patriotic ardour which impelled the nation to risk everything in the protection of its national life. They approved of the sentiments and the object of the very paper against which they felt constrained to vote. They had to do violence to their feelings in obeying their conscience. They had elsewhere, by speech and pen, advocated those sentiments, and that, in some instances at least, at great personal sacrifice. Why then did they refuse to avow them in and through the General Assembly? For the same reason that they would refuse, at the command of an excited multitude, to sing the "Star Spangled Banner" at the Lord's table. They refused because in their judgment it was wrong and out of place.

It would fill a whole number of our journal to reprint the report of the numerous and protracted speeches delivered in the course of this debate. It might be well to have those speeches collected and published, after revision by their authors when possible, in a pamphlet form. All we can attempt is to state the course which the discussion took, and to vindicate in few words the part taken by the minority. The venerable Dr. Gardiner Spring, on the third day of the sessions of the Assembly, introduced a resolution proposing the appointment of a committee to consider whether any declaration of the sentiments of the Assembly on the present state of the country was desirable, and if so, to report a paper for the consideration of the house. This resolution was by a vote of 122 to 102 immediately laid on the table. On a subsequent day Dr. Spring proposed the adoption of a paper appointing a day of special prayer, and containing a declaration of loyalty to the Constitution and Government. After the debate had continued for several days, it was determined to appoint a committee of compromise, of which the Rev. Dr. Musgrave was chairman, to whom was referred Dr. Spring's resolutions, together with some eight or ten different papers, which had been presented as modifications or substitutes. That committee made a majority and minority report, which are as follows:

"Gratefully acknowledging the distinguished bounty and care of Almighty God towards this favoured land, and also

recognizing our obligation to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, this General Assembly adopt the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That in view of the present agitated and unhappy condition of this country, Monday, the first day of July next, be hereby set apart as a day of prayer throughout our bounds, and that upon that day ministers and people are called upon humbly to confess and bewail our national sins, to offer our thanks to the Father of Lights for his abundant and undeserved goodness to us as a nation, to seek his guidance and blessing upon our rulers and their counsels, as well as upon the Congress then about to assemble, and implore him in the name of Jesus Christ, the great High Priest of the Christian profession, to turn away his anger from us, and speedily restore to us the blessings of a safe and honourable peace.

"*Resolved*, That the members of this General Assembly, in the spirit of that Christian patriotism which the Scriptures enjoin, and which has always characterized this church, do hereby acknowledge and declare their obligation, so far as in them lies, to maintain the Constitution of these United States, in the full exercise of all its legitimate powers, to preserve our beloved Union unimpaired, and to restore its inestimable blessings to every portion of the land.

"*Resolved*, That in the present distracted state of the country, this Assembly, representing the whole church, feel bound to abstain from any further declaration, in which all our ministers and members, faithful to the constitution and standards of the church, might not be able conscientiously and safely to join, and therefore, out of regard as well to the interests of our beloved country as to those of the church, the Assembly adopt this minute as the deliverance of the church."

Dr. Anderson, as the minority of the Committee, reported Dr. Spring's original resolutions, with very slight modifications. The first resolution recommending a day of prayer, was the same in both reports. The second resolution of the minority report was as follows:

"*Resolved*, That this General Assembly, in the spirit of that Christian patriotism which the Scriptures enjoin, and which has

always characterized this church, do hereby acknowledge and declare our obligation to promote and perpetuate, so far as in us lies, the integrity of these United States, and to strengthen, uphold, and encourage the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions under our noble Constitution, and to this Constitution, in all its provisions, requirements, and principles, we profess our unabated loyalty. And to avoid all misconception, the Assembly declares that by the term 'Federal Government,' as here used, is not meant any particular Administration, or the peculiar opinions of any political party, but that central Administration, which, being at any time appointed and inaugurated according to the terms prescribed in the Constitution of the United States, is the visible representative of our national existence."

The vote on the majority report was as follows:

YEAS.—Messrs. Kennedy, J. T. Backus, L. Merrill Miller, Aitken, Lane, Hall, Westcott, Lindsley, Imbrie, Martin, Hornblower, Hodge, Hamill, Studdiford, Adams, Snowden, Schenck, Watts, Musgrave, Happersett, McPhail, Latta, Gayley, Jas. Williamson, Lawrence, Yeomans, Dickson, Murray, Joseph Clark, Motzer, McMichael, Stockton, Alrich, Mahaffey, Lloyd, Hunt, Layman, Scott, Goodman, Bergen, Heckman, Lyon, Barnett, Taylor, Hamilton, Haines, Mutchmore, Wines, Mathes, Slagle, Matthews, Condit, Hawthorn and Ogden, *Ministers.* Messrs. Church, Newland, Guest, Lockwood, Ballantyne, Rankin, Osborne, Scudder, Robert Barber of Burlington, Morris Patterson, Henry McKeen, Macalester, Deal, Henry, Rea, R. Barber of Northumberland, Giles, Linn, Meredith, Sheets, William Semple, H. K. Clarke, Houston, Mercer, Young, Harbison, Warren, Tunstall, Hubbard and White, *Ruling Elders.*—84.

NAYS.—Messrs. William Clark, Kellog, Bullions, Cochran, Drake, Baldwin, Crane, Hubbard, Reeves, Barr, Kehoo, Edwards, Farquhar, Hastings, Donaldson, Coulter, Critchlow, S. J. M. Eaton, Annan, William Eaton, Maxwell, J. D. Smith, Kelly, Sackett, Semple, Pratt, Dubuar, William Campbell, Badeau, Eastman, Thomas, Monfort, Elliott, Long, Lee, T. M. Hopkins, Pelan, Irwin, Forbes, Fisk, John A. Campbell, Laird, Newell, Stone, Price, Crozier, Vaill, Hanson, Coon, Lord, Swan, Mathers, Robertson, Thayer, Jones, Dodd, Conkey, McGuigan, Stryker, Reaser, Symington, Leighton, Rutherford, McInnis, H. M. Smith, Gillespie, McNair, and Anderson, *Ministers.* Messrs. E. B. Miller, Wilkin, Lowrie, Beard, Hutchinson, Fithian, Gulick, William Wilson, Humphrey, Cunningham, Little, Dungan, Martin, Kinkead, Lawson, Ewing, John Johnston, Bailey, McConnell, Rodgers, Hamilton, Banks, Moore, Alexander, Lewis, Davy, Thomas Johnston, Samuel Price, Graham, L. H. Stewart, Hazeltine, Conn, Thomas, Frost, Neal, McChord, Kinnear, Fisher, J. L. Meredith, J. L. Williams, Seller, Neely, Waddel, Reynolds, Gregg, Row-

land, Spring, Scates, Stirrat, Baldwin, Mason, Russell, Windsor, Wayland, Claypool, and Caldwell, *Ruling Elders.*—128.

Messrs. Peden, Balch, and T. C. Stuart, *non liquet.*

Mr. Hoyte was excused from voting.

The majority report having been rejected, that of the minority was adopted by the following vote:

AYES.

Synod of Albany—Clark, Kellog, Bullions, Cochran, Newland.

Synod of Buffalo—L. M. Miller, William E. Guest, E. B. Miller.

Synod of New York—Westcott, Drake, Martin, Wilkin, Lowrie, Rankin, Beard.

Synod of New Jersey—Baldwin, Crane, Reeves, Hubbard, Studdiford, Barr, Snowden, Kehoo, Mackey, Osborne, Lytle, Hutchinson, Scudder, Fithian, Ryerson, Gulick, Humphrey, Cunningham.

Synod of Philadelphia—Schenck, Musgrave, Edwards, Latta, Farquhar, Williamson, Lawrence, Waller, Patterson, Dungan, Macalester, Henry, Martin, Kinkead, Rea, Barber, Lawson.

Synod of Baltimore—Murray, Clark, Linn.

Synod of Pittsburg—McPherson, Jacobus, Hastings, Donaldson, Ewing, Johnston, Bailey, McConnell, Rogers, Hamilton.

Synod of Allegheny—Coulter, Critchlow, Eaton, Annan, Banks, Moore, Alexander, Lewis.

Synod of Wheeling—Eaton, Maxwell, David.

Synod of Ohio—Smith, Kelly, Sackett, Semple, Pratt, Johnston, Price, Sheets, Graham, Stewart.

Synod of Sandusky—Dubuar, Badeau, Clarke, Hazeltine, Conn.

Synod of Cincinnati—Eastman, T. E. Thomas, Montfort, Elliott, Long, William Thomas, Frost, Neal.

Synod of Indiana—Lee, Hopkins, Pelan, McChord, Kinnear, Fisher, Houston.

Synod of Northern Indiana—Irvin, Goodman, Forbes, Fisk, Campbell, Meredith, Williams, Seller, Neely.

Synod of Illinois—Laird, Newell, Bergen, Stone, Price, Crozier, Waddell, Reynolds.

Synod of Chicago—Vaill, Hanson, Coon, Lord, Swan, Gregg, Rowland, Spring, Scates.

Synod of Wisconsin—Matthews, Hickman, Robertson.

Synod of St. Paul—Thayer, Lyon, Barnett, Stirratt, Baldwin.

Synod of Iowa—Jones, Dodd, Conkey, Mason.

Synod of Southern Iowa—McGuigan, Taylor, Stryker, Hamilton, Haines, Russell, Windsor.

Synod of Upper Missouri—Reaser.

Synod of Missouri—Wines, Slagle.

Synod of Pacific—Anderson, Caldwell.

Yeas—154.

NAYS.

Synod of Albany—Kennedy, Church.
Synod of Buffalo—Aitken, Lane, Hall, Lockwood, Ballentine.
Synod of New York—Sprole, Lindsey, Imbrie, Childs, Wells.
Synod of New Jersey—Hornblower, Hodge, Hamill, Wilson, Simpson.
Synod of Philadelphia—Watts, Happersett, McPhail, Gayley, Yeomans, McKeen.
Synod of Baltimore—Dickson, Murphy, Motzer, Giles.
Synod of Pittsburg—McMichael.
Synod of Wheeling—Stockton, Alrich, Mahaffey, Meredith.
Synod of Ohio—Lloyd, Hunt, William Semple.
Synod of Sandusky—Layman.
Synod of Indiana—Scott.
Synod of St. Paul—Mercer.
Synod of Missouri—Mutchmore, Leighton, Mathes, Wayland.
Synod of Kentucky—Hopkins, Matthews, Frazer, Cheek, Offutt, Condit, Hawthorn, Harbison, Warren, Tunstall, Hubbard.
Synod of Virginia—Brown, Claypool.
Synod of Nashville—Harrison, White.
Synod of Mississippi—Peden, Balch, Rutherford, McInnis, Smith.
Synod of Memphis—Gillespie, Stewart.
Synod of Texas—McNair, Baker.
Nays—66.

Dr. Hodge, Mr. Hoyte, and several others, gave notice that they would enter a protest against the vote just passed; and Mr. Lloyd gave notice of dissent.

Agreeably to notice, the following protest was presented and placed on the minutes:

We, the undersigned, respectfully protest against the action of the General Assembly in adopting the minority report of the Committee on the State of the Country. We make this protest, not because we do not acknowledge loyalty to our country to be a moral and religious duty, according to the word of God, which requires us to be subject to the powers that be; nor because we deny the right of the Assembly to enjoin that and all other like duties on the ministers and churches under its care; but because we deny the right of the General Assembly to decide the political question, to what government the allegiance of Presbyterians, as citizens, is due, and its right to make that decision a condition of membership in our church.

That the paper adopted by the Assembly does decide the political question just stated, is, in our judgment, undeniable.

It asserts not only the loyalty of this body to the Constitution and the Union, but it promises, in the name of all the churches and ministers whom it represents, to do all that in them lies to "strengthen, uphold, and encourage the Federal Government." It is, however, a notorious fact, that many of our ministers and members conscientiously believe that the allegiance of the citizens of this country is primarily due to the States, to which they respectively belong; and, therefore, that when any State renounces its connection with the United States, and its allegiance to the Constitution, the citizens of that State are bound by the law of God to continue loyal to their State, and obedient to its laws. The paper adopted by the Assembly virtually declares, on the other hand, that the allegiance of the citizen is due to the United States; anything in the Constitution, or ordinances, or laws of the several States, to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is not the loyalty of the members constituting this Assembly, nor of our churches and ministers in any one portion of our country that is thus asserted, but the loyalty of the whole Presbyterian Church—North and South, East and West. Allegiance to the Federal Government is recognized or declared to be the duty of all the churches and ministers represented in this body. In adopting this paper, therefore, the Assembly does decide the great political question which agitates and divides the country. *The question is, whether the allegiance of our citizens is primarily to the State or to the Union?* However clear our own convictions of the correctness of this decision may be, or however deeply we may be impressed with its importance, yet it is not a question which this Assembly has the right to decide. A man may conscientiously believe that he owes allegiance to one government, or another, and yet possess all the qualifications which the word of God or the standards of the church authorizes us to demand in our members or ministers. As this General Assembly represents the whole church, the acts and deliverances of this Assembly become the acts and deliverances of the church. It is this consideration that gives to the action of this Assembly in this case all its importance either in our own view or in the view of others.

It is the allegiance of the Old School Presbyterian Church to

the Constitution, the Union, and the Federal Government which this paper is intended to profess and proclaim. It does, therefore, of necessity decide the political question which agitates the country. It pronounces or assumes a particular interpretation of the Constitution. This is a matter clearly beyond the jurisdiction of the Assembly.

That the action of the Assembly in the premises does not only decide the political question referred to, but makes that decision a term of membership in our church, is no less clear. It is not analogous to the recommendation of a religious or benevolent institution, which our members may regard or not, at pleasure; but it puts into the mouths of all represented in this body a declaration of loyalty and allegiance to the Union and to the Federal Government. But such a declaration made by our members residing in what are called the seceding States, is treasonable. Presbyterians under the jurisdiction of those States cannot, therefore, make this declaration. They are consequently forced to choose between allegiance to their States and allegiance to the church.

The General Assembly, in thus deciding a political question, and in making that decision practically a condition of membership to the church, has, in our judgment, violated the constitution of the church, and usurped the prerogative of its Divine Master.

We protest, secondly, against this action of the Assembly, because it is a departure from all its previous actions. The General Assembly has always acted on the principle that the church has no right to make anything a condition of Christian or ministerial fellowship, which is not enjoined or required in the Scriptures and the standards of the church.

We have at one time resisted the popular demand to make total abstinence from intoxicating liquors a term of membership. At another time the holding of slaves. In firmly resisting these unscriptural demands, we have preserved the integrity and unity of the church, made it the great conservative body of truth, moderation, and liberty of conscience in our country. The Assembly have now descended from this high position in making a political opinion a particular theory of the Constitution, however correct and important that theory may be, the

condition of membership in our body, and thus, as we fear, endangered the unity of the church.

In the third place, we protest because we regard the action of the Assembly as altogether *unnecessary and uncalled for.* It was required neither to instruct nor excite our brethren in the Northern States. It was not needed as a vindication of the loyalty of the North.

Old-school Presbyterians everywhere out of the so-called seceding States, have openly avowed and conspicuously displayed their allegiance to the Constitution and the Government, and that in many cases at great cost and peril. Nor was such action required by our duty to the country. We are fully persuaded that we best promote the interests of the country by preserving the integrity and unity of the church.

We regard this action of the Assembly, therefore, as a great national calamity, as well as the most disastrous to the interests of our church which has marked its history.

We protest, fourthly, because we regard the action of the Assembly as unjust and cruel in its bearing on our Southern brethren. It was, in our judgment, unfair to entertain and decide such a momentous question when the great majority of our Southern Presbyteries were from necessity unrepresented in this body. And it is, in our judgment, a violation of the law of love, to adopt an act which must expose the Southern churches that remain in connection with our church to suspicion, to loss of property, to personal danger, and which tends to destroy their usefulness in their appointed fields of labour.

And finally, we protest because we believe the act of the Assembly will not only diminish the resources of the church, but greatly weaken its power for good, and expose it to the danger of being carried away more and more from its true principles by a wordly or fanatical spirit.

Charles Hodge; William Chester; John C. Backus; Cyrus Dickson; Daniel Motzer; W. S. Giles; Thomas A. Ogden; Charles K. Imbrie; George Fraser; John H. Condit; Thomas S. Childs; John D. Wells; Charles Hubbard; George Meredith; W. E. Hunt; W. Semple; W. McMichael; H. B. Scott; J. Trumbull Backus; M. Peden; R. McInnis; John W. Yeomans; G. Wilson McPhail; Henry McKeen; Duncan

Kennedy; J. B. White; W. A. Harrison; Robert Lee; J. P. Lloyd; John Leighton; W. R. Mercer; A. L. Lindsley; J. T. Balch; Samuel A. Gayley; J. V. Harbison of Kentucky; T. C. Stuart, Chickasaw Presbytery, Miss.; Daniel McNair, Brazos Presbytery, Texas; E. H. Rutherford, Presbytery of Central Mississippi; W. C. Matthews, Presbytery of Louisville, Ky.; James M. Brown, Presbytery of Greenbrier, Va.; W. D. Symington, Presbytery of Upper Missouri; Henry R. Tunstall, Presbytery of Muhlenburg; L. L. Warren, Kentucky; Abraham Wayland, Presbytery of Wyaconda; Robert Watts, Presbytery of Philadelphia; William Ballantyne, Rochester City; A. A. Mathes, Presbytery of Potosi; Thomas G. Murphy, Presbytery of Lewes; William M. Baker, Presbytery of Central Texas; S. B. Cheek, Presbytery of Transylvania; Stephen Lockwood, Buffalo City Presbytery; William H. Hornblower, Passaic Presbytery; Samuel Mahaffey, St. Clairsville Presbytery; J. H. Gillespie, Memphis; J. W. Hoyte, Tennessee; Henry M. Smith, New Orleans; H. H. Hopkins, Kentucky; James Hawthorn, Kentucky.

Rev. Dr. Thomas, from the Committee to answer the Protest of the Rev. Dr. Hodge and others, presented a report. The paper was adopted, and is as follows:

Answer to the Protests.

The Committee appointed to answer the protests of Dr. Hodge and others, respectfully present the following:

The action of the General Assembly, in reference to which these protests are offered, embraces two resolutions, against the former of which no objection is alleged. The whole stress of the protestation is directed upon the following sentence in the second resolution:—"*Resolved*, That this General Assembly, in the spirit of that Christian patriotism which the Scriptures enjoin, and which has always characterized this church, do hereby acknowledge and declare our obligation to promote and perpetuate, so far as in us lies, the integrity of these United States; and to strengthen, uphold, and encourage the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions under our noble Constitution; and to this Constitution, in all its provisions, requirements, and principles, we profess our unabated loyalty."

The first and main ground of protest against the adoption of this resolution is, that the General Assembly has no right to decide purely political questions; that the question whether the allegiance of American citizens is due primarily and emi-

nently to the State or to the Union, is purely political—of the gravest character—dependent upon constitutional theories and interpretations, respecting which various opinions prevail in different sections of our country; that the action of the Assembly virtually determines this vexed question; decides to what government the allegiance of Presbyterians, as citizens, is due; and makes that decision a term of communion.

That the action of the Assembly has political as well as moral bearings is readily admitted. So had the decision of our Divine Master, when he said to the Pharisees and Herodians, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," (Mark xii. 17,) a decision still binding upon all men, and underlying this very act of the Assembly. The payment of the required tax was both a moral and a political duty.

"There are occasions," says the author of an able article on the State of the Country in the January number of the *Princeton Review*—"There are occasions when *political* questions *rise into the sphere of morals and religion;* when the rule of political action is to be sought, not in considerations of state policy, but in the law of God. . . . . When the question to be decided turns on moral principles; when reason, conscience, and the religious sentiment are to be addressed, *it is the privilege and duty of all who have access in any way to the public ear* to endeavour to allay unholy feeling, and *to bring truth to bear* on the minds of their fellow-citizens." The General Assembly heartily approve these principles, and doubt not that if ever there was an occasion when political questions rose into the sphere of morals and religion, the present circumstances of our beloved country are of that character.

The protestants "deny the right of the General Assembly to decide to what government the allegiance of Presbyterians, as citizens, is due." Strictly speaking the Assembly has made no such decision. They have said nothing respecting the allegiance of the subjects of any foreign power; or that of the members of our mission churches in India, China, or elsewhere; who may hold connection with our denomination. The action complained of relates solely to American Presbyterians, citizens of these United States.

Even with regard to them, the Assembly has not determined, as between conflicting governments, to which our allegiance is due. We are the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America. Such is the distinctive name, ecclesiastical and legal, under which we have chosen to be known by our sister churches, and by the world. Our organization as a General Assembly was cotemporaneous with that of our Federal Government. In the seventy-four years of our existence, Presbyterians have known but one supreme government, one nationality, within our wide-spread territory. We know no other now. History tells of none. The Federal Government acknowledges none. No nation on earth recognizes the existence of two independent sovereignties within these United States. What Divine Providence may intend for us hereafter—what curse of rival and hostile sovereignties within this broad heritage of our fathers, we presume not to determine. Do these protestants, who so anxiously avoid political entanglements, desire the General Assembly to anticipate the dread decisions of impending battle, the action of our own government, the determination of foreign powers, and even the ultimate arbitration of Heaven? Would they have us recognize, as good Presbyterians, men whom our own Government, with the approval of Christendom, may soon execute as traitors? May not the highest court of our church, speaking as the interpreter of that holy law which says, "Ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake," Rom. xiii. 5, warn her communicants against "resisting the ordinance of God?" Rom. xiii. 2. In the language of the learned Reviewer above cited, "Is disunion morally right? Does it not involve a breach of faith, and a violation of the oaths by which that faith was confirmed? We believe, under existing circumstances, that it does, and, therefore, it is as dreadful a blow to the church as it is to the state. If a crime at all, it is one the heinousness of which can only be imperfectly estimated."

In the judgment of this Assembly, "this saying is true;" and, therefore, the admission, on the part of the Assembly, that Presbyterians may take up arms against the Federal Government, or aid and comfort its enemies, and yet be guilt-

less, would exhibit that "practical recognition of the right of secession," which, says the Reviewer, would "destroy our national life."

But we deny that this deliverance of the Assembly establishes any new term of communion. The terms of Christian fellowship are laid down in the word of God, and are embodied in our standards. It is competent to this court to interpret and apply the doctrines of the word; to warn men against prevailing sins, and to urge the performance of neglected duties. We regard the action against which these protests are levelled, simply as a faithful declaration by the Assembly, of Christian duty towards those in authority over us, which adds nothing to the terms of communion already recognized. Surely the idea of the obligation of loyalty to our Federal Government is no new thing to Presbyterians. And this is a sufficient reply, also, to the second article of this protest. Having established no new term of membership, this Assembly is not liable to the charge of having departed from the old paths.

A third ground of protest is the allegation that this action of the Assembly is uncalled for and unnecessary. Yet, on the admission of these protestants themselves, it is "a notorious fact" that many of our ministers and members believe themselves absolved from all obligations of loyalty to our National Government; believe, in contradiction to the Princeton Reviewer, that disunion is morally right; and some are already in arms to vindicate these opinions. What, when "a crime, the heinousness of which can only be imperfectly estimated"—"striking as dreadful a blow at the church as at the state," is already committed; when thousands of Presbyterians are likely to be seduced from their allegiance by the machinations of wicked men; when our national prosperity is overclouded, when every material interest is in jeopardy, and every spiritual energy paralyzed—when armed rebellion joins issue with armed authority on battle-fields where tens of thousands must perish—when it remains a question whether our national life survives the conflict, or whether our sun sets in anarchy and blood—is it uncalled for, unnecessary, for this Christian Assembly to renew, in the memories and hearts of a Christian people, re-

spect for the majesty of law, and a sense of the obligation of loyalty? Let posterity decide between us.

That this decision of the Assembly is unjust to a portion of our church not now fully represented in this body, is a fourth reason of protest. We need only reply that the roll of this Assembly shows delegates from Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas. All might have been as easily represented. Besides, this action has no local or sectional character; the subject is of national relations, as well as of such pressing urgency, that to have waited for a full Southern representation, in a future Assembly, would have been to lose for ever the critical moment when action would be productive of good.

As to the final ground of protest, it is enough to record our simple denial of the opinions expressed. We sincerely believe that this action of the General Assembly will increase the power of the church for good; securing, as we humbly trust it will, the favour of her exalted Head in behalf of those who testify for a suffering truth.

Signed, THOMAS E. THOMAS, JESSE L. WILLIAMS,
WILLIS LORD, N. EWING,
WILLIAM C. ANDERSON,

Committee.

It will be perceived that the prominent ground of protest against the action of the majority of the house, in this case, is the denial of the constitutional right of the Assembly, under the circumstances, to adopt Dr. Spring's resolutions. To understand the views of the protestants in this matter, it is necessary to remark that there are two theories which have been advanced as to the legitimate jurisdiction of the church. Two years since, at Indianapolis, the extreme doctrine was advocated that the power of the church is so purely spiritual, and its province so entirely limited to its own members, that it cannot lawfully recommend any voluntary society, however scriptural in its object or conduct, or express any judgment for or against any act of the civil government. On this ground, the right of the Assembly to recommend the Colonization Society was denied; and it was asserted that should the govern-

ment chose to reopen the African slave-trade, or to perpetrate any similar enormity, the church dare not open her lips. Great indignation was felt at the promulgation of a doctrine so inconsistent with the true mission of the church, and so diametrically opposed to past action of our General Assembly. The advocates of this new doctrine were the first to abandon it, when an emergency arose to put the principle to the test.

The doctrine of our church on this subject is, that the state has no authority in matters purely spiritual, and the church no authority in matters purely secular or civil. That their provinces in some cases overlie each other; that civil rights and religious duties may be involved in the same question, is indeed true. Slavery, for example, is a civil institution, and lies within the province of the state, and the state may, within the limits prescribed by the divine law, determine the extent of the master's power and of the slave's obligation to obedience. Nevertheless, the relative duties of masters and slaves, as prescribed in the word of God, it is the prerogative and duty of the church to teach, and as concerns her own members, to enforce. The same is true in a multitude of other cases. It may therefore often be a difficult question to decide where the power of the state ends, and where that of the church begins. Nevertheless the two institutions are distinct, and their respective duties are different. "Synods and councils," says our Confession of Faith, "are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical; and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary; or by way of advice for the satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate." Chap. 31, § 4.

The General Assembly last year passed a resolution, without a dissenting voice, in which, on the one hand, it disclaimed "all right to interfere in secular matters," and, on the other hand, asserted it to be "the right and duty of the church, as God's witness on earth, to bear testimony in favour of truth and holiness, and against all false doctrine and sin, wherever professed or committed." As this resolution was unanimously adopted, we ought to be of one mind as to the principle, however we may differ in its application. It is agreed that it is

the duty of the church to proclaim, and, within its own pale, to enforce the law of God. It is agreed that the divine law determines the relative duties of parents and children, of husbands and wives, of masters and slaves, of magistrates and people. It is agreed that loyalty to the government under which we live—submission to the higher powers, as ordained of God, is a moral duty; and therefore that the church is bound to teach that duty to all men, and to enforce its observance on its own members. So far there can be no difference of opinion.

But suppose there is a difference of conscientious conviction among the members of the church as to the government to which their allegiance is due, what is the province of the church in that case? This is a matter of frequent occurrence. In almost every country in Europe there have been numerous instances of disputed succession to the crown. The claims of the parties sometimes rest on questions of legitimacy; sometimes on the proper interpretation of treaties; sometimes on the view taken of the organic law. Is it the province of the church to decide these matters? Could the church have rightfully determined the points at issue between the houses of York and Lancaster in England, between Charles I. and the Parliament, between William III. and the adherents of the house of Stuart? Has the church the right to determine whether the abrogation of the Salic law in Spain, which regulated the descent of the crown in that country, was valid or not? No one, we presume, will answer any of these questions in the affirmative. But on the decision of the points therein involved depended the allegiance of the subject. While, therefore, the church was bound to inculcate in all these cases the duty of loyalty, the question to which claimant of the throne allegiance was due, was of necessity left to every man's conscience. The church, acting under the law of God, had no right to decide it. The Scriptures give no rule by which she can determine whether a child had been born before or after the marriage of its parents; whether the Constitution of England admitted of the overthrow of the royal authority, or its transfer to the house of Hanover, or not. When this country declared its independence of the crown of Great Britain, the Christians of England and Scotland, in good conscience, and it may be, with good reason,

regarded us as rebels. They deemed our armed opposition to the authority of the mother country a great crime. But neither the Church of England nor that of Scotland attempted to decide the question of allegiance. Neither of them issued mandates of loyalty to King George, or declared it to be obligatory on Christians in this country to do all that in them lies to strengthen, uphold, and encourage him in the exercise of the prerogatives of his crown. Had any such attempt been made, the American Presbyterians would doubtless have said that the church had exceeded its powers, that it was not her province to decide on the political questions at issue, that we must be allowed to determine those matters for ourselves on our responsibility to God.

All this seems to us undeniable. The application of this principle to the case before the Assembly, seems to us no less plain. It cannot be denied that two theories, as to the nature of our Constitution, have, from the beginning, more or less prevailed among the people. According to the one theory, our Union is a mere confederacy of sovereign States, from which any one or more of them may withdraw at pleasure. This is what is meant by the right of secession. According to the other, our Union constitutes us one nation, in such a sense that it can be lawfully dismembered only by common consent. The question is not, which of these theories is true. It is admitted that the people in the Northern States, almost with one voice, and the great majority in the South, cordially adopt the latter. Every Northern member of the late Assembly, and, with very few exceptions, every delegate present from Southern Presbyteries, regarded the doctrine of secession as a political heresy, destructive, in its practical operation, of our national life.

We need not say that such is our own personal conviction. We believe the course of the South, in its attempt to break up our glorious Union, is unreasonable, ungrateful, and wicked. We believe that the war in which the government is now engaged is entirely righteous, necessary for the preservation of our existence as a nation, and for the security of the rights, liberty, and well-being not only of this generation but of generations yet unborn. We believe that it is the duty of every man in these United States, to do all that in him lies "to

strengthen, sustain and encourage the Federal Government" in the conflict in which it is now engaged. Such is the conviction which we have not only avowed, but which we have done our best to justify and to impress upon the minds of others. But our private convictions have nothing to do with the rights of the General Assembly. Our Presbyterian brethren in South Carolina are as fully entitled to their convictions as to the true construction of the Federal Constitution as we are to ours. One or the other must be fearfully wrong, and fearfully guilty in the sight of God; but it is not the province of the General Assembly to decide between us. Two men may be contending for an estate. Each may be sincerely convinced of the justice of his claim. Each may think the other dishonest or rapacious. One or the other is in the wrong, but it is not the prerogative of a church-court to decide between them. During the Revolutionary war, some of the best men in this country conscientiously believed that their allegiance, notwithstanding the declaration of independence, was due to the crown of England; others thought differently. The one class were traitors, and the other rebels, in the estimation of the other class. Treason and rebellion are great crimes, and therefore they mutually regarded each other as great criminals. But was this a question for the church to decide? Presbyterians being all on one side in that struggle, were at liberty to declare their sentiments in Synod and elsewhere, as freely as they pleased. In the present case, however, Presbyterians are divided. And the Assembly had no more right to say to our brethren in South Carolina, your theory of the Constitution is wrong, and therefore you are rebels, than the Church of Scotland had a right to decide whether George I. or Charles Stuart was lawfully the king of England. Let it be remembered, that the moral question in all these cases depends on the political one. If the Jacobite theory of the English constitution was right, their allegiance was in fact due to the house of Stuart; if the whig doctrine was right, then they were rebels. In like manner, if the doctrine of secession is the true, then the Presbyterians in South Carolina are bound to renounce allegiance to the Federal Government. If it is wrong, they are in rebellion, and may, and ought to be treated accordingly by the state, but not by the church.

It must not be supposed that we hold that if a man thinks a thing be right, to him it is right; that a man's conscientious convictions are his rule of duty. The Bible teaches otherwise. Paul thought it right to persecute Christians, but he confessed himself therein, and therefor, to be the chief of sinners. Many men have conscientiously believed that they might innocently commit murder or theft. Such a plea would avail nothing at the bar either of the state or of the church. When the thing for which a man pleads the approbation of his conscience, is in itself sinful, and is so declared by the word of God, then his conscientious conviction does not free him from responsibility, either to the church or to the state. But when the thing is in its own nature indifferent, *so far as the church is concerned*, he may act according to his conscience.

The church can only exercise her power in enforcing the word of God, in approving what it commands, and condemning what it forbids. A man, in the exercise of his liberty as to things indifferent, may be justly amenable to the laws of the land; and he may incur great guilt in the sight of God, but he cannot be brought under the censure of the church.

Eating meat sacrificed to idols was, the apostle tells us, a matter of indifference. To eat it, however, under the circumstances in which the Corinthians were placed, was a sin not only against their brethren, but against Christ. He however expressly forbids the church interfering in the matter. To his own Master, in such cases, a man must stand or fall. Drinking wine, under some circumstances, may be a great sin, but it can never be made a ground of censure at the bar of the church. In like manner, an adherent of the Stuarts may have committed a great sin in refusing allegiance to the house of Hanover, and be justly punished by the state; but he could not be justly censured by the church. He might be a true Christian, and yet conscientiously believe that his loyalty was due to his exiled sovereign. Thus, too, a man who acts on the theory of secession, may be justly liable to the penalty of the civil law; he may be morally guilty in the sight of God; but he has committed no offence of which the church can take cognizance. We therefore are not inconsistent in asserting, 1. That secession is a ruinous political heresy. 2. That those

who act on that doctrine, and throw off allegiance to the Constitution and the Union, are guilty of a great crime; and, 3. That nevertheless they are not amenable in this matter to the church. The question whether they are morally guilty, depends on the question whether their theory of the constitution is right. If it is right, they are heroes; if it is wrong, they are wicked rebels. But whether that theory is right or wrong it is not the province of the church to decide.

This then is the first ground we assume in vindication of the protest. The General Assembly had no right to decide the political question, to what government the allegiance of Presbyterians as citizens is due, any more than the Church of Scotland had a right to decide between the rival claims of the houses of Stuart and Hanover. The next question is, Did the Assembly decide that point? This has been denied. It is said, in the answer to the protest, that the Assembly has "said nothing respecting the allegiance to any foreign power; or that of the members of our mission churches in India, China, or elsewhere. . . . The action complained of relates solely to American Presbyterians, citizens of these United States." This is perfectly true, and was taken for granted; and, therefore, the language of the protest was to be understood with that obvious limitation. The complaint was, that the Assembly decided the political question about which American Presbyterians are divided. But, "even with regard to them," continues the answer to the protest, "the Assembly has not determined, as between conflicting governments, to which our allegiance is due." This assertion is sustained by saying, "In the seventy-four years of our existence, we have known but one supreme government, one nationality within our wide-spread territory. We know no other now," &c.

That, however, is not the point. Is not South Carolina a government? Are not Georgia, Alabama, Virginia, commonwealths? These brethren do not presume to say that the Assembly did not decide the question, whether the allegiance of Presbyterians as citizens is due primarily to the several States to which they belong, or to the United States? The several States have constitutions, and laws, which their citizens are sworn to support and obey. They are recognized in the

Constitution and laws of the United States, by the Federal Government, and by all the nations of the earth. They are established, legitimate governments, to which allegiance, supreme or subordinate, is due. The answer, therefore, entirely ignores the real question in dispute. Its authors could not, of course, maintain that there was no difference of opinion among Presbyterians as to which of these governments, the State or Federal, they owe supreme allegiance. It is not correct, therefore, for them to say, that "the Assembly has not determined, as between conflicting governments, to which our allegiance is due." This is the very thing they did decide. The government of South Carolina is in conflict with the government of the United States; and the Assembly decided that Presbyterians in that State, and everywhere else in this country, are under obligations to strengthen, support, and encourage the Federal Government. If the public mind were not so excited, and, therefore, prone to misapprehension and injustice, it would not be necessary for us to say again that we agree with this decision of the Assembly; we only deny their right to make it. We fully believe that the allegiance of the American citizen is to the Union, anything in the constitution, laws, or ordinances of his particular State to the contrary notwithstanding, and consequently that those who, in obedience to their States, take up arms against the Union, are as much rebels as if they thus acted in obedience to a town council. Such is our conviction; but we have no right to call upon the Assembly to adopt our interpretation of the Constitution, nor to make that interpretation the ground of its official action. The advocates of Dr. Spring's resolutions themselves admit that the Assembly did assume and act on that interpretation. Dr. Wines, for example, says: "The Assembly claimed, unequivocally and emphatically, that the allegiance of the citizens of the United States is due to the Constitution of the United States, and to the government created by that Constitution, in all its constitutional functions." Exactly so; and as the Presbyterians of South Carolina emphatically deny that their allegiance is *now* due to the Constitution and the Federal Government, the Assembly has decided the question of contested allegiance—a question which we may safely challenge

any man in the world to prove that it had the right to decide. It is useless to discuss this matter any further. The main point in the debate, the very key of the whole position, was precisely this. The country is in a great conflict. The struggle between the two principles of State sovereignty and of national unity has been transferred from the Senate chamber to the camp. It is a struggle for life. The Assembly was called upon to pronounce judgment on one side or the other. While we concur in the judgment, we deny the right of the court to pronounce it.

The next prominent ground of the protest is, that the Assembly made allegiance to the Constitution and government a term of communion. By term of communion is not meant simply prescribed conditions of membership in a church. Anything which prevents a man otherwise qualified from being a communicant or minister in our church, becomes in his case a term of communion. The General Assembly has enacted that a foreign minister shall pass a probation of six months before he can be received into any of our Presbyteries. Such probation, therefore, is to that class of ministers a term of ministerial communion. Should the Assembly enact that no foreign minister should be thus received until he was naturalized, then naturalization would be a term of communion. Or, if the Assembly should ordain that any Presbytery which failed for two years in succession to be represented in that body, should be excluded from our church, it would practically cut off almost every Presbytery, with the churches under their care, established by us among the heathen. Or, if it should enjoin that every minister who did not at least once in two or three years attend the Presbytery to which he belongs, should have his name stricken from the roll, that would be a condition of membership with which few of our foreign missionaries could comply. The only question then is, have we any members or ministers who are so situated that they cannot remain connected with a church which professes its obligation to strengthen, sustain, and encourage the Federal Government in the present conflict? This is a mere question of fact. Many of our Southern brethren told us that they were so situated. They said their lives would not be safe, should they remain in the church after such a declaration.

It would be regarded as treason in the States in which they lived. They therefore implored the Assembly not to drive them out of the church in which they had been born, whose unity they had laboured to preserve, and for which they had already been called to suffer so much. To all men in such circumstances, the act of the Assembly became *practically*, as the protest asserts, a term of communion. In order to continue in the church, such men must renounce their charges, give up their fields of labour, and return to some State still loyal to the Union. Who gave the Assembly the right to attach this new condition to their remaining in our church? They have all the qualifications which our book, or the word of God prescribes; what right had we to demand anything more? To force out of our church some of our best and most devoted ministers, by passing certain resolutions on a subject which a decided majority of the Assembly had declared ought not to be touched, seems to us an act of cruelty as well as of injustice.

It has, however, been said that the report of the majority of the compromise committee, for which most of the signers of the protest voted, is liable to the same objections. Surprise has been expressed that those who voted for the one report should protest against the adoption of the other, since they are substantially the same. There is, however, an essential difference between them. The one says, "*The members of this Assembly* declare their obligation" to maintain the Constitution, &c. The other says, "*This General Assembly* does acknowledge and declare," &c. The members of Congress may pass what resolutions they please, but for Congress to do it is a different affair. The members of the Assembly were willing enough to profess their own loyalty to the Federal Government, but they denied the right of the Assembly, speaking in the name of the Presbyterians of South Carolina and Georgia, to make that profession. This difference is perfectly plain, and was instantly perceived. It was said the Assembly might as well adjourn, and its members meet in the basement, as a convention, and pass the resolutions under debate. This was not what was wanted. It was the Assembly, as the organ of the church, and of the whole church, that was called upon to take sides, in the name of the church, with the general Government, against

the doctrine of secession and its consequences. In thus doing, they have rendered it impossible for some of our ministers and members to remain in the church. They have, therefore, practically made loyalty to the Federal Government a term of communion. If it is not a condition of salvation, the church has no right to make it a condition of membership in Christ's church. And therefore the protest.

Another ground of protest was, that the action of the Assembly in this matter was unnecessary. This we believe was the deliberate conviction of two-thirds of the members of the house. Many who deemed the introduction of the subject eminently unwise, when it was introduced felt constrained to vote for the resolutions. This was done by some, avowedly on the ground that the people demanded it. This consideration was urged with frequency and zeal. We were told that thousands would desert our standard, if we refused as an Assembly to take sides in the conflict which was rending the country. This fear of what the public would say and do, was openly appealed to in order to control the action of the house. Others, again, felt that they would be disloyal to vote against resolutions which affirmed allegiance to the Constitution and the Government. Thus Dr. Wines, for example, who had voted repeatedly to get rid of the subject, when the final vote came, sided with the majority. Others say, that to refuse to adopt the resolutions, when they had been once introduced, would have compromised the character of the Assembly. Still they all deprecated the discussion. The general feeling obviously was, that the wisest course for the Assembly, in the present state of the country, and in the absence of nearly one-third of the delegates, was quietly to attend to the necessary routine of business, and to adjourn. So strong was this feeling, that when Dr. Spring introduced his motion for a mere committee of inquiry, it was laid on the table immediately, by a vote of 122 to 102; although, by so doing, the danger of offence and misconstruction was encountered. If we ask ourselves what good could be reasonably expected from the passage of the resolutions, it will be hard to find a satisfactory answer. They were not required to excite the patriotism of the country. The country was already thoroughly aroused. It no more needed the action of our Assembly, than

a tornado needed to be assisted by a pair of bellows, or a prairie fire by a lucifer match. It was not required to strengthen the Government. Its whole tendency was to weaken the Government, and to sever the remaining bonds of the Union. The enemies of the country exulted over the passage of those resolutions. They saw in them a new source of exasperation between the North and the South, and a new blow given to our staggering Constitution. The evils likely to flow from the action of the Assembly can hardly be estimated. It is the first time, in the history of our church, that it has succumbed to pressure from without. It has lost the prestige acquired by its oft repeated opposition to popular excitement. No man present in the Assembly can doubt, that if the members had felt free to act in obedience to their own convictions, they would have avoided any action on the state of the country. This is apparent, as just stated, by their laying Dr. Spring's resolution for a committee on the table, which was felt to be apparently discourteous to a venerable man, as well as liable to misconstruction. But after that was done, the Assembly was assailed by outsiders, by letters, and telegrams, threatening or foretelling the indignation of the people; and then the house receded from the position which it had assumed. This was a defeat of the house by a power outside of itself, and may justly be regarded as a great humiliation. It is not, however, only in this concession to popular excitement that the evil consists. Who can estimate the lamentable consequences to the church, the country, and to the cause of truth and of religion, should the Old-school Presbyterian Church, so long regarded by friends and foes as the great bulwark of sound doctrine and of ordered liberty in our land, be dismembered. Its power for good depends in no small degree upon its nationality. Neither part can ever become, separately, what the two are conjoined. The one controls and modifies the other. The friends of religion and of conservative principles, in other denominations, were praying for the sake of the country and of the cause of Christ, that our church might not be divided, while we had not an enemy in the land which did not long for that consummation, and rejoice in the passage of Dr. Spring's resolutions. Papers

under the control of our New-school brethren, could not repress their joy that our time for separation and disaster had come. However, the Lord reigns, and it becomes us to submit. We were bound to resist a measure which we deemed wrong in principle, and disastrous in its consequences; but having done our duty we shall hope for the best. Although the action of the Assembly may force some of our brethren to leave us, we are far from thinking that it justifies a general withdrawal of the Southern churches. Nothing but necessity, or the preservation of a good conscience, can justify before God any thing so serious as the division of the church. An unjustifiable or unnecessary division is the crime of schism, from which we pray God we may be delivered.

Conclusion.

The length to which this article has been protracted forbids our dwelling on other topics of interest. The Rev. Dr. Krebs, of New York, was elected Professor of Theology in the Theological Seminary at Chicago; and the Rev. Dr. Moffat, of the College of New Jersey, was chosen Professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary at Princeton. A resolution was unanimously adopted, acknowledging the ability, courtesy, and fairness with which John C. Backus, D. D., had discharged the duties of Moderator, under peculiarly trying circumstances. Dr. Backus delivered a touching and appropriate farewell address; and the Assembly finally adjourned, having directed the next Assembly to meet in May next, at Columbus, Ohio.

SHORT NOTICES.

Sermons by the late Rev. William Bouton Weed, Pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society of Norwalk, Connecticut. Published by order of said Society, for the benefit of his family. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1861.

The discourses of Mr. Weed, gathered in this volume, are of a high order. Their prominent characteristics are, 1. Great richness in divine or scriptural truth in its various aspects, doctrinal, casuistical, experimental; and in the exposition, defence, and application thereof, so that they are peculiarly profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness. The type of doctrine which predominates in this volume, harmonizes with the opening sentence of the first sermon: "When the Westminster Assembly of divines were engaged in preparing that Catechism, which, so long as the distinctive doctrines of revelation are held in honour, must, we think, be regarded as the best and most perfect digest of them that ever was made or ever can be." Not only so. He defends this system of doctrines against the philosophical and popular objections with which they were vehemently assailed, during the period, and in the region, of his public life and ministry. The specious assaults of Pelagianism he repels with great force and ingenuity; and with the frequency and earnestness of one who was often obliged to encounter and exercise them. These sermons also betray the workings of a mind trained in the plausible superficialities of the New Divinity, but boldly struggling out of them into the deeper channels of evangelical truth, in obedience to the demands of faith and reason, experience and logic. Hence his arguments have a living freshness and force, such as we look for in vain from those who are strangers to such struggles, and have had no living contact with such errors. While this is so, it is proper to add, that on two or three points he had not worked himself through to what we Presbyterians judge needful for the full apprehension and most efficient maintenance of the Calvinistic scheme. We refer to imputation, the dependence of moral acts, states, and dispositions, on their nature and not on their origin, for their good or ill desert; and the kind of interdependence which exists between the will and the affections. In regard to this last, he reaches the same solution as Chal-

mers. He denies to the will an immediate control of the affections, while he asserts for it a mediate power over them, through the intellect, by directing its attention to those views and objects which are fitted to elicit right affections. This state of mind is extremely common among those, in New England especially, who have been led to thread their way out of the entanglements of the New Divinity towards the Augustinian system.

Another noteworthy feature of these discourses, is the united vigour, density, and clearness, of the thoughts presented in them. They are seldom more than thirty-five or forty minutes in length, yet the amount of solid and instructive matter which they contain is very great. At the same time they are as clear as crystal. They exhibit that highest intellectual quality of sermons, whereby they are level alike to the strongest and weakest hearers.

But the great feature of these sermons, which gave them their peculiar power when spoken, and gives them peculiar power now, is the affluence, originality, beauty, and force, of the illustrations with which they are aglow—with which the dryest reasonings are brightened, the most abstract truths turned into concrete realities, the invisible made visible, and the spiritual incarnated into sensible and breathing forms. To this purpose a powerful imagination turns vast stores of knowledge, acquired by large reading, and preserved by a prodigious memory. This, in connection with the qualities already noted, especially his burning zeal, which fired his affections, his imagination, his logical powers, indeed his whole soul, and body too, and consumed him in his prime, gave him extraordinary power as a preacher. This originality and fertility of illustration, combined with depth and energy of thought, render the volume eminently suggestive and quickening, not merely to private Christians, but to ministers. It is rare that any volume of sermons is given to the public which is more full, not only of thought, but of the seeds of thought.

The Hartford Ordination. Letters of Rev. Dr. Hawes, Spring, and Vermilye, and Rev. Messrs. Childs and Parker. Republished from the *New York Observer;* with Notes and a Review; to which is added a Statement of the Manchester case. Second edition. Hartford, Connecticut: Alexander Calhoun & Co. 1860.

The revelations contained in this pamphlet in regard to certain doctrinal manifestations in Connecticut, are startling. They are presented with decided ability and candour by the author, Rev. Mr. Childs, pastor of the Presbyterian church in Hartford, Connecticut. We are glad that a production so well

worthy the attention of the public has reached a second edition. It is impossible to give an outline of its contents without going beyond the limits of a short book notice. We had prepared a regular article in review of it, but it has been excluded for the present, for lack of room.

Memoir of the Rev. Jacob J. Janeway, D. D. By Thomas L. Janeway, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1861.

This is a worthy memorial, by the hand of filial love and veneration, for one who, through a ministerial life of some sixty years, was, (with the exception of a brief interval of membership in another communion,) one of the chief pillars and ornaments of our church. Beginning when the Presbyterian church in the United States numbered less than three hundred congregations, with the pastorate of a congregation second to none in our connection as to position, intelligence, wealth, activity, and influence, he held his charge for some thirty years with constantly increasing acceptance, influence, and success. Called away from this post, by the unanimous voice of the church, to the chair of Theology in the Western Seminary, which unexpected providences led him speedily to resign, his subsequent life was mainly spent in devotion to the great interests of the church, in connection with her Boards, Colleges, and Theological Seminaries. Of many of these, he was an official and leading guardian, and to them he devoted his time, his benefactions, and his prayers. Possessing an ample fortune, he was frugal, that he might have means to bestow in charity. He was a faithful and able defender of orthodox doctrine. Firm, wise, prudent, studious, liberal, valiant for the truth, he was more than all remarkable for his devotional spirit and eminent Christian experience, the faithful portraiture of which constitutes the value and the charm of this volume.

Adam and his Times. By John M. Lowrie, D. D , Author of "Esther and her Times." Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Fort Wayne, Indiana. Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1861.

In the volume which preceded this, and which, in title, character, and style, bears a strong analogy to it, the author won a place among sound, readable, and edifying writers. The topics of this are the facts pertaining to the "first man," as a private and as a representative person, as acting for himself and for his posterity; together with their manifold relations to sin and redemption, to this world and the next. These, and matters affiliated with them, are treated from an orthodox and evangelical stand-point, and with a force and vivacity that render the book interesting as well as instructive.

Discourses on Sacramental Occasions. By Ichabod S. Spencer, D. D., Author of "A Pastor's Sketches," etc. With an Introduction by Gardiner Spring, D. D. New York. Published by M. W. Dodd. 1851.

The two volumes of "Pastor's Sketches," published by Dr. Spencer during his life, and the two volumes of his sermons published shortly after his death, have established his reputation as a Christian author. Few religious writers have commanded a wider circle of readers in so brief a period. Notwithstanding the proverbial danger of setting sermons in dead type, which exercised a mighty mastery when spoken by the living voice, Dr. Spencer's published discourses have successfully endured this ordeal. They embody those sterling qualities of evangelical truth and unction, of robust, massive thought, of vigorous and elegant diction, which render them both instructive and eloquent to reader as well as hearer.

This volume of sacramental discourses, although subject to the disadvantage of posthumous publication, has the advantage, nevertheless, of being composed of sermons out of which it was the author's design to make a selection for the press. It has the further advantage of a unity of theme amidst a large variety of related topics. This one theme is Christ and him crucified, as visibly set forth in the signs and seals of his body and blood. The volume is rich in what pertains to the person and offices of our Saviour, the manifold applications of his grace to the need of man, and the increase of that grace in the souls of believers through the due participation of the Lord's Supper. This ordinance, too often undervalued by Christians, needs to be more and more lifted up in their affections, and their mode of observing it. All works tending to magnify it render a valuable service to true religion.

The Rock. With an Introduction, by the Rev. Henry A. Boardman, D. D. Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union. Pp. 364.

The title of this book is so indefinite as not to give a precise idea of his object. It is not inappropriate; for it is a rock, or rather, it sets before us the Rock on which our hopes must be founded. It gives us, says Dr. Boardman, "that information respecting the Bible, the necessity of a revelation, its evidences, the canon of Scripture and its paramount authority, which every reflecting person desires to have." It exhibits also the nature of true religion, and the difficulties, duties, and privileges of the believer, with great ability and force. The writer tells us he "has been engaged for nearly fifty years in the religious instruction of young persons in Sunday-schools, and for nearly three-fourths of that time has had charge of one or two weekly

Bible-classes of young ladies." This is training of which few men can boast. It is therefore only what we might expect from an able man, after such an experience, that he should produce a book which perhaps no other man could write.

The Teacher Taught: An humble attempt to make the Path of the Sunday-School Teacher Straight and Plain. Philadelphia: American Sunday-School Union. Pp. 446.

The Teacher Teaching: A Practical View of the Relations and Duties of the Sunday-School Teacher. By the author of "The Teacher Taught." Philadelphia: American Sunday-School Union. Pp. 371.

These are new and improved editions of works of established reputation.

The Works of Francis Bacon, &c. Boston: Brown & Taggard. 1861. Vol. I. Pp. 537.

We have repeatedly called the attention of our readers to this complete and elegant edition of the works of Lord Bacon. The present issue, while it forms the sixth volume in the order of publication, is Vol. I. of the entire series, and the first volume of the Philosophical Works. It contains a history of this new edition; Dr. Rawley's Life of Bacon; a General Preface to his Philosophical Works, by Robert Leslie Ellis; a Preface to the Novum Organum, by the same author; and the first and second books of the Organum itself. The price of each volume is one dollar and a half.

Sermons preached in Trinity Chapel, Brighton, by the late Rev. Frederic W. Robertson, M. A., the Incumbent. Third Series. Third American from the Fourth London edition. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1859.

The number of editions through which these discourses had passed in Britain and America some two years since, evinces a kind of power in them, which gives them popularity and currency. We learn that admirers of them are not wanting, even among evangelical Christians in this country, who are doing their utmost to circulate them. This has led us to examine the only volume of them that has come to hand. We find in them unmistakeable evidence of intellectual force, culture, and brilliancy. Many subjects are ably treated, and many things well said, particularly in regard to the moral virtues, and upon things related to Christian piety, rather than directly upon that piety itself, in what, in our view, constitutes the marrow and essence thereof. Experimental piety the author obviously understood very imperfectly himself, and, of course, gives a very unsatisfactory exposition of it to his readers. But the book has qualities which are well fitted to

charm those who like adventurous thought neatly expressed on religious subjects, but are either sceptical, or indifferent, or undiscriminating, in regard to the fundamental truths of Christianity. Faith in these doctrines will be very likely to be shaken, in the case of those who really understand and follow the author. All this will be none the less so, because he professes to maintain and reclaim their real life and power, while repudiating those statements and representations of them to which all branches of the church have clung. We consider this patronizing attitude toward the fundamentals of the Christian religion, on the part of those who are really subverting them, one of the most insidious and dangerous kinds of attack. An extract or two will illustrate our meaning.

"In Christ, Humanity was the perfect type of Deity; and therefore Christ's absolution was always the exact measure and counterpart of God's forgiveness. Herein lies the deep truth of the doctrine of His eternal priesthood—the Eternal Son, *the Humanity of the Being of God, the ever Human Mind of God.*" P. 123.

He vindicates priestly absolution in this wise. "The priest proclaims forgiveness authoritatively, as the organ of the congregation, as the voice of the Church, in the name of man and God. For human nature represents God. The Church represents what human nature is, and ought to be. The minister represents the Church. *He speaks, therefore, in the name of our Godlike human nature.* He declares a divine fact; he does not create it. . . . . He specializes what is universal; as, in baptism, he *seals the universal Sonship on the individual by name, saying, 'The Sonship with which Christ has redeemed all men, I hereby proclaim for this child.'*" P. 124.

"Our expectations resting on revelation deceive us." P. 133.

"We have heard of the doctrine of 'imputed righteousness;' it is a theological expression to which meanings foolish enough are sometimes attributed, but it contains a very deep truth which it shall be our endeavour to elicit." "Christ is the realized idea of our humanity. He is God's idea of man completed. There is every difference between the ideal and the actual—between what a man aims to be and what he is; a difference between the race as it is, and the race as it existed in God's creative idea when he pronounced it very good. In Christ, therefore, God beholds humanity; in Christ he sees perfected every one in whom Christ's spirit exists in germ. . . . To the Infinite Eye, who sees in the perfect One the type and assurance of that which shall be, this dwindled humanity of ours is divine and glorious. Such are we in the sight of God

the Father as is the very Son of God Himself. This is what theologians—at least the wisest of them—meant by 'imputed righteousness.' . . . Gazing on that perfect Life, we, as it were, say 'That is my religion, that is my righteousness—what I want to be.'" Pp. 148—152.

This rationalized ritualism, or ritualized rationalism, manifests its clear and undubitable affinity with the new Oxford school, which we have before brought to the notice of our readers, and which has already begun to convulse the Anglican church.

Geschichte der Assyrier und Iranier vom 13ten bis zum 5ten Jahrhundert vor Christus. Von Jakob Kruger. *History of the Assyrians and Iranians from the 13th to the 5th century before Christ.* By Jacob Kruger. Frankfort, A. M. H. L. Brönner. Pp. 525.

An attempt to combine the results of recent antiquarian research among the cuneiform monuments and those of reading in Persian literature, with the information contained in Hebrew Scripture touching the Assyrian kingdom and the ancient Iranian people. The plan of the work is suggestive of interesting inquiry. In his preface the author presents some curious facts respecting the relations of the oriental to occidental civilization, and what the latter owes to the former. He then gives an account of the geography of the field of his work and of the sources whence he draws. These latter are of three classes; one consisting of Scripture, the religious records of Iran and the classical accounts; the second of old Persian poetical legends, and especially the Shah-nameh of Firdusi; and the third of the cuneiform inscriptions. He proceeds to treat of the chronology under five heads, as that of the sacred chronology of Persia; the historical chronology of Persia, comparing it with that of the Chinese and of the Egyptians; thirdly, the chronology of the Assyrians, drawing from Herodotus, from the division of the old and new Assyrian empire, from comparison of the Assyrian royal lists with the Persian chronology, and from the *data* of the cuneiform inscriptions; fourthly, in a tabular view of his conclusions, he reduces all to terms of the Christian era; and fifthly, he adduces, for the sake of comparison, the chronology of the Hebrews.

The second book narrates, or rather treats of the history of the Assyrian empire under the heads of three periods. First is that in which the imperial power predominated, extending from 1244 to 1117 B. C. The second is that in which the power of the local lords predominated—a kind of feudality—from 1117 to 945 B. C. And the third period is that wherein

the two powers were balanced over against one another, and which continued from 945 to 725 B. C.

In his third book the author gives the history of the West Asiatic States from the disruption of the Assyrian and Iranian kingdoms until the fall of the feudality, under Cyrus. This he divides into two periods; first, the life and death struggle between Assyria and Iran, under the leadership of the Medes, which terminated in the victory of the latter, and the fall of Nineveh, which event he puts at 606 B. C.; and secondly, that of the restoration of the Iranian monarchical power, and the subjugation of Western Asia under the family of the Achæmenidæ, and closes in the reign of Darius Hystaspis.

Much light has been thrown upon the subject from the cuneiform inscriptions as combined with the information of Scripture and the labours of minute scholarship among the remains of ancient Greek; but we are constrained to say that very little historical value can be attached to the more recent literature of Persia. The author's use of the Shah-nameh goes further to evince his own scholarship than to establish or enlarge the number of his facts.

Philosophia Ultima. Charles Woodruff Shields. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1861.

No person competently trained in questions of philosophy as related to theology, can fail to detect in these pages the evidences of a philosophic capacity, insight, and culture, quite extraordinary in a young pastor. The volume, which we judge to be introductory and tentative, with reference to the fulfilment of the "project of the ultimate philosophy," foreshadowed in the "prolegomena" at the end, is characterized by depth and acuteness of thought, along with a classical terseness and elegance of style. Indeed, we think that the insight and comprehension of the subject, shown in the outline given at the close of the volume, are quite remarkable. We do not share the enthusiasm of the author as to all the sublime achievements he expects to reach in his *ultima philosophia.* Neither do we subscribe to every philosophical position he advances. But in perfect consistency with this, we are free to pronounce this a production to which none but the fewest are equal, in its manifestation of philosophic, rhetorical, and esthetic power; and full of promise as to the author's future.

TERMS FOR 1861.

THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW is published quarterly, in January, April, July and October, at THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

1. Subscribers for one copy, who remit THREE DOLLARS *in advance*, to the office of publication, will be entitled to payment of postage on all numbers issued after the receipt of the money.

2. Subscribers who remit FIVE DOLLARS *in advance*, to the office of publication, will be entitled to one copy for two years, postage paid.

3. Six or more persons uniting in a club, and remitting *in one sum* to the office of publication at the rate of TWO DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS each, will be entitled to payment of postage on the numbers issued after the receipt of the money. Payment at club-rate will not be received from a less number than six subscribers in one association. If payment is delayed by members of a club until after the expiration of the year, the full price of THREE DOLLARS will invariably be charged.

4. Theological Students, Missionaries, Young Men's Christian Associations, &c., are furnished with the Review, at TWO DOLLARS per year; or $2.25 by mail, postage paid.

5. All arrearages are charged at THREE DOLLARS per year.

The above are the only terms upon which the Review is furnished to subscribers in the United States or British possessions.

Bills of all solvent banks in the United States or British Provinces received in payment, and may be sent by mail at the risk of the publisher; but those who send are requested to keep a memorandum of the contents and date of their letter till they receive a receipt. Those who act as agents, or remit in large amounts, are requested to procure a check or draft. Subscribers in Canada may send their orders and money to the Rev. A. KENNEDY, London, Canada West; and those in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island, to the Rev. WM. ELDER, St. Stephen, New Brunswick.

PETER WALKER,
821 *Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.*

☞ It is a standing rule of the Office to send the Repertory to those subscribers who do not give notice of discontinuance by the first day of January. And even when due notice is given, the work will not be discontinued, till all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the Publisher.

☞ NOTICES *of Removal or of Discontinuance must be sent direct to the office of publication,* 821 *Chestnut st., Philadelphia.*