



THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1863.

No. III.

ART. I.—*The Inspired Theory of Prayer.*

AS one of the evidences that Christianity, even when most purely conceived as a supernatural power, is preëminently rational, we may reckon the freedom of Christ and the apostles, especially the apostle Paul, in speaking of the manner of its operation. It thus appears that our rational exercises are usefully employed, not only under the influence of saving grace, but upon the work of grace itself. Accordingly, the church has presumed that a just speculative view of the doctrine of justification by faith will promote the saving exercise of faith; and that a definite and rational doctrine drawn out from what the Scriptures teach concerning the atonement of Christ, will be used by the Holy Spirit to help us in receiving and applying the atonement itself. The benefit of the sacraments is undoubtedly increased by a just and reasonable view of the manner of their operation. From the apostle's great pains to give, in 1 Cor. xv., the theory of the resurrection, we might presume that a well-formed philosophical doctrine on that subject, adjusted to the apostle's outline, would help the practical influence of the scriptural view on the mind and heart of the church. In like manner, we may hope that a rational expansion of the suggestions of the Scriptures, and particularly

of St. Paul in Romans viii. 26, 27, on the theory of prayer, will help to sustain the interest of the people of God in their devotions, and to make their prayer more fervent and effectual. Respecting prayer there is a doctrine to be understood, as well as a duty to be done.

The outline of the apostle on this subject is very brief, but very suggestive. "The Spirit helpeth our infirmities [in prayer], for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints, according to the will of God." The view will be unfolded in a natural way by explaining the infirmity of Christians in prayer; the office of the Spirit as a help to this infirmity; the manner in which the help is given; and the relation of this work of the Spirit, both to the conscious desires of the suppliant, and the course of Providence in the world.

In the first place, this divine provision of help for the people of God presupposes their own infirmity. It assumes that men without this aid are not able to maintain their vital communion with God, particularly in the form of direct supplication. This infirmity is not alone the general infirmity of man considered as a sinner by nature, and without supernatural grace. It is not alone the natural and total indisposition and inability for any mental exercise, which can receive the approval and blessing of God. It is the remaining and necessary infirmity of the spiritual man in his earthly state, without minute and infallible foresight of the course of providence, which proceeds without variableness or shadow of turning. He knoweth not what he should pray for as he ought, in order that his prayer may coincide with the preëstablished course of providence, which will reveal the will of God.

The apostacy of man from God, by the first transgression, broke up the living communion between them, and introduced an enmity which maintains the separation, and hinders the proposed reconciliation. The opposition of the natural man to all good is overcome by degrees in this life, and only imperfectly to the last. As grace advances, the man becomes less averse to communion with God, and more reconciled to a habit

of prayer; his prayers improve in their spiritual character, and have a growing power in promoting the kingdom of Christ. In this whole course of improvement, from the first, the man is the subject of this gracious operation by which the Spirit helps the infirmity of the children of God in prayer.

Now in order that the believer might be fully qualified, in and of himself, to maintain the perfect kind of prayer which shall be a uniform condition of progress in the work of God, he would need to know perfectly the nature and measure of his own sin, and all the best means of removing it by the appointed degrees, in all the circumstances of his life. He must also know the exact nature and all the varying phases of all the evil in the world; and the best way of overcoming it, by a course of moral discipline with nations and with individuals, that will reveal the manifold wisdom of God. In other words, he must have an exact and ever-present knowledge of the plan of God in detail, and of the stages of its execution; and thus be able to anticipate in prayer each step in the course of providence by which that part of the redeeming work is to be accomplished. This knowledge man does not possess by nature, nor does the Christian acquire it by the Spirit which enlightens and renews him. By this infirmity of knowledge the Christian knows not what he should pray for as he ought.

As this is called an infirmity by the apostle, and treated as a defect to be supplied by a special provision, it must disqualify for perfect prayer. It does not totally disqualify for useful exercises of devotion, or for asking good from the Lord agreeably, in some respects, to his will, and therefore with benefit to ourselves; for if it did, there could be no acceptable prayer in the world. But it disables us for asking those things which it would be fit and proper, suitable to the established order of things, that we should pray for. We are unable to ask so as to coincide, in all respects, with his plan of operation. Yet in order to the perfect effect of prayer, we certainly must ask only for those things which are agreeable to the eternal foreordination of God. No other things than those can ever occur; and prayer that is offered for any other things cannot be specifically answered. On this account it is that the help of the Spirit is needed, and on this account it is given. It is

necessary that prayer, which is certainly appointed, and always to be reckoned as one of the guiding conditions of the works of God, should harmonize with the chain of causes which mark the inflexible line of the divine operation in the world.

On account of this infirmity, there cannot be, without the aid of the Spirit, any efficacious prayer among men. Leaving out of view the other defects, even of Christian people, which vitiate all their intercourse with God, and their prayers perhaps most of all, it would be enough to destroy all good effect of prayer, if they were without this spiritual intercession, and should not know what to pray for as they ought. Even an occasional blind coincidence with the coming event, would argue no influence of the prayer in producing the event. And besides this, the language of the apostle implies, that in order to the virtue of any prayer, there must be, in some mind connected with the prayer, an intelligent apprehension of the things which God has provided to bestow; and this apprehension the human suppliant does not possess. The apostle presupposes that the law of the spiritual kingdom requires this knowledge as the condition of all effectual prayer. He thus not only suggests, in the strongest possible way, the utter inability of the natural man to offer any effectual prayer to God; but also teaches that Christians themselves have not the necessary knowledge. The man is unable to specify the particular thing which it may be the will of God to bestow; and must therefore feel that when he asks a particular favour he cannot know, by the result, whether his prayer is effectual or not.

This infirmity is revealed and recognised in many ways. There are those who have stronger presentiments respecting the uniformity of the divine operations in nature, than they have respecting the office and power of prayer in the kingdom of grace; and among these there is great difficulty in maintaining either a theoretical belief or a practical trust in the utility of prayer. In such minds the natural speech of reason is, He is of one mind, who can turn him? and what profit shall we have if we pray unto him? Such thoughts are, in themselves, impious; but they are a confession that ignorance of the divine will concerning future events would be fatal to all prayer among men, were it not for the intercession of the

Spirit. All Christians, moreover, even those who most firmly believe in the duty and the value of prayer, are more or less troubled with speculative difficulties about relying on answers to specific petitions; and there is among all such a restless desire to discover, if possible, the law by which this reliance may be sustained and regulated. Hence some insist that, according to the Saviour's promise, Christians receive every thing they pray for, when they *believe* that they will receive it. And this being assumed, it follows, and Christians are sometimes exhorted accordingly, that the reason for so much ineffectual prayer is the want of this particular belief that the precise thing asked for will be given. Such exhortation, if followed, leads to the unprofitable endeavour to obtain an assured faith respecting the particular things suggested as the special matters for prayer. In general, however, the exhortation has no other effect than to make some unhappy because they have not this faith, and others perhaps fancy that they have it. It is all an attempt, however, to avoid the acknowledged difficulty arising from the fact that we know not what we should pray for as we ought, and is one of the ways in which this want of knowledge is vaguely recognised. The infirmity is acknowledged, also, in the universal admission, not only that most of the special petitions of Christians are not granted in form, but that most of the utility of prayer is really found in benefits not answering to the petitions, yet bestowed in consequence of them; as in the case of the apostle Paul, whose prayer for the removal of his affliction obtained not the removal of the evil, but the grace sufficient to bear it. And it amounts to an impressive confession of this infirmity, that all Christians, not so much from any remembrance of the revealed theory of prayer, as from a present sense of their weakness in such intercourse with God, confess their dependence on the present and special help of the Spirit in teaching them how to pray. In these and other ways, it appears that the infirmity of Christians in prayer, in the sense and extent we have ascribed to it above, is everywhere and always recognised in the consciousness of the church.

This is a radical and fatal defect. It has its foundation in the sinful nature of man. To see this in strong light, consider

how an analogous infirmity would impair the other forms of earthly life. The beasts of the field and the fowls of the air have unerring discernment in selecting what their Maker has provided for their nourishment and comfort. Each species or individual judges for itself of the quality and quantity of its supply, amidst the immense variety and abundance to which it has access. Nature is its guide. The ox does not crop the wormwood and the ivy, nor too much of the nutritious grass. The brutes have all their supports, and their means of development and happiness, among the objects of sense; and they need no supernatural help for any infirmity of their instinct, to ensure their safety or their progress towards their chief end. But should their instinct fail them, and they not know what they should seek for as they ought, how quickly must they perish! Man is a spiritual being. With all that is animal and earthly in his present constitution, he is still in his essence a spirit. He lives in the spiritual sphere, and is formed and required to receive all his supplies, for body and soul, through living intercourse with his Maker, and with the spiritual world. His intercourse with earthly things, even as means of bodily support and comfort, is to be considered by him as intercourse with God. It is to be entirely conducted with a devout recognition of the divine presence. It must be mixed with faith and prayer. The changes which he produces in earthly things, he must ascribe to God in him and in them. His obedience to the laws of nature in the world, he must reckon as obedience to God. He is taught by special revelation to recognise the invisible spirits of heaven as agents to minister to his security and happiness, and invisible wicked spirits as dangerous to his life and peace. All his earthly life has this heavenly connection, is to be promoted in all its interests by spiritual means, and directed to spiritual ends. He thus lives as to body and soul in the spiritual sphere. He is not to commit himself for guidance to the animal instinct alone, like the brute, but also to the rational and moral instinct of his spiritual nature. Had man followed the rational and moral guide within him, in his primitive state, he would have obeyed the true law of his life, and gained its chief ends, the glory and the blessedness of God. We can imagine, by the help of analogy, somewhat of

the manner of his life in such a course of perfect obedience. His living functions would all have proceeded in the spontaneous way, without resistance from any tendencies introduced by sin. He would have needed neither impulse nor guidance from without. His action would have been prompted and directed by the law of his inward life, under the regular and regulating course of divine providence. The law would have been written in his heart. He would have been a law unto himself. His natural desires would have uniformly agreed with the will of God, as given in the course of providence; and those desires would have been his continual asking for things agreeable to that will; and his unvarying coöperation with God in thought, in feeling, and action, in procuring the gratification of his desires, would have been the form of his prayer. It might take place without any other knowledge except that acquired by experience of the ways of God. He might be unerringly directed by his natural instinct as a spiritual being, in all matters pertaining as well to his spiritual sphere, as to the earthly department of his existence. His mode of life in his sphere would thus be analogous to that of other creatures in theirs. He would no more desire what would not promote his highest good, than the ox would hunger for the poisonous herb. His appetite for his appointed spiritual nourishment, and for the wholesome and nutritious food and drink provided for the use of his body, would be as healthful and as trustworthy as the instincts of the lower orders of life in their spheres amidst the objects of sense. That would have been his perfect life. In receiving from the fulness in store for him in God, how freely and with what discerning instinct would his pure and healthful desires have taken precisely what had been designated, by the eternal purpose, for their satisfaction! How perfectly would they have seemed to know what they should seek for as they ought!

But how mournful does the sin of man appear, when we consider how it has quenched the inward light which would have revealed to him the will of God in every particular respecting himself, and enabled him, at every point, to see the way to his highest good. This was a great defection, perhaps the chief one, in the apostacy of man. He lost communion with God. The light of his soul went out in darkness. This beaming

feature of the divine image in him was utterly effaced. He could no more be a law unto himself. He could no longer be trusted to guide his own way through life, amidst the order which God had established in the world. His very heart is deceived and deceitful in seeking his welfare; and in his blind endeavour to find the way of life, he must ask and receive not, because he asks amiss. The mass of Christian people, even of the better standing, may not be accustomed to dwell in humiliating reflection on this general infirmity, as they do on hatred, envy, covetousness, and similar evils of the grosser kind. But viewed thus as a fatal loss of standing in communion with God, as a state of utter blindness and helplessness in choosing for ourselves among things supposed to be possible in the course of providence with us, this failing must be regarded as our chief infirmity, if not the sum and substance of all our sin. What could be worse for the brute than a vitiated instinct, with which he could not distinguish his proper food from poison? One thing only could be worse; and that would be the *perverted* instinct which rejects the wholesome food and chooses the poison. And this is the failing of fallen man. He chooses evil rather than good.

When the Spirit of grace takes possession of this fallen creature, the infirmity we speak of has begun to be supplied. The intercession of the Spirit is then begun. But the Christian himself, even as a Christian, with all the enlightening and sanctifying influence which constitutes him a child of God, has not the infirmity removed. He still knows not what he should pray for as he ought. He is so ignorant of his own spiritual state, and knows so little of the legitimate effects of providential events upon his experience and character, that the more minutely he should attempt to specify the things he would ask for himself, the more would he fail to ask for things agreeable to the will of God. He knows so little of the real condition of his fellow-men around him, and so much less of all others in the world whom he must pray for, that his particular petitions for all men must be extremely random and inappropriate. Scarcely can such prayer fall short of presumption. It must be in some sense, and according to its persistency, a grief and a resistance to the Spirit. It is not, therefore, to the natural

man alone that this infirmity in prayer belongs; but the spiritual man, in his earthly condition, must carry it with him to the end of his earthly life. So the apostle's words imply. He speaks of it not as belonging to any one stage of our earthly course, but as a characteristic of all Christians in this world. "We know not what we should pray for as we ought," and the Spirit helpeth our infirmities. It is very important to our understanding of the apostle's view of this whole subject, that we clearly conceive this infirmity as not merely a defect of our carnal nature, but as belonging to the earthly childhood of our spiritual man. It is also one which our growth in grace does not overcome; and which, like the mortality of the regenerate body, will be removed only by the sudden and perfect development of our last change.

We should add, that it justly appears to the Christian as partaking of the nature of sin. It belongs to that state of our moral being from which we hope to be delivered. The spiritual mind feels it as a blemish, acknowledges it as such, and endures it not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope. The child of God would consider it a great evil to have such an infirmity for ever, and never to know what is for his true health and happiness. He is taught by the Holy Ghost, as by a spiritual instinct, to hope for that higher kind of communion in heaven, in which his resources in God will be sought and applied with a perfect and delightful intelligence, and with the happiest results to his eternal well-being.

In the second place, we notice the office of the Spirit as a help to this infirmity. While the apostle recognises the universal and grievous infirmity of the people of God, he also assumes, with equal decision, that there must be an inward and strict conformity of the new creature to the whole redeeming operation of God—a conformity that is manifest to God, and accepted as prayer for things agreeable to his will. The infirmity must be provided for. The deficiency must be supplied. The creature cannot adapt his own prayer to the divine scheme. Yet there must be adapted prayer. The Spirit, therefore, must produce it. He is not to give the man the knowledge of the things, for that would be virtually the gift of prophecy. In thus speaking of prayer as produced in the

spiritual mind without knowledge of the thing prayed for, the apostle uses the words prayer and intercession in a very broad sense, to denote the whole mental posture of expectation and desire,—the whole presentiment of the new creature, conscious and unconscious, in agreement with the work of God in the world. This presentiment in reference to particular facts of the future, is what the creature cannot originate in himself; and if he could, and thus have conscious knowledge of coming events, he would obtain what the Father hath chosen to keep in his own power. But the prayer must exist; and the Spirit, who does the things, and who has them eternally in his mind, with a knowledge perfectly vivid and accurate, takes, in the new creature, that previsive and expectant posture which the apostle describes by his terms “maketh intercession.” This constitutes the mysterious and effectual substitute for our knowing what we should pray for.

There are two Greek words in the New Testament which are translated by the word *help*. One has the leading sense of coöperation, the other that of doing for another a deed in which he can bear no part, particularly in relieving distress. The distinction may not hold, in full, in every case, but is still very clearly noticeable in the current use of the words. Thus, for instance, (Luke x. 40,) Martha uses the former, in her request to the Saviour, “Bid my sister that she help me;” and (Phil. iv. 3,) where Paul entreats a friend to “help those women who laboured with him;” while, (Matt. xv. 25,) the woman of Canaan, worshipping him, and saying, “Lord, help me,” uses the latter. The former word is the one by which the apostle signifies the help of the Spirit in prayer. It is here, and in the passage in Luke, compounded with two prepositions; elsewhere with one. It expresses coöperation; and suggests that those only have this help in prayer, who are praying themselves. This is a practical consideration of the utmost importance, to prevent the apostle’s idea of the Spirit’s intercession from being taken as occasion for neglecting the formal exercise of prayer. It is, then, to be noted as one part of the intercessory office of the Holy Spirit, that he is a helper. He prays “together with” the saints. It is not a separate exercise that he performs within them, disconnected

from any exercise or corresponding endeavour of their own. But first moving them to call on the Lord, and thus placing their own powers in suitable coincidence with his work, he takes *their* petitions as *his* occasions; and, though his own personal state of holy aim and tendency in them must be conceived as perpetual and always the same, agreeably with his divine nature, yet his occasions for available activity in their behalf, are their own devotional frames. He is thus our helper in prayer, by blending his petitions with ours. This is not the place to explain in full the relation of his prayer to our own. But it belongs here to state, that the office of the Spirit, as signified by the apostle's word, is that of a true and proper fellow-helper; taking hold with us upon the throne of grace, and giving to the breathings of our pious and earnest, but blind desire, the efficacious quality of his intelligent and pure intercession.

Another aspect of the office in which the Spirit helpeth our infirmity in prayer, appears in his being our spirit of prayer. It is one of the common petitions of Christians that the Lord would give the spirit of prayer. They mostly mean by this the disposition to pray, and the fervent mind in prayer. But the Scripture doctrine concerning prayer would teach them to add this idea of the apostle, which would soon become the chief one in their thoughts; namely, that the Spirit in the saints prays for them in his own way; and that for us to have the spirit of prayer, in Paul's sense, is to have our minds so controlled by the Holy Spirit, and their motions so swallowed up in his, that we shall pray only in his thoughts and words, and with his pure affection. But this cannot be done by voluntary effort in that direction. It must come by growth in grace. And to do this perfectly is what no Christian attains in this life. Such a complete absorption by the Holy Spirit is reserved for the heavenly state. But here it is permitted and required in the earthly measure. We are exhorted to pray *in* the Spirit. Pray in the Holy Ghost. This office of the Holy Ghost, as the spirit of prayer in the church, is always to be recognised, when we pray. His function as the spirit of prayer is not all fulfilled by giving us a devotional frame, and awakening the fervent desire; nor by teaching us to pray, and giving specific direction to our

petitions. The most availing, may we not say the *only* availing part of his help for us, is his own prayer, which, of course, is the only part of the complex exercise that is perfectly according to the will of God.

The office of the Spirit in helping the prayers of the saints, is that of an intercessor. He maketh intercession for them. The scriptural idea of an intercessor, in its most general import, is that of an advocate; one who appears for others to plead their cause, or render them encouragement and aid by using his influence in their favour. There are two Greek words used in the New Testament, in speaking of the Saviour's manner of using his influence in the invisible world for his people yet on earth. Both these words have the sense of advocacy; and both are applied to the work of the Holy Ghost in that sense. Thus one is used of Christ, Heb. vii. 25, and is translated, "to make intercession." The idea is explained, Heb. ix. 24, by the words, "to appear in the presence of God for us." This is the word applied, in the passage before us, to the Holy Ghost, who is spoken of as helping the prayers of the saints. The other word is used in 1 John ii. 1, where we are said to have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous. The same apostle in his gospel, (John xiv. 16,) reports Christ as applying the term to the Holy Spirit, calling him the Comforter (or Advocate) whom the Father would send to the disciples after their Lord's departure. The personal office of the Holy Spirit as an intercessor, however distinguished from that of Christ, is plainly denoted in Scripture by the same terms, and must be regarded as one and the same efficient operation. We have here, therefore, one of the many cases in which the same things done by one of the three persons of the Godhead are ascribed to another. The helping of the prayers of the saints is indeed an inward work, done in the soul; and the Holy Ghost is the divine person most commonly thought and spoken of as dwelling in us for the purpose of applying the redemption purchased by Christ. But the three persons are inseparable, and alike omnipresent; and according to Christ's own declaration, all dwell personally in the saints. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, and the Spirit of the Father; and both work through him. The Holy Spirit is the efficient per-

son of the Godhead. Christ is the medium or mediator. The invisible and original source or ground of both, is the Father, whom no man hath seen nor can see. All are everywhere present together; each existing and acting according to his own personal distinctions and prerogatives. Thus, in the intercession for the saints, the Father determines and directs, the Son mediates, the Spirit performs. This glorious and merciful work of intercession is effected by the Holy Spirit, through the mediation of Christ; and both execute their office in obedience to the will of the Father. The church, therefore, sees the help of God for her infirmities in prayer, to be the intercession of the Spirit, because the Spirit effects it; the intercession of Christ, because Christ mediates and conveys the Spirit for that purpose; and she may view it as the intercession of the Father himself, in this sense, that the Father determines and directs it. This explains the idea of the Holy Spirit as an intercessor. The view does not confound the office and work of the Spirit with those of Christ. It preserves the mysterious distinction of the personal offices after the scriptural manner, and brings out to view the valuable instruction which the apostle would convey. The intercession of the Spirit is Christ's intercession, as the Spirit himself is Christ's Spirit. In whatever other ways Christ may be conceived as interceding for his people, besides thus helping their prayers, in those ways also the Holy Spirit must be conceived as performing his efficient part.

The office of advocate, held by the Holy Ghost and by Christ himself, may be considered as concentrating several of its various functions in this intercession for the saints. The two words distinguished above, have some senses in common; one being more comprehensive than the other. The general office of advocate is not confined to the one operation of helping our infirmities in prayer. The Saviour represented himself as an advocate in behalf of his disciples, when he spoke to them of *another* advocate, [comforter,] whom the Father would send them after his departure. Yet Christ fulfilled his office for them, not alone by supplementing their knowledge in prayer, but in their defence before rulers, and indeed in all their Christian exercises and labours. So the Holy Spirit, whose

greatly enlivened operation in their hearts would be their inward evidence of Christ's own continued presence with them, would be his efficient power in them, according to their need in all respects. He would take of all that was Christ's and show it unto them. But all the Christian endowments contribute to the propriety and efficacy of prayer, and it was natural to take this comprehensive exercise of the direct communion of the soul with God, as an instance of the Spirit's advocacy, in which all the departments of the important office were concentrated.

In the third place, we consider the manner in which this divine office is fulfilled. The apostle designates our matters for this head, by his three phrases, *καθὸ δεῖ, κατὰ Θεὸν, and στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις*. The first two are nearly related, but are sufficiently distinct to be separately considered.

The infirmity that calls for the help of the Spirit is, that we know not what we should pray for *καθὸ δεῖ, as we ought*; according to what is fit and proper in relation to the course of providence, or the divine plan and order of operation. Our firmest belief in the efficacy of prayer, must not involve the presumption that our prayers interrupt the established course of providence, or change the divine, eternal plan of operation. We should learn to bear this always in mind, whenever we think of the nature and office of prayer in the kingdom of God. Here is a reason why the substance of all prayer to God should contain the sentiment, *Thy will be done*. We believe all events to be predetermined. We therefore owe it to our doctrinal consistency, and our comfort in prayer, that we should endeavour, when we pray, to obtain the clearest possible view of our position in prayer in relation to the known fact of a divine, eternal purpose, and fore-ordination of every event. We must pray for things which it is agreeable to the will of God to bestow. These things are all predetermined and anticipated in the established order of the world. That we may have the benefit of coöperating with God by prayer for the accomplishment of his will, the prayer must embrace the thing which God has appointed. But these we cannot know without the gift of prophecy. Either, then, the prayer must be ineffectual, or contain some virtue of knowledge which we ourselves are not conscious of. This virtue of knowledge is

actually present; so that the requisite conformity to the decree of God is effected. And this is one part of the manner in which the Spirit intercedes. He gives to the prayer the virtue of an intelligent accordance with what is fit, and agreeable to the course of the divine operation. His intercession is also in such a manner as befits ourselves. It helps us at a weak point. How utterly profitless must be our prayer without this precious accession. The help of the Spirit is the only property of the believer's prayers which makes them available; the only part that is acceptable to God. So prominent is this plea of the Spirit, that the Father testifies his respect for it, in passing by the spoken petitions, all the requests which we think, and feel, and utter, to those deeper yearnings of the Spirit, which are not uttered so much as into conscious thought and affection; yearnings which the Father sees as the searcher of hearts, and as knowing what is the mind of the Spirit. These deep and silent groanings, or yearnings of the Spirit, are exactly suitable to our infirmities and our wants. They are perfectly pure, free from all worldly taint, and even from the imperfection of our carnal nature, which begins to corrupt all the workings of the Spirit, the instant they come into vital and active combination with our conscious motions of thought and affection. How suitable to our all-pervading sinfulness, which belongs to every thing merely natural in us, that the Spirit should *so* apply his help for our infirmities, as to leave it distinguishable, by the eye of God, from our own infirm and worthless petitions; that it may still be known and unreservedly honoured as the mind of the Spirit, entitled to prevail for its own intrinsic worthiness; that, when our random requests, born so often and so largely as they are of carnal blood, have been all put out of the account, and set aside as they deserve, there may be enough left in us to form abundant ground of acceptance with God;—nay, that the whole ground is left, on which we ever prevail with God in prayer. As the righteousness of Christ in general so comes into the view of God, that it alone is taken into account, and yet so keeps itself pure from the taint of our sins, that it appears to the eye of God in its original, unblemished glory;—so this particular part of that righteousness which comes in the place of our infirmities in

prayer, exactly answers to those infirmities; supplying precisely what we ourselves should have, if we knew what we should pray for "*as we ought.*" It is just the help meet for us in the case. And further, the working of the Spirit befits us as engaged in the exercise of prayer. The advocate here becomes properly intercessor. When we ask, he also appears and asks for us. How becoming the title, The Spirit of Prayer. The Holy Ghost in us, teaches, reproves, comforts, strengthens, sanctifies; but he also prays. He does not merely work in us responsively, in some sort, to our supplications, by imparting the general benefits of redemption, but he conforms his working to the posture of supplication itself. And this is an admonition to us, that as we value the Spirit's intercession for ourselves, our friends, and a dying world, we shall be much in prayer ourselves, as our true way of employing the prevailing intercession of the Spirit in behalf of those great interests. In all these particulars, and many more which might be mentioned, the help of the Spirit may be seen to be *καθὸ δεῖ.*

It is also *κατὰ Θεὸν*; expressed in our version by "according to the will of God." The meaning of this phrase, by any possible interpretation, must indeed *include* the sense given in our version. And from the point of view from which the translators probably contemplated this intercession of the Spirit, that sense would naturally appear the leading and even the only one. But the view taken by most commentators of the secret and unexpressed intercession of the Spirit, seems to allow the presumption that, if the apostle intended thus to limit the meaning, he would have used the full phrase, *κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ* as in Gal. i. 4. And the scriptural use of the similar phrases, *κατὰ σάρκα*, *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, as in Rom viii. 4; *κατὰ Χριστόν*, as in Rom xv. 5, and Col. iii. 8; especially *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*, after the manner of man, Rom. iii. 5; and the same phrase *κατὰ Θεὸν*, 1 Peter iv. 6, afford ample grammatical authority for giving the words the broader sense, "after the manner of God." What is thus done after the manner of God, will be, of course, agreeable to his will. The intercession of the Spirit would thus be described as purely a divine operation, not a prayer of our own, corrected by the Spirit. Although taking place in us, it does not partake of any human charac-

teristics, as seen and approved of God. The only righteousness in us which God approves, is the righteousness of Christ. The only prayer in us, which prevails with God, is the intercession of the Spirit of Christ. The intercession of the Spirit must appear to the Father by itself, with only those characteristics of prayer which are truly divine. It would not otherwise fill the place appointed for prayer in the kingdom of God, and answer its ends. So far as it partakes of the attributes of our fallen humanity, it becomes imperfect. And this imperfection we always acknowledge. We recognise it as belonging to every prayer we offer as our own. The confession is true and proper. And we may always justly add, that if the Lord were strict to mark the imperfection of our prayers, he would not regard them. With the view now before us, we may say he *is* thus strict, and does not regard them. For we here see that there is a purely divine intercession in us, which, however closely united with our own motion, is still distinct from it, and is actually distinguished by the Searcher of hearts. It is strictly "the mind of the Spirit." God knows it as such, and considers and estimates it by itself. He approves it. This is even involved in his knowing it. He knoweth the mind of the Spirit, as he knoweth the way of the righteous. And thus we should remember, that the only element in our prayer which he thus approves, and therefore the only efficacious element, is that which is *κατὰ Θεόν*, and not *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*. The interceding office of the Spirit in the saints is thus conducted in a manner entirely divine.

The other characteristic given by the apostle to the Spirit's intercession, is designated by the words *στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις*—"with groanings that cannot be uttered." There is strong proof in this whole chapter that the special inspiration of the apostle gave him an insight into the spiritual constitution of the kingdom of God, without moving him to construct a complete philosophical view of that kingdom as a whole. He sees the whole creation pervaded by the omnipresent Spirit, as a living power. His conception is that of an organic whole, with redeemed man for its head, being moved throughout, by that same Spirit which dwells in the saints, with a silent, unconscious, imperceptible, and inexpressible yearning towards

the manifestation of the sons of God, *i. e.*, the resurrection glory of our body, in which our salvation is consummated. The life of the whole system is to have its perfection in the glorified life of the saints. To that it ministers with the harmony and unity of a living system, (ver. 28.) The one Spirit in the whole creation makes it one organism, as the one Spirit in the saints and Christ makes them all one body. Now this Spirit in the saints tends, with longing and hope, towards their complete glorification. It also communicates the same tendency to all parts of the creation, which it fills with its presence and power. But no where else is that tendency joined with such a rational and conscious activity of the creature as in man. Here is to be found the character of the inexpressible groanings in the saints. They are nothing audible; no vehement feeling; not attended by sensible agitation. They are unexpressed, not because too strong for expression, but because they are not brought forth to the conscious exercise of any of the faculties of expression. They are not uttered within, to the conscious knowledge of the suppliant himself. The Holy Spirit breathes them, or cherishes them as his own feeling or aim; a yearning towards the fulfilment of the divine will; and he is so dwelling in the heart of the saint, as to impart the yearning to the spirit of the man, yet without causing it to come up to a verbal expression, or to thought, or definite, conscious desire. The expression is hindered, it may be, by tendencies of the human nature not yet reconciled to the Spirit's motion. The faculties do not yet "move in swift obedience" to the divine impulse in the inner man. The expression might come if the man were thoroughly spiritual in his frames of mind. At least it might be given as object of knowledge and of specific desire. Or, on the other hand, there may be items in the Spirit's views which, from their nature, are incommunicable to the human mind in its earthly state. There are "things of the Spirit of God" which the spirit of man *cannot* know—which cannot be imparted to it by the Divine Spirit as matters of knowledge; and some of these, perhaps all of them, connected as they are with the work of God and the nature and progress of his kingdom, have more or less to do with the efficacy of prayer; while, from their nature,

they cannot be given as matters for the human understanding, and for the specific desires of the heart. Such things must remain unexpressed through the human faculties, for want of the proper adaptation of the faculties to conceive and utter them; and yet these all may have a living connection with the course of the Lord's work, and with the welfare of the individual believer. A part of these inward yearnings are towards things of which there is no personal and conscious discernment or knowledge, and therefore the yearnings may not be themselves revealed in any of the conscious exercises of the soul, but exist only as tendencies, unperceived in themselves, but by no means inoperative in the innermost man, as the groans of the unconscious world, while possessing immense dynamic value, receive no conscious recognition by the "creature."

The groanings are thus not such as can be suitably designated by that term. Yearnings they more properly are; but even these are commonly conceived as states of conscious life. Tendencies have scarcely enough of intense activity for the apostle's idea; and yet there seems to be great felicity in Olshausen's conceiving an analogy between these groanings and the yearning for perfection in a plant; where the impulse towards glorification appears in the motion of the vegetable organs to obtain and appropriate the light on which the blossom and the fruit depend. If they should be called presentiments, joined with desire, the inspired idea would seem to be answered in full. Only we should not by any means conceive them as consciously entertained by the soul in ordinary cases.

These deep yearnings of the inner man, not only unspoken, but unthought and unfelt, are the availing property of the Christian's prayer. It is not necessary for its efficacy that the mind of the Spirit should find its way into the thoughts and the speech of the suppliant; neither, as we have said, is it possible. The acceptable state of the soul in the effectual prayer consists very largely of those profound and silent aspirations which do not open into the field of human observation. They are known only by the Searcher of hearts. They express not so much the intensity as the depth of that spiritual motion which is really at the bottom of all the prayers of the saints. They are the intercession of the Spirit, according to the will of God

performed in obedience to his direction—after a divine, and not a human manner, and for things which God has provided for his people. He helpeth our infirmities.

In the fourth place, it remains to consider how this intercession of the Spirit is connected with the prayers of the saints and with the course of providence in the world.

This can be ascertained from the Scriptures only. The whole subject is a secret of the spiritual world. It cannot be discovered or explained by observation or experience. It is not revealed by any of our conscious exercises. The apostle treats it as a part of the hidden process of that kingdom which cometh not by observation; revealed only by the Spirit of the Lord to the apostles, and to be received by faith. In the heart of the saint it is known only to the Searcher of hearts. It is the mind of the Spirit. That is the mind of God, and God only knows it. Only from the Scriptures do we learn that the Spirit intercedes at all; and from the same source alone do we learn how the Spirit's intercession is connected with the conscious supplications of the believer.

The intercession of the Spirit and the intercession of Christ stand in one and the same connection with the believer's prayers. The two kinds of intercession differ from one another as two parts of one whole. Whatever the Spirit does in the believer, he does as the Spirit of Christ. He is Christ's agent in it all. There is a *mediating* part of the operation which remains peculiar to Christ. Without this mediation the Holy Spirit could do nothing. Without this mediation the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father at all. Christ mediates the Spirit's intercession. He is the middle person through whom the Spirit works. The work is therefore as properly the work of each, as of either. It is Christ's work in one respect, and the Spirit's in another. The mediating part of the intercession is Christ's. He is the responsible superintendent through whom it is done. Then there is the *efficient* part of the operation which remains peculiar to the Spirit. Christ is said to intercede at the right hand of God, to show that he stands first as the representative of divine authority and power; that as the power proceeds from the Father to work in men, it passes first to the person of Christ; and then, through him,

into the person of the Holy Spirit, and in him, into efficient operation, in and for the believer. Nothing of all this is to be understood as transacted in space and time. The Son, as Son, proceeds eternally from the Father; the Spirit proceeds eternally from Father and Son. In other words, the whole being of God is an omnipresent Spirit of living power, in which the three persons are eternally to be distinguished; and all the three have their part in every divine work. The intercession of Christ and that of the Spirit are parts of one and the same work, and therefore both are vitally connected with the believer's prayer.

The Spirit's intercession may be viewed as prompting the prayer of the saints. It is a most inspiring and encouraging thought, that the intercessory motions of the Spirit are the source of all our disposition to pray. We know that the Holy Spirit is the author of all desire for spiritual good in men, and therefore of all disposition to ask for it. The intercession of the Spirit may therefore be considered as lying at the bottom of the believer's own prayer, and as being expressed in that prayer, so far as the believer prays "in the Spirit." These motions of the Spirit, if we may call them motions, are the eternal and unchangeable state of the mind of the Spirit with reference to the work of God. The new creature in Christ is formed by this indwelling of the Spirit in the natural man; and of course this indwelling Spirit retains there all this perpetual motion, tendency, or yearning in the direction of the work of God. This we described above as what the apostle signified by "groanings that cannot be uttered." This tendency of the Spirit is always in the believer, and therefore the believer has always in himself a motion prompting him to pray. If he should "pray always and not faint," he would be obeying always the leading of the Spirit. It is possible for us to "pray always in the Spirit," because the Spirit is always praying in us. Even when the infirmity of the flesh, or necessary occupation, or the love of the world, prevents the actual form of prayer, the Spirit still retains his own yearning, and would impart it if not hindered by the insusceptible state of the preoccupied mind. The more the Christian falls in with this constant tendency of the Spirit, the more he adorns the

doctrine of Christ concerning prayer, and the more he walks worthy of his vocation. This motion of the Spirit prompting him always towards prayer, is one of the ways in which the calling of God is expressed to his heart. When the life of the Christian is not duly pervaded by the Spirit of prayer, he is in a state of contention against his inward intercessor. He "restrains prayer" which the Spirit in his heart would move him to offer. Whenever he is moved to pray, the motion of the Spirit is the cause. The prompting may be partly by knowledge of this doctrine of the Spirit of prayer; and hence the utility of knowing this precious truth as we are trying to teach it; but it may also be something like the unconscious presentiment, which a person may express concerning a future event, without knowing what or why he speaks. But the prompting commonly takes place without bringing forth in the suppliant any presentiment of the things agreeable to the will of God; leaving the thought and words of the prayer to the natural idiosyncrasy, or to the suggestion of circumstances, for want of a readier coincidence, or a proper reconciliation of the whole man with the work of the Spirit within him. The uttered prayer thus becomes an index, not of the mind of the interceding Spirit, but only of the fact of his prompting to prayer.

We further notice here a fact of great practical importance in relation to the connection of the Spirit's intercession with the prayers of the saints, that the intercession does not avail except when the person prays himself. It is, therefore, in the first place, no encouragement for any to neglect the offering of their own supplications unto God. If any one is not moved enough by the Spirit to address the Lord in prayer in any form, he derives no benefit from any interceding motions of the Spirit within him. The spiritual influence in that case is wholly lost upon him. It is as when a sinner is moved by the Spirit towards any religious duty which he entirely neglects. He receives no saving benefit from the operation of the Spirit upon him. In the second place, the refusing to direct the desires of the heart to God in some devout and reverential way, is a quenching and grieving of the Spirit, and is a great sin, extremely dangerous to the spiritual welfare. This view reflects a heinous aspect on the sinful state of those who live

under the administration of grace, without prayer. It is a state of active contention against God. This shows, moreover, that the connection between the Spirit's intercession takes place in the living principle of both the divine and the human person. It avails for the man only when it blends itself with his own life, and shows itself in his outward acts in some degree. Though that intercession alone is effectual for the saints, yet, if they do not so far accept it as to yield to its influence in prayer for themselves, they receive no good. The Spirit of prayer in the church is a part of the life of Christ which we receive; and unless the individual accepts it, and yields himself in willing obedience to its power, it will not avail for him. Every one who earnestly prays to God, may have the consoling assurance that the Spirit is interceding for him. But one who offers no prayer, can have no such assurance. Even though he has the Spirit in his heart, and striving there to lead him to prayer, as he strives in all under the gospel to lead them to repentance, yet, by his own perverse resistance, the Spirit of prayer is grieved, as the Spirit of repentance is grieved in other cases, and his benefits are forfeited and lost. No one can say that his own prayers are unnecessary, because in themselves ineffectual, or because they can add nothing to the efficacy of the intercession of the Spirit, or for any other reason. The Spirit *helpeth* us in prayer. If we do not pray, he does not help us. We have always cause to repent and condemn ourselves, that our prayers are not more obedient to the silent dictates of the Spirit in the heart. When, however, we so far yield to his influence, as to engage our own faculties in prayer, in good faith and earnest, then we have his effectual help. But if we so utterly repress the heavenly intercessor, that his influence does not reveal itself through the superincumbent weight of worldliness and unbelief, and produces no thought or feeling of devout supplication in us, we have no benefit of his prayer. The prayerless soul under the gospel light is condemned for resisting the Spirit. Its state is worse than that of a heathen, to whom such Christian, new covenant influence is never imparted.

Again, the intercession of the Spirit, while thus vitally connected with our own prayer, though not itself recognised in

the conscious experience, is nevertheless a ground of assurance as to the efficacy of prayer. The fact of the intercession is known only by revelation. Whenever we feel a disposition to pray, we may know that this disposition is from the Holy Spirit. And we are taught by the apostle, that besides giving this disposition, the Spirit "helpeth" by an intercession of his own. And knowing all this, though we know not how far our particular supplications may be indited by the Spirit, we still have a ground of assurance proportionate to the sincerity and submission of our prayer. The special matter of our petitions may be very little affected by the Spirit, though the disposition to pray is wholly from him. Believing the fact, we trust upon it as the real and only evidence of our acceptance with God. What we lack in perfect conformity to the will of God in prayer, we make up by humble and thankful reliance on the Spirit's own prayer for us. So in all other respects; wherever we feel ourselves wanting in what is good, we rely on the righteousness of Christ, applied to our use by his Spirit. Wherever we perceive anything good in ourselves, we ascribe it to Christ. It is the work of his Spirit in us. Though not conscious of *his* prayer, we are conscious of the great imperfection of our own, and may find welcome relief in trusting by faith on his gracious intercession for us, where our own failure is so deeply felt.

From our present point of view, we can observe that the intercession of the Spirit is related to the Christian's own prayers, as the perfect principle of life in general is to the actual, imperfect phenomena. The Spirit of God in the Christian dwells deep in the heart. His control of the Christian's action is effected by working on the innermost principles of his being. His help in prayer, therefore, is not a superficial work. It is not a suggestion of words, or even of thoughts. It is not an awakening of desire. It is a diffusion, through the innermost being of the man, of that pure and perfect power of life whose tendencies or motions perfectly agree with the ideal work of God in his kingdom. From this new life, the life of the Spirit itself, arise the desires, the thoughts, the words of actual prayer. As it dwells in the heart, it is perfect. The apostle signifies this by describing it as according to the will

of God, or after the divine manner. He signifies it even more strongly, by describing its motions as "groanings that cannot be uttered"—too high for the faculties of expression in imperfect men. If, now, as it works outwardly through the human faculties, it met no obstruction or disturbance, it would make the frame and expression of the Christian's prayer throughout according to the will of God, because conformed entirely to the mind of the Spirit, so far as a finite mind can be. But the mind of the Spirit, in coming forth into the forms of devout thought, and feeling, and expression, meets the various imperfections of our fallen nature, the obliquities of thought, the perversities of feeling, the infirmities of expression, which render only an imperfect report of the divine thought and operation within. We notice here the usual disagreement between the perfect motions of life within and the actual phenomena of the life. We know not how to preserve our life and health as we ought. There is great disagreement between the inward vital motions which proceed immediately from the creating and preserving power, and those voluntary motions of the man, put forth with the conscious desire to preserve and strengthen the living powers, and to accomplish their purposes in the world. Were the delicate springs of any man's life subject to the immediate impulse of his voluntary action, they would be rudely disturbed, and soon entirely interrupted. But his living motions rise continually from a power within, of which he has no conscious knowledge, and no immediate control. The original vital impulse of our being lies beyond the range of our voluntary agency. And that primitive impulse, as it comes from its divine source, is perfect. But in working outward into the experience and the character of the man, it encounters resistance from imperfect organization and various disturbing forces arising from the circumstances of its operation. While the original living power in the man, considered as the power of the new creation, tends to produce the perfect human formation of mind and body, its actual production falls far short of its true standard, "the glory of God." In human society also, so little do the members know of the laws of true prosperity, and so liable are they to break the laws they do know, that if their social welfare were wholly subjected to their conscious

and voluntary agency, they would soon bring their system to a stand. But there is a current of life in society, infinitely better than the speculation or the practice of the members. From this arises the conscious desire of improvement in the members, and their aspiring activity. All their progress is but a growing conformity to the primitive impulse of the inward social principle of human life. While they know not how to guide their social course as they ought, and work oftener against their well-being than for it, the inward spirit helpeth their infirmities—maintains the radical vitality of their system, and gives it a primary and incipient impulse, according to the will of God. These, also, are a species of groanings which cannot be uttered; the deep, silent yearnings of the indwelling Spirit in the social heart of man, which the articulating organs of the system have not yet the configuration to express. All earthly life, indeed, is constructed and administered in this way. There is no actual development of plant, tree, animal, or man, according to the idea of the perfect form. The principle of life, as it proceeds from the Creator, is perfect. But its development is so disturbed by adverse forces that, as a general rule, in all the kingdoms of earthly life, certainly in the human in every case, it falls short of perfection.

The intercession of the Spirit may also be considered in its connection with the course of Divine providence. We are not taught that God answers prayer by interrupting or disturbing the established laws of his providence. If prayer interfered with the appointed course of nature, it would destroy its stability altogether. For if, as the Bible teaches us to expect, the acts of God will yet all be done from respect to the prayers of the saints, the order of the world would be entirely subverted. The confidence of men in the laws of providence would be wholly overthrown. We are not to presume that effectual prayer introduces a new condition of things, and changes the divine course. With God, there is nothing new. His plan had, from the beginning, a place for every thing, and every thing in its place.

The intercession of the Spirit takes its place in the system of the world by its connection with infinite intelligence. The virtue of the Spirit's intercession, in the apostle's view, lies in

this, that it is according to the will of God. It is not expected to change or influence that will, in any degree or respect. The will of God is unchangeable; and to be conformed to it, is the whole duty and interest of man. All effectual prayer in the church is that which says or implies, in every word and thought, "Thy will be done." The infinite intelligence of the Spirit is one reason for the accordance of his intercession with the will of God. For the Spirit knoweth infallibly what the will of God is. This knowledge, of course, includes all things embraced in the eternal plan of God for the creation and administration of the world. The Spirit's intercession must, therefore, be comprehensive. That infinite intelligence embraces all that God has appointed to come to pass; and has its eye not only on that particular which may immediately concern the Christian's interest for the time, but what may concern him for all time, and what may concern all men for time and eternity. This is altogether beyond our view. It is more than we are able to ask or think.

Besides the intelligent discernment of the will of God, the Spirit has an efficient agency in fulfilling that will; and this increases the virtue of his intercession. His connection with the course of providence is vital. His own living, personal efficiency is the actual, operative principle of the providential scheme. "The Spirit is life." In him the will of God, and the eternal Word which expresses it, become actual existence and work. The Spirit is to the will of God as actual life and force are to their originating purpose. His intercession is, therefore, the efficient form of the petition, "Thy will be done." That is to say, it is not the speaking of that word, but the doing of it. The speaking of the word belongs to the Son; the doing of it belongs to the Spirit.

When the Spirit says within us, "Thy will be done," his speech is action. His utterance is the personal exertion of that power which is the essential foundation of the active forces of the world. It is his motion towards the irresistible fulfilment of the eternal decree. His infallible discernment of the fore-ordained particulars of the scheme is an important part of his help to our infirmity. It is in intelligent conformity to the course of divine operation. That operation is personally his

own; and he knows what he himself is doing. It furnishes a rational ground for our confidence that the prayer we offer, though not with his infinite knowledge, yet by his prompting, belongs in the appointed order of the world. As the personal efficiency of the Holy Spirit is the acting power of providence, his intercession is a part of his effectual working. It is his working among the intermediate agencies by which the particular things contemplated are to be brought to pass. An important part of these agencies is that of the people of God themselves. Their prayer is ineffectual unless joined with action. The diligent use of means for obtaining the good we pray for, is an indispensable condition of the answer to prayer. It is thus that the Spirit himself proceeds. His effectual intercession is not without effectual working. The two offices, that of helper in prayer, and that of helper in the work of God, cannot be separated. They cannot be in all respects distinguished. With him, prayer is work. The "groanings that cannot be uttered" are his silent energizing towards the fulfilment of the work of Christ in the hearts of his people. So in relation to the whole course of providence in the world. The Holy Spirit pursues his efficacious agency, through all the course determined by the will of the Father, and committed to the mediation of Christ; working in the saints to will and to do according to his good pleasure; and his working in them to will, can be very easily identified with prompting them to pray.

Effectual prayer, then, does not interfere with the established order of the world. It is included in that order. The decree which ordains the end, ordains the means. It is the Unchangeable One who hears prayer. The Maker of the world is Christ; who also prepared it to become the temporal dwelling-place of his church, and appointed its laws for the discipline of his people. His redeeming power works in agreement with the laws of the natural world. The work of the Spirit in renewing the people of God and building them up in holiness through faith unto salvation, is a supernatural work; but it harmonizes with the established series of cause and effect in the natural world; allows its own spiritual causes to be incorporated with those that are natural, and to proceed with them in the same

invariable order. This is a great truth, taught by the Scriptures, and beyond contradiction. It is founded in the nature of God as supreme, almighty, eternal, and unchangeable. It appears in the method of his government in heaven and earth. It is one of the fundamental articles of Christian knowledge. Our faith should receive and rest upon it, as it rests on any other doctrine concerning Christ and his kingdom. Firmly as we believe that God hears prayer, so firmly must we believe that the prayer he hears belongs to the established and unchangeable order of his administration. Clearly as we discern one of these truths, so clearly must we, at the same time, discern the other. Neither of these doctrines is healthful for the human mind, except in living union with the other. The two ideas, of the effectual supplication of the church and the unchangeable divine decree, belong together. They are united in the glorious reality; let them be united always in the thought of the church. The faith which can apprehend them clearly in their proper unity, is a principle of heavenly origin and of great power; worthy of the Spirit of Him, who verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world, but whose coming was at the desire and prayer of his people.

The apostle's doctrine of the intercession of the Spirit, as we have endeavoured to explain it in the foregoing pages, has great practical value.

From the great infirmity of Christians in their communion with God, they have cause to humble themselves deeply before him, and confess the great defects of their prayers. If their acceptance depended on the fitness and propriety of their own petitions, they might well despair. When the Christian considers how little he knows of the will of God, as to particular future events, especially in the spiritual kingdom, he must be convinced of his entire inability to comply, of himself, with the conditions of effectual prayer. And this is one form of the enmity of the carnal mind against God. A Christian mind, with such a view of its infirmity, will not be liable to think more highly of itself than it ought to think. The heart of a true believer is most effectually humbled when brought into most striking contrast with the perfection of God. And here is one of the points of striking contrast; the man, on the one hand,

offering prayer without knowing what he should pray for as he ought, and with scarcely a shadow of intelligent conformity to the will of God, as to the particulars of his prayer; and on the other hand, the Holy Spirit making silent intercession, after the truly divine manner, and in perfect agreement with the will of God, which is about to be done in the case.

The apostle's doctrine of the intercession of the Spirit is a valuable caution against presumption in prayer. Importunity and fervency are virtues, but only when duly subjected to the will of God. The help of the Spirit avails chiefly for us on this account. The pure motions of the Spirit are a still, small voice, and like the higher and more refined principles of the natural mind, are easily lost amidst impassioned mental exercises and persistent habits, and are best heard by the most delicate and cultivated spiritual sense—by those that “have ears to hear.” There are methods of maintaining the communion of the church and of individual believers with God in the ordinance of prayer, which are founded in speculative misapprehension of the nature and efficacy of the ordinance, and consecrated to popular religious feeling by long usage, but which would seem, in the light of the apostle's doctrine, almost of necessity to overbear the still, small voice of the Spirit, and encourage, under the specious guise of fervency and importunity, a presumptuous thoughtlessness of the will of God.

This doctrine of the Spirit's intercession offers fruitful hints on the nature of our living intercourse and communion with God. That intercession is, to our own prayer, as we have said, what life in general is to the phenomena of life. The Spirit prompts prayer as the living principle puts forth thought and affection. Prayer thus becomes a part of the process of life. It is hardly using a figure to call it the breath of the spiritual man. It is the action of the life, and the means of preserving and strengthening it. By our prayers, the Spirit's living intercession comes forth into our personal activities, and is appropriated as a part of our personal life. And this, as to our own benefit, is a large part of the answer of prayer. This is the principal, normal form of our communion with God. It is making the life of the Spirit in us, common to him and ourselves. Our communion with Christ in general, is after this

manner. Being ingrafted into Christ, we become more and more partakers of his living powers, by the exercise of the life he gives. "As I live, ye shall live also."

A legitimate effect of the apostle's prominent and absorbing view of this help of the Spirit, is a high estimate of prayer as a means of spiritual discipline for the people of God. When once the Christian has formed the habit of daily prayer, with a watchful and submissive looking for the mind of the Spirit as to the particular things to be prayed for, in what other exercise could he find so powerful aid in "bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ"?

That God has provided this intercession of his Spirit as a help to his people in prayer, is the argument of all arguments for believers to pray without ceasing. What assurance does it give that every sincere prayer of the follower of Christ receives the gracious regard of the Father in heaven. Those who pray in the Spirit, have the privilege and honour of coöperating with God in a special sense. Every praying soul is joined with the Spirit in the work of God. Every praying family labours together with God. Every community of believers, united to maintain prayer by the help of the Spirit, is a partner with God in his work, and in the glory that shall follow.

ART. II.—*Religious Instruction in the Army.*

AN army may be contemplated in varied points of view, according to the thought habitually uppermost in the mind of the observer. To our amiable and patriotic President, his war Secretary, and General-in-Chief, no doubt it appears as a mighty engine of vast destructive capacity, to be employed in crushing the power of an audacious rebellion, and reëstablishing the authority of the government over the whole territory of the nation. To the Commissary Department, it must appear as a huge monster, of insatiate appetite, requiring all the energies of a most productive climate and soil to be strained, that suitable and sufficient food may be provided for it. The

Medical Department regard it as a body liable to wounds and disease; and all the appliances of the healing art are ready to be employed to preserve or restore its health. To the eye of the philanthropist, an army is a vast assemblage of human creatures, by their position, and the exigencies of the service to which they are called, liable to severe privations and grievous sufferings, far removed from the kind care of those whom nature and the God of nature have provided as the kindest, gentlest, and most faithful nurses by the bedside of the sick and dying;—and nobly has the whole country responded to the appeals which have been made to it to provide all that it is possible to apply to the alleviation of the sufferings of those who are sick among strangers, and amid all the discomforts of the hospital and the camp. In the mind of a Christian, the contemplation of an army awakens the most painfully solemn emotions. Here are congregated hundreds of thousands of immortal beings. They are, by the necessity of their position, segregated from society, set free from its restraints, and removed beyond the reach of its refining, elevating, purifying influences. Their associations and modes of life are, in their positive tendencies, such as to develope some of the worst vices of our nature. These demoralizing tendencies have free play to work out their appropriate results, unchecked by the influences of home, the habits of refined society, or the institutions of religion. The camp has always been a school of vice. There are peculiar temptations; there are fewer restraints; there is the example of superiors and comrades; there is the thought, that no reproof from sorrowing affection will follow the act of the transgressor. Is it strange, then, that masses of men, mostly young, thus cut off from all the humanizing influences of society, should rapidly deteriorate? Is it strange that parental affection, in parting with those in whom the richest and tenderest hopes are garnered up, should fear for them, less the dangers of battle than the corruption of the camp? What Christian heart must not be stilled to its inmost depths, when considering the moral state of the brave defenders of our dearest rights, the preservers of the rich heritage bequeathed to us by our fathers? But when this additional reflection arises, that these immortal beings, placed in circum-

stances so unfavourable to their moral culture, are liable to be summoned, at any moment, by some one or other of the many casualties of war, to meet the solemn issues of eternity, it is impossible for the Christian to rest satisfied until he has done what, providentially, he may be enabled to do, in behalf of those having such strong claims upon him.

Now, it is the settled conviction of all Christian men, that the gospel of the blessed God is the remedy provided by infinite wisdom for all human evil. The right of every human being everywhere to participate in all the privileges of the gospel, is a question which, at this age of the church, no one cares to discuss. The right is indisputable. The public preaching of the gospel, by those duly called thereto, is the great means appointed of God for bringing all men everywhere into the kingdom of his Son. It follows, then, that it is the duty of the Christianity of this nation, to see to it, that those who are perilling all in the cause of human liberty and progress, who have the common claim of humanity to a portion of the care of the church, and, superadded to this, a stronger claim arising from gratitude for service nobly rendered, from a sense of their peculiar exposure to evil, and their constant liability to sudden death, shall enjoy the preaching of the gospel among them, as the only agency that can fit them to live, or prepare them to die.

These considerations have had such an influence, that in the laws providing for the organization of our armies, there is provision made that every regiment may have a minister of Jesus Christ, appointed for the work of religious instruction therein. Moreover, the President of the United States is authorized by law to appoint chaplains in hospitals, where, in his judgment, they are needed, that the consolations of religion may be brought to the thousands of sick, who are, by wounds or disease, separated from their comrades in the field.

These provisions of law would seem to be ample; and yet it is undeniable that the public mind is not satisfied as to the fact that our soldiers enjoy, to the extent that they might and ought, the preaching of the gospel. The dissatisfaction seems to have reference to two points, if we take the publications of the press as correctly indicating the state of the public mind.

First, it is alleged that the number of chaplains in the service is insufficient; and *secondly*, that great inefficiency characterizes the efforts of many who hold this position. Both these points certainly deserve a thorough discussion, that the extent of the evils complained of may be accurately ascertained, and that the appropriate remedies may be forthwith provided and applied.

The object of the writer, in the following pages, will be to give what information on these points his position as a chaplain in the army has enabled him to acquire. Neither the time allowed him from official duties, nor the circumstances under which he writes, will allow an exhaustive discussion of the important topics which will come under review. It is hoped, however, that some useful hints may be thrown out, and that more competent minds may be able to suggest some plan by which our armies may be more thoroughly evangelized, and the reasonable expectations of the Christian sentiment of the country more fully met.

On the *first* of the points suggested, the writer regrets that he can give not even an approximate estimate of the number of regiments in the service that have, and the number that are destitute of chaplains. There can, however, be no doubt that very exaggerated statements of the amount of destitution have been made by different parties, who, from one cause and another, think it to their interest to make such statements public. That there are destitutions, no one can deny. Can the cause, or causes, be ascertained? If so, the matter may be remedied,

1st. The law under which chaplains are appointed in the volunteer service provides that they "*shall be appointed by the regimental commander, on the vote of the field-officers and company commanders on duty with the regiment at the time the appointment shall be made.*" There are regiments in the service who have never had a chaplain appointed, through an omission on the part of those in whose hands the appointing power is lodged by this law. It requires no very vigorous exercise of the imagination to surmise many reasons why certain officers omit to make a selection of a minister of religion, whose very presence they might feel as a sensible incon-

venience, and whose official duties might oblige him to denounce some of their darling sins. Suppose the appointment of missionaries for the city of New York were lodged in the hands of the mayor, upon the vote of the residents of the Five Points, would it be strange if the franchise, thus conferred, should lie unused, and the office of city missionary remain vacant to the end of time? Again, the regimental commander may be an infidel—he may regard religion as a delusion, and its ministers as deceivers of the people. Such a man has been found in the House of Representatives, and afterwards in the Senate of the United States, opposing the election of a chaplain there. Is it strange that colonels should sometimes be found treading paths that senators have trod before them?

2d. A very singular fact happens to be within the personal knowledge of the writer, and which, though affecting only the regiments of a single State, accounts, to the extent of its influence, for the want of chaplains in some of the volunteer regiments.

By another section of the law already cited, it is provided that "*The Governors of the States furnishing volunteers under this act, shall commission the field, staff, and company officers requisite for the said volunteers.*" In a certain regiment of volunteer infantry, a minister of the Presbyterian church had received the appointment of chaplain. He applied personally to the Governor of the State to obtain his commission. The Governor put him off from time to time, pleading the pressure of other business. Much time was thus consumed, and in the meanwhile, an amendment to the law respecting the appointment of chaplains was enacted by Congress, providing that no one should receive the appointment unless he received the endorsement of five ministers of the denomination to which he belonged, certifying that he was a proper person for the position. The provisions of this law, although wholly inapplicable to appointments made prior to its enactment, the Governor insisted must be complied with, and the brother was put to considerable trouble to procure the names, from the fact that but few of his ministerial brethren were accessible. At last, armed with certificates, duly made out, in compliance with an *ex post facto* law, he waited upon his Excellency, but that most scrupulous

official utterly declined to act in the premises, assigning as his reason, that the regiment having now been mustered into the service of the *United States*, he had nothing further to do with it.

It is said that his Excellency is a believer in the theological teachings of Robert Owen, and that consequently he regards a teacher of evangelical religion as a very unnecessary appendage to an army. However this may be, the facts given above, as to his course in this particular case, can be implicitly relied on.

3d. Vacancies exist in many regiments, because the chaplains who held the appointment have either died in the service—(two brethren of a single Presbytery, Transylvania, have thus finished their course)—or, through the failure of their health, have become unfit for the hardships and exposures of the field, or, owing to the condition of their families, have found it necessary to resign. Why their places have not in every case been taken by others, may perhaps appear from what yet remains to be said on another part of this subject.

4th. Resignations have also occurred from other causes. Some of these may be unjustifiable. Yet before pronouncing sentence of condemnation, the facts and circumstances should be duly weighed, and proper allowance made for the imperfections of human nature.

Prior to the law approved July 17, 1862, a chaplain in the volunteer service was entitled to "*the pay and allowances of a captain of cavalry.*" By that law a material reduction was made in the pay of officers generally. That reduction was chiefly in the line of cutting off certain perquisites, in the matter of commuting forage, &c., to which, by general consent, officers regarded themselves entitled. In a struggle so vital to the nation as that in which we are engaged, no good citizen will object to bear his full share of the burdens which such a struggle necessarily entails. Officers in the army would generally have yielded cheerfully to any reasonable reduction of pay, if that reduction had been made to apply, in just proportion, to all branches of the public service. But it is perfectly notorious, that the very Congress which so zealously and patriotically reduced the pay of the men, who, at great expense,

had raised companies and regiments for the war, and at the sacrifice of their private business, and the risk of their lives, had taken the field against the common enemy, not only refused to reduce *their own* snug salaries of three thousand dollars a year, for a few months' service in Washington, a service involving no privations, and causing but little loss to private interests, but they they also refused to abate the nuisance of congressional mileage, so long a stench in the nostrils of the nation. Nay more, not only did the members of this Congress, who saw so clearly the necessity of the reduction of the salaries of public servants, and of retrenching or abolishing all perquisites of office, omit to apply the pruning-knife to their own pay or perquisites, they, with generous liberality, voted to themselves the usual amount of books, stationery, newspapers, &c. And also, with some trepidation, it is true, yet still by a sufficient majority, voted themselves *triple* mileage for the same Congress, sternly rejecting every proposition to reduce the enormous rate per mile, or to straighten the zig-zag courses by which congressional mileage is still reckoned.

It is left to others, not subject to the pains and penalties of Article 5th of the "Articles of War," to characterize such conduct in befitting terms. It is only alluded to here, as a ground of great dissatisfaction in the minds of officers, who feel the injustice of being subjected to special burdens, not shared by those who impose them upon others.

This law has been made to bear more harshly upon chaplains than upon other officers. They are no longer paid as captains of cavalry, but a special rule is applied to them, which singles them out, and subjects them not only to reduction of pay to the amount of over three hundred and fifty dollars a year, but to special indignities besides.

Chaplains are but men; and it is an old discovery, that "in man there is a great deal of human nature." It is all very well to talk of being above pecuniary considerations, and acting from pure regard to the rewards of the heavenly world. The government pretends to act on the principle of paying for labour bestowed in its service. The Bible itself declares that "the labourer is worthy of his hire," that no man "goeth a warfare at anytime at his own charges." Whatever the sneer-

ing infidel, or the ungodly of every class may assert, it is the sentiment of this Christian country, that adequate provision should be made by law for supporting the teachers of religion in the public service.

It is strange, then, that men, many of whom made a pecuniary sacrifice by entering the service, seeing a disposition on the part of those, happening, for the time, to have the power, not merely to alter the rate of compensation held out when the office was accepted, but to discriminate, in the reduction, to their injury, should conclude that it was their privilege and right to resign a position which no longer remained such as when they accepted it? Still less can we wonder at such a conclusion, when the necessary effect of such reduction of rank and pay, is so to degrade and belittle the position of chaplain in the eyes of those with whom they associate, whose training and modes of thought and habits, lead them to attach undue importance to such adventitious considerations, as seriously to cripple their influence, and interfere with their usefulness.

5th. Another reason for the want of chaplains in the field, is the fact that so many regimental chaplains are detailed for duty in the various general hospitals established at different points. It has already been stated, that the President is authorized to appoint chaplains to such hospitals, but for some reason, the power thus conferred has not been exercised to any considerable extent, at least in the West, and many regiments have had their chaplains taken from them, and kept on duty in these hospitals for months, and in some cases for more than a year, the regiments in the meantime being left destitute. And it is with shame that the writer is obliged to confess, that some chaplains, for one reason or another, so much prefer duty in hospitals, to accompanying their regiments in the field, that sometimes an unseemly eagerness has been manifested to secure such appointments, and a strange unwillingness exhibited to return to their proper post when relieved from such service. Of course, to the regiment, it makes no difference whether they have no chaplain at all, or that he who nominally holds the position should be kept on detached service, cut off entirely from all intercourse with them.

6th. There is still another class of causes operating to give

ministers of the gospel who respect themselves, and who have been accustomed to receive at least courteous, and mostly kind and considerate treatment, from those with whom their duty calls them to mingle, a distaste for the position of chaplain in the army, arising from the supercilious and haughty demeanour towards them of officers, especially if of the regular army, and the disposition to construe all the rules and regulations of the service so as to oppress, insult, and degrade those who hold this position. A few instances within the knowledge of the writer will exemplify what is meant.

It is provided in the Army Regulations, that "an officer who travels not less than ten miles without troops, escort, or military stores, and under special orders in the case from a military superior, * * * shall receive ten cents mileage, or, if he prefer it, the actual cost of his transportation, and of the transportation of his allowance of baggage for the whole journey." A chaplain travelled by the ordinary mail route, some four hundred miles, under an order from Major-General Buell, then commanding the Department of the Ohio, and upon his arrival at his destination, presented his account to the quartermaster having charge of transportation at the post. At first, some exception was taken to the distance charged for. When, after some delay, it was made clear that the distance was computed by the usual mail route, and that the shortest continuous route known, and that this was the route actually travelled, a further delay was caused by an alleged absence of a check-book. When the check-book was obtained, the captain decided that he would only pay the actual cost of transportation, notwithstanding the provision giving the officer presenting the account *his* option. Thus all other expenses, except for mere fare by stage or car, must be borne by the officer himself. And finally, when the whole question was referred to the Quartermaster-General, a decision was rendered in about these words, "The Army Regulations have not been construed as allowing mileage to chaplains."

Another chaplain, ordered to duty in a hospital, for a time, as the other officers and attachés, occupied a room in the hospital building. The surgeon in charge, for some cause, wishing to be rid of his presence, deprived him of his room. He sought

the Quartermaster, whose duty it was to furnish quarters to officers; and a question arising as to his right to claim them, this question was also referred to Washington. In due time, an order, purporting to come from the Quartermaster-General, was returned, to the effect that chaplains are not entitled to quarters or fuel at the expense of the government. No reason or argument is employed to sustain this purely arbitrary decision—a decision seemingly in the teeth of one of the plainest provisions of the Army Regulations—a decision which, if not set aside or disregarded, renders the continuance of chaplains at certain posts impossible. But there it stands. So far as it is promulgated, the subordinates in the Quartermaster's Department are bound to act in accordance with it; and the chaplain has no option but to submit to humiliation, expend his pay in purchasing fuel at from fifty to sixty cents a bushel for coal, in paying boarding at five or six dollars a week, and hiring a room at from eight to twelve dollars a month, and withal have the further mortification of seeing officers on duty at the same post, of all ranks and grades, provided with the finest quarters the splendid private residences of the city where these incidents occurred, can furnish.

There are other reasons operating to deter men from entering, or causing them to abandon the service as chaplains, which may be merely hinted at, without a very distinct enumeration. Some brethren in the service have been compelled to abandon it and return home, to counteract schemes for displacing them from their churches, which they did not wish permanently to resign, nor would the people consent to it, when they entered the army. Some find so many obstacles thrown in the way of their usefulness in their regiments, either by a want of coöperation on the part of those in authority, or by positive opposition and wilful hinderances needlessly interposed by them, that they become discouraged and resign. Some, no doubt, from natural restlessness of disposition, when the novelty has worn off, become tired, and forsake the post to which they had aspired.

But allowing full weight to the operation of all these causes, still there is a host of earnest, faithful, laborious, God-fearing men, who, amidst all discouragements and discomforts, with

hearts burning with love to Christ and the souls of the men who have interposed with their lives to save our country from destruction, still labour on, animated by the hope of the rich reward which shall be the portion of them that turn many to righteousness.

We come now to notice the second of the points suggested for consideration—the alleged inefficiency of the labours of those who are engaged in the work of religious instruction in the army.

1. Reflecting men need hardly be cautioned against readily believing charges affecting the character of a large number of Christian ministers, and casting discredit to some extent even on religion itself. Such charges often originate in a spirit of mirthfulness and thoughtless raillery, and what is uttered in jest, is often, by misapprehension or perversion, received and circulated as sober reality. A good joke on a parson never loses anything in the repetition. Let a youthful and mischievous colonel, as in a case actually occurring, conceal a *bottle* in the baggage of the chaplain of the regiment, and then discover this evidence of the parson's secret indulgence in tipping, and if the chaplain be one of your sober, matter-of-fact personages, easily annoyed by a practical joke, and incapable of laughing at and laughing off a piece of harmless pleasantry, of which he himself is the victim, this will only give additional zest to the story, which will spread through the camp, and perhaps reach the ears of some at home, who will mourn over the corruptions of camp-life, that affect even the teachers of religion. Many charges against chaplains have their origin in personal malignity. A faithful discharge of his duty to his Divine Master, and to the government of which he is a sworn officer, will often place him in such relations towards the enemies of both as to excite their ill-will towards him personally, and this ill-will finds its most natural vent in insinuations and open charges affecting his character and labours. Hostility to religion itself is often exhibited in a spirit of detraction towards its friends, and especially its public teachers and defenders. Every clergyman is, to a greater or less extent, subjected to annoyance from this source. A chaplain is peculiarly exposed. He is surrounded by many who are the most bitter opposers of reli-

gion. He is removed from the support of most of those who at home sustain the minister, and frown the slanderer into silence. It is not just then, as assuredly it is far less than generous, for those who do not share in the malicious feeling which prompts the slanderous insinuation, to join forthwith in the hue and cry. It is not wise to give heed to the idle tales of men in the army respecting chaplains, whose opinion of religion and its ministers at home no one would regard as entitled to the slightest attention.

2. Much of the complaint made against chaplains is also due to the imperfect information possessed of the circumstances in which they are placed, and the opportunities afforded them for the discharge of the functions of their office.

The Army Regulations prescribe no distinct duties for the chaplain. The duties of the army-surgeon are explicitly defined. The means and appliances for enabling him efficiently to discharge those duties are abundantly provided. He is supreme within the limits of his own department. No interference by others with him, while in the discharge of the duties of his office, would be tolerated. The same is true of the adjutant, quartermaster, and other officers, both of the staff and line. With the chaplain it is different. Owing, perhaps, to the peculiar nature of his duties, or to the incongruity of Congress prescribing by law to ministers of religion the manner in which they must discharge the functions of their office, the chaplain has no definite department—he is clad with no authority, he can issue no command, he is left to discharge his duties according to his own sense of what is fit and proper; he has no means of enforcing what may seem to him decorous and right, and he is constantly liable to be interfered with in the measures which he may adopt, by those whose authority he has no means of resisting. It is no easy matter often to determine what can be done by him, for the moral and religious welfare of the men to whom he sustains the relation of religious teacher and guide. Of course, he feels it to be his duty to preach to the regiment. But often the regiment is on a march, for it is too true that there are no Sabbaths in war; or if not on a march, the weather may be inclement, and as the only shelter provided for the soldier, in attendance on worship, is the

vaulted roof of heaven—their only seat the lap of mother earth, or some chance rock or log—it is evident that there are many Sabbaths of the year when preaching to a regiment in the field is impossible. But, if other circumstances are favourable, some general may select the Sabbath for a review, or the colonel may order an inspection, or some grand parade of some kind or other may occupy the hours appropriate for public religious services.

Next to the preaching of the gospel, the faithful chaplain relies upon the circulation of religious books and tracts, to instruct the men and impress them with a sense of their duty. A collection of suitable books is often kept by the chaplain as a circulating library, and lent to such men as can be induced to avail themselves of its advantages. Other books are given to the men as presents, and it is most gratifying to see the eagerness with which these books are received, and the general perusal which they get. The compiler of the little volume published by the Presbyterian Board, entitled the “Soldier’s Pocket Book,” may enjoy the thought that thousands and thousands have eagerly received and most attentively read, and carefully preserved this little manual; that it has cheered many a weary hour in hospital and camp, and has, without doubt, been blessed to the eternal welfare of many precious souls. The difficulty in the way of chaplains using the religious books, so freely contributed by the various publication societies of the country, to a much larger extent, and with much happier results, arises from the want of any provision for the transportation of the books along with the regiment on a march. The quartermaster has means to transport his stores for the comfort of the body; the surgeon is allowed transportation for his instruments, books, medicines, and hospital stores; but food for the mind, remedies for the diseased souls of men, in the shape of religious books and tracts, and copies of the word of God, are not contemplated as part of the equipment of an army, and for them no transportation is provided. The effect of this omission is greatly to cripple the chaplain in his use of one of his most potent means of doing good.

There are always some men in the regiment who are sick,—the hospital of a regiment is seldom entirely empty. Often

men are accessible by religious teachers, under the mellowing power of sickness, who ordinarily are careless and indifferent. Here is a wide field for the labour of a faithful chaplain. He can visit the hospital daily. He can read a portion of the divine word, and pray with and for the men. He can kindly inquire into their condition, and drop a word of sympathy or of counsel. Such labour is not in vain. It is rare to meet with a man who will not kindly and gratefully listen to one whom he sees concerned for his own highest welfare. He will regard the chaplain as a friend. The effect will be salutary on others. The influence of such labour, faithfully performed, can hardly be over-estimated. But, even here, there is a liability to interference. In the hospital, the surgeon is supreme. He may object to religious services, or he may interfere with them by various methods. Cases have occurred in which no hour of the day could be allowed to the chaplain for the purpose of holding religious service. If the surgeon is an infidel, or if he be unfriendly to the chaplain, or if he desire to display his authority, or if he be subject to whims and caprices, he may baffle every effort of the chaplain to hold service in the hospital. In such a case the chaplain has no remedy. The regulations give him no right to visit the hospital contrary to the wish of the surgeon, and if such right be given him by a general order, he is invested with no authority to resist an invasion of it.

It is the practice of some chaplains to go on the parade ground at the time of "dress parade," and there, when the whole regiment is assembled, invoke the blessing of Almighty God in prayer. This practice is decorous in itself, and most salutary in its influence. It is a daily recognition of the presence of God, and of the dependence of all upon him. But, unless the colonel consent, this service cannot be held. It depends wholly on his will, whether an opportunity shall be afforded for this most becoming recognition of the presence and power of the Most High.

These are the chief opportunities for the public exercise of the functions of his office, afforded to the army chaplain. It has been seen how many interferences he is subject to in the performance of those functions: how dependent he is on the good will and coöperation of others, to enable him to perform

them at all. Have those who so freely bestow their censure upon the chaplain, been aware of the extent of this dependence? Have they ascertained the amount of this interference? Are they sure that the persons so liberally defamed and accused, are wholly to blame for the want of regular preaching and other religious services in the regiment? Is it not a possible thing, that in many cases, they are not to be blamed at all? Undiscriminating censure can do no good to any one; it may be the occasion of much harm.

3. There is a tendency in human nature to magnify the failings of those, who, from their positions and office are forced to perform the part of public censors. No retort so readily rises in the mind of one who has been reprov'd, as "physician, heal thyself." This tendency has had its influence in giving currency to the most exaggerated statements respecting the faults and shortcomings of chaplains. Those who repeat these exaggerations would be surprised to find how far the truth of the case differs from the representations which they contribute daily to circulate. It is not necessary to dwell on this point. The simple suggestion of it is sufficient for the present purpose.

4. But, after all, it must be confessed that some ground for complaint does exist in certain quarters, and it is proper and right that the causes should be ascertained, and so far as possible removed. One reason for the inefficiency which characterizes this branch of the public service, is the appointment of improper men to the office. There are bad men, who, for unholy ends, have sought and obtained this position, just as such men are sometimes found pastors of churches. But as no one thinks of applying the rule "*Ex uno disce omnes*" to the latter, it would be unfair to apply it to the former. There are weak men, who fail to command the respect and attention of the regiment. There are impracticable men, always involving themselves in difficulty, and creating discomfort, generally, to those within reach of their influence. There are men who do not belong to any of these classes, but who are wholly unsuited to the manner of life and the kind of work required. How could it happen otherwise than that unsuitable appointments should often be made, when the appointing power is lodged

where it is? It is the right of every church to choose its own minister; yet how unwisely oftentimes do they choose. But how much greater the probability of an unwise selection, when the choice is made, not by a body of Christian people, but by twelve or fifteen officers, who may have very peculiar tastes and preferences, and who may be governed in their selection by very different considerations than those which ought to control the choice of a teacher of religion. How avoid the influence of favouritism, political preferences, importunity of candidates, considerations of policy, or some other motive utterly unworthy of weight, but still powerfully operative in the choice. Considering the kind of men who are always ready to employ the most reprehensible means of self-advancement, and the kind of men who often hold the appointing power, and the kind of motives which govern such men, it is not wonderful that most unfortunate appointments are often made. These men soon render themselves notorious. The hundreds of good men and true, who quietly and faithfully perform their work, are not heard of—the exceptional cases are taken as the rule, and the country is filled with complaints against army chaplains.

Another cause why so little is accomplished by chaplains in the army, is the inherent difficulty of the work itself. None know so well and none mourn so bitterly the want of fruit in this field of labour, as the faithful labourer himself, who is often almost discouraged at the apparent want of success. It would seem that men so liable to sudden death as those in the army would be deeply impressed with a sense of the importance of religion, and that nowhere could the minister of Christ find a more promising field of labour than among them. But how widely different the facts. Nowhere is there more reckless indifference; nowhere more heaven-daring impiety; nowhere a more utter disregard of religion than in the army. Christianity itself has been pronounced by the Westminster Reviewers a failure, because so large a portion of mankind are uninfluenced by it. Arguments against maintaining the ordinances of religion are urged by the same school, on the ground that so few regard, or are benefitted by them. Now for aught that appears, the argument in these cases is every whit as sound as that of those who maintain that the chaplaincy system

is a failure, because so much remains to be accomplished of what is desirable in the evangelization of our army.

Still another cause of the alleged inefficiency of chaplains in the army, is the fact already alluded to, but deserving explicit mention here, that hinderances are often interposed by officers, either through personal ill-will, or hatred of religion. And often when no positive opposition to his work is exhibited, their utter indifference, their failure to coöperate with him, or even attend upon religious services, taken in connection with their habits of profanity, intemperance, lewdness, and dishonesty, exert such an evil influence upon the men, that the effect which his labours might otherwise have exerted, is counteracted and destroyed. And yet, these often are the men who join most vehemently in the cry, that chaplains are utterly useless, and their labours in the army without beneficial results.

Such are some of the causes which hinder the work of religious instruction in the army. How these causes may be removed, or what counteracting influences may be devised, it enters not into our present purpose to suggest. Let others more competent to the task devise and apply the fitting remedy. But it must be allowed the writer, before closing, to express his deep regret, that to some extent religious men and the religious press have joined in the cry against army chaplains, and have made the most sweeping charges of utter failure and inefficiency against the whole system. When the enemies of truth and righteousness act thus, it occasions no surprise, and is not so hard to be borne. But when men eminent in position, distinguished for their untiring labours and splendid munificence in the cause of Christ, and his church, give the sanction of their honoured names to these charges, and our most respectable religious newspapers are made the instruments to disseminate them far and wide through the church, it is time to utter a word of sorrowful remonstrance, and most earnest protest and expostulation. What must be the effect of such publications, where they have any influence at all? Will it not be to add to the embarrassments which already impede the faithful chaplain in his work, by putting reproaches in the mouth of adversaries, and cutting him off from the sympathies and coöperation of pious people at home? What need for these charges? Could not the brethren of the Christian

Commission proceed and do their noble work, without undervaluing and decrying all other agencies, operating for the same great end? Are they compelled, in order to make their appeals for money and supplies effective with the public, to represent the patient as already half-dead, that more eclat may be gained for the panacea that is to prove a remedy for every evil? We can assure those brethren, that as much as we respect them personally, and highly as we value their coöperation in our work, they have made a grave mistake in countenancing statements and giving them currency, tending to bring the chaplaincy system into disrepute. It is through chaplains that they can most effectually perform their work, and by alienating them, they shut the readiest door of approach to the men whom it is their noble purpose to benefit.

Great prominence is given to the fact, in the publications referred to, that a Major-General of the army of the United States, has "declared publicly, that the chaplaincy system of the army had proved a failure,"—that "his own division of fifteen regiments had now but two chaplains remaining."

Has it not been said, not by one man in a prominent position, but by senators and representatives, by the public press, and by thousands of the people, that our generals have proved a failure? Is this, however, any reason for joining in such sweeping condemnations, or for urging the abolition of the office. So too, it has been asserted, again and again, that the medical system of the army has proved a failure. Incompetent surgeons, or surgeons utterly heartless, not to say brutal in their treatment of the sick; dishonest surgeons, and rascally nurses, and hospital attachés, embezzling public stores, and consuming stimulants and delicacies provided for the sick, have roused the indignation of the nation. Cowardly, and drunken, traitorous, and utterly incompetent and imbecile officers, over and over again, have sacrificed their men, lost important positions, surrendered to the enemy, betrayed important trusts, and caused the heart of the patriot to be sad, and his cheek to burn with shame. But in such cases, the proper remedy has been thought to be, ridding the service of such men, by relieving them from active duty, or subjecting them to a court of inquiry, or by sentence of a court-martial, or summary dismissal from

the army, and appointing suitable men in their room. But a perfectly unique remedy is proposed in the case of the delinquent chaplains.

The religious instruction of the army is to be farmed out. A voluntary society has undertaken the contract. Their plan is recommended to the public on the ground of its possessing some very novel features. Two of these features, made specially prominent, are: 1st. "The enlistment of at least one minister of the gospel, of *talent, position, and approved adaptation* to this special service, for each brigade in the army, during a period of two or three months each. Each *city or large town* can spare one pastor, at least, and the *best* one, for this noble work"; and 2d. "The service thus proposed should be gratuitous." * * In showing the superior advantages of this system, the advertisement proceeds: "The army would have a demonstration of the benevolence of the gospel and of its ambassadors. The very presence of a reputable, experienced preacher of Christ in the camp, on the one errand of salvation, with no earthly reward, would be a living sermon. Able and earnest appeals to the consciences of officers and men," &c., &c.

It is implied in all this, that the great cause of the failure of the chaplains is, that they are deficient in talent, position, adaptation, reputation and experience, and that they receive compensation for their labours. On all this, it is not proposed to say a word. It is simply quoted as found, particular expressions being emphasized, that the eminent Christian gentlemen who have signed it, may ponder over them, and reflect on the effect such an appeal must have on the brethren engaged in the work of religious instruction in the army, and on the religious public, in their estimate of chaplains. If they find nothing to regret in the implications and insinuations to which their reputation has given currency, no one else has any particular concern in the matter. But the scheme, to recommend which such statements are deemed necessary, is entitled to distinct consideration.

If this plan is designed to ignore or supersede a salaried chaplaincy, it is liable to serious objections. It is the revival, in another form, of the question of voluntary societies as substitutes for church institutions. This question has been

decided. It occasioned for years warm discussion and serious dissensions, but to the satisfaction of the great body of Christians of all denominations, it has come to be admitted, that voluntary societies, while they have their legitimate and important spheres of operation, are not to be trusted or allowed to take the work of the church into their hands. They cannot be permitted to control the education of the ministry, or the appointment and location of the preachers of the gospel. Whatever the "Christian Commission" may accomplish in the way of distribution of books, and the labour of its agents, lay or clerical, for the comfort and instruction of the soldiers, it has no more right to interfere with the regular chaplains of the army, than a city missionary society has to set aside the pastors of our churches. There is abundant room in our cities for labourers of all classes; for Bible-readers, tract-distributors, male and female, and for clerical missionaries; and there is room enough in the camps and hospitals for all the agents of the "Christian Commission," as well as for the regular chaplains. That Commission has done, and is doing, an immense and most important work; but it would be as unwise in its friends and officers to interfere with the army chaplains, as for the Sanitary Commission to ignore or set aside the army surgeons. Another false position assumed in the quotations above cited, is that the unpaid preachers of the gospel are assumed to have greater influence than salaried ministers. If this is a sound principle, it must admit of general application. If preaching the gospel "without earthly reward," is "a living sermon," an "able and earnest appeal to the consciences" of men, why should not all preachers labour gratuitously? What reason can be assigned why chaplains, rather than missionaries or pastors, should be unpaid? The whole assumption is false. It is, as the apostle says in 1 Cor. ix. 4—15, contrary to all usage in the affairs of life, contrary to justice, contrary to the divine institutions of the Old Testament, and contrary to the express command of Christ, who has ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel. It is not worth while for men to try to be either better or wiser than Christ. It is to be earnestly desired that the "Christian Commission" may be content to do

its own great work, and not attempt to interfere with the regularly appointed religious officers of the army.

But we must draw this article to a close. There is not an enterprise of the present day more worthy the efforts of the church in this land, than the thorough evangelization of our armies. There are many difficulties to be overcome in performing this work. These it should be the aim of the wise and judicious counsellors in the church to diminish or remove. There are many discouragements to which the labourers in this field are subject. Ought not brethren at home to aid them by sympathy, kind counsel, and fervent prayers? There are rich present rewards to the faithful labourer. Soldiers are not insensible to efforts for their good. The gospel is not without power even in the camp, as many can testify by joyful experience. But whatever the difficulties and discouragements of the present, there is a rich reward in reserve for those who endure hardness in the service of the Captain of their salvation, and who shall be so happy as to turn many to righteousness, through the divine blessing resting upon their efforts in his cause.

ART. III.—*Faith, a Source of Knowledge.*

ON the two great questions, which relate to the origin and the end of the material universe, science gives us no satisfactory light. Revelation answers both. It tells us not only by whom and how, but for whom and why, "the worlds" were made. It would seem that this latter question, to wit, what a world, which exhibits so much plan and skill in its construction, and is governed by a mechanism and laws so admirably adjusted throughout, was made for, no less than the former, would be constantly pressing upon every studious, thoughtful man. That it would be with him the question of all questions, in comparison with which the laws that govern electrical phenomena, or the affinity that gives its exact form to the crystal, or the forces which control planets and comets, would be pro-

nounced as of altogether inferior importance. These very laws dictate this greater inquiry. Science has many knotty points, but the hardest problem of all, is that which is the greatest, and lies back of all,—nay, is that, which, considered in a large view, makes the others worthy of philosophical investigation,—What was the world made for? This question receives no answer, which is not childish and trivial, unless we look for it in the immortality of man, and that invisible future state brought to light in the Scriptures.

Faith, or truth, is so essential an element of our intellectual being, that, if smothered, when a ground on which it ought to rest is presented, the tendency is to dwarf the mind. The Scriptures reveal truth which is essential no less to the well-being of the mind than of the heart. To the same extent that important truth is discarded or neglected, will the mind be misguided, possibly seriously unhinged, in its operations. That the quality of the most gifted intellect must be improved by the admission of truth, and suffer loss by its denial or refusal, needs only a statement. “The entrance of thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple.” Ps. cix. 130. Are we to suppose that the humble faith and prayerful spirit of a Newton had no influence on his intellect, and the grandeur of those results which it wrought out? Would a Humboldt have been any less distinguished in the world of letters, or a less safe guide as a teacher of scientific truth, if he had been a humble believer in Jesus? No mind can be in a truly healthful state, or can be a safe guide in any matters which involve moral questions, so long as it is destitute of faith towards God, in respect to any of the manifestations he has been pleased to make of himself. To insist that the senses, or experiment, shall be the determining test, as to the limits of all that passes under the name of knowledge, what is it but to ignore the immortal nature of man, and bring him down towards the level of the brute? Man has an immortal, as well as a rational nature, a heart as well as mind. God, in his word, recognises and takes both under his direction; and is thus true to our whole nature. The Bible is the most thought-inspiring book in the world. Even men who have not been careful to square their lives by its precepts, have confessed to its quickening

power on their intellects. It makes large contributions to the sum of human knowledge in the department of science, as well as that of literature. These were to some extent enumerated in a former volume of this work, so far at least as one portion of the Bible, the Pentateuch, is concerned.*

It is, however, a sincere faith in the revelations of the Bible which can alone supply what our nature needs. It ennobles the mind. It raises it above the present, with all its difficulties and darkness, to the hope which may be gathered from the progressive character of God's works and dispensations, beginning in the distant past, and stretching on to the unending future. As a source of positive knowledge, reference might be made to the revelations, which faith appropriates, concerning the nature of the Supreme Being, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and his purposes of grace towards our fallen race. We might even point to that purely spiritual, yet experimental knowledge, which it begets in the innermost consciousness of the believer, enabling him with a holy confidence in the words of the great apostle, to say, "I know whom I have believed;" or to claim the knowledge of all those things which the beloved apostle, in his first epistle, ascribes to sincere faith. But, in considering faith as a source of knowledge, as we now propose to do, we shall confine the discussion to the two points already indicated, the first cause and the final cause of the creation, as clearly demonstrating the homage which is due from Science to Revelation, and pointing out the dividing line between the domains of the two.

It will be necessary, in the first place, to determine the sense of that faith, for which we claim so much. We use it, in precisely the same sense the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews used it, in the familiar passage, "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." This is not to be taken as a definition of justifying faith, or of faith as justifying, but is a description of the efficacy and operation of this faith in them who are justified. It refers to the disposition, wrought in Christian believers, by which they live and walk, looking not on the things which are seen, but the

* See the No. for July, 1858, Art. "Historical Value of the Pentateuch."

things which are not seen. It is not faith as opposed to works, by which they are justified; but faith as opposed to sight, by which they can patiently wait, in the face of all difficulties, for the fulfilment of the most ancient promise. It is the substance, or as the margin, with greater precision, renders *ὑπόστασις*, the ground or confidence, *i. e.*, the well-grounded confidence of things hoped for; it is the evidence, *i. e.*, demonstration, *ἔλεγχος*, or manifestness (as the rendering is in the Syriac Testament*) of things not seen. It is a confidence in the reality of things hoped for, as if they were in actual possession; a realization of things invisible, as if they were in sight. As the confidence of things hoped for, it relates exclusively to the future; as the demonstration of things not seen, it may relate to the past as well as the future.

Now, it is through the operation of faith, as thus described, that all who have it in exercise, as the apostle to the Hebrews proceeds immediately to declare, understand, or perceive, *νοοῦμεν*, as if the knowledge were obtained through the medium of the senses, that the worlds were framed by the word of God. It is not, we say again, in, or by means of faith, as men come to the knowledge of Christ as a Saviour; but it is an understanding, which, by virtue of their faith, has been begotten within them; or, it is faith viewed as an act, which gives the knowledge and proof of the reality of things hoped for and unseen; and which, therefore, gives them, on the authority of God's revealed truth, the demonstration that the worlds were formed by the word of God. Faith is to be viewed not as a mere dogma demanding definition; it is an appropriation by the mind and heart, of all the great truths God has revealed as necessarily connected, and of all the great things he has promised, as if their possession had already been entered upon. The creation of the worlds, as understood by faith, of course must have exclusive reference to the second part of the general description of it, to wit, that it is the evidence or demonstration of things not seen. It was an event of which there were, and could have been, no human witnesses, when the things which are now visible were made, not out of apparent materials,

* See Murdock's Translation.

or matter already in existence, but out of nothing. We have human testimony as to the reality of the miracles of Christ; but we have no such testimony as to the framing of the worlds by the word of God. Man could not have been a witness of that creation of which he was a component part. That portion of the inspired record, therefore, which gives an account of the origin of all things, is pure revelation, as much so as a prophecy of the future. It is an unfolding of the past, by him who knoweth all things, just as prophecy is an unfolding of the future. It is the testimony of man only as Moses testifies that he spake by the express authority of God. God himself (with reverence be it spoken!) was the earliest historian of the world. We know absolutely nothing—we mean to include the greatest scholars among men—of the origin of things, except what he has told us. Every true philosopher must come back to what the Bible has told him, that God is the author of all things, or he will surely prove himself to be but a fool. It is here that the simple-hearted peasant is on a footing with the profoundest student, and may often have an advantage over him, because he is simple-hearted. He believes, and is not tempted by a false science to rush in where science is of no more account than the sheerest ignorance. It is through faith, and through faith alone, that men, whether learned or unlearned, can understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God. It accepts God's own testimony, that he is the Creator of all things; and so accepts it as to know or perceive things, not perceptible by the senses. It opens up in the man a higher region of perception and knowledge than that which exists in the senses. It is well remarked by the great Dr. Owen, that as when it is said, we are justified by faith, faith includes its object, Christ and his righteousness, so in this case, faith includes its object, the divine revelation, made in the word of God. "By the word of the Lord, were the heavens made; and all the hosts of them, by the breath of his mouth. He gathered the waters of the sea together as a heap: he laid up the depths in storehouses." "He spake and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast." Ps. xxxiii. 6, 7, 9.

There was first a calling of the matter, of which the worlds are composed, by a sovereign word, into existence, and then

a framing of this matter into distinct worlds, and a fashioning of all created things into that beautiful order which we behold. All this was accomplished by the simple fiat of the Almighty. He said, BE; and IT WAS. There were no intermediate agencies, instruments, or powers, coming in between his will, or his word, and the result. The vastness of the work is intimated, by the expression "the worlds;" *i. e.*, the universe, in all its vastness and variety, beginning from the lowest and ascending to the highest; or, beginning from the highest, and descending to the lowest. There was first, as we have said, the creative act, by which they were called out of nothingness into existence, "so that things which are seen were not made" out of preëxisting materials. The omnipotent power of God was employed in this work. Nothing else was adequate to the performance of it. Every thing out of himself, or distinct from his own being, was made by him. "Without him (the Creator) was not any thing made that was made." John i. 3. That "from nothing, nothing can come," is true only in respect to the power of created, dependent beings. It would be a contradiction in terms, that an omnipotent Being could not cause that to exist, which did not exist before. Ancient philosophers, governed by the maxim that "from nothing, nothing comes," held to the doctrine of the eternity of matter. Some of them, to the eternity of the world, as it now exists; others of them to the eternity of the atoms, or elements, which were at length fortuitously brought together in the form of worlds. The very highest point which the most cultivated of them ever attained was, that the world must have been formed by an intelligent Power, but out of preëxisting materials. But modern philosophy is ready to concede that a first cause, essentially different from all dependent causes, is an intellectual necessity. The mind can find no satisfaction, no repose, except in an all-creating, self-existing mind. It cries out for God; and the senseless clod, and shapeless stone, no less than the solar system, unite in proclaiming his existence, wisdom, and power. "In his self-existence," says the acute author of the *Fundamental Principles of Mathematics*, "as it 'was, and is, and is to come,' is to be found *THE one, the absolutely necessary truth*: all others are contingent, just so far as *He* has made them so.

Herein is to be found, moreover, *the great, the final hypothesis*, upon which rests *the structure of the universe*; and which, too, undergirds and sustains the universe, in *all its relations*." The wisest of the ancients needed such a revelation of God as we have in the sacred oracles, to enable them to rise to the height of this great truth, that he created the world. They needed just that discovery, which is contained in the opening sentence of the Bible, "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth." They needed the enlightening power of faith.

God, having called the world into existence, by his word, did then, by divine skill, "frame," or fashion them. He said, Let there be light; and the darkness fled away. Let there be a firmament; and it was arched above the world. Let the waters be gathered into one place; and the waves rolled back, and were shut up as in storehouses. Let the dry land appear; and valleys and plains were stretched out; mountains lifted their crowns towards heaven. Let there be light to divide the day from the night, and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and for years. He speaks again, and the beautiful, and as yet tenantless world, is replenished with another and higher form of life; fishes swarm the sea, birds fill the air, cattle and beasts roam and graze in the fresh and ample pastures; and, at last, "the master-work," man, stands forth, and gazes on the scene, and listens to the morning stars singing together, and the sons of God shouting for joy, over this finished work, "very good," even in the eyes of the holy Being who made it. There was a design in his every work, and an adaptation of every work to its proper end, fitted to excite the adoration of every intelligent creature. He established that beautiful order which reigns among the heavenly bodies, and those laws which control winds, rains, seas, seasons, and the fruits of the earth, and make it a fit dwelling-place for man. All objects have their appropriate purposes; all faculties have their corresponding objects. Everywhere we are met with the evidences of divine wisdom.

Such, in brief, was the work, concerning which we are made to know something, through faith, which we can learn in no other way. Admit it to be true, if you please, that science now shuts the door as effectually against the self-existence, or

eternity of the material universe, as the Bible does, still it does not follow that science alone could make us acquainted with that great truth, which we learn, through faith, to wit, that the worlds were framed by the word of God. Have we the least reason for concluding that modern philosophy, without the revelation we have of God, in the Scriptures, would have contended any more successfully against the tendencies of a depraved nature, to darken and mislead the mind? Is not the revelation of the eternal power and Godhead of the Ruler of the world, as we have it in the Bible, absolutely essential to such beings as we are, notwithstanding all the light of nature, or all that science can teach, when we come to deal with the origin of things? Reason may decide against the eternity of the material universe, but can reason, in such depraved creatures as we are, find out the true God, or find out any better divinities than were adored, when it reigned proudly, as of old? Would it not still talk of appetency, necessity, adaptive energy, or of development, and attribute to such blind phantoms as these the work of God? And if it cannot find out a God omnipotent, and infinitely wise, can it ascertain that great truth, which is at the beginning of all our knowledge, that all things were made by him? No; it must sit down humbly at the feet of revelation, for the sublime teaching, that in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. It may investigate the composition, changes, and mutual actions of material substances; but it cannot give an account of the origin of these substances. It may treat of the structure, formation, and position of the mineral masses of the globe, and the causes of their physical features; but its explorations are sure to reach primitive beds, which it finds it impossible to trace to any antecedent matter. It may take the wings of the morning, and traverse the nebulous paths of the heavens, and expatiate amidst the so-called original fire-mist of the astral regions, as if, with its keen eye, it actually saw it rotating and aggregating into suns and planets; but who made this star-dust? who sowed the vast fields of space with it, as a husbandman would scatter wheat from his hand over his ploughed acres? "Declare, if thou hast understanding. Who hath laid the measures thereof, if thou knowest? or who hath stretched the line upon it?" Job xxxviii.

4, 5. The profoundest philosopher is just as much dependent for this knowledge, on the first verses of Genesis and of John, as the most unlettered Christian.

But even if science, after reaching the conclusion that the material universe must have had a beginning, could then have inferred that it owed its origin to an omnipotent Power, still it could not have found out that it was brought into existence by the simple word of a personal Jehovah; that he spake, and it was done; he commanded and it stood fast. Here, then, unmistakably, is a clear, dividing line between Revelation and Science, where the former says to the latter, in tones of authoritative majesty, "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further." That great fact of the Divine authorship of worlds, of which ancient philosophy was ignorant, and which modern science fails of itself to discover, we understand through faith, by the revelation God has made of it in his word. The eminent astronomer, La Place, because he could find, as he said, in the solar system no indications of an end, was unable to find in it any trace of a beginning. The Bible, in its very first flash of light on our darkness, finds that beginning. It "establishes," to use the words of the lamented Hugh Miller, "the divine authorship of the universe, and shows that all its various forces are not self-existent, but owe their origin to a great First Cause." *Test. of the Rocks*, p. 384, Am. ed.

That faith, in behalf of which we set up the claim that it is a source of positive knowledge, is just our faith in the Bible, or the revelation it contains. It has evidences without, and evidences within, which convince us that God addresses us in its pages. He must have revealed directly to Moses the account it contains of the creation of all things. Hence the grounds of our faith in the Divine authorship of the universe are just the grounds of our faith in the Divine origin of the Scriptures. Strike away the one, and you strike away the other, and remand us to the ignorance of ancient philosophers, or to the mere speculations of science. Let those who disparage faith, or condescend to speak of it, in comparison with science, in a patronizing tone, as if it belonged to some less certain, less important sphere, ask themselves, how, without it, they would arrive at any correct knowledge of the origin of things. Faith

makes us to know. It makes us "understand." It is a source of positive knowledge. We use these words in their plain, natural sense. It brings great light to the understanding. Its own source of light is the scriptural, supernatural revelation. Without this, it would be no better than a dream, a delusion, or, at the best, the suggestion of a plausible theory; but with God to guide it, it guides the human mind to the acquisition of the highest species of knowledge. The Scriptures not only contain the revelation, which gives light to the understanding, but they seem to put, as we have already seen, the knowledge gained through faith, on much the same footing with that gained through the senses, as to the certainty of it. It certainly fills the mind with the most noble conceptions and ideas: whatever is revealed to us in the Scriptures, that we may be said to understand, through faith. All the great and glorious things contained in them, and not discoverable by the mere light of nature, constitute the knowledge we acquire through faith. Without faith, the Bible makes nothing known to us any more than light discovers to a blind man the objects and scenes among which he is moving. The light to us is in Divine revelation; and faith is the instrument, the eye, by which we discern things in that light. To estimate them, the value of faith, as a means of positive knowledge, we must estimate the value of that revelation on which it rests. Such is that sometimes despised, and little understood thing, FAITH. That by which we understand some of the greatest things the men of this world do not understand. It not only "brings distant prospects near," and is thus the confident ground of things hoped for; but it "sets times past in present view," and is in that direction also the demonstration or manifestness of things unseen. It looks backward as well as forward. It places, as it were, the weak mortal, of whom God asks, "Where wast thou when I laid the foundation of the earth?" at his right hand, and permits him to see his work, as it rises out of nothing, and hear his voice, as he speaks to things that are not, and they are. It fills his own understanding, and makes him know, for a great moral purpose, how this world arose out of eternal nothing into being.

But we are as much indebted to faith for our knowledge of

the final cause of the creation, as of its first cause. It gives us the same certainty in respect to the one as in respect to the other, as it is founded on the same revelation. That revelation declares that the world was created not only by Him, but for Him, who is the Lord both of the dead and the living, who was in the beginning with God,—a beginning before that spoken of by Moses in the first verse of the Bible, before any thing was made that was made. “By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and FOR HIM. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.” Col. i. 16, 17. He is the end as well as the beginning of his works, the Omega as well as the Alpha; and his work of redemption is the end of all his other works. All his works of providence, as well as creation, are subservient to it,—are designed to work out the eternal counsels of sovereign, saving grace. Here, surely, is a province in which science is as blind,—if not even more so,—and must be as silent as in the former case. What can it know, or possibly discover, respecting the gracious purposes of God? Faith in divine revelation, and this faith alone, tells us what the world, and what we were made for. It represents the whole creation, standing as with outstretched neck, waiting, and even groaning and travailing in pain for the longing it hath for some grand event of the future. And what is 'that event? The manifestation of the sons of God, the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body. Redeemed man, in his whole nature—that body made out of the dust of the earth, no less than the soul from the breath of the Almighty—is to be made partaker of immortal life. The hour is coming in the which all that are in their graves shall come forth. It is this “deciphers man.” He was not made merely for this short, vain life. That the resurrection is not too great a hope, we have the same power which created the body out of dust, as well as the promise of him who created it, to rest upon. What could be more opposed to the long-received principles of natural reason, than that the worlds were made out of nothing? The same faith that assures of this, assures us of the resurrection, and places it among the items of our knowledge.

The resurrection past, the heavens and the earth, which are now, or as at present constituted, will also pass away. This appearing and disappearing of human generations, in long succession, so that history is constantly reproducing itself, or, in the words of Solomon, the thing that is, and hath been, is that which shall be, and that which is done is that which shall be done, is not to go on for ever. They stand, as it were, waiting for the great change which has been predicted in them, and is to fit them to be the theatre of man's immortality. The very things which science, perhaps, would pronounce abnormal, or exceptional to the usual course of nature, are her interceding groans for the coming of that brighter era. The jars and discords of a disjointed world—the reverberation of the elemental war—the sighing of the midnight storm—the angry voice of tempest-wrought oceans, are cries for deliverance, the prayers which earth sends up, “How long, O Lord, how long?” The heavens and the earth, created by his word, and at his will, when the fulness of the time is come, will be dissolved. “The heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up.” 2 Peter iii. 10. Our faith as to this matter rests on the same ground precisely, as does our faith as to the original framing of the heavens and the earth. God hath told us so, and we know whom we have believed. The scoffers, who are to come in the last days, saying, “Where is the promise of his coming?” are described as those who are “willingly ignorant of this, that, by the word of God, the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water.” Because they are willingly ignorant of the beginning of the heavens and the earth, they are, in like manner, ignorant of their predicted end. If we know the one, we may know the other. By the same word, we “look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness,” and in them discover the glorious completed end of a benevolent God, in the first creation. “Behold, I create new heavens, and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind.” Isa. lxv. 17. The God who could make this creation out of nothing, can fashion and garnish new heavens and a new earth out of the ruins of the former, and so

much more glorious, by indwelling and abiding righteousness, that the old shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. The fairest scene of beauty which they present, and which have won the praises of the gifted children of song, shall be for ever forgotten. Should it be said, in derogation of our faith, that there are no appearances, in the present imperfect, disordered state of things, which favour such a hope, we do not forget that there were no appearances which prognosticated the creation of this world. It was not made of things which do appear. What if there be no encouraging appearances, and such as there be are quite discouraging! What are they to Him who made heaven and earth out of nothing? What cannot that God who made the heavens do? He will, out of "this tempestuous state of human things," bring forth order and beauty, evoke a new creation, call into being, or frame out of the ruins of this, another world, pure, peaceful, blissful, everlasting; which no storm shall ever smite, no sin ever defile, no strife ever deluge with tears and blood.

Such are the great certainties, in respect to the origin and ultimate end of creation, which that faith, which is the demonstration of things not perceptible by the senses, makes us to know. The universe has a Creator—omniscient, omnipotent, merciful. There is a presiding Intelligence, a controlling Hand, a sovereign Will, over the dread potencies which are at work among these worlds and systems of worlds. Let not science, in investigating them, ignore Him who is in them, his agency or purpose, or attempt to place Jehovah at too great a distance from his works. In drinking at the fountain of knowledge, we are not to "dissolve the pearl of our salvation in the draught." For, upon what, then, shall we rest our hope? where seek the elements of faith? or, where look for consolation, to keep up the sinking heart, amid the woes and deaths through which we are making our way to the grave?

ART. IV.—*The True Tone in Preaching, and the True Temper in Hearing.*

PREACHING the revelation of God, and hearing it, are the two functions upon which the whole temporal and eternal welfare of mankind is made to depend. "Preach the preaching that I bid thee"; "take heed how ye hear,"—these are the two messages of God to the herald and the congregation. Both parties must hear the message, and endeavour in God's strength to come into right relations to each other, if they would receive the divine blessing. "For," says Richard Baxter, "we bring not sermons to church, as we do a corpse for a burial. If there be *life in them*, and *life in the hearers*, the connaturality will cause such an amicable closure, that through the reception, retention, and operation of the soul, they will be the immortal seed of a life everlasting."* This passage from one of the most fervid and effective of preachers, gives the clue to Christian eloquence. Life in the preacher, and life in the hearer,—vitality upon both sides,—this, under God, is the open secret of successful speech.

For the relation which properly exists between the Christian preacher, and the Christian hearer, is a reciprocal one, or that of action and reaction. Yet it is too commonly supposed that eloquence depends solely upon the speaker; that the hearer is only a passive subject, and as such, is merely to absorb into himself a mighty and powerful influence that flows out from the soul of the orator, who alone is the active and passionate agent in the process. It will be found, however, upon closer examination, that eloquence in its highest forms and effects is a joint product of two factors; of an eloquent speaker and an eloquent hearer. Burning words presuppose some fuel in the souls to whom they are addressed. The thrill of the orator, however exquisite, cannot traverse a torpid or paralyzed nerve in the auditor. It is necessary, therefore, as all the rhetoricians have told us, in order to the highest effect of human speech, that the auditor be in a state of preparation and recipiency; that

* Baxter's sermon on Christ's absolute dominion. (Preface.)

there be an answering chord in the mass of minds before whom the single solitary individual comes forth, with words of warning or of consolation, of terror or of joy.

It follows consequently, that if there be a true *tone* in preaching, there is also a true *temper* in hearing. If it is incumbent upon the sacred ministry to train itself to a certain style of thinking and utterance, it is equally incumbent upon the sacred auditory to school itself into the corresponding mood, so that its mental attitudes, its pre-judgments, its intellectual convictions, its well-weighed fears and forebodings, shall all be, as it were, a fluid sea, along which the surging mind of the public teacher shall roll its billows. What then is the true tone in preaching, and what is the true temper in hearing, religious truth?

The divine interrogatory, "Is not my word like as a fire?" * suggests, it is believed, the true tone which should at all times characterize public religious address to the natural man; and the decided utterance of the psalmist, "Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness," † on the other hand, indicates the temper which the public mind should maintain in reference to such a species of address. From the voice of God, speaking through the most shrinking yet the most impassioned of his prophets; from the voice of God, emitted from the deepest, clearest, widest religious experience under the old economy, we would get our answer.

The purpose, then, of this article, will be to specify, in the first place, some distinctively biblical views of truth, that are exceedingly intense in their quality, and penetrating in their influence, and should therefore enter as constituent elements into preaching; and in the second place, to indicate the proper attitude of the popular mind towards such preaching.

I. The prophet Jeremiah, in the well-known interrogatory to which we have alluded, directs attention to those elements in revelation, which are adapted to produce a keen and pungent sensation, like fire, whenever they are brought into contact with the individual or the general mind. Just in proportion, consequently, as public address upon religious themes emits this

* Jeremiah xxiii. 29.

† Psalm cxli. 5.

subtle and penetrating radiance, because the preacher has inhaled the vehement and fiery temper of the Scriptures respecting a certain class of subjects, will it speak to men with an emphasis that will startle them, and hinder them from sleep.

1. Commencing the analysis, then, we find these elements of force and of fire, of which we are speaking, in *the Biblical representation of God as an emotional Person*, or, in Scripture phrase, the "*living God*."

And here we shall pass by all those more general aspects of the Divine personality which have been abundantly brought to view in the recent and still existing contest between theism and pantheism, and confine ourselves to a notice of those more specific qualities, which have been somewhat overlooked in this controversy, and which constitute the core and life of the personal character of God. For the Biblical representation of the Deity not merely excludes all those conceptions of him, which convert him into a Gnostic abyss, and place him in such unrevealed depths that he ceases to be an object of either love or fear, but it clothes him with what may be called *individuality of emotion, or feeling*. Revelation is not content with that inadequate and frigid form of theism, that deism, which merely asserts the Divine existence and unity with the fewest predicates possible, but it enunciates the whole plenitude of the Divine Nature upon the side of the *affections*, as well as of the understanding. When the Bible denominates the Supreme Being the "*living God*," it has in view that blending of thought with emotion, that fusion of intellect with feeling, which renders the Divine Essence a throbbing centre of self-consciousness. For subtract emotion from the Godhead, and there remains merely an abstract system of laws and truths. Subtract the intellect, and there remains the mystic and dreamy deity of sentimentalism. In the Scriptures we find the union of both elements. According to the Bible, God possesses emotions. He loves and he abhors. The Old and New Testaments are vivid as lightning with the *feelings* of the Deity. And these feelings flash out in the direct unambiguous statement of the psalmist—"God *loveth* the righteous; God is *angry* with the wicked every day;" in the winning words of St. John, "God is love," and in the terrible accents of St. Paul, "Our

God is a consuming fire." Complacency and displeasure, then, are the two specific characteristics in which reside all the vitality of the doctrine that God is personal. These are the most purely individual qualities that can be conceived of. They are continually attributed to the Supreme Being in the Scriptures, and every rational spirit is represented as destined to for ever feel the impression of the one or the other of them, according as its own inward appetences and adaptations shall be. While, therefore, the other truths that enter into Christian theism are to be stated and defended in the great debate, the philosopher and theologian must look with a lynx's eye at these emotional elements in the Essence of God. For these, so to speak, are the living points of contact between the Infinite and Finite; and that theory of the Godhead which rejects them, or omits them, or blunts them, will, in the end, itself succumb to naturalism and pantheism.

There are no two positions in Revelation more unqualified and categorical, than that "God is love," and "God is a consuming fire." Either one of these affirmations is as true as the other; and therefore the complete un mutilated idea of the Deity must comprehend both the love and the displeasure in their harmony and reciprocal relations. Both of these feelings are equally necessary to personality. A being who cannot love is impersonal; and so is a being who cannot abhor. Torpor in one direction implies torpor in the other. "He who loves the good," argued Lactantius fifteen centuries ago, "by that very fact hates the evil; and he who does not hate the evil, does not love the good; because the love of goodness flows directly out of the hatred of evil, and the hatred of evil springs directly out of the love of goodness. There is no one who can love life without abhorring death; no one who has an appetency for light without an antipathy to darkness."* He who is able to love that which is lovely, cannot but hate that which is hateful. One class of emotions towards moral good implies an opposite class towards moral evil. Every ethical feeling necessitates its counterpart; and therefore God's personal love

* *Lactantius*, De ira Dei, c. 5. Compare also *Tertullian*, De testimonio animæ, c. 2.

towards the seraph necessitates God's personal wrath towards the fiend. There is, therefore, no true middle position between the full scriptural conception of God, and the deistical conception of him. We must either, with some of the English deists, deny both love and indignation to the Deity, or else we must, with the prophets and apostles, attribute both love and indignation to him. Self-consistency drives us to one side or the other. We may hold that God is mere intellect, without heart, without feeling of any kind; that he is as impassive and unemotional as the law of gravitation, or a geometrical axiom; that he neither loves the holy, nor hates the wicked; that feeling, in short, stands in no sort of relation to an infinite Nature and Essence; or we may believe that the Divine Nature is no more destitute of emotional than it is of intellectual qualities, and that all forms of righteous and legitimate feeling enter into the Divine self-consciousness,—we may take one side or the other, and we shall be self-consistent. But it is in the highest degree illogical and inconsistent, to attribute one class of emotions to God, and deny the other; to attribute the love of goodness, and repudiate the indignation at sin. What reason is there in attributing the feeling of complacency to the nature of the Infinite and Eternal, and denying the existence of the feeling of indignation, as so many do in this and every age? Is it said that emotion is always, and of necessity, beneath the Divine Nature? Then why insist and emphasize that “God is *love*?” Is it said that wrath is an unworthy feeling? But this, like love itself, depends upon the nature of the object upon which it is expended? What species of feeling ought to possess the Holy One when he looks down upon the orgies of Tiberius? when he sees John Baptist's head in the charger? Is it a mere illicit and unworthy passion, when the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against those sins mentioned in the first chapter of Romans, and continually practised by mankind? And may not love be an unworthy feeling? Is not this emotion as capable of degenerating into a blind appetite, into a mere passion, as any other one? Which is most august and venerable, the pure and spiritual abhorrence of the seraphim, awakened by the sight of the sin and uncleanness of fallen Babylon, or the selfish fondness,

and guilty weakness of some of the unprincipled affection of earth? Which is most permeated with eternal truth and reason, and so most worthy of entering into the consciousness of a Divine and Supreme Mind, the wrath of law, or the love of lust?

So the Scriptures represent the matter; and upon the preacher's thorough belief in the strict metaphysical truth of this biblical idea of God, and his solemn reception of it into his mind, in all its scope and elements, with all its implications and applications, depends his power and energy as a religious thinker and speaker. He must see for himself, and make his hearers see, that God is just that intensely immaculate Spirit, both in his complacency and his displeasure, in all his personal qualities, and on both sides of his character, which revelation represents him to be. No other energy can make up for the lack of this. With this, though his tongue may stammer, and his heart often fail him, the preacher will go out before his accountable, guilty, dying fellow-men, with a spiritual power that cannot be resisted.

For man's mind is startled when the Divine individuality thus flashes into it, with these distinct and definite emotions. "I thought of God, and was troubled." The human spirit thrills to its inmost fibre, when God's *personal character* darts its dazzling rays into its darkness. When one realizes, in some solemn moment, that no blind force or fate, no law of nature, no course and constitution of things, but a Being as distinctly self-conscious as himself, and with a personality as vivid in his feelings and emotions towards right and wrong as his own identity, has made him, and made him responsible, and will call him to account; when a man, in some startling and most salutary passage in his experience, becomes aware that the intelligent and the emotional I AM is penetrating his inmost soul, he is, if ever upon this earth, a roused man, an earnest, energized creature. All men know how wonderfully the faculties of the soul are quickened, when it comes to the consciousness of guilt; what a profound and central activity is started in all the mental powers by what is technically termed "conviction." But this conviction is the simple consciousness that God is one person, and man is another. Here are two

beings met together—a holy One, with infinite and judicial attributes, and a guilty one, with finite and responsible attributes—the two are in direct communication, as in the garden of Eden, and hence the shame, the fear, and the attempt to hide.

If, however, it is supposed that there must be some abatement and qualification in order to bring the biblical representation of the Deity into harmony with some theory in the head, or some wish in the heart, it loses its incisive and truthful power over the human mind. If the full-orbed idea be so mutilated that nothing but the feeling of love is allowed to enter into the nature of God, the mind softens and melts away into moral imbecility. If nothing but the emotion of displeasure makes up the character of the Deity, as was the case, to a very great extent, with the sombre and terrible Pagan religions, the mind of the worshipper is first overwhelmed with terror and consternation, and finally paralyzed and made callous by fear. But if both feelings are seen necessarily to coexist in one and the same eternal nature, and each exercised towards its appropriate and deserving object, then the rational spirit adores and burns like the seraph, and bows and veils the face like the archangel.

2. In close connection with the doctrine of the living God, the Bible teaches the doctrine of *the guilt of man*; and this is the second element of force and fire, alluded to by the prophet in his interrogatory.

We have already spoken of the close affinity that exists between a vivid impression of the Divine character, and the conviction of sin. When that comparatively pure and holy man, the prophet Isaiah, saw the Lord, high and lifted up, he cried, "I am a man of unclean lips." And just in proportion as the distinct features of that Divine countenance fade from human view, does the guilt of man disappear. But here, again, as in the preceding instance of the Divine emotions, the difficulty does not relate so much to the bare recognition of the fact, as to the degree and thoroughness of the recognition. We have noticed that there is a natural proneness to look more at the complacent, than the judicial side of the Divine nature; to literalize and emphasize the love, but convert the wrath into

metaphor and hyperbole. In like manner, there is a tendency to extenuate and diminish the degree of human guilt, even when the general doctrine is acknowledged. To apprehend and confess our sin to be our pure self-will and *crime*, is very difficult. We much more readily acknowledge it to be our disease and misfortune. Between the full denial, on the one hand, that there is any guilt in man, and the full hearty confession on the other, that man is nothing but guilt before the Searcher of the heart and Eternal Justice, there are many degrees of truth and error; and it is with regard to these intermediates that the preacher especially needs the representations of the Bible. It is by the dalliance with the shallows of the subject, that public religious address is shorn of its strength.

The Scriptures, upon the subject of human guilt, never halt between two opinions. They are blood-red. The God of the Bible is intensely immaculate, and man in the Bible is intensely guilty. The inspired mind is a rational and logical one. It either acquits absolutely and eternally, or condemns absolutely and eternally. It either pronounces an entire innocency and holiness, such as will enable the possessor of it to stand with angelic tranquillity amidst the lightnings and splendours of that countenance from which the heavens and the earth flee away; or else it pronounces an entire guiltiness in that Presence, of such scarlet and crimson dye, that nothing but the blood of incarnate God can wash it away. The Old Testament, especially, to which the preacher must go for knowledge upon these themes, because the old dispensation was the educational dispensation of law, is full, firm, and distinct in its representations. Its history is the history of an economy designed by its rites, symbols, and doctrines, to awaken a poignant and constant consciousness of guilt. Its prophecy looks with eager straining eye, and points with tremulous and thrilling finger to an Atoner and his atonement for guilt. Its poetry is either the irrepressible mourning and wail of a heart gnawed by guilt, or the exuberant and glad overflow of a heart experiencing the joy of expiated and pardoned guilt.

And to this is owing the intense vitality of the Old Testament. To this element and influence is owing the vividness

and energy of the Hebrew mind,—so different in these respects from the Oriental mind generally. The Hebrews were a part of that same great Shemitic race which peopled Asia and the east, and possessed the same general constitutional characteristics. But why did the Hebrew mind become so vivid, so intense, so dynamic, while the Persian and the Hindoo became so dreamy, so sluggish and lethargic? Why is the religion of Moses so vivific in its spirit, and particularly in its influence upon the conscience, while the religions of Zoroaster and Boodh exert precisely the same influence upon the conscience of the Persian and the Hindoo, that poppy and mandragora do upon his body? It is because God subjected the Hebrew mind to this theistic, this guilt-eliciting education. From the very beginning, this knowledge of God's unity and personality, of God's emotions towards holiness and sin, was kept alive in the chosen race. The people of Israel were separated purposely, and with a carefulness that was exclusive, from the great masses of the Oriental world. Either by a direct intercourse, as in their exodus from Egypt, with that personal Jehovah who had chosen them in distinction from all other nations; or else by the inspiration of their legislators and prophets, the truth that God is a Sovereign and a Judge, "keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression, and that will by no means clear the guilty," was made more and more distinct and vivid in the Hebrew intuition, while it grew dimmer and dimmer, and finally died out of the rest of the Oriental populations. This education, this *Biblical* education of the Hebrews, was the source of that energy and vitality which so strikes us in their way of thinking, and modes of expression, and the absence of which is so noticable in the literatures of Persia and India.

And here it is obvious to remark upon the importance of a close investigation of those parts of the Old and New Testaments which treat of the subject of atonement, as antithetic to that of sin and guilt. For this doctrine of expiation, in the Christian system, is like a ganglion in the human frame; it is a knot of nerves; it is the oscillating centre where several primal and vital truths meet in unity. This single doctrine of sacrificial oblation is a vast involution. It implies the personality of

God, with all its elements of power. It involves the absolute self-will and responsibility of the creature in the origin of sin. It implies the necessary, inexorable nature of Justice. And if we analyze these again, we shall find them full of the "seeds of things;" full of the substance and staple of both ethics and evangelism. Those portions of the Bible, therefore, which treat of this central truth of Christianity, either directly or indirectly, should receive the most serious and studious investigation. The Mosaic system of sacrifices should be studied until its real meaning and intent is understood. The *idea* of guilt—and we employ the word in the Platonic sense—and the *idea* of expiation, as they stand out pure and simple, yet vivid and bright, in the Prophets and Psalms, and in their inspired commentary, the Epistle to the Hebrews, should be pondered until their intrinsic and necessary quality is apprehended. For there is danger lest the very ideas themselves should fade and disappear, in an age of the world, and under a dispensation, in which there is no daily sacrifice, and frequent bleeding victim, to remind men of their debt to eternal Justice. The Christian religion, by furnishing the one great sacrifice to which all other sacrifices look and point, has of course done away with all those typical sacrifices which cannot themselves take away guilt, but can remind of it.* And now that the daily remembrancers of the ritual and ceremonial are gone, the human mind needs more than ever to ponder the teachings, and breathe in the spirit of the legal dispensation, in order to keep the conscience quick and active, and the moral sense healthy and sound, in respect to the two great fundamental ideas of guilt and retribution.

It has been an error, more common since the days of Grotius, than it was in the time of the Protestant Reformation, that the doctrine of the atonement has been explained and illustrated too much by a reference to the attribute of benevolence and the interests of creation, and too little by a reference to the attribute of justice and the remorseful workings of conscience. There is hazard, it is conceived, upon this method, that the simple, uncomplex ideas of guilt and atonement, as

* "In those sacrifices there is a *remembrance* again made of sins every year." Heb. x. 3.

they operate in the very moral being of the individual sinner, and as they have their ground in the very nature of God, should be lost sight of, and the whole transaction of reconciliation be transferred into a region with which he ought ultimately, indeed, to be familiar, but which, during the first exercises of an awakened soul, is too distant for a vivid apprehension and impression. Man must in the end, indeed, come to understand the bearings of the sacrifice of the Son of God, upon what Chalmers calls "the distant places of God's creation;" but he will be more likely to attain this understanding, if he first comes to apprehend its bearings upon his own personal guilt and remorse, and how the blood of the Lamb expiates crime within his own burning self-consciousness. For guilt and expiation are philosophical correlates, genuine correspondencies, set over against each other, like hunger and food, like thirst and water. "My flesh," saith the Atoner, "is meat *indeed*; my blood is drink *with emphasis*." He who knows, with a vivid and vital self-consciousness, what guilt means, knows what atonement means as soon as presented; and he who does not experimentally apprehend the one, *cannot* apprehend the other. If, therefore, any man would see the significance and necessity of sacrificial expiation, let him first see the significance and reality of crime in his own personal character and direct relationships to God. The doctrine grasped and held *here* presents little difficulty. For the remorse now felt, necessitates and craves the expiation; and the expiation now welcomed, explains and extinguishes the remorse.

Now, it is the peculiarity of the Biblical representation of this whole subject, that it handles it in the very closest connection with the personal sense of sin; that is to say, in its relation to the conscience of man on the one side, and the moral indignation of God on the other. In the Scriptures, the atonement is a "*propitiation*;" and by betaking himself to it, and making it his own spontaneous mode of thinking and speaking upon this fundamental doctrine, the preacher will arm his mind with a preternatural power and energy. Look at the preaching of those who, like Luther and Chalmers, have been distinguished by an uncommon freedom and saliency in their manner

of exhibiting the priestly office and work of Christ, and see how remarkably the Old Testament atonement vitalizes the conception and the phraseology. There is no circumlocution nor mechanical explanation. The *remorse* of man is addressed. The simple and terrible fact of guilt is presupposed, the consciousness of it elicited, and then the ample pacifying satisfaction of Christ is offered. The rationality of the atonement is thus seen in its inward necessity; and its inward necessity is seen in the very nature of crime; and the nature of crime is seen in the nature of God's justice, and felt in the workings of man's conscience. In this way, preaching becomes intensely personal, in the proper sense of the word. It is made up of personal elements, recognises personal relationships, breathes the living spirit of personality, and reaches the heart and conscience of personal and accountable creatures.

Is not, then, the word of God as a fire, in respect to this class of truths, and its mode of presenting them? As we pass in review the representations of God's personal emotions, and man's culpability, which are made in those lively oracles from which the clergyman is to draw the subject-matter of his discourses, and the layman is to derive all his certain and infallible knowledge respecting his future prospects and destiny, is it not plain, that if there be lethargy and torpor on the part of either the preacher or the hearer, if there be a lack of eloquence, it will not be the fault of the written revelation? As we look abroad over Christendom, do we not perceive the great need of a more incisive impression from those particular truths which relate to these personal qualities, these moral feelings of the Deity, which cut sharply into the conscience, probe and cleanse the corrupt heart, and induce that salutary fear of God which the highest authority assures us is the beginning of wisdom? Is there in nominal Christendom such a clear and poignant insight into the nature of sin and guilt, such reverential views of the divine holiness and majesty, and such a cordial welcoming of the atonement of God, as have characterized all the earnest eras in church history—the Pentecostal era in the Primitive Church, the Protestant Church in the age of the Reformation, and the American churches in the Great Awakening of 1740? Is there not a leaven of legality, even in the

Christian experience of the day, that interferes greatly with that buoyant, evangelic spirit which ought always to distinguish what Luther calls a "justified" man? And if we contemplate the mental state and condition of the multitude who make no profession of godliness, and in whom the naturalism of the age has very greatly undermined the old ancestral belief in a sin-hating and a sin-pardoning Deity, do we not find still greater need of the fire and the hammer of the word of the Lord?

II. How, then, can we more appropriately conclude the discussion of this subject, than by directing attention, in the second place, to that sort of understanding, with regard to this mode of preaching, which ought to exist between the preacher and the hearer; that intellectual temper which the popular mind should adopt and maintain towards this style of homiletics. For if, as we remarked in the outset, the effectiveness of the orator is dependent, to some extent, upon the receptivity of the auditor, then there is no point of more importance to the Christian ministry, than the general attitude of the public mind towards the stricter truths and doctrines of revelation. What, then, is the proper temper in hearing, which is to stand over against this proper tone in preaching?

In order to answer this question, we must in the outset notice the relation that exists between divine truth and an *apostate* mind like that of man, and the call which it makes for moral earnestness and resoluteness. For we are not treating of public religious address for the seraphim, but for the sinful children of men; and we shall commit a grave error, if we assume that the eternal and righteous truth of God, as a matter of course, must fall like blessed genial sun-light into the corrupt human heart, and make none but pleasant impressions at first. It is therefore necessary, first of all, to know precisely what are the affinities, and also what are the *antagonisms*, between the guilty soul of man, and the holy word of God.

It is plain that such an antagonism is implied in the prophet's interrogatory. For, if the word of God is "as a fire," the human mind, in relation to it, must be as a fuel. For why does fire exist except to burn? When therefore the message from God breathes that startling and illuminating spirit which thrilled through the Hebrew prophets, and at times fell from

the lips of Incarnate Mercy itself, still and swift as lightning from the soft summer cloud, it must cause

“Anguish, and doubt, and fear, and sorrow, and pain,
In mortal minds.”

The posture, consequently, which the “mortal mind” shall take and keep in reference to such a painful message and proclamation from the heavens, is a point of the utmost importance. Many a human soul is lost, because at a certain critical juncture in its history, it yielded to its fear of mental suffering. The word of God had begun to be “a fire” unto it, and foreseeing (oh with how quick an instinct!) a painful process of self-scrutiny and self-knowledge coming on, it wilfully broke away from all such messages and influences, flung itself into occupations and enjoyments, and quenched a pure and good flame that would have only burnt out its dross and its sin; a merely temporary flame that would have superseded the necessity of the eternal one that is now to come. For there is an instinctive and overmastering shrinking in every man from suffering, which it requires much resolution to overcome. The prospect of impending danger rouses his utmost energy to escape from it, and his soul does not recover its wonted tranquillity, until the threatening calamity is overpast. In this lies all the power of the drama in its higher forms. The exciting impression made by a tragedy springs from the steadily increasing danger of suffering which thickens about the career of principal characters in the plot. The liability to undergo pain, which increases as the catastrophe approaches, united with the struggles of the endangered person to escape from it, waken a sympathy and an excitement in the reader or the spectator, stronger than that produced by any other species of literature. And whenever the winding-up of any passage in human history lifts off the burden of apprehension from a human being, and exhibits him in the enjoyment of the ordinary, happy lot of humanity, instead of crushed to earth by a tragic issue of life, we draw a breath so long and free as to evince that we share a common nature, one of whose deepest and most spontaneous feelings is the dread of suffering and pain.

And yet, when we have said this, we have not said the whole.

Deep as is this instinctive shrinking from distress, there are powers and motives which, when in action, will carry the human soul and body through scenes and experiences at which human nature, in its quiet moods and its indolent states, stands aghast. There are times when the mind, the rational judgment, is set in opposition to the body, and compels its earth-born companion to undergo a travail and a woe from which its own constitutional love of ease, and dread of suffering, shrink back with a shuddering recoil.

This antagonism between the sense and the mind is seen in its most impressive forms within the sphere of ethics and religion. Even upon the low position of the stoic, we sometimes see a severe dealing with luxurious tendencies, and a lofty heroism in trampling down the flesh, which, were it not utterly vitiated by pride and vainglorying, would be worthy of the martyr and the confessor. But when we rise up into the region of entire self-abnegation for the glory of God, we see the opposition between the flesh and the spirit in its sublimer form, and know something of the terrible conflict between mind and matter in a fallen creature, and still more of the glorious triumph in a redeemed being, of truth and righteousness over pain and fear. "If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee," is a command that has actually been obeyed by thousands of believers—by the little child, and by the tender and delicate woman who would not adventure to set the sole of her foot upon the ground, for delicateness and tenderness—not in stoical pride and self-reliance, not with self-consciousness and self-gratulation, but in meekness and fear, and in much trembling, and also in the spirit of power, of love, and of a sound mind.

There is call, therefore, on the part of the hearer of religious truth, for that sort of temper which is expressed in the words of the Psalmist, "Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness." In this resolute utterance, suffering is not deprecated, as it would be if these instincts and impulses of human nature had their way and their will, but is actually courted and asked for. That in the Psalmist which needs the smiting of the righteous and of righteousness, and which, for this reason, shrinks from it, is rigorously kept under, in order that the

infliction may be administered for the honour of the truth, and the health of the soul.

And such, it is contended, should be the general attitude of the public mind towards that particular form and aspect of divine revelation which has been delineated in the first part of this article. Every human being, the natural as well as the spiritual man, ought to say, "Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness; let the truth and law of God seize with their strongest grasp, and bite, upon my reason and conscience, it shall be an eternal blessing to me." We do not suppose that the natural man, as such, can make these words his own in the high and full sense in which they were uttered by the regenerate and inspired mind of David. But we do suppose that every auditor can control his impatience, and repress his impulses to flee away from the hammer and the fire, and conquer his prejudices, and compel his ear to hear doctrinal statements that pain his soul, and force his understanding to take in truths and arguments that weigh like night upon his feelings, and that say to him, as did the voice that cried in the tortured soul of Macbeth, "Sleep no more; rest and peace for thee in thy present state are gone for ever." Has not the Christian ministry a right to expect a tacit purpose, and a resolute self-promise, upon the part of every attendant upon public worship, to hold the mind close up to all logical and self-consistent exhibitions of revealed truth, and take the mental, the inward consequences, be they what they may? One of the early fathers speaks of the "ire of truth." Ought not every thinking, every reasoning man, be willing to resist his instinctive and his effeminate dread of suffering, and expose his sinful soul to this "ire," because it is the ire of law and righteousness?

Let us, then, for a moment, look at the argument for this sort of resolute temper in the public mind towards the strict and cogent representations of the pulpit.

1. In the first place, upon the general principles of propriety and fitness, ought not the sacred audience, the assembly that has collected upon the Sabbath day, and in the sanctuary of God, to expect and prepare for such distinctively Biblical representations of God and themselves as have been spoken of?

The secular week has been filled up with the avocations of business, or the pursuits of science and literature, and now when the distinctively religious day and duties begin, is it not the part of consistency to desire that the eternal world should throw in upon the soul its most solemn influences, and that religious truth should assail the judgment and the conscience with its strongest energy? Plainly, if the religious interests of man are worth attending to at all, they are worth the most serious and thorough attention. This Sabbatical segment of human life, these religious hours, should be let alone by that which is merely secular or literary, in order that while they do last, the purest and most strictly religious influences may be experienced. A man's salvation does not depend so much upon the length of his religious experience and exercises, as upon their thoroughness. A single thoroughly penitent sigh wafts the soul to the skies, and the angels, and the bosom of God. A single hearty ejaculation, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," not only lifts the soul high above the region of agony, but irradiates the countenance with the light of angelic faces. But such exhaustive thoroughness in the experience, is the fruit only of thoroughness in the previous indoctrination. He, therefore, who is willing to place himself under the religious influences of the Sabbath and the sanctuary, should be willing to experience the very choicest of these influences. He who takes pains to present himself in the house of God, should expect and prepare himself for the most truthful and solemn of all messages. Professing to devote himself to the subject of religion, and no other, and to listen to the ministration of God's word, and no other, his utterance should be that of the Psalmist: "Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness." Seating himself in the house of God, it should be with an expectation of plain dealing with his understanding, and with the feeling of that stern, yet docile auditor, whose uniform utterance before the preacher was: "Now let the word of God come." We lay it down, then, as a maxim of fitness and self-consistency, that the public mind ought ever to expect and require from the public religious teacher, the most distinctively religious, and strictly Biblical exhibitions of truth upon the Sabbath day, and in the house of God. Other days, and other convocations, may expect and de-

mand other themes, and other trains of thought, but the great religious day of Christendom, and the great religious congregation, insists upon an impression bold and distinct from the world to come. "He has done his duty, now let us do ours," was the reply of Louis XIV. to the complaint of a fawning and dissolute courtier, that the sermon of Bourdaloue had been too pungent and severe. There was manliness and reason in the reply. The pulpit had discharged its legitimate function, and irreligious as was the grand monarch of the French nation, his head was clear and his judgment correct.

If, now, the auditor himself, of his own free will, adopts this maxim, and resolutely holds his mind to the themes and trains of thought that issue from the word of God, a blessing and not a curse will come upon him. Like the patient smitten with leprosy, or struck with gangrene, who resolutely holds out the diseased limb for the knife and the cautery, this man shall find that good comes from taking sides with the divine law, and subjecting the intellect (for we are now pleading merely for the human understanding,) to the searching sword of the truth. There is such a thing as common grace, and that hearer who is enabled by it, Sabbath after Sabbath, to overcome his instinctive fear of suffering, and to exercise a salutary rigour with his mind respecting the style and type of its religious indoctrination, may hope that common and prevenient grace shall become renewing and sanctifying grace.

Probably no symptom of the feeling and tendency of the popular mind would be witnessed and watched with more interest, by the Christian philosopher or the Christian orator, than a growing disposition on the part of the masses to listen to the strict truths, the systematic doctrines of Christianity, and to ponder upon them. And why should there not be this disposition at all times? That which is strictly true is *entirely* true; is thoroughly true; true without abatements or qualifications. Why then shall a thinking creature shrink back from the exactitudes of theology, the severities of righteousness? Why should not the human mind follow out everything within the province of religion, to its last results, without reference to the immediate painful effect upon the feelings? If a thing be true, why confer with flesh and blood about it? If certain distinctly

revealed doctrines of revelation, accurately stated, and logically followed out, do cut down all the cherished hopes of a sinful man, with respect to his future destiny, why not let them cut them down? Why not, with the unsparing self-consistence of the mathematician, either take them as legitimate and inevitable conclusions, from admitted sources and premises, in all their strictness and fearful meaning, or else throw sources, premises, and conclusions all away? How is it possible for a thinking man to maintain a middle and a neutral ground in doctrinal religion, any more than in science?

2. But leaving this mainly intellectual argument for the Psalmist's temper towards the stern side of revelation, we pass, in the second place, to the yet stronger moral argument drawn from the nature of that great spiritual change, which the Founder of Christianity asserts must pass upon every human being, in order to entrance into the kingdom of heaven.

Man, though self-ruined, is helplessly, hopelessly ruined. Loaded with guilt, which he cannot expiate, and in bondage to a sin from which he can never deliver himself, he cannot now be saved except by the most powerful methods, and the most thorough processes. What has been done outside, in the counsels of eternity and in the depths of the Triune God, to bring about human redemption, evinces the magnitude and the difficulty of the work undertaken. But of this we do not propose to speak. We speak only of what is to be done *inside*, in the mind and heart of the individual man, as evincing conclusively that this salvation of the human soul cannot be brought about by imperfect and slender exhibitions of truth, or by an irresolute and timorous posture of the auditor's mind. No man is compelled to suffer salvation. Pardon of all sin from the eternal God, and purity for eternal ages, are offered to him, not as a cheap thing to be forced upon an unwilling recipient, but as a priceless boon. Our Lord himself, therefore, bids every man count the cost, and make up the comparative estimate, before he commences the search for eternal life. "Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else *make the tree corrupt*, and his fruit corrupt." Be *thorough* in one direction or the other. Either be a saint or a sinner. The Redeemer virtually advises a man not to begin the search at all, unless he begin it in earnest.

The entire Scripture representation is, that as man's salvation cost much on high and in the heavens, so it must cost much below, and in the soul of man. If, then, religion be not rejected altogether, and the hearer still expects and hopes to derive an everlasting benefit from it, he should take it precisely as he finds it, and allow its truths to wound first, that they may heal afterwards; to slay in the beginning, that they may make alive in the end.

For such is the method of Christianity. Conviction is the necessary antecedent to conversion. But how is this great process to be carried through, if the public mind shrinks away from all convicting truth, as the sensitive plant does from the touch? How is man to be conducted down into the depths of an humbling and abasing self-knowledge, if he does not allow the flashing and fiery illumination of the law and the prophets to drive out the black darkness of self-deception? It is impossible, as we have already observed, that divine truth should pour its first rays into the soul of alienated man, without producing pain. The unfallen seraph can hear the law proclaimed amidst thunders and lightnings with a serene spirit and an adoring frame, because he has perfectly obeyed it from the beginning. But Moses, and the children of Israel, and all the posterity of Adam, must hear law, when first proclaimed, with exceeding fear and quaking, because they have broken it. It is a fact too often overlooked, that divine truth, when accurately stated and closely applied, cannot leave the mind of a sinful being as quiet and happy as it leaves that of a holy being. In the case of man, therefore, the truth must in the outset cause foreboding and alarm. In the history of the human religious experience, soothing, consolation, and joy, from the truth are the subsequents, and not the antecedents. The plain and full proclamation of that word of God which is "as a fire," must, at first, awaken misgivings and fears, and, until man has passed through this stage of experience, must leave his sinful and lost soul with a sense of danger and insecurity. There is, consequently, no true option for man, but either not to hear at all, or else to hear first in the poignant and anxious style. The choice that is left him is either that of the Pharisee, or the Magdalen; that of the self-righteous, or the self-condemned; either to hate the

light, and not come to the light, lest painful disclosures of character and conduct be made, or else to come resolutely out into the light, that the deeds may be reprovèd.

For this work of reproof is the first and indispensable function of religious truth, in the instance of the natural man. If there be self-satisfaction, and a sense of safety, in the unrenewed human soul, it is certain that as yet there is no contact between it and the Divine word. For it is as true of every man, as it was of the apostle Paul, that when the law shall "come" with plainness and power to his mind, he will "die." His hope of heaven will die; his hope of a quiet death-bed will die; his hope of acquittal and safety in the day of judgment and at the bar of God, will die. That apostolic experience was legitimate and normal, and no natural man must expect that the truth and law of God, when applied with distinctness and power to his reason and conscience, will leave him with any different experience in the outset, from that which has initiated and heralded the passage from darkness to light, and from sin to holiness, in every instance of a soul's redemption. There is no royal road across the chasm that separates the renewed from the unrenewed man. In order to salvation, every human creature must tread that strait and narrow path of self-examination, self-condemnation, and self-renunciation, which was trodden by the goodly fellowship of the prophets, the glorious company of the apostles, and the noble army of the martyrs.

In subjecting the mind and conscience to the poignant influence of keen and pure truth, and doing everything in his power to have the stern and preparatory doctrines of the legal dispensation become a schoolmaster, to lead him to the mercy and the pity that is in the blood of Christ, any man is simply acting over the conduct of every soul that, in the past, has crossed from the kingdom of darkness to the kingdom of light. He is merely travelling the King's highway to the celestial city; and whoever would climb up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber. Even the thoughtful pagan acknowledged the necessity of painful processes in the human mind, in order to any moral improvement. Over the Delphic portal was inscribed the words, "Without the descent into the hell of self-knowledge, there is no ascent into heaven." We do not sup-

pose that this remarkable saying exhibits its full meaning within the province of the pagan religions, or of natural religion. The heathen sage often uttered a truth whose pregnant significance is understood only in the light of a higher and supernatural dispensation. But if the agony of self-knowledge is postulated by paganism, in order to the origin of virtue within the human soul, much more then is it by Christianity. If the heathen moralist, with his low view of virtue, and his very indistinct apprehension of the spirituality of the moral law, and his utterly inadequate conception of a holy and happy state beyond the grave, could yet tell us that there is a hell of self-knowledge to be travelled through, a painful process of self-scrutiny and self-condemnation to be endured, before moral improvement can begin here, or the elysiums of the hereafter be attained—if this be the judgment of the heathen moralist, from his low point of view, and in the mere twilights of natural religion, what must be the judgment of the human mind, when under the Christian dispensation the moral law flashes out its nimble and forked lightnings upon sin and pollution, with a fierceness of heat like that which consumed the stones and dust, and licked up the water in the trench about the prophet's altar; when Divine truth is made quick and powerful by the super-added agency of the Holy Ghost, so as to discern the very thoughts and intents of the heart; when the pattern-image of an absolute excellence is seen in him who is the brightness of the Father's eternal glory; and when the heaven to be sought for, and what is yet more, to be prepared for, is a state of spotless and sinless perfection in the light of the Divine countenance! Plainly, self-knowledge within the Christian sphere implies and involves a searching and sifting examination into character, motive, thought, feeling, and conduct, such as no man can undergo without shame, and humiliation, and self-condemnation, and remorse, and, without the blood of Christ, everlasting despair.

The same course of reasoning respecting each and all the remaining processes that enter into the change from sin to holiness, and the formation of a heavenly character, would in each instance help to strengthen the argument we are urging in favour of the plainest preaching, and the most resolute hear-

ing, of religious truth. The more a man knows of sin and of holiness, of the immense gulf between them, and of the difficulty of the passage from one to the other, the more heartily will he believe that the methods and the processes by which the transition is effected must each and all of them be of the most energetic and thorough character. And the deeper this conviction, the more hearty and energetic will be his adoption of the Psalmist's utterance, "Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness."

We have thus considered the mutual relations of the Sacred Orator and the Christian Auditor. In doing this, we have passed rapidly over a very wide field, and have touched upon some of the most momentous themes that can engage the human mind. What, and how, we are to conceive of God; and particularly how we are to represent Him as affected in his own essential Being, towards the holiness or the sin of his creatures, is of all subjects the most serious and important. In closing the discussion, we are more than ever impressed with the importance of a bold and biblical theism in the Christian pulpit. Whenever the preacher asserts that God loves the righteous, let him assert it with energy, and warmth, and momentum. Let him make his hearers see and know that the great God is personal in this emotion; that He pours out upon those who are in filial sympathy with him and his law the infinite wealth of his pure and stainless affection, and that it permeates the whole being of the object so beloved with warm currents of light and life eternal. And whenever he asserts that God hates sin, and is angry with the sinner, let him assert it without any abatement or qualification. Let him cause the impenitent and sin-loving man to see and know, that upon him, as taken and held in that sinful character and condition, the eternal and holy Deity is pouring out the infinite intensity of his moral displeasure, and that, out of Christ, and irrespective of the awful passion of Gethsemane and Calvary, that immaculate and stainless emotion of the Divine essence is now revealed from heaven against his unrighteousness, and is only awaiting his passage into the eternal world, to become the monotonous and everlasting consciousness of the soul.

Amidst the high and increasing civilization and over-refine-

ment that is coming in upon Christendom, and especially amidst the naturalism that threatens the Scriptures and the Church, the Christian ministry must themselves realize, as did the Hebrew prophets, that God is the *living* God, and by God's own help and grace, evoke this same consciousness in the souls of their hearers. Let, then, these two specific personal qualities—the divine wrath and the divine love—be smitten, driven, hurled, like javelins, into the consciousness of the nations. Then will there be the piercing wail of contrition, preceding and heralding the bounding joy of conscious pardon.

ART. V.—*The General Assembly.*

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America met at Peoria, Illinois, May 1863. The opening sermon was preached by the Moderator of the last Assembly, Charles C. Beatty, D. D., from Eph. iv. 7. "Unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ." The Rev. J. H. Morrison, of Lodiana, Northern India, was chosen Moderator, and J. H. M. Knox, D. D., of the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, was elected Temporary Clerk.

After the appointment of the several standing committees, and the despatch of several items of routine business, the correspondence between the Moderator of the last Assembly and the Moderator of the Assembly of the Presbyterian church, was submitted, and is as follows:

STEUBENVILLE, OHIO, June 6, 1862.

REV. DR. GEORGE DUFFIELD, *Moderator*:

Rev. and Dear Brother—I have the great pleasure of communicating to you, as Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church recently met in Cincinnati, the accompanying document, being a minute adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church which met in Columbus.

The expressions of all the members with regard to a correspondence with your branch of the Presbyterian family were

of the kindest character, and the action was had with entire unanimity. It was much regretted at the time, that, as your Assembly had closed its sessions, we could not have presented this to you before its adjournment. We hope that you will lay it before your Assembly at so early a period of its next meeting, that, if agreeable, commissioners may be sent to our next meeting at Peoria, Illinois, and be assured that, at the earliest information of a favourable action by you, we shall be pleased to nominate commissioners to your Assembly.

I am instructed by our Assembly to accompany this with our Christian salutations to you and to the body over which you preside. With earnest prayer that such spiritual blessings may be bestowed, from our covenant God, upon the whole church which you represent, I remain, dear sir, with respect and esteem, your brother in the hope of the gospel,

CHARLES C. BEATTY,

Moderator General Assembly Presbyterian Church U. S. A.

“In the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America, in session at Columbus, Ohio, the matter of a fraternal correspondence, by commissioners, with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, (New-school,) in session at Cincinnati, Ohio, being duly considered, is decided as follows:

“This Assembly having considered several overtures sent to it by a few of the Presbyteries under its care, proposing that steps should be taken by it towards an organic union between this church and the church under the care of the Presbyterian General Assembly, (New-school,) and having determined against the course proposed in said overtures, has also been informed that the other General Assembly has, about the same time, come to a similar conclusion on similar overtures laid before it by a certain number of its own Presbyteries. Of its own motion, this General Assembly, considering the time to have come for it to take the initiative in securing a better understanding of the relations which it judges are proper to be maintained between the two General Assemblies—each body sending to the other, one minister and one ruling elder, as commissioners, to enjoy such privileges in each body to which they are sent, as are common to all those now received by this body

from other Christian denominations. The Moderator will communicate this deliverance to the Moderator of the other Assembly, to be laid before it, with our Christian salutations."

Copy of a letter addressed by the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, convened in Cincinnati, Ohio:

To the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, convened at Columbus, Ohio:

REV. CHARLES C BEATTY, D. D.

DETROIT, June 20, 1862.

Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, etc.

Rev. and dear Brother—On my return to this city from a visit into Kentucky, made after the adjournment of the General Assembly at Cincinnati, I had the pleasure to receive your very courteous and fraternal communication of the 6th inst., with the accompanying copy of the "deliverance" of the General Assembly over which you preside, relative to the matter of a correspondence by commissioners with the body I have the honour, for the time being, to represent.

Had not the General Assembly at Cincinnati adjourned on Saturday evening, 24th ult., before hearing of the action of the General Assembly at Columbus, it would have been my pleasing duty to have announced the prompt and cordial acceptance of the proposal you have communicated for "a stated annual friendly interchange of commissioners" between the two bodies, and also the names of delegates to attend the next meeting of the General Assembly at Peoria, Illinois. It is the unanimous desire for such interchange.

It will afford me pleasure at the earliest period of the sessions of the next General Assembly at Philadelphia, D. V., to lay your communication, with accompanying document, before that body, that the interchange of commissioners, as proposed, may take place before the adjournment of the next two assemblies.

I have directed the Stated Clerk to transmit to you a certified copy of the action of the General Assembly at Cincinnati, evincing the entire cordiality with which such a correspondence will be commenced and cherished.

Had not my return to this city been delayed, I should, in accordance with the sentiments of many members of the Gene-

ral Assembly at Cincinnati, have expressed fraternally my own and their great satisfaction in the prospect of intercourse between bodies too closely and vitally united, to remain permanently estranged to each other. A fit of sickness since my return has prevented an earlier reply to your favour awaiting me.

Accept, my dear sir, my Christian salutations to yourself, and the General Assembly over which you preside. Our prayers ascend for your peace and prosperity.

With sentiments of respect and cordial esteem, I remain yours in the sufficiency of the gospel,

GEORGE DUFFIELD,

Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the U. S. A.

In consequence of this correspondence, delegates were appointed by the two Assemblies, to represent each other at the meetings then in session. The Rev. Dr. Patterson and the Hon. W. H. Brown appeared as delegates from the Assembly in session at Philadelphia. Dr. Patterson made the following address:

In ordinary circumstances, it would give me great pleasure to meet you here; and I now depart from my usual custom of making an apology, because from indisposition I feel that I cannot do justice to the occasion. But I can hardly trust myself to speak upon the present occasion. There are some embarrassing circumstances in the case. The resolutions passed by the Assembly at Columbus last year, were not received in time for action last year. It was not till a very late hour that we received notice of our appointment, and that by telegraph. We are here to tender Christian salutations, and kindly fraternal regards to this venerable body, and the churches here represented. We recognise you as one with us, as Presbyterians, acknowledging the same Confession of Faith, the same Form of Government and Book of Discipline. It is fitting, therefore, that we should acknowledge each other as brethren, and we rejoice to inaugurate this correspondence, which has been too long neglected. Twenty-five years have elapsed since the lamentable division, and in that time there have been no tokens of friendship interchanged. It is high time to disabuse the public of impressions made by this course. We are drawing nearer each other in many respects. Our

sympathy, true spirit, missionary plans, are all approximating to yours; and we rejoice in your resolutions to push forward the good cause, regarding our civil government as the great exponent of civil and religious freedom to the world.

Mr. Moderator, we rejoice in your success no less than in our own. We have watched your progress with joy, feeling that your success is ours, and your joys ours. We present to you the last minutes of our body, which will show our progress. We are growing more homogeneous, our institutions better established, our progress more steady, and our preparation more and more fully completed. Hitherto we have passed through great difficulties. Our work hitherto has been preparatory; now we are ready to go forward in the missionary work, with all who love the Lord Jesus Christ. Brethren, pray for us, that the word of God may have free course, and be glorified with us. We regret that we cannot remain with you to the end of the session, to listen to your interesting and instructive discussions.

Hon. Mr. Brown spoke as follows:—Mr. Moderator, I shall content myself with presenting the Christian salutations to the lay members of this body, and express the ardent desire that in the future, if we remain two bodies, we may go forward in harmony and unison and brotherly love.

Rev. Dr. Humphrey, being in the chair, responded as follows:

I regret that the Moderator has been called away suddenly from the chair. He for twenty-five years has been a missionary in India, and it would rejoice you to hear salutations from his lips. It is also pleasant to associate with the ministerial delegate and the ruling elder representing your body, according to the great idea of our church government. This venerable Assembly has also appointed two delegates to represent us in the Assembly in Philadelphia, and they will extend to you that assurance of fellowship which you have given to us. We are a missionary church, and are glad to know that you are entering also upon this missionary work. We will meet with you there upon heathen soil as well as here, and the hearts of your missionaries and ours will beat in unison in their great work. Brethren, we ask you also to pray for us,

that we may be blessed, and gather many precious souls as crowns of rejoicing. This intercourse has been, perhaps, too long delayed; but now we borrow from this very delay, reason for increased tokens of Christian affection, and we give you the right hand of fellowship as brethren in the Lord.

The Rev. Dr. Tustin and the Hon. Judge Sharswood were appointed to represent our Assembly before the Assembly in Philadelphia, and were cordially received. Dr. Tustin made the following address:

Mr. Moderator and Brethren of the Assembly:—In the year of our Lord, 1837, a violent ecclesiastical convulsion was experienced in the heart of this city. By that convulsion the great Presbyterian church was rent in twain, like the vail of the temple, from the top to the bottom. From that time down to the present, a period embracing a full quarter of a century, we have been two distinct peoples, bearing, it is true, the same name, and rejoicing in the same sublime symbol of faith; but still separate in our action, and alienated in our affections.

With respect to the causes, real or imaginary, of that disruption, it would be inexpedient, if not indecorous of me, to speak at this time and in this presence. Some things, however, ought to be named, even though it should cover us with shame and self-condemnation. We have indulged in a spirit of bitterness towards each other, not warranted by the gospel we profess. We have indulged prejudices for which we can find no justification. We have uttered words of unkindness and reproach which we can well afford to have obliterated, not only from our own recollection, but from the remembrance of God.

The question is frequently propounded by lips upon which have often trembled the words of prayer and supplication for the unity and prosperity of our Zion, "Shall we be always thus separated? Shall the barriers which now separate us never be removed? Shall we never become what we once were, a united, happy, and prosperous church, the praise and the glory of the whole land?"

In reply to these touching and emphatic interrogations, I would say, that in my representative character, I am not authorized to express a judgment on this branch of the subject.

I might, if it would answer any valuable purpose, speak of individual opinions and wishes, but not of the embodied sentiment of the church-court which I represent.

One thing, however, I am authorized to say, that so far as we are concerned, the strife is at an end. The fierce war-cry that grated so long upon the heart of piety, has died away into an echo so indistinct as to be scarcely distinguishable. Our ecclesiastical war-steeds, if we may so speak, are reclining amidst the olive groves of peace.

I come to you bearing aloft the trophies of fraternal love and affection—for love has its triumphs as well as hate—peace as well as war. I come to invite you back to our confidence and esteem. I come to express to you the wishes of my brethren, that the blessing of God, in its richest manifestations, may rest upon you individually and collectively, that harmony may characterize all your deliberations, that a heavenly influence may so pervade your hearts, as that nothing shall occur to mar the beauty and symmetry of the body of Christ.

By the kindness and courtesy of my venerable and honoured friend, the Moderator of the last General Assembly which met a year ago at Columbus, Ohio, I was placed at the head of the "Committee on Foreign Correspondence." This position soon enabled me to ascertain the views and feelings of my brethren, from different sections of the church, on this interesting question. I found that, while some difference of opinion prevailed with respect to the reunion of these two bodies at the present time, there was but one sentiment in reference to the propriety and desirableness of an interchange of Christian salutations through the medium of annually appointed delegates.

Having heard, whether rightfully or not, I am not prepared to say, that you were discussing this same subject in your General Assembly at Cincinnati, Ohio, the Committee of our Assembly hastened to anticipate your action, and thus secure the honour of inaugurating a measure so creditable to the source where it might first originate. It may have been ungenerous, but candour obliges me to confess that the Committee was ambitious of that high distinction. You, Mr. Moderator, and the brethren of this Assembly, will, I am sure, in such a case, pardon our aspirations. Accordingly, the Com-

mittee reported in favour of immediate action by the Assembly, and actually nominated a worthy brother, who should be the bearer of our Christian and friendly salutations, with the pleasing expectation that you would reciprocate our well-meant courtesies.

Some of the brethren, however, thought this action too hasty and precipitate for so grave a subject, and proposed a more sedate and deliberate procedure. With a view of securing unanimity on a measure so dear to many hearts, the Committee surrendered their original report, and presented the paper which has been read in your hearing, as a substitute. This paper was not only unanimously, but I feel warranted in saying, cordially adopted by the Assembly.

Having learned through the telegraph, of your favourable action on the subject, the Assembly now in session at Peoria, Illinois, have, through the same medium, authorized me to represent them in part, in this Assembly.

I accept this appointment with unfeigned satisfaction. I am sincerely grateful to my brethren for the distinguished honour which they have thus bestowed upon me. I regard it as the crowning glory of my life. In my declining years and enfeebled health, (pardon this personal allusion,) it comes like the breath of the vernal morning to the fevered and aching brow.

While I would thus express my high appreciation of the privilege extended to me by my brethren, of representing them in this Assembly, I am also grateful to you, Mr. Moderator and brethren of this Assembly, for your prompt and courteous attention to their communications on a subject of vital interest to our common Zion. I can only repay you by my earnest prayers, that divine and celestial influences may descend so plenteously upon you, as that love shall beam from every eye, distil from every lip, shower from the fingers of every hand, and create around this Assembly an atmosphere which angels will descend to inhale, and in which God himself will delight to dwell.

I cannot close these brief remarks without adding a word in relation to a subject not remotely akin to that which is now claiming our attention. The last quarter of a century has been signalized by the spirit of division which has pervaded

all the departments of church and of state. Churches have divided—Presbyteries have divided—Synods have divided—General Assemblies have divided—Conferences have divided—Conventions have divided—and last, though not least, our beloved country, in some sense, has divided. Different portions of our once happy people are now arrayed in hostile attitude, and are pouring out each other's blood like water upon the ground. The wail of sorrow and anguish is heard from ten thousand homes and hearts throughout the land—Rachel weeping for her children, and refusing to be comforted, because they are not.

The question is pertinent, whether the disintegrating spirit which has been fostered in our churches has not had some considerable influence in producing this last great disruption, over which we all lament and mourn. I strongly incline to the judgment expressed on this subject by your venerable Moderator, in his admirable discourse at the opening of this Assembly; and if this be so, what is the duty of the several denominations who have been instrumental indirectly in bringing these great and terrible evils upon our land?

In the halcyon days of the Republic, it was my privilege, for five or six consecutive years, to minister at the altar of this great nation, in the capacity of chaplain to the Senate of the United States. My position gave me opportunities of information, which were enjoyed by comparatively few. Among other things, I learned that statesmen and politicians watched the movements of the church more closely than we imagined. Nullification was dead and buried; but secession—the disruption of the Union, and the establishment of a glorious confederacy, separate and independent—was among the deceptive dreams of southern statesmen and politicians, even in that day. The divisions of the church seemed, in their estimation, to encourage the hope, and sanction the fearful enterprise.

Mr. Calhoun more than once, in his public speeches on the floor of the Senate, referred, with evident satisfaction, to the disintegrating policy which the churches were pursuing; and he appeared especially gratified when those divisions were the result of sectional considerations. The terrible crisis at length arrived—the fatal blow was struck—the Republic trembled

from its centre to its circumference, and now we find ourselves contending at the point of the bayonet for the integrity of our blessed Union and the perpetuity of our institutions.

Whilst, then, the church, convinced of her error, is endeavouring, as far as practicable, to repair the damage she has done, let politicians and statesmen imitate her example. Let them come and contemplate this present scene, and catch the spirit of this holy season, until their hearts shall become blended into one great heart of love, affection, and brotherhood. Ignoring politics and party, let them meet on the great platform of a pure and elevated patriotism, and devote all their energies to the restoration of an honourable peace to our bleeding, afflicted, and weary country. And let us, my brethren, cease not, day nor night, to cry unto the Lord God of hosts, that he would interpose for our speedy deliverance from all the calamities which now afflict us, and bestow a spirit of Christian unity not only upon the churches, but upon all the people of this land. Then shall we not only see the "stars and stripes," that glorious emblem of our national renown, waving unmolested in the North, the South, the East, the West, but we shall behold that brighter symbol of our hope and safety, the cross of Jesus, elevated in our midst, and glittering with augmented splendours. Then shall the red battle-field, now vocal with the groans and sighs of the wounded and the dying, become a glorious cathedral, which shall resound only with hallelujahs and thanksgivings to God. Then shall the now sorrowing people of our land unite with descending angels in repeating the heaven-composed song, which celebrated the advent of the great Peacemaker between God and man—saying, "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good-will to man."

"How long, dear Saviour, O how long
Shall that bright hour delay?
Fly swiftly round, ye wheels of time,
And bring the welcome day."

A letter of Judge Sharswood, addressed to the Assembly, was read, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, May 26th, 1863.

Rev. and Dear Sir:—I am informed that I have been appointed by the General Assembly at Peoria, one of their

delegates to the body over which you preside. It would afford me great pleasure to be present when the delegates are heard; but my official engagements will prevent me, and, if present, the fatigue and exhaustion of mind and body consequent upon a long session of the court, would incapacitate me from participating. It is, however, of no importance, as my colleagues will fully represent the views and feelings of our constituents on so happy an occasion. I hope, however, to be present at your session some time before your final adjournment.

Presenting my cordial salutations to yourself and the members of the Assembly, I remain, very truly, yours,

GEORGE SHARSWOOD.

Rev. H. B. SMITH, D. D., Moderator.

The *Moderator*—It becomes my duty, as the Moderator of this Assembly, to make a response to those courteous, those cordial words which have come to us from the kindred Assembly now in session at Peoria. We esteem it a happy circumstance that these words should be uttered to us, that these feelings should be expressed to us, by the reverend gentleman who was the occasion of bringing the subject, in the form in which it finally passed, before that Assembly last year. It is a peculiar satisfaction to us to hear his voice uttering these words, which speak joy and strength to all our hearts; for division, after all, is weakness, and union is strength.

The first time that I ever came to this city of Philadelphia—the first time I ever attended a meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, was in the year 1837—the year to which reference has already been made—the year in which that grand, noble, powerful church was shaken to its centre—the next year to be riven asunder. It was a time when men's hearts were full of anxiety and fear; for no one could tell what the rupture of such a body might portend either in church or in state. Since that time we have been separate, but still two powerful growing denominations; for not even division and separation can prevent the victorious progress of our faith and polity in the land. Yet we were sundered from one another, with no words of welcome from the ecclesiastical assemblages to the other—no words of cheer or comfort dropped, except as individuals, ministers to ministers, and above all, lay-

men to laymen. But this separation has been superficial. Deeper than the separation has been, must be the oneness and the unity. The separation belongs to those earthly vestments which see corruption; the unity belongs to that spiritual inheritance which abideth forevermore. [Applause.] Through many years, and first of all among the deepest feelings of the church's heart, this desire for reunion—for the united expression of opinion and feeling, has been growing stronger; and now, in the crisis and juncture of our nation's history and threatened separation, these churches are drawing nearer and nearer together; and it may be that our national troubles shall be sanctified to the church of Christ itself, and unite all that love Christ's name by stronger ties, by undying affinity. [Applause.]

Presbyterians, of whatever branch, are separated, after all, simply by parenthesis and accident of a necessarily temporary nature. Those that have the same standard of faith—those that have the same history—those that have the same polity,—those that have the same ends in view, are really one; the differences are nominal and temporary. Our churches, more than we have believed, have been one during all these rolling years, which have witnessed so many bitter words, which now we all repent of, and ask God to forgive.

Consider for a moment, in what respects we are one. Both these branches of the Presbyterian church have the same history. Since the first churches were planted here from that noble dispersion which came to us from Scotland and from Ireland, and from England, and from the Palatinate, to gather themselves under the Presbyterian "order," until one hundred and fifty years since, in this city of Philadelphia, they were formed into the first Presbytery, and then one hundred and forty-two years ago were formed into the first Synod, and then immediately after our National Constitution was established here, in the same city of Philadelphia, honoured ever for its loyalty and its patriotism, and also honoured ever for its devotion to Presbyterianism, were formed into a General Assembly—both the branches of our church have a common heritage in that long history, that noble descent. We equally own and reverence the names of Makemie, of Andrews, of Finley, of

Witherspoon, of Blair, names known and honoured throughout the land. We have also the same standards of faith. That matchless Confession, inspired by the deepest genius of the Reformation, formed in the halls of Westminster, and those catechisms, the ripest product of the whole doctrinal movement of the Reformation, in which are gathered together as nowhere else so clearly and distinctly, the most decided teachings of God's word—those belong to us equally. A system excluding Pelagianism, Socinianism, and Arminianism—a system Augustinian, Pauline, Reformed, and Calvinistic—it equally belongs to us. We confess it in the same words—we teach it in the same formulas. [Applause.]

We also have the same polity—the most honoured and the strongest polity that sprang from the loins of the Reformation, with the greatest aggressive organizing power—equally removed on the one hand from independency—that polity belongs to us, one and the same.

We also have the same devotion to this, our beloved country. We are equally devoted to her cause—heart, soul, body, spirit, life—ready to give all and do all, that our country may be successfully carried through its conflicts—that this rebellion be overcome, and that we be a united people. Loyalty is at the depth of the heart of both our Assemblies. We also share in sympathies and prayers for that ill-fated, down-trodden race, placed by Providence in the midst of us, whose burdens lie so heavy upon our nation's heart, and whose oppression lies so deep among our nation's sins. For that race, it is our common prayer that God may open a way for deliverance and elevation, to secure both their good and ours, and to secure the final unity of this our grand, imperial, American Republic. [Applause.]

We are also one in our general aims and spirit as a denomination—as we go forth throughout the land, having for our great object, to evangelize this country and all that come within our borders—to bring them under the spirit and power of the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Besides unity in all these things, and many more that might be mentioned, we also have only one hope, one Saviour, one eternity, one heaven. We know that, whatever the divisions in

time, there is to be at last but one general assembly and church of the first-born, the names of whose members are written in heaven.

With the deepest feelings, with the most heartfelt cordiality, we reciprocate all your expressions of kindness and of love, and pray that the Spirit of peace, the dove of heaven, may descend and dwell in the midst of us, and inspire all our hearts. We ask not anxiously concerning the future. We accept what you have offered in the Spirit and terms in which it has been communicated. We seek not to cast the horoscope of the future. God alone knows what that may be. It was surely a grand vision, that the different branches of the Presbyterian family spread throughout our Republic, should and could be gathered into one glorious, united, advancing host, going on conquering and to conquer. But who believes that the wisdom or power of man is adequate to lead or guide such a host? We each have a providential mission, and in that mission our whole object in respect to each other will be to provoke one another unto love and good works, and where the Master has placed us, there to labour, relying upon his wise guidance and grace in the future, as we have experienced the same in the past.

Brethren, what a grand and boundless opportunity spreads before these churches in the future history of our country! If so be that God carry us through this conflict, and bring us out again into a large and wealthy place, what a work has then God's church to accomplish here upon the earth, demanding all its resources, all its energies, all its united zeal, in order that the evils which threaten the safety of our Republic may be destroyed, and that the kingdom of Christ may advance through all our borders—may make the waste places to rejoice and blossom like the rose—may diffuse a pure and undefiled religion, and may bring the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to bear upon all the institutions, relations, and races of men in the midst of us, and thus become our strength, our joy, our peace as a nation, enabling us to triumph under the banner of Immanuel, Prince of Peace.

The church which you represent, we wish God-speed in every good word and work. We pray that they may experience the increase of God. We pray that the blessing of God the

Father, and Christ the Son, and the Holy Spirit may rest upon you, upon them, upon us, upon all the Israel of God forevermore. Amen.

The Moderator having concluded, the Assembly, on the suggestion of the Rev. Dr. Skinner, united in singing the hymn beginning,

“Blest be the tie that binds
Our hearts in Christian love!”

The Assembly was then led by the Rev. Dr. Cox in a fervent appeal to the Throne of Grace.

On the eighth day of its sessions, the Assembly at Peoria adopted the following minute, in answer to certain overtures contemplating the union of the two branches of the Presbyterian church.

Resolved, That in the judgment of this General Assembly, it is not deemed expedient to take at this time any decided action with a reference to a reunion of the New and Old-school Presbyterian churches.

Resolved, That in the fraternal correspondence now happily inaugurated, the General Assembly would recognise an initiative in the matter of securing a better understanding of the relations which subsist between the two Assemblies, and the means of promoting that mutual charity and that just apprehension of the true grounds of Christian union and fellowship, which may serve to prepare the way for a union that shall be harmonious and permanently promotive of the interests of truth and vital godliness.

Resolved, That as a still further preparative to such a desirable union, the General Assembly deem it important—and this in reference to both these branches of the Presbyterian church—that the ministers, elders, and such as have the care and instruction of the young, be increasingly careful to exhibit clearly the distinctive principles of Christian doctrine and church polity as held by the Presbyterian church. That the ministers of these two branches of the church cultivate fraternal intercourse, a free interchange of views and feelings, and in all suitable ways encourage and aid one another in the appropriate work of the ministry; and that the members of the one or the other branch connect themselves with existing

congregations of either, rather than cast in their influence and aid with bodies whose principles and form of government are foreign to their own.

Every Christian must rejoice in the spirit manifested in both the venerable bodies which have thus auspiciously inaugurated the measures which contemplate the ultimate reunion of the two great churches which they represent. The causes which led to the separation of the two bodies, were partly diversity of opinion on matters of doctrine; partly diversity of principle and practice on matters of ecclesiastical organization; partly difference of views as to the import of the formula of subscription to the Confession of Faith; partly conflicting views as to the best method of conducting missionary and other benevolent operations; and partly, no doubt, alienation of feeling on the part of leading men on both sides. All these causes are gradually ceasing to exist. There is, perhaps, at this moment, greater harmony of views between the two bodies on all these points, than has existed at any time since the separation. Certain we are, that every Old-school man would joyfully subscribe to every principle, and cordially sympathize with every sentiment contained in the beautiful address of the reverend Moderator of the Philadelphia Assembly, above quoted.

BOARDS OF THE CHURCH.—*Church Extension.*

The following is an abstract of the annual report of this Board:

Applications.—The number of applications for aid put on file from April 1, 1862, to April 1, 1863, was seventy. These applications were from churches in the bounds of twenty-one Synods, thirty-seven Presbyteries, and fifteen States and Territories. These seventy churches ask for aid amounting in the aggregate to \$24,954.40, averaging \$356.49 each.

Besides these new applications filed during the year, there were sixty-one previous applications, calling for \$24,991.75, undisposed of April 1, 1862. The Board, therefore, had before it, during the twelve months under review, one hundred and thirty-one applications, calling for nearly \$50,000.

During the year, six applications, asking for \$8625, were

declined chiefly for want of funds; and thirty-seven applications, requesting aid to the amount of \$13,691.75, were stricken from the file, because they had not furnished the requisite information in the two years allowed for that purpose.

There remained on file, and undisposed of, for want of the usual information, April 1, 1863, applications from thirty-two churches, calling for \$12,750.

Appropriations.—During the year under review, appropriations amounting to \$10,308.40, were made to forty-six churches in the bounds of seventeen Synods, thirty-one Presbyteries, and sixteen States and Territories. The average amount appropriated to each of these forty-six churches was \$224.09.

Appropriations amounting to \$625 were, during the year, withdrawn from five churches. To one of these, however, a new appropriation was soon after made. The names and localities of all these churches will be found in the appendix to the Report.

From April 1, 1862, to April 1, 1863, thirty-seven churches drew their appropriations. The amount credited the Treasurer on account of payments to churches during the year, is \$7631.65.

Receipts and Expenditures.—The appropriated balance in the treasury, April 1, 1862, was \$10,756.29. The receipts from all sources, during the year, were \$19,225.22, of which sum, \$14,240.27 was from churches. The available means, therefore, of the year, were \$29,981.51.

The expenditures of the year, as shown by the Treasurer's statement in the appendix, were \$9474.93. The balance in the treasury, April 1, 1863, was consequently, \$20,506.58. There were, however, unpaid at that time, liabilities amounting to \$14,172.66, leaving as the unpledged balance, April 1, 1863, \$6333.92. Thus, for the first time in our history, we close a fiscal year with a considerable unpledged balance in the treasury.

Cost of Church Edifices.—Since the organization of the Board, July 1855, appropriations have been made to four hundred and eighty-six different churches. Of these, sixty-six were aided by special appropriations, for which the Board took no responsibility. As nearly as we can ascertain, the remain-

ing four hundred and twenty churches cost \$817,252, or \$1946 each.

The reported average cost of the church edifices aided by the Board during the year under review, is \$1,687.01. This is an advance of \$559.11, or nearly fifty per cent. over the reported cost of those aided during the previous year, and was to be expected from the general advance in the price of labour and materials.

The Committee to whom this report was referred presented the following paper, which was adopted.

“1. We recommend that the Assembly approve of the minutes of the Board, and that the report also be approved and published as usual.

2. We call attention to the fact, that more than two-thirds of our churches are still entirely delinquent in contributing to the funds of this Board. That the small amounts given—less than ten churches reaching the sum of \$100—indicate that the wants of the cause are too little laid before our people, and that the increased cost of building makes larger contributions more important than before. We recommend, therefore, that the Presbyteries be directed to inquire, at their fall meetings, what churches have taken collections, enjoined by the Assembly, for July, on behalf of the Board of Church Extension, and to urge a more general attention hereafter to the wants of this Board.

3. The Committee are gratified to learn that the Board of Church Extension, in view of the difficulties of the times, has made special efforts to conduct their work economically, and express the assurance, that if the churches knew how carefully their contributions are applied to the purposes of the Board, and how needy are many of the recipients of their benefactions, this knowledge would result in a great increase of the Board's funds.

4. The Committee would further call attention to the efforts, so remarkably simultaneous, often so liberal and so generally successful, which have lately been made all over the land for the payment of church debts—would express their gratitude to God for his special favour upon their efforts—would recognise that prayer has had a most special and delightful agency in leading to these results, and would express the hope that other

churches labouring under such a disadvantage as a church debt, may endeavour to throw off the incumbrance; this would certainly tend to the comfort of all the churches, and prepare them to give more efficient aid to other churches in less favoured circumstances than themselves. At what less should the Presbyterian church aim than a house of worship for every houseless church in the land, and no house indebted to the community around it for anything else but love."

The Corresponding Secretary of the Board (Rev. Mr. Coe) was invited to address the Assembly, and proceeded to speak with much earnestness and force, to set forth the claims of the cause, and the necessities of the churches, and of the great importance of continuance in this good work, and of its constant enlargement.

Board of Education.

In the department of ministerial education, and of schools, academies, and colleges, the affairs of the Board are in a very cheering and hopeful condition. The debt of \$4051.67 on account of the Candidates' Fund, with which the treasury was burdened at the close of the last year, has been cancelled; all the necessary expenses have been met, and the current year begins with a balance to the credit of the Candidates' or Ministerial Education Fund of \$4436.84. There is also a balance of \$3923.45 in the General Education Fund, and of \$928.11 in the African Education Fund; making a total balance in the Treasury applicable to the various purposes of the Board, of \$9283.40.

On the 1st of May, 1862, the balance in the Treasury to the credit of the General Education Fund was \$1727.58; the receipts during the year were \$3794.32; and the total income was, of course, \$5521.90. The appropriations during this period to schools, academies, and colleges, were only \$1598.45—less by \$200 than the balance at the beginning of the year, while the entire contributions of the year remained untouched, and the balance at its close had swelled to within a fraction of \$4000.

The joy awakened by the prosperous condition of the finances is somewhat chilled by the fact that only thirty-eight new can-

didates have been received during the past year, this being only about one-half the number received during the preceding year, and less than one-half of the number received during any of the nine years prior to the last.

In regard to the proposed new Constitution and By-laws, the Committee have had three papers before them on the subject, from which, after careful consideration, they have prepared a Constitution and code of By-laws, compiled from them all, which are submitted to the Assembly.

The Rev. Dr. Wines, chairman of the appropriate committee, made an extended report on the operations of this Board, concluding with the following resolutions:

Resolved, 1. That the General Assembly recognise as matter of fervent gratitude to God, the fact that in the midst of civil war, and of the agitations, calamities, and financial pressure consequent thereupon, the Board of Education should not only have been able to meet promptly all current expenses as they accrued, but also to liquidate a debt of more than \$4000, and to accumulate a balance altogether of \$9283.41, of which amount nearly one-half is to the credit of the Ministerial Education Fund; and the Assembly hereby records its approval of the diligence, zeal, and wisdom with which the Board and the Executive Committee have discharged the duties of their position.

Resolved, 2. That the General Assembly has noticed, with a concern proportioned to its deep and far-reaching significance, the alarming decrease in the number of candidates offering for the gospel ministry, and exhort that earnest prayer be made of the church continually, that the Lord of the harvest will multiply and send forth labourers into the harvest.

Resolved, 3. That the General Assembly concurs with the Board in urging upon all ecclesiastical bodies having academical institutions under their control, that they use the most strenuous endeavours to elevate the standard of academic culture, and to make such culture broad, thorough, and every way worthy both of the past history and of the future exigencies of the Presbyterian church.

Resolved, 4. That the General Assembly is deeply impressed with the importance and value of the Ashmun Institute, as the

only seminary which has for its object the education of coloured young men for the gospel ministry; rejoices in the manifest tokens of the Divine favour enjoyed by it; approves the wisdom and efficiency with which it is managed, and cordially commends it to the confidence, the prayers, and the liberality of our churches, and of all benevolent and Christian people, who would promote in the best manner, and in the highest degree, the welfare of the African race.

The remaining resolutions contain nothing special, except a proposition that a special committee be appointed to inquire whether the Thursday after the first Sabbath of February might not be substituted for the last Thursday of February, as the day of prayer for colleges.

The Rev. Dr. Chester, the Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Education, made some remarks concerning the items of the report, and closed with an appeal for prayer for more labourers in the great harvest.

Board of Domestic Missions.

The Committee to which was referred the Annual Report of the Board of Domestic Missions, presented the following report:

A careful examination of the document put into our hands, and an attempt to survey the field which this Board is called to cultivate, and the probabilities of a speedy enlargement of that field, have forced upon us the conviction, that the magnitude and importance of the domestic missionary work are not appreciated. The present destitutions of the West and North-west alone, are more than sufficient to absorb all the means that have in past years been placed at the disposal of our Board. But from the tide of immigration from Europe, which seems now to be setting in to our country, the call for missionary labours in those extended regions is likely to be greatly increased. We ought not to forget, that among the foreigners who have settled and are settling in the great West, there are many who know little of the gospel, and are therefore easily carried away with the bold infidelity and iniquity which prevail there; whilst on the other hand, there are many from Northern Europe, Germans, Norwegians, Swedes, and Welsh, whose early

training in the doctrines of the Reformation, brings them into sympathy with the Presbyterian church, and gives us a power to influence them which sister churches in this land do not possess. The vast agricultural and mineral resources of this great valley assure us that it will, at no distant day, contain a population which must exert a mighty influence over the destinies of this whole nation. In view of all these things, how important is it that the seed of the word should be sown broadcast over this whole region, and churches planted not only in the principal towns, but in every village, and hamlet, and neighbourhood!

But if we turn our eyes to the South, we see not only destitutions as in former years, but desolations that are appalling. Hundreds of congregations there, which were once self-sustaining, have been weakened and scattered by the war, and are likely to need the fostering care of this Board for a season, to save them from utter extinction. If, as we hope and trust, it is the will of God to uphold our free government in its efforts to defend the national life, and restore peace and unity, these weakened and scattered churches will have claims upon us, from which we cannot turn away without incurring the displeasure of the great Head of the Church.

In such a state of things, and with such prospects before us, what have we done for the cause of Domestic Missions during the past year? The whole church has contributed a little over \$71,000. Many, very many churches have contributed nothing to this cause, and others but a mere pittance, as appears from the report now before us. Surely these things ought not so to be; surely we are called to awake and enter upon this work in another spirit. God has mercifully preserved much the greater part of our country represented in this Assembly from the horrors of war, save only the drain of our self-sacrificing young men to the army, and the loss of life there. The pecuniary burdens of the war are little felt, and a good degree of prosperity enjoyed; and if it be his holy will to crown with success the efforts of our government to enforce obedience to the laws in every part of our widely extended country, liberal thank-offerings will certainly be required of us to repair the moral desolations occasioned by the rebellion. With these convic-

tions, the Committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, 1. That the Report be approved, and published by the Board.

Resolved, 2. That the Assembly feel themselves called upon to give thanks to God, for having put it into the hearts of his people to furnish the Board with the means of liquidating the debt incurred in former years, which amounted at the commencement of the year which has now closed, to something like \$5000, retaining in the treasury a balance with which to commence the operations of the current year.

Resolved, 3. That it would have been still more satisfactory, if this result could have been achieved by increased contributions from the churches, instead of continuing the reduction of the scanty allowance to missionaries, and avoiding new fields. We regret to learn from this Report, that instead of increase, there was considerable falling off in the amount received from the churches, as compared with the year preceding. The Board acted wisely, we have no doubt, in making the liquidation of the debt an object of primary concern; but we can find no apology for the churches withholding, in a year of so much pecuniary prosperity, the means which were needed for the vigorous prosecution and extension of the work.

Resolved, 4. That it be enjoined on all our Presbyteries to take action on this subject, and labour to bring up all their churches to contribute liberally, once every year, to this work of faith and labour of love.

Resolved, 5. That it be, and hereby is enjoined on the Presbyteries, to investigate with great care the necessities of churches applying for aid, and to refuse to recommend to the Board any but the really necessitous. Let a careful watch be preserved, also, over those receiving aid, and every effort made to induce them to aim at self-sustentation. And we recommend to Presbyteries, in all cases where churches receiving aid appear to be making no progress in that direction, to send a committee to inquire into the circumstances, and to ascertain, if possible, why they are not advancing.

Resolved, 6. That the Assembly once more urgently request the missionaries of the Board to be prompt in transmitting

their annual reports to the Secretary as required, that the report to the Assembly may give the full results of the year's labours; also, that they give a new and earnest attention to the duty of supplying full and particular statements and narratives as to the condition, wants, trials, and encouragements of their several missionary fields, for publication in the *Home and Foreign Record*.

The Committee further report, that the records of the Board and those of the Executive Committee have been put into our hands. From the very limited examination which our time would permit, we believe them to have been carefully kept, and find in them nothing objectionable. All which is respectfully submitted.

The Rev. Dr. Janeway, Secretary of the Board, made some interesting statements concerning the operations of the Board.

The Rev. Dr. De Lancey felt a great interest in this subject, not only from its importance, but from personal connection with it. The speaker, in coming to this place, was cast into the company of many immigrants. Of these he saw some that he knew were of Presbyterian parentage. He asked himself whether the church here would take care of these wanderers from the Old World. He was made sad when he first went to the Presbytery of Londonderry, to hear a proposition to shut up a Presbyterian church, and that one the only church in the town. But the words "destitutions" and "desolations," used in the Report, concerning the South, moved his heart. At the last meeting of his Synod in the South, it met eight hundred miles from the preceding place of meeting. He travelled four hundred miles in going to that meeting, without seeing but one Presbyterian church. The Synod of Texas covers more territory than the six New England States, and New York, Ohio, and Indiana. Twenty-nine missionaries only were in that Synod. No one knows aught about the desolations of the South. Nearly three-fourths of our churches in the South are closed. The military officers reported that they found scarcely a church opened. Nashville is knocking at your door. West Virginia is knocking. There is no room in this country for two Anglo-American Protestant nations. If you subdue the

South, you will be bound to care for that country, and care for their churches. Your sons and brothers go there, as they will, to repair these desolations. You will have to follow them. Four millions of the African race will be cast upon you, and this responsibility you must assume.

The Rev. Mr. Scott, of California, wished to state some facts concerning California as a mission-field. There are no vacancies in California for candidates. Every one must go to lay foundations, and build for himself. The speaker went to Humboldt Bay, and was successful in building up speedily a church self-supporting, which has now a pastor. The same thing can be done in various parts. There are no vacancies in California, but hundreds of "Humboldt Bays"—that is, places where churches may be built up rapidly. There are but six missionaries in California. There are hundreds in California who never hear a sermon. They are in the mountains and mines. They are intelligent, and the minister must be instructed. The great matter, as far as the Board is concerned, is to give the means to get the men to California. When they reach the State, in most instances they will be supported by the people.

Rev. Mr. Speer—It is proper that each should give some reports of the destitutions of the field he occupies. The speaker represented the extreme Northwest, particularly Minnesota. The country has been settled with unusual rapidity, with a large population, who have sought a healthy country. It will always be a resort for that large class of immigrants. There is, then, a large proportion there of American born citizens of unusual intelligence. But Mr. Speer would direct special attention to the Scandinavian population of that country. Other churches have shown great interest in this land, and have met with much success. If we do not send the gospel to the Upper Mississippi, others will, and will gather the families of Presbyterians. It is, however, entirely a missionary field.

Rev. Mr. Osmond related some facts in regard to the missionary fields of Pennsylvania.

Rev. Mr. Giltner had heard the remark often made, while a student, that the Presbyterian church was not a missionary church. He felt that it was so. He then resolved to become

a missionary on the extreme border. He went to Nebraska, and was the first missionary except one, in Nebraska. He soon found Presbyterians, and the growing tide of emigration soon brought more. Now it is flowing in fast, and to regions beyond. The need is great; the missionaries are weak, and are greatly discouraged. We need more missionaries, and have not been able to obtain them.

The Rev. J. H. Morrison, Moderator of the Assembly, called the attention of the Assembly to the resolution enjoining Presbyteries to be very careful in recommending churches to appropriations from the Board, and made some forcible and appropriate remarks.

Board of Foreign Missions.

The order of the day was taken up, which was the report of the Standing Committee on the Report of the Board of Foreign Missions. The report was accepted, and the following is an abstract.

The past year was one of unusual solicitude and peril, because of national interest in the state of the country, absorbing means which heretofore were turned to this cause. Yet the work has been encouraging, and the treasury is free from debt at the end of the year. The work has not been restricted in its essential force or general outline.

The total receipts for the past year have been \$188,000. Expenditures for the same period, \$187,000. After paying a small balance from last year, there remains in the treasury the sum of \$336. The rise in foreign exchange was one great embarrassment. This still threatens in the future, in the transmission of funds to the missions, and the church of God must come up in faith to meet this new demand.

Eight new missionaries have been appointed, to be sent forth when finances will permit. Four ministers, three of them married, and three teachers, were sent out during the year to different missions.

The Report gives information concerning the missions among the Chippewa, Iowa, and Omaha Indians, the Chinese in California, in Japan, China, Siam, India, Western Africa, Brazil, New Granada, and some of the Roman Catholic countries of

Europe, and to the Jews of New York city. In these fields are employed sixty-seven ministers, sixteen male and seventy-one female assistant missionaries from this country, and ninety-seven native assistant labourers. The number of scholars in mission schools is about five thousand. The issues of the printing press in India and China are larger than usual. The translation of the New Testament into Pushto, the language of the Afghans, and the completion of the Chinese translation of the Bible, have been accomplished during the year. The church has lost, by the hand of death, Dr. Culbertson, Dr. Campbell, Mr. Gayley, and Mr. Clemens, all faithful and beloved servants of the Lord. Yet there are many reasons for encouragement in the hope of the reign of Christ the King.

From every quarter the call comes for more labourers in the vineyard. To meet this loud demand from the heathen world, a higher standard of consecration must be reached by the people, and pressed upon each individual member.

The Report of the Board gives entire satisfaction, with the single exception that the Board has not been able to enlarge these operations, by reason of financial embarrassments. To meet this want, they would suggest that the children of the Sabbath-schools be called upon to contribute at least each one cent each Sabbath for this cause. We have one hundred and forty-nine thousand Sabbath-school children, representing about fifty thousand families. These might furnish a large amount. It is hoped the churches will receive this suggestion kindly, and act upon it, for thus a zeal will be kindled in this cause in our churches. Let the churches also increase their contributions, to meet the rise in exchange, from twenty-five to forty per cent. above last year. They also recommend increased circulation of the *Missionary* publications. The Committee, in conclusion, commend this Board to the prayers and liberality of all who desire the world's conversion.

Dr. John C. Lowrie, Secretary of the Board, was heard in statements concerning the condition and prospects of the Board.

Mr. Robert Carter, ruling elder, said that there had been great anxiety at the Mission Rooms at New York, in regard to

the duty of the Board. Young men have offered themselves to the Board, and have asked to be sent forth. But the Board have not thought themselves authorized to put the church in debt, and the calls from India, China, and all other places, have been allowed to lie on the table, until the church comes forward to the help of the cause. Mr. Carter related some touching instances of self-denial, and expressed his own deep and growing interest on the subject of foreign missions.

The Rev. J. H. Morrison, Moderator, spoke with great feeling, as one appearing for the last time before the Assembly to speak of foreign missions. He begged to refer to the question of the Secretary of the Board, "Shall the church go forward in this work?" The Moderator proposed the question in the following form, "Shall the church cease to go backward?" The retrograde movement has begun. This is especially true of the mission in India. The speaker made several specifications in regard to this retrograde movement in this mission. The appeals of the missionaries have been unheard. They have had to give up stations. The General Assembly has been warned of this, and the predictions have been fulfilled. Unless more missionaries are sent, more stations must be given up. For two years men have been ready to go out, but have given up their purpose to go. The church is discouraging those who would go. Will the church consider this, and say whether it will continue to go back? The circulation of missionary periodicals is diminishing. This is significant of diminished interest.

Mr. Ainslie said missions beget missions. Every church planted in heathen lands may grow into a General Assembly. Presbyteries and Synods have grown up from single missions in India. All the institutions of a church will follow. Let us enlarge the field of our church, and not narrow it.

Dr. Beatty said the time for practical action had come. He had once been a missionary, appointed by a previous Board. He had been prevented, but one whom he had educated had gone. He delighted to go to the Mission Rooms in New York, and always came away with his heart refreshed. He hoped that the Assembly would pledge herself anew to the cause.

Rev. Mr. Sheddan—It was sad, Moderator, that the Assem-

bly, after thirty years' work, was deliberating whether they should go forward or not, and this, when one twenty-five years in the foreign field was in the Moderator's chair. If we say we will not go forward, other channels will be found. God is leading us forward. Let us follow.

Rev. Mr. Hay asked from the Assembly the most rigid scrutiny of the affairs of the Board, if any causes, arising out of the administration of affairs hinder the liberality of the people. This is due to the Board and the cause. The speaker related several instances of self-denial and effort in missionary labour, resulting in great success. He had received letters from India begging for help, and from native converts, asking that there be no retrograde movement.

Rev. Mr. Speer spoke briefly of the exhausting labour of missionaries, and of the necessity, growing out of this fact, for multiplying labourers.

The Report was adopted.

The following resolution was offered by Mr. Conger:

Resolved, That relying for support, in this solemn declaration, upon the Great Head of the Church, we hereby call upon the Board to go forward, and we do hereby pledge ourselves severally to urge the immediate attention of this subject upon our several Presbyteries, and to renewed effort to bring our churches to a more efficient coöperation in this noble work.

This resolution was unanimously adopted by the members of the Assembly rising to their feet. While standing, the Assembly was led in prayer by the Rev. Mr. Finley. The scene was very solemn and affecting.

After this, the following resolution was passed:

Resolved, That our pastors and superintendents be urged to endeavour to secure from all of her Sabbath-schools, a contribution equal to at least one cent per week from each scholar for this Board.

Board of Publication.

This Board has for several years been subjected to severe strictures, both on the floor of the Assembly, and in some few of our religious papers. With the concurrence of all parties, the Assembly of 1862 appointed a large and highly respectable

Committee to examine into the principles on which it was conducted, and into the general administration of its affairs. That Committee, after a thorough investigation, made an elaborate report, which was read to the Assembly by the Rev. John M. Lowrie, D. D., Secretary of the Committee.

The principal points embraced in the Report are the following:

1. Complaints from various quarters, chiefly from individuals, were received by the Committee.

2. Facilities were given by the Board and all its officers for the investigation.

3. The first matter of investigation was into the character of the publications of the Board.

The various *criteria* by which to judge of these publications are, 1. Orthodoxy. 2. Adaptation to the wants of the church. 3. The actual sales secured by these publications. 4. Attractiveness in style and appearance. In all these respects, the publications of the Board are thought to be worthy of approval.

4. *Financial Operations, and the Capital of the Board.*—The capital is \$237,000. Of this, only about \$160,000 can be used actively. The average annual profit for thirteen years is six and four-fifths per cent. The salaries of officers may be retrenched. Under this head, the following recommendations were made: 1. That the salary of the Corresponding Secretary be unchanged; but that he be made the Editor of the Board. 2. That the office of the Treasurer and Superintendent be combined. 3. That the duties of the Publishing Agent be assigned to the Superintendent of Depository, without any increase of salary. 4. That the office and salary of Solicitor be discontinued. 5. That a book-keeper be continued as at present, with the same salary.

The question arises, Should the Board do all its work of printing and publishing? After examination and consideration, the Committee do not think it wise or necessary at the present time. No censure is made by the Committee on this part of the subject.

5. *The General Efficiency of the Management of the Board.*—The Committee made an examination into the work of the last thirteen years, and submitted the following table:

YEARS.	Total Capital.	Estimated Capital, exclusive of Real Estate, Plates, &c.	Sales.	Salaries.	Expenses.	Profits.	Profits per Cent.			Per ct. expenses on sales.
							On entire capital.	On actual capital.	On sales.	
1849	\$84,054	\$60,000	\$39,454	\$6,229	\$2,950	\$2,999 *22,656	3.5	5.	7.6	23.2
1850	109,689	63,000	58,644	6,595	2,515	9,314	8.5	14.8	15.9	15.5
1851	119,003	69,000	59,457	7,999	2,570	12,086 *6,000	10.1	17.5	20.3	17.8
1852	137,084	76,000	70,968	7,350	2,214	14,132	10.3	18.6	20.	13.4
1853	151,221	86,000	77,648	10,193	2,889	17,980	11.9	21.	23.1	17.
1854	169,202	100,000	65,793	11,188	3,254	7,253	4.2	7.25	11.	21.8
1855	176,455	103,000	65,341	11,342	2,949	11,186	6.3	10.8	17.1	21.8
1856	187,641	108,000	81,055	12,723	3,706	11,937	6.3	11.	14.7	20.26
1857	199,578	112,000	73,811	13,071	3,937	12,231	6.1	10.9	16.5	23.
1858	211,809	118,000	69,087	14,076	3,706	5,463	2.6	4.6	7.9	25.7
1859	217,272	120,000	80,933	14,180	3,539	12,161	5.5	10.	15.	21.8
1860	229,453	130,000	81,842	15,397	4,762	13,154	5.7	10.	16.	24.6
1861	242,587	140,000	31,031	13,660	3,036	-5,200	-2.			54.6
1862	237,387	135,000								

* Donated for building purposes.

Having before said that the average of profits on the entire capital was 6.8 per cent., we now add, that the average per cent. of profits on the active capital as estimated, is 11.9; the average per cent. cost of salaries on average sales is 16.4; the average per cent. of total expenses on average sales is 21.3; and the average per cent. of profits above expenses on average sales is 17.5.

The Committee here considered the operations of the Board as business operations and benevolent operations. The Board was not intended to be simply a business concern. But the benevolent operations must not be hinderances to the extension of the trade of the Board. In regard to the general operations, the work of the Board may compare favourably with any other institution of the same kind. Bad debts only amount to seventy dollars per annum.

Another question is, Cannot the sphere of the Board be enlarged, and its operations made even more efficient? Depositories, the Committee concluded, were not the means to enlarge the efficient operations of the Board. The control of

the business should not be given to one person, and a proposition made to the Board was wisely declined.

Recommendations.—1. Books for Sabbath-school libraries should be multiplied. 2. A more liberal discount should be given to one good bookseller in every large city. 3. That the Board should sell entire editions of works to other publishers, with their imprint.

6. *Colportage.*—This is an important branch of the Board's work. The Committee was urged to consider this as merely a business matter. Some think that all denominational efforts of this kind should cease. The Committee dissent from both these opinions. They think too much money has been spent in salaries of District Superintendents. It is true that the Assembly has endorsed this; but the Committee think the sum might be diminished.

7. *Periodicals of the Board.*—Little need be said about the *Home and Foreign Record*, as all the Boards are concerned in this. The *Sabbath-School Visitor* is worthy of support. Its cost should be reduced.

The Report was respectfully submitted. It was referred to the Committee on the Report of the Board of Publication. That Committee subsequently made the following report:

Resolved, 1. That the Assembly approve of the principles expressed by the Committee touching the character of the Board's publications, and commend the efforts of the Board to furnish reading more and more attractive, acceptable, and useful to the church.

Resolved, 2. That the Assembly highly appreciate the faithful services of the Rev. Dr. William M. Engles, as the Editor of the Board from the beginning until now; but, as in our view the duties of Editor should belong to the Corresponding Secretary, for the sake of economy and propriety, the Board is hereby directed to assign these duties to the Secretary, and to discontinue the separate office of Editor.

Resolved, 3. That the salary of the Corresponding Secretary should constitute the sole emolument for services rendered to the Board. That therefore the amount deposited with the Presbyterian Annuity Company be withdrawn—that the Board be

hereby directed to withdraw it, and to establish this principle in regard to that officer.

Resolved, 4. That the Board is hereby directed to add the duties of the Treasurer to those of the Superintendent of Colportage, without any increase of the present salary of the latter. That adequate security be still required for the proper fulfilment of the trust; and that the office of Treasurer, as a distinct one, is hereby dispensed with.

Resolved, 5. That the Board is hereby directed to assign the duties of Publishing Agent to the Superintendent of Depository, without any increase of his present salary.

Resolved, 6. That the Board is now directed to discontinue the office and salary of Solicitor, and to continue the office and salary of Book-keeper as at present.

Resolved, 7. That the Board be directed to put the Periodical Department under the charge of one individual, making him responsible for that department; he furnishing clerks and assistants at his own expense, and that he be allowed a salary not exceeding \$1300 per annum.

Resolved, 8. That the first sentence of the resolution on the General Assembly's Digest of 1842, (*Digest*, p. 241,) is hereby repealed, and the Board is directed to proceed upon the principles recommended in the report of the Special Committee, with such changes as their wisdom may suggest, still keeping in view this one matter—that no further accumulations of capital from their business, except as set forth in that report, are expected by the Board.

Resolved, 9. That the Assembly now approves of the theory of colportage as expressed in the report of the Special Committee; that the Board is hereby directed to consider carefully the matter of Superintendents of Colportage, the suggestions of the Committee respecting the employment of colporteurs, and that this whole matter be renewedly commended to the confidence, liberality, and prayers of God's people.

Resolved, 10. That the Board be directed to discontinue payments for matter furnished for the *Sabbath-School Visitor*, until they can be made from the income of the paper. That communications be invited from the church at large, or selected

from various sources, and that due efforts be made to make the paper less expensive to the church.

Resolved, 11. That the Executive Committee be directed to publish the whole Report of the Special Committee in the Annual Report of the Board.

In regard to the *Home and Foreign Record*, the Committee recommend that the whole edition be issued in a pamphlet form, (with cover,) at the same price as the newspaper edition already issued, and that advertisements of a suitable character, enough to pay the additional expense, be solicited.

These resolutions were, in all essential points, adopted by the Assembly, although not without considerable opposition and debate. The resolutions to abolish the office of Editor, to consolidate those of Treasurer and Superintendent of Colportage, to forbid any further accumulation of capital, and to dispense with the office of Solicitor, were strenuously resisted by those most familiar with the operations of the Board. A dissent from the action of the Assembly, in abolishing the office of Editor, was entered upon the minutes, signed by Dr. E. C. Wines and thirty-five other members. We are constrained to say that we deeply regret the action of the Assembly in adopting the suggestions of the Committee of Investigation appointed last year. We deem those suggestions unwise for the following reasons. We think the Committee, in some measure at least, travelled out of the record, or transcended the intent and object of their appointment. It is true, the language of the Assembly, in the resolution constituting that Committee, admits of great latitude of interpretation. The resolution declares that they were "to make a thorough examination of the affairs of the Board of Publication." This would seem to give unlimited scope to their investigations and recommendations. It is, however, notorious, and is admitted by the Committee, that the occasion of their appointment was the fact that various complaints against the efficiency and economy of the business operations of the Board had been urged with great zeal on the floor of the Assembly, and in some of our religious journals. "To hear these (complaints,) and to investigate their truthfulness, was a chief duty of the Committee," as they themselves certify in their report. They therefore called for the complain-

ants, and gave them every latitude of statement and proof. They received written communications from any parties choosing to present them. They testify that the Board itself and all its officers gave them a cordial welcome, and afforded them every facility in prosecuting their investigation. The result was, that they pronounced all these complaints unfounded. Here their legitimate business ended. They were not appointed to suggest organic changes. Had they recommended that the Board should be abolished, and an Executive Committee put in its place; or, that it should be composed exclusively of laymen or exclusively of clergymen, every one would see that they transcended the intentions of the Assembly. In like manner, although to a less degree, their recommendations that there should be no Editor, no separate Treasurer, no Solicitor, that such and such discounts should be allowed booksellers, seem to us, at least, to be beyond the limits of their legitimate authority. This objection, however, would not be of much weight, were the recommendations themselves judicious. This, as we think, is not the case. They all proceed on a wrong assumption of the relation in which the Assembly stands to its several Boards. The Assembly being a body consisting of two or three hundred members, meeting only once a year, and having a multiplicity of business of all kinds on their hands, is utterly unfit to conduct the work of missions, education, church extension, or publication. It must select trustworthy men to which such work may be committed. It has complete authority over them, to appoint and to displace; to investigate all charges against their efficiency or their integrity. It can prescribe the objects of these several Boards, and the general principles of their organization and operations; but all details of plan and execution must be committed to their trusted agents. The relation between the Assembly and the Boards is analogous to that between the Trustees and the Faculty of a college. The former appoint and remove the latter at pleasure, and superintend and correct any want of competency or fidelity; but the details of instruction and discipline must be left in the hands of the latter. Or it is analogous to the relation between the cabinet and an army in the field. The former determines the objects of the war, the men and the means by which it is to be prose-

cuted; but all military operations must be confided to military men, responsible for their success. How could the British cabinet in London, composed of lords and lawyers, control the action of Wellington in the Peninsula, and instruct him what officer is to do this, and what that, which regiments are to be united, and how his supplies are to be located and transported? History furnishes abundant and lamentable evidence of the results of the interference of the civil authorities with military operations. Politicians and laymen undertake to pronounce on the plans and operations of generals a hundred or a thousand miles off, although utterly ignorant, not only of the art of war, but of the facts of the case. All this is evidently absurd and ruinous. It is no less unreasonable for the General Assembly to pretend to judge of the details of the business operations of our several Boards. How can the ministers and elders constituting that body, most of whom know nothing of the business of making and selling books, and all of whom are ignorant of the real interior working of the several departments included in these complex operations, know whether the duties of Editor and Secretary can be wisely combined? whether a Treasurer and Superintendent of Colportage should be the same person? whether there should be a salaried Solicitor? whether the capital should be increased or diminished? or what discount should be allowed on the publications of the Board? We confess ourselves utterly incompetent to form an enlightened opinion on any one of these points. We should deem it absurd, were this a private concern, to prefer our own ignorant conjectures to the judgment of wise and experienced men. The Assembly, for the sake of economy, abolishes the office of Solicitor, and thus saves a hundred dollars a year. The gentlemen who, for a quarter of a century, have conducted the operations of the Board, assure us that a paid Solicitor has saved the Board two or three hundred dollars a year. What wisdom is there in this? The Assembly say the Board do not need an Editor distinct from a Corresponding Secretary. What do they know of the duties of the Editor? Those of its members who have had any experience in the operations of the press, have some idea what it is to revise and correct numerous manuscripts, to correct proofs, and carry hundreds of publications through

their various processes of preparation. We are informed that the late Editor has been obliged to pay six hundred dollars, one-half of his whole salary, for the single item of proof-reading in one year. The true principle which should govern the Assembly is the grand results. Are the publications of the Board sound and adapted to the design of the institution? has the business been safely conducted? have bad debts been avoided, and capital for future enlargement been accumulated? Are its various operations, as a whole, economical, judged by the standard not of a money-making concern, but of a great benevolent institution? Are the men who conduct its affairs men of experience, fidelity, and ability? If all these questions are answered affirmatively, as they are answered by the Investigating Committee, then is the Board entitled to the confidence and coöperation of the churches; and all carping objections to this and that particular in the details of its operations, should be discountenanced as unwise and injurious. On the general operations of the Board, Dr. Boardman, in his letter of resignation, which we deeply regret, says: "Within a quarter of a century which has elapsed since it was founded, some of the great religious publishing societies of the country have more than once been brought to the verge of bankruptcy. Others have accumulated bad debts to an enormous amount; and others still have extricated themselves from financial troubles only by means of munificent and praiseworthy benefactions privately collected. During the same period—covering, it will be remembered, several great commercial crises—our Board has been able, by the good hand of our God upon us, to pay all its bills in cash, and usually in advance. It has never been in debt. Its bad debts have summed up 'about seventy dollars per annum.' It has never called upon its friends for a single dollar to relieve it from embarrassment. It has issued (besides tracts) six hundred and fifty different works—as good and as cheap, to say the least, as any books in the market. It has constantly grown in the confidence and esteem of the churches; and its capacity of usefulness was never greater than at this moment."

From these facts he was authorized to conclude that the affairs of the Board had been conducted "with zeal, fidelity,

economy, and efficiency," as affirmed by the General Assembly of 1861. Apart, therefore, from personal considerations due to the long, able, and faithful services of Dr. Engles as Editor of the Board, on the general principle on which men conduct their private affairs, it had been wise, as we think, had the Assembly left the Board to conduct its affairs, as they have hitherto done, according to their experienced and enlightened judgment.

The Support of Disabled Ministers.

Joseph H. Jones, D. D., Secretary, read the annual report on this subject, and the Rev. A. T. Rankin, Chairman of the Committee to which that report had been committed, made the following report, viz.

Resolved, 1. That the Assembly have heard with deep interest the Report of the Trustees for the Fund for Disabled Ministers in need, and the destitute widows and orphans of deceased ministers.

Resolved, 2. That they learn with great satisfaction, of the rapid progress of this good cause, as evinced in the increasing number and amount of the collections.

Resolved, 3. That in view of the success and favourable acceptance of the plan recommended by the Assembly of 1849, and sanctioned by several subsequent Assemblies, this Assembly re-affirm said action, and recommend that annual collections be solicited in all the churches for current expenditures; and also, that large donations and bequests be solicited, to form gradually a permanent fund, the interest of which shall be pledged in aid of the objects indicated.

Resolved, 4. That the report be appended to the Minutes of this Assembly, and be printed by the Board of Publication, a copy of which shall be sent to each pastor, with a request that it be read to his congregation.

Resolved, 5. That if the sums contributed by the church in any year exceed the sum needed to meet the demand upon it, the Trustees be authorized to invest such surplus as a part of the Permanent Fund, in such way as that it shall be safe and productive.

Resolved, 6. That the thanks of the Assembly are due, and

are hereby tendered to those generous friends of the cause, by whose liberality a large proportion of the expenses of this important agency are provided for.

Judge Leavitt moved the adoption of the report, and begged leave to make a few remarks. There was no necessity to speak in vindication of this Fund. He asked to be heard on two grounds: 1. He has had a connection with this subject for some years. 2. Ministers may feel some delicacy in speaking on this subject, and therefore a few words from a ruling elder might be acceptable. He thought that the present method of raising funds had proved itself to be the best under the present circumstances. The policy of a permanent fund of a large amount, he thought unwise and impracticable. The committee appointed by the last Assembly, on this subject, had not been called together, and he supposed the policy was abandoned. He also spoke of the generous gifts by which the officers of this fund were supported, and the gifts of a few individuals.

Dr. McKennan, as a layman, spoke warmly of his interest in this noble cause. The ministers had been too reluctant to bring this subject before the people. Whenever it was done, it met with hearty support. Other churches had led the way in this respect, and he was glad that we were following in the wake. Many had suffered in silence, but they were now relieved. He spoke highly of the skill and fidelity with which this fund had been managed.

Rev. Mr. Baker called attention to one feature of the report, namely, the formation of a Permanent Fund. He was opposed to this, except so far as the support of the officers was concerned. He thought the churches needed culture in benevolence. They needed to have their sympathies drawn out, and, in this case, by yearly collections.

Rev. G. S. Plumley considered this, although the youngest of the benevolent Boards of the church, not the least important. He was glad to note progress in this matter. The subject is in safe hands, and the plan is working well. The Permanent Fund is to grow mainly through legacies, &c., and will not grow faster than the necessities of the cause will demand.

T. H. Nevin.—The Endowment Fund will not carry forward this cause. It will be better to rely on the yearly contributions of the churches. It is a cause which is growing in favour among our churches. Let the ruling elders take this matter up at home.

George Junkin, Jr.—He knew something of the preparation of the report, and the fear was, that the present plan might be interfered with. It was therefore carefully prepared, in order that the church might be induced to let well enough alone. He thought the ministers were blameworthy in not bringing the matter of ministerial support before the people. He called attention to one point in one of the resolutions, viz., that the report be read in the churches. He hoped that the ministers should be *directed* to read this report to their churches. He moved this as an amendment.

Dr. J. M. Lowrie opposed a *requirement* upon the ministers, making it necessary to read any report. He strongly opposed the plan of adducing extreme cases as a specimen of the general treatment of ministers of our churches.

Dr. Nevin hoped it would be passed. He further said, that if this Fund is not supported, there would be a great secularization of the ministry. He admitted that isolated and extreme cases should not be adduced as proofs of a general rule. He hoped that the ruling elders would persist in their support of this noble cause.

Mr. Junkin withdrew the amendment.

The report was adopted.

Treasurer's Report.

The Committee to whom this subject was referred, made the following report:

They have examined the report of the Treasurer, and compared the statement of the accounts therein presented with the books kept by him, as also the items of interest received upon the several investments, and find them correct, as stated. The amount received by the Treasurer, from all sources, during the last financial year, viz., from May 1st, 1862, to May 1st, 1863, was \$25,672.73, making, together with \$7893.56, the balance in the hands of the Treasurer from last year, the sum of

\$33,566.29. The expenditures during the year have amounted to \$18,517.32, leaving a balance in the hands of the Treasurer, at the close of the fiscal year, of \$15,048.97.

This amount is all invested in first mortgage bonds, except \$2000 in a Camden and Amboy Railroad bond—all of which is believed to be perfectly safe, and worth the full amount above stated.

The Committee of Finance being limited by the General Assembly, to bonds and mortgages, in making investments, have found great difficulty in obtaining such securities, in consequence of the large amount of capital now seeking first-class investments. The Committee would suggest that the General Assembly should allow investments to be made in such securities as trustees, executors, and guardians are by law, in the State of Pennsylvania, permitted to invest—in which are the public loans of the United States, of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the city of Philadelphia, and of bonds and mortgages.

The permission to invest the funds of the Assembly in the securities above mentioned was granted.

Judicial Cases.

Dr. Humphrey, from the Judicial Committee, reported Judicial case No. 1, being a complaint of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge and others, against the action of the Synod of Kentucky, respecting the right of suffrage in the election of a pastor. The complaint was found to be in order, and ready for trial. The Committee recommend the following order of proceeding: 1. The reading of the papers from the Presbytery of Louisville and Synod of Kentucky; 2. The hearing of the complainants; 3. Hearing the members of the Synod of Kentucky; 4. The judgment of the Assembly.

The papers of the case were read. The case originated in questions addressed to the Presbytery of Louisville, which were referred for answer to the Synod of Kentucky. The answer of the Synod of Kentucky was, in effect, that no persons are competent to vote on the election of a pastor except those who are professors of religion, and in full communion with the church. From this decision, Dr. Breckinridge and others complained to the General Assembly.

Dr. Humphrey.—In the year 1860 these questions were referred to the Synod of Kentucky. In the fall of the same year they were answered. A complaint to the General Assembly was entered, and has been postponed from year to year, and is now regularly before this venerable court. The Synod of Kentucky have determined that no persons have a right to vote but communicants who—1. Are in good standing; and 2. Who contribute their just proportion to the expenses of the congregation. The complainants contend that in addition to these, those not members of the church, who contribute to the expenses, have this right. They say that there are two classes of electors, one communicants, and the other the class contributing. They also contend that it proceeds upon a false theory of the church. The true theory of the church is, that it is composed of members in communion with the church and their children. The opposite is the theory of the Brownists, and the theory of the anti-Pedobaptists. They further say that it is inconsistent with the relation of baptized persons to the church. The opposition contend that none but those under the government of the pastor should vote for him. But the Directory of Worship, Chapter IX., says that children born in the church and baptized, are under the government of the church. It is also contrary to the most prevailing customs of the church. It is a part of a new theory of the church. The speaker appealed to the knowledge of the Assembly upon this subject. Undoubtedly there have been exceptions to this; but the prevailing custom is that for which these complainants contend. It is further destructive of the rights of the Christian people of our churches. It attaches to the voters who are communicants another condition, namely, a contribution. This may exclude the poor, also the females, who are most important and useful members of the church. It is also destructive of the rights of many members of our congregations. They have a right to say who shall train the minds of their children. The teacher who instructs them through the week is selected by them; shall they not say *who* shall teach their children the way of salvation? Shall they not say who shall come as intimates in their families?

Further. Has not an impenitent man something to say who

shall preach the gospel to him? Shall he not have a word to say who shall be his guide in heavenly things? Here we come to a distinction which we must observe. As to the ruling elder, he is only to rule; the pastor to *teach* and to *rule*. Teaching is the most important part of the minister's work. His relation, as a teacher, is the same to those outside as to those who are communicants; therefore they should exercise a choice in the calling of the teacher. It is also inconsistent with the relations of the Christian church to the evangelizing of the world. The world has something to do with the church under the present dispensation. Cornelius, the centurion, was a Gentile, but was selected to call Peter to the work of preaching to the Gentiles. This is the genius of this dispensation. It is, lastly, hostile to the peace, growth, and unity of our congregations. It will disturb your peace; it will alienate many from you. But the other side object, that infidels, and the children of the wicked may thus rule the church. The Presbytery, however, may interfere. Relief will doubtless be given by the Presbytery. Power is in the hands of Presbytery, Synod, and General Assembly, that they may redress the grievances of God's people.

After protracted discussion, the vote was taken, and resulted as follows: for sustaining the complaint, seventy-seven; for sustaining in part, forty-nine; for not sustaining, thirty-nine. A Committee, consisting of Drs. Lillie, Wines, and Nevin, and ruling elders Judge H. H. Leavitt, and George Junkin, Jr., Esq., was appointed to bring in a minute expressing the judgment of the Assembly. This Committee could not agree, and brought in three separate reports.

The minute proposed by Dr. Wines and Judge Leavitt, members of that Committee, was the following resolution:

Resolved, That the complaint be sustained; but the Assembly, in this judgment, does not intend to condemn a practice prevalent in some of our congregations, in which the right of voting for pastor is confined to communicants.

Dr. Nevin and George Junkin, Jr., Esq., proposed the following:

The Assembly sustains the complaint in so far as the action of the Synod declares that our Form of Church Government restricts the right of voting for a pastor, to full communicants,

to the exclusion of other baptized members of the church. But the latitude of suffrage which the complainants plead for, seems to the Assembly too vague, and tending too much to obliterate the scriptural and constitutional distinctions between professing and baptized members, and persons who have no other connection with the church than the contribution of funds to support her ordinances.

The Assembly is of opinion, that whilst no one is *entitled* to vote except professing Christians, and baptized persons not under censure, and who contribute their just proportion to the necessary expenses of the congregation, yet that it is competent for congregations to *permit* mere contributors to the expenses of the congregation, to vote in cases where this course, by reason of peculiar circumstances, may be deemed best for the prosperity of the church.

The third minute proposed was presented by the Rev. John Lillie, D. D.

The Assembly sustains the complaint in so far as the action of the Synod restricts the right of voting for a pastor to full communicants, to the exclusion of baptized members of the church. But the latitude of suffrage which the complainants plead for, the Assembly does not sustain, because it tends to obliterate the scriptural and constitutional distinction between baptized members, and persons who have no other connection with the church than the contribution of funds to support her ordinances.

The selection of pastors for particular congregations has, in all ages of the church, been a matter of contention; and great diversity of usage has prevailed in relation to this subject. In prelatial churches, it often rests with the bishop of the diocese; in endowed churches, the right is vested in the patron; in the Dutch Reformed church, the pastors are chosen by the great consistory, that is, (as elders are elected annually,) by the acting elders, and by all others belonging to the congregation, who have exercised the office of the eldership. In New England, according to the old usage, there were two distinct bodies, the church and the parish; the former consisting of the professedly regenerated, united by covenant, and the latter, of those inhabitants of the neighbourhood (or parish) who fre-

quented the church, and contributed to the support of its minister. These bodies voted separately for the pastor, and their concurrence was requisite for a choice. Of the church, only the male members, or brotherhood, voted. In the Presbyterian church, great diversity of usage has prevailed. Perhaps the most common method is for heads of families, and they only, whether communicants or not, to vote in the choice of pastor. In other cases, all communicants, male and female, adults and minors, and all contributors vote. In others again, the elective franchise is confined to adult members of the congregation. This diversity of practice betrays great confusion of ideas. There is no one clear recognised theory by which the practical question is controlled. It is easy to say, a pastor is an ecclesiastical officer, he is a minister of the church, and therefore only members of the church can be entitled to a voice in his election. But then the question arises, what is the church? This is a question to which no one answer can be given. In other words, the term is used in Scripture and in ecclesiastical language in very different senses. The church, which is the body of Christ, which he loved, and for which he gave himself, is the whole body of the elect. Sometimes the word means the whole body of Christ's true people on earth. Sometimes it designates the true children of God collectively, in some one place; at others, all those who profess the true religion throughout the world, together with their children; sometimes such professors when united in one organization, as when we speak of the church of England, the Presbyterian, or the Methodist church; or, in a more limited sense, the first, second, or third church of any place or city. These are only some of the legitimate meanings of the word; and it is evident that no progress is made in deciding who are members of the church, until it is settled in what sense the word church is to be taken. As men differ as to the meaning which they assign to the word, they of course differ on all the points involved in its interpretation. According to the Puritan, or Independent theory, a church is a body of regenerated persons united together by covenant, meeting together for Christian worship and mutual watch and care. According to others, a particular or individual church consists of all baptized persons united as

an organized Christian assembly. According to the scriptural and common usage of the term, an individual church is a worshipping assembly of professed Christians. Thus, when we speak of St. Giles's church, Edinburgh, or the Grand Street church, New York, or the Tenth Presbyterian church, Philadelphia, every one understands us to mean the stated worshipping congregations which are thus designated. Thus, in the New Testament, the church of Antioch, the church in the house of Aquila. Perhaps the most common meaning of the word in the New Testament, is a worshipping assembly. As any assembly, or congregation of people, was an *ἐκκλησία*, so any stated congregation of worshippers is an *ἐκκλησία* in the religious sense of the word. The *ἐκκλησία Κυρίου* is correctly defined to be, *coetus cultorum Dei*. It does not follow that all the members of the church have the same privileges, any more than that all the citizens of a state have the same rights. The elective franchise, for example, in the state is confined to a small portion of the citizens. All minors, and females, at least, are excluded. So in the church, different members have different privileges. Some have the right to administer discipline, some to the ordinance of baptism, some to admission of pastors, some to vote for church officers. The right of particular members depends partly on their gifts and qualifications, partly on the judgment and choice of those authorized to decide in such cases. It is plain, therefore, that the decision of the question, who should be allowed to vote in the selection of a pastor, does not simply depend on the question who are members of the church. That is one point to be settled, but it is not the only one.

The Puritan, or Independent theory of the church, that it consists exclusively of those who are deemed regenerate, and their minor children, has unfortunately gained ascendancy over many of our ministers and members. This is to be attributed partly to the general familiarity with the writings of Owen and other English Independents, but especially to the all-pervading influence of the ideas and principles of the New England Congregationalists. This theory, however, is thoroughly opposed to the common faith of the church, and, as we think, to the plain teachings of the New Testament. It owes

its origin to the desire to make the phenomenal agree with the real, the visible with the invisible church. This can never be realized in this world, and it never was designed that men should accomplish this desirable end. Men cannot read the heart. They cannot discriminate between the growing wheat and tares. The apostolic churches consisted largely of those who were carnal, and walked as men. The same is true of all churches since that time. He is a Christian in the sight of God, who is a true believer; but we must regard and treat as Christians, those who profess the true religion, and are free from scandal. Whether they are regenerated or not, we cannot tell. It is, however, on this erroneous theory of the church, that many are in favour of restricting the right of a voice in the choice of pastors to communicants.

The second theory on this subject is, that the visible church consists exclusively of those who have been baptized, and consequently, that no unbaptized person is entitled to vote. But this theory is clearly against our standards. Our Book, and the general consent of Christians, teach that the visible church consists of those who profess the true religion, together with their children. Baptism is one, but not the only way of professing the true religion. Many confessors and martyrs never were baptized. An orthodox Quaker, if regenerated by the Holy Ghost, is a true Christian; and if he confesses Christ with the mouth, is a member of the visible church. Baptism does not make a man a member of the church; it is the public and orderly recognition of his membership. Since the recent New England custom of confining baptism to the children of communicants, some of the most respectable and worthy members of our congregations are unbaptized; and, on the other, some of the least worthy members of the community were baptized in infancy. There seems therefore no reason, either on the score of principle or of expediency, in confining the elective franchise to baptized persons.

The truth is, that a church, in the eye of the law, in the general usage of the community, according to the language of the New Testament, and the Westminster standards, is an organized Christian society. Such society may place what restrictions they please on the right of suffrage. They may

confine it, as do the Dutch, to the eldership; or to the adult male communicants; or to the communicants, whether male or female; or the heads of family, orderly members of the society; or they may throw it open to all contributors, whether adults or minors. We have no established rule, except the general directions contained in the Form of Government on this subject. The security, under our system, is in the Presbyteries. No man can be chosen or installed as pastor over any of our congregations, who has not passed through all the prescribed trials for ordination, and who has not received the official sanction of his brethren as an orthodox and faithful man.

Judicial Case No. 2.

This case is an appeal of Mr. C. J. Abbott against the Synod of Missouri. Mr. Abbot, in a letter addressed to a member of the General Assembly, states that he is prevented by sickness from attending, and prosecuting his appeal; and he asks for the reference of his case to the Assembly of 1864. The Committee recommended that his request be granted.

Judicial Case No. 3.

This was an appeal and complaint of Smiley Shepherd against the Synod of Illinois. The Committee made the following report, viz.

The following facts are stated in the records of the Presbytery of Bloomington, and are not denied by the complainant: The Second church of Union Grove, in October, 1859, had, for about twenty years, neither meeting-house, pastor, nor stated supply, nor had it submitted, through the whole of that period, until 1859, either statistical reports or sessional records. It had worshipped regularly with the First church of Union Grove. In fact, in 1859 it consisted of the complainant and his family alone. But the complainant claimed and exercised the right, as ruling elder, to receive members to his church, and to sit and vote in Presbytery and Synod. For about fifteen years the Presbytery had considered the church as without even a nominal existence, having, in 1841, dropped it from the roll; and it was not restored to the roll until 1856, and then only with a view of having it regularly united with the First church of Union Grove. On the 11th of October, 1859, Presbytery

dissolved the said Second church, and directed the Stated Clerk to furnish its members with the usual certificates to some other Presbyterian church.

Against this proceeding Mr. Shepherd appealed, and complained to the Synod of Illinois; but his complaint was not sustained. He now appeals and complains to the General Assembly. He does not deny the facts as stated by the Presbytery, but alleges that both Presbytery and Synod were guilty of certain gross irregularities, and an arbitrary use of power in the proceeding. But the papers do not contain evidence sustaining these allegations. There is no testimony of any kind filed with these papers. It is impossible for the Assembly to determine from the record, whether the power of the Presbytery was discreetly exercised. The Committee therefore recommend that the appeal and complaint be dismissed.

The report was adopted, and the appeal and complaint dismissed.

Judicial Case No. 4.

This was an appeal of Mr. John Turbitt against the Synod of Illinois. The Committee reported that Mr. Turbitt, in a letter addressed to the Moderator of the Assembly, declines to prosecute his appeal, and they recommend that his appeal be dismissed. The report was adopted.

Judicial Case No. 5.

The complaint of Mr. William B. Guild against the Synod of New Jersey. The case being in order, the Judicial Committee, with the consent of the parties, recommended the following as the final judgment in the case, viz., The complaint is sustained *pro forma*; but under existing circumstances in the congregation, Mr. Guild shall cease to act as ruling elder in the Third church at Newark, New Jersey. The report was accepted and adopted.

Judicial Case No. 6.

Judicial Case No. 6, being an appeal of James W. Hamilton against the Synod of Sandusky. The report was accepted.

The hour of 4½ P. M. having arrived, the Rev. Robert W. Patterson, D. D., and ruling elder William H. Brown, delegates from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church

now sitting in the city of Philadelphia, addressed the Assembly in the interchange of fraternal salutations, and were responded to by the Moderator.

Judicial Case No. 6 was again taken up.

Dr. F. T. Brown moved that the case be recommitted. The motion was lost.

The report of the Judicial Committee on the case was then adopted as follows: The Committee in this case report the papers in order and ready for trial. But the Committee find certain serious irregularities in all the proceedings of the inferior courts subsequent to the twenty-fifth day of August, 1861, when the appellant was censured by a public admonition. Of this admonition he does not complain. The irregularity of the subsequent proceedings is set forth in a paper, prepared by the Judicial Committee, and made a part of this report. And on the ground of that irregularity, without prejudging the case on its merits, the Committee recommend that the appeal be sustained, and the proceedings of all the inferior courts, from the twenty-fifth of August, 1861, be set aside.

Judicial Case No. 7.

Case No. 7, being the complaint of George P. Strong and others against the Presbytery of St. Louis.

The Committee reported that the complaint was not put into the hands of the Clerk of the Assembly until the third day of its business. It is, therefore, barred by the rule, and the Committee recommend that it be dismissed. The recommendation was adopted.

Judicial Case No. 8.

This was an appeal of Mr. M. Hummer against the Presbytery of Highland. The last General Assembly passed the following order, viz., "Overture No. 19, being a memorial of the Rev. George D. Stewart and others, that the General Assembly would take action in the case of the Rev. Michael Hummer, who, having been deposed by the Presbytery of Iowa, had been restored by the Presbytery of Highland, against the remonstrance of the Presbytery of Iowa, just as if he were an independent minister. It is recommended that this General Assembly declare that it is irregular and unconstitutional for any

Presbytery to receive and restore a member of another Presbytery who has been deposed: and, therefore, that the action of the Presbytery of Highland in restoring Mr. Hummer was improper; and the Presbytery of Highland is directed to reconsider its action, and proceed according to the requirements of the constitution." In relation to this decision, the Presbytery of Highland adopted certain resolutions, carrying out the directions of the Assembly. From that decision Mr. Hummer appealed. The Committee recommended that he have leave to withdraw his papers, as the Presbytery did nothing more than they were required to do by the General Assembly, and an appeal does not lie in such a case.

Judicial Case No. 9.

This was an appeal of the Rev. John Crozier against the Synod of Illinois. The Committee recommended that this case be taken up by the Assembly, and adjudicated according to the Book of Discipline, Sec. 8. The Assembly appointed Mr. S. G. Malone to represent Mr. Crozier. After reading the papers, the vote was taken, and resulted as follows: To sustain the appeal, 47; to sustain in part, 10; not to sustain, 58; *non liquet*, 10.

Judicial Case No. 10.

This was a complaint of the Rev. D. Owen Davis against the Synod of Cincinnati. "The Committee report that there was no evidence, either in the record before them, or from any other accessible source of information, that the complainant had given any previous notice of his complaint to the Synod. Indeed, the complaint itself bears date May 19, 1863, several months subsequent to the adjournment of the Synod. For this reason the Committee recommend that the complaint be dismissed." The recommendation was adopted.

Judicial Case No. 11.

This is the appeal of Dr. Thomas F. Worrell against the Synod of Illinois, together with the complaint of the Rev. Isaac A. Cornelison against the same Synod.

"The Committee report that the appeal and the complaint relate to the same matter, and they recommend that they be tried together as one cause. The Committee find, further, that

the Synod, in a minute expressing its judgment in a certain case then pending, to which Dr. Worrell was a party, adopted the following as a part of their judgment: "And, further, inasmuch as this trial grew out of a previous one with Dr. Worrell, in which the adjustment partook of the nature of a compromise, and certain irregularities which are not constitutional; and as the ends of discipline were not accomplished in the case of Dr. Worrell, the session of that church should review their proceedings in his case. This part of the minutes is the subject-matter of the appeal and complaint. In the judgment of the Committee, it was not competent for the Synod, when judicially determining one case, to open another case already settled and determined—this last case having been adjusted two years before, and the record of the adjustment having already passed before Synod, by way of review and control. The Committee therefore recommend that the appeal of Dr. Worrell be sustained. The complaint of Mr. Cornelison being to the same effect, is determined by this judgment on the appeal."

From this decision Dr. Loyal Young, and eight other members, entered their dissent. The action of the Assembly was reconsidered, and the decision was affirmed. Against this decision, the Rev. J. W. Johnston and others offered a protest, which was admitted to record, and is as follows:

"On the 8th day of September, A. D. 1859, Dr. Worrell was found guilty, by the session of the First church of Bloomington, of the sins of falsehood and slander, and suspended from the communion of the church. After hearing the case upon an appeal regularly taken, the Presbytery of Bloomington, on the 11th of November, A. D. 1859, affirmed the decision of the session. Thereupon, Dr. Worrell, on the 12th of November, presented to the session a paper, which the session accepted as such a confession of guilt, and profession of penitence, as is required by the Directory for Worship, Chap. X., Sec. 5, and restored him to the communion of the church. This action of session was on the same day communicated to the Presbytery, and that communication was entered upon the records of Presbytery. On the 5th day of December following, Dr. Worrell issued a printed circular, in which he declared that he had never intended to confess his guilt of the charges of which he had

been convicted; and, also, that the session had 'conceded that he was not guilty of any one of the charges of which they themselves had convicted him.'

"For making the statements contained in that circular, charges of falsehood and insincerity were preferred against Dr. Worrell, upon which he was tried by the session, found guilty, and suspended the second time. From this decision of the session, Dr. Worrell appealed to the Presbytery, and the appeal was sustained. The session then appealed to the Synod of Illinois, and the Synod made the decision brought before this General Assembly, by the appeal and complaint in this case.

"The question, therefore, presented by the charges in this case is, whether Dr. Worrell, in the paper presented by him to the session, made such a confession of guilt, and such a profession of penitence, as the session assumed him to have made in the former case. If he did, the session might justly have found him guilty of falsehood and insincerity, in the statements made in the circular. If he made no confession, then the session could not rightfully find him guilty of the charges in this case. The session did find him guilty. The Presbytery reversed the decision of the session. The Synod concurred with the Presbytery, and gave as the reasons for their decision in the minute appealed from and complained of, viz.—that the transaction between Dr. Worrell and the session, by which he was restored, was of the nature of a compromise, and was therefore irregular and unconstitutional, and they directed the session to review their proceedings in that respect."

We protest against this action of the General Assembly, for the following reasons, viz.

"1. Our first ground for protest is, that this Assembly has decided the appeal and complaint on the merits, by the adoption of a resolution proposed by the Judicial Committee, without hearing the case in the manner prescribed by the Book of Discipline, Chap. VII., Sec. 3, Sub. Sec. 8; and also without any opportunity for either party to be heard in the case. The very question presented by the appeal to the Assembly was, whether the Synod could rightfully make the decision appealed from. And this question has been decided by a resolution proposed

by the Committee, and not by the judgment of the Assembly, pronounced after a regular hearing of the appeal.

“2. We also protest against this decision, on the ground that the action of Synod was not only constitutional, but also eminently just and proper. If it be true—as in this case it must be assumed to be—that the session had restored Dr. Worrell without any profession of penitence, such as is contemplated by the constitution of the church, (see Directory for Worship, Chap. X., Sec. 5,) then clearly it was the duty of Synod to rebuke the irregular and unconstitutional proceedings of the session, and to direct them to review it. This it seems to us was clearly within the power of the Synod, either in giving a complete judgment upon the appeal case before them, or in the exercise of their power of review and control over inferior judicatories. (See Book of Discipline, Chap. VII., Sec. 1, Sub. Sec. 5.)

“3. The suggestion of the Committee, that the fact that the Presbyterian records containing the action of the session in the first case of Dr. Worrell, had been approved by the Synod, without exception, from which we suppose the Committee designed it to be inferred that Synod could not afterward review the action of the session mentioned in that record, does not, as it seems to us, justify that inference. Such approval by Synod, of minutes, ought not to be held to have any effect whatever in their subsequent decision of a judicial case regularly presented. If this opinion be not correct, then is the decision of the Assembly against which we now protest, clearly wrong, since, no longer ago than last Saturday, this venerable body approved, without any exception, the minutes of the Synod of Illinois, including the record of their proceedings in this very case. And this approval was after the Judicial Committee had made their report, and the motion to adopt it had been under discussion.

“4. We further protest, because this action of the General Assembly seems to us to decide an important judicial case upon mere technical grounds, and without a full investigation of its merits; and therefore tends, as we think, greatly to embarrass and discourage inferior judicatories, and especially church sessions, in the exercise of discipline.”

Judicial Case No. 12.

This was a complaint of Dr. Alfred Nevin against the Synod of Philadelphia. The Committee report that the complaint did not come into the hands of the Moderator of this Assembly until Monday, the fourth day of its sessions. It is therefore barred by the rule, and the Committee recommend that it be dismissed. The recommendation was adopted.

Numerous Overtures were, as usual presented to the Assembly, of which the following have permanent interest. First, the Directors of the Western Theological Seminary requested that the General Assembly take measures to prevent, in ordinary cases, the licensure of candidates until the completion of the full course, as prescribed by the General Assembly.

“The Committee recommend, in view of the great importance of a thorough course of theological study, that the Presbyteries exercise great care and prudence in regard to the licensing of candidates, and that, in ordinary cases, this be postponed until the completion of the theological course, that their undivided attention may be given to the prosecution of their studies while in the Seminary.” The recommendation was adopted.

This matter rests with the Presbyteries, and we fear that this recommendation of the Assembly will not prove more effectual than others of a similar character. They are too much disposed to yield to the amiable desire to gratify the wishes of impatient young men who are importunate for licensure. There are cases, undoubtedly, in which good reasons exist for the licensure of candidates before the completion of their theological studies. But in the great majority of cases, it is a great evil to the young men, to the institutions with which they are connected, and to the church. As a general rule, it is the more superficial, the less serious, and the less prepared class of candidates who are so desirous to assume the responsibilities of preachers. As soon as such men obtain licensure they cease to be faithful students. Their time is largely devoted to preparing sermons, and their minds intent on seeking settlements. We have known young men to obtain licensure and receive calls before they had even commenced the study of theology proper. We hope the Presbyteries may be induced to pay some respect

to the repeated expression of the judgment of the Assembly on this subject. With them, however, rests the responsibility, for they have the constitutional right to license any young man, a member of the church, who has been nominally engaged two years in the study of theology, although those years may have been almost exclusively devoted to church history and Hebrew.

Second: The Central Presbytery of Philadelphia asked the Assembly whether, in case of sickness, or other urgent necessity, the session of a church can properly administer the Lord's Supper in a private house. To this request the Committee recommend the following answer, which was adopted:

"The standards of our church are clear in their teaching, that the Lord's Supper is not to be received by any one alone, yet, in cases of protracted sickness or approaching death, when the desire is very strongly urged by a member of the church, to enjoy the administration of the Lord's Supper, a pastor, having duly admonished the applicant that such ordinance, however a source of spiritual comfort, is not, in such cases, an imperative duty, or indispensable to salvation, may, with a member of his session, and such communicants as may appropriately be permitted to partake in such solemnity, proceed to administer this sacrament—a minute of every such act to be entered on the records of session."

Third: A request from the Presbytery of Cincinnati, that the Assembly define the respective rights of the trustees and session in the control of the edifice used for public worship, and direct what steps be taken in case of disagreement or collision between them. The Committee report thereon as follows:

"When a church edifice is held by trustees, the legal title is vested in them; and having the title, the custody and care of the property pertains to them for the uses and purposes for which they hold the trust. These uses and purposes are the worship of God, and the employment of such other means of spiritual improvement as may be consistent with the Scriptures, and according to the order of the church; to which may be added congregational meetings for business relating to the church or corporation. By the constitution of the church, the session is charged with the supervision of the spiritual interests of the congregation; and this includes the right to direct and

control the use of the building for the purpose of worship, as required or established by the special usage of the particular church, or the Directory for Worship. This being the principal purpose of the trust, the trustees are bound to respect the wishes and action of the session, as to the use and occupation of the house of worship. The session is the organ or agent through whom the trustees are informed how and when the church building is to be occupied; and the trustees have no right to refuse compliance with the action of the session in this regard. These are general principles, applicable to all cases, except, perhaps, in some localities where special statutory enactments by competent authority may confer other rights, and prescribe other duties.

“But there are other purposes for which the use of the church edifice is sometimes desired, which, though they partake of a religious or intellectual character, do not fall within the class of objects which are properly described as belonging to the worship of that congregation. The house may not be used for such purposes without the consent of the trustees; and this consent they may properly, in their discretion, refuse. As the function to determine what is a proper use of the house is vested in the session, the trustees have no legal right to grant the use of it for purposes which the session disapprove. And as the strict rights of those who are represented by the session, to the use of the house, are limited to the worship of that congregation, the trustees are under no obligation to grant it for any other purpose.

“When the trustees grant the use of the house to others, contrary to the expressed wishes of the session, and, as they suppose, to the prejudice of the cause of religion and of that church, the proper appeal is, first, to the persons composing the congregation, to whom the trustees are responsible; secondly, to the Presbytery, for their advice; and finally, if necessary, to the legal tribunals.”

The report was accepted and adopted.

Fourth: The Presbytery of Saline requested the Assembly solemnly to reaffirm the testimony of 1818, in regard to slavery. In reply, the Committee recommended the following minute, which was adopted.

“The Assembly has, from the first, uttered its sentiments on the subject of slavery in substantially the same language. The action of 1818 was taken with more care, made more clear, full, and explicit, and was adopted unanimously. It has since remained that true and scriptural deliverance on this important subject, by which our church is determined to abide. It has never been repealed, amended, or modified, but has frequently been referred to, and reiterated in subsequent Assemblies. And when some persons fancied that the action of 1845 in some way interfered with it, the Assembly of 1846 declared, with much unanimity, that the action of 1845 was not intended to deny or rescind the testimony on the subject, previously uttered by General Assemblies; and by these deliverances we still abide.”

It may be true that “the action of 1845” did not “modify” the testimony of 1818, but it most certainly explained it. If by slavery is meant the system of slave-laws which prevail in our Southern States; laws which forbid slaves to marry; which deny to husbands and parents the right to their wives and children; which prohibit their being taught to read the word of God; which deny them a just recompense for their labour, and subject them to the almost unrestricted will of their masters, then slavery is an utter abomination, and all that is said in the Act of 1818, is to the letter true. And this no doubt was the sense in which our fathers used the word, when that minute was adopted by the unanimous vote of the Assembly, representing the slaveholding as well as the non-slaveholding part of the country. But when fanatical abolitionists began to include under the condemnation and denunciations of the Act of 1818, all involuntary servitude, all such slaveholding as that permitted to Abraham, and practised by the Ephesian Christians, whom Paul addressed as his dear brethren, then it became necessary for the Assembly to state in what sense the word was to be understood. This was the design of the minute adopted in 1845. It was intended to discriminate between slavery, as simple, involuntary servitude, and that system of slavery, or of slave-laws which is in force in our Southern States. And this distinction has been almost universally regarded as just and indispensable. It is absolutely necessary to make the tes-

timony of the church consistent with the Scriptures, and with allegiance to its Divine head and lawgiver. We have not the least objection to the recent deliverance of the Assembly on this subject, understood, as it must be understood, in connection with the unrepealed and accepted interpretation afforded by the act of 1845.

The Assembly adopted, with almost absolute unanimity, a declaration of their loyalty and allegiance to the Constitution and Government of the United States, and their condemnation of the wicked rebellion, which for two years has desolated so large a part of the country. The late wonderful manifestations of the favour of God, in the defeat and probable destruction of the rebel army under General Lee, and the surrender of Vicksburg, has filled the hearts of all loyal Christian men with devout gratitude to God, and with the confident hope that he means, in his great mercy, soon to restore us to unity and peace.

Theological Seminaries.

The appropriate committee reported, that in the Seminary at Princeton, seventy new students had been received during the year; that the whole number in connection with the institution was one hundred and eighty-one; and that thirty-eight had completed the whole course of study. In the Western Seminary, one hundred and thirty-four had been enrolled in the course of the year; forty-four new students had been admitted; and twenty had completed the regular course of study. Dr. Plumer having resigned the chair of Didactic and Pastoral Theology, it was recommended that a successor be appointed. On account of the unsettled state of things in Kentucky, occasioned by the war, the Seminary at Danville had been much interrupted, only eight students being in attendance during the last session. Dr. Stanton had been inaugurated as Professor of Church Government and Pastoral Theology. In the Seminary at Chicago, six new students had been received; twelve had been in attendance, and six completed the course of study. The committee recommended the appointment of a professor to fill the chair of Biblical Literature and Exegesis. Agreeably to these recommendations, the Rev. Lyman H.

Atwater, D. D., of Princeton, New Jersey, was chosen as Professor of Didactic Theology in the Western Seminary. Dr. Atwater received one hundred and fifty-nine votes, and Rev. E. D. MacMaster, D. D., of Indiana, thirty-one votes. The Rev. Charles Elliott, D. D., of Oxford, Ohio, received one hundred and fifty votes for the Professorship of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in the Northwestern Seminary, no votes being cast for any other person. These gentlemen were consequently declared duly elected.

The next General Assembly was appointed to meet in the Third church in Newark, New Jersey.

There appears to be a great infelicity in the manner in which the Assembly conducts its business. Everything is fragmentary. A subject is introduced one day, and partially discussed, then laid aside for something else; then resumed, and again and again laid aside. Thus the judicial case Number 1, was introduced during the first days of the sessions, and not decided before the very last days. We have known a member to be four days in delivering a speech, which would not have taken an hour, if delivered continuously; but which, being broken into fragments of ten or twenty minutes, was protracted to an insufferable length, greatly to the detriment of its effect, and to the speaker's annoyance. It is evident that this is a great evil, especially in judicial cases. The minds of the members are distracted, and the whole subject gets confused. Some hear one part, and others another part of the evidence or argument. All this may be avoided, if, instead of making particular matters of business the order of the day for a specified time, the Assembly should determine simply the order in which the several items on the docket shall be taken up. It might determine to take up the reports of the several Boards, and dispatch each before taking up anything else. Then take up, say a judicial case, and hear it to the end, before any other topic is introduced.

The business of the Assembly consists, besides matters of routine, of three great divisions—reports of the Boards, judicial cases, and the consideration of overtures. There might be some advantage in taking up these subjects in their order; but, at any rate, it seems to us eminently desirable, that when any

one important subject is introduced, it should be finally determined before it is laid aside.

The Committee on the Book of Discipline reported the Book as revised and amended, the consideration of which, after a few alterations had been adopted, was referred to the next Assembly.

ART. VI.—*Date of the Books of Chronicles.*

THE historical books of the Old Testament may be variously numbered and classified. It might, in fact, even be made a question, which books are properly so designated. The denomination historical, as distinguished from the legal, poetical, and prophetic books, describes them not absolutely, but as to their prevailing character. Thus Chronicles contains poetical passages, prophecies, and ceremonial enactments; yet, as these are merely incidental and occasional, and do not constitute the main body of the work, it is properly classed among the historical books. So, too, Jeremiah and Isaiah are prophetic books, notwithstanding the occurrence of historical paragraphs, and even chapters. The mixed character of a book might, however, in certain cases, be such as to create a doubt to which of its constituents the greater prominence should be accorded. Thus some have thought that the books of Jonah and of Job should be regarded as historical, since the former is rather the narrative of a prophetic mission than a proper prophecy, and the latter is substantially a history, though in poetic form. But when we consider that the mission of Jonah, turning his back on Israel to preach to Gentiles, who heard his word and were saved, was itself a prophecy of the future, and that the facts in the life of Job only form the ground work of a sacred poem wrought in the very highest style of Hebrew art, the ordinary classification of these books is justified.

Restricting our consideration, then, to those books which are

usually and properly denominated historical, (and excluding the books of Moses,) we have the following twelve, viz.,

Joshua,	2 Samuel,	2 Chronicles,
Judges,	1 Kings,	Ezra,
Ruth,	2 Kings,	Nehemiah,
1 Samuel,	1 Chronicles,	Esther.

In the ancient catalogues of the canon, the two books of Samuel are commonly combined into one, so the two of Kings, and the two of Chronicles; the number is thus reduced to nine. Some of these catalogues make a still further reduction to seven, by reckoning Ruth an appendix to Judges, or a part of it, and Nehemiah as forming one book with Ezra.

Adopting, however, the more familiar number twelve, we may divide these books into two equal classes in respect to the official character of their writers. They are in our English bibles, which follow in this the order of the Septuagint and the Vulgate, arranged together in chronological succession. In the Hebrew Bible, on the contrary, they are parcelled between two of the leading divisions of the canon, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa. Six books are classed as Former Prophets, to denote that, though of an historical character, they were written by prophets. These are,

Joshua,	1 Samuel,	1 Kings,
Judges,	2 Samuel,	2 Kings.

The remaining six are found in the Hagiographa, or that portion of the Old Testament which was written by men who, though inspired of God, were not prophets in the strict and official sense. We have, therefore, the authority of tradition, so far as that is expressed in the Hebrew arrangement of the canon, for believing this to have been the case with

Ruth,	Ezra,	1 Chronicles,
Esther,	Nehemiah,	2 Chronicles.

Dr. Addison Alexander was in the habit of combining the books of Moses with the twelve historical books, and then dividing the whole after the analogy of the former into three pentateuchs. This ingenious and convenient distribution can

be best exhibited in his own words, here quoted from one of his manuscript lectures:

“Of these seventeen books, two are not so much continuations of those earlier in date, as parallel, collateral, and supplementary. These are the books of Chronicles, excluding or postponing which we come to a residuum or minimum of fifteen books, composing a continuous unbroken series. As an aid to the memory, these fifteen books may be grouped or classified in three pentateuchs, or groups of five, each containing one great division of the history. The first, that which usually bears the name of Pentateuch, comprises the whole history from the creation to the death of Moses. The second, which includes the books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, and 1 and 2 Samuel, carries on the narrative until the close of David’s reign. The third, composed of 1 and 2 Kings, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, brings it down to the close of the Old Testament canon, after which we are dependent upon uninspired but authentic writings, till we reach the threshold of the gospel history. Each of these pentateuchs contains one book, which although necessary to complete the series, is rather of an episodic character. Such a book, in the first Pentateuch, is Leviticus, containing very few events, and chiefly occupied with legislation; in the second, that of Ruth, belonging strictly to the history of David’s family; in the third, that of Esther, which relates to a remarkable deliverance of the Jews in Persia.”

Another simple and serviceable division of these books may be obtained by reducing the number from twelve to nine, in the manner already described as current in the ancient church and synagogue. They will then consist of three groups of three, representing the three great periods of the history, the shorter periods being covered by the single books, and the second and longest, by the three double books. This yields the following scheme:

Joshua,	Samuel,	Ezra,
Judges,	Kings,	Nehemiah,
Ruth,	Chronicles,	Esther.

The first three relate to the period of the Hebrew commonwealth, or of the pure theocracy under Joshua and the Judges;

the next three contain the history of the monarchy, its institution by Samuel, with Saul as the first king; its culmination and splendour under David and Solomon, and finally its decline and overthrow. The last three belong to the period subsequent to the captivity, which was one of foreign domination. In each of these groups the first two members cover the entire period to which they relate; the third being supplementary, and recording additional facts, which did not fall strictly within the scope of the preceding. Thus, Ruth belongs to the period of the book of Judges, Chronicles passes afresh over that of Samuel and Kings, while the events recorded in Esther belong to the time included within the book of Ezra.

A characteristic common to all these books, with the exception of Nehemiah (ch. i. 1,) is, that they are anonymous. This is the more remarkable from the contrast with the books of the prophets, every one of which has a title prefixed, declaring the name of the author. The same fact recurs again in the Gospels and Acts of the New Testament, as contrasted with the Epistles and Revelation. The names of the writers are prefixed to the latter, with the exception of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where it is easy to conjecture a special reason for the omission. The former are without titles, so far as their proper text is concerned, though a steadfast and well-accredited tradition has preserved to us the knowledge of their authors.

‡ The reason of this singular difference is doubtless to be sought in the nature of the case. The personality of the prophet was of the utmost importance. He claims to be a messenger sent from God, and the only voucher of the truth and authority of his declarations and injunctions is the certainty of his divine commission. An anonymous book of prophecy would, therefore, be without the requisite necessary to establish its own validity. The credit of the historian, on the other hand, rests less upon the weight attached to his own person, than upon the general recognition of the truth of his testimony by those amongst whom he lived, and who were equally cognizant of the facts with himself, or had access to the same sources of information. That these books were, upon their original publication, accepted as a true history, and that they have always

been so regarded since that time, sufficiently entitles them to our confidence in their veracity and accuracy.

This impersonality of the sacred history is the cause of another phenomena equally pervading. The events recorded are viewed in their purely objective character; the personal relations of the writer sink completely out of sight. Accordingly the inspired historians speak of transactions in which they took part themselves, precisely as if they were narrating the acts or the experience of others. They use the third person of themselves; they detail with the same artless simplicity things worthy of praise and of censure. Thus the author of the Pentateuch speaks of Moses just as he does of Joshua or any other of his contemporaries, and neither shrinks from saying, on the one hand, that he was meek above all men on the face of the earth, nor, on the other, from detailing how he spoke unadvisedly with his lips, and incurred the sentence of exclusion from the promised land. It is different with the prophets. In delivering their messages from God, they are not mere disinterested reporters, but are fulfilling their personal commission. It hence becomes of moment, not only that the message is correctly given, but that it is given by him who was specially entrusted with it. Accordingly we find that Daniel, Isaiah, and other prophets, in the historical chapters or sections of their books, speak of themselves in the third person, after the manner of historians, while in the properly prophetic chapters the first person is as regularly employed. The principal exception to the above remark is found in Ezra (vii. 28, viii. 1, etc.,) and Nehemiah, who betray themselves by the use of the first person, as Luke does occasionally in the Acts of the Apostles.

In the absence of any express testimony, concerning the date and authorship of the several historical books of the Old Testament, we are left to such incidental evidence as we are able to gather, chiefly from internal sources. This sort of evidence, however, if sufficiently clear and unambiguous, is always held to be the most satisfactory and convincing. It has this peculiar advantage, that it is not testimony delivered of set purpose to establish a particular end, but it is involuntarily given, in allusions and expressions, by which a writer betrays, without intending

it, the circumstances and the time in which he lived. It is thus lifted above all suspicion of intentional fraud or deception.

In the application of these internal criteria, it becomes necessary, first, to fix the limits and determine the constitution of each work separately. Are the twelve historical books so many distinct works, each of which is capable of being, and must be, investigated by itself? Opinions here have been far from accordant, and yet it is manifest that an error at this point would vitiate the most carefully formed conclusions. If the opinion expressed by Bertheau,* were correct, that all the books from Genesis to 2 Kings compose together one continuous and connected treatise, the theme of which was the sacred history from the beginning of the world to the Babylonish exile, of course our judgment respecting the date of the earlier portions of the canon would be materially different from that which would otherwise be entertained. Now it is a fact, that the histories of the Old Testament are consecutive for the most part, one taking up the narrative where its predecessor ends. Several of the books are, besides, linked in a formal manner at the beginning with the close of the one before them, thus showing that in the intention of their authors they are to be regarded in the light of sequels, or continuations. Thus the Pentateuch ends with the death of Moses; the book of Joshua connects itself directly with this by beginning, "Now, after the death of Moses, the servant of the Lord, it came to pass," etc. This book ends with the death of Joshua, whereupon Judges begins, "Now, after the death of Joshua, it came to pass," etc.; and then, after a few preliminary statements necessary to a correct appreciation of what follows, it, as it were, begins afresh and makes its connection with the book of Joshua still more intimate and apparent by repeating ii. 6—9, the verses which conclude the life of Joshua, (Josh. xxiv. 28—31,) and attaching the following history to them. So Samuel begins where Judges leaves off, and Kings takes up the closing days of David, where Samuel drops them. It may be observed further, that the historical books commonly begin with the conjunction *and*, for which our translators have substituted the word *now*. This simple con-

* Das Buch der Richter und Rut, Erklärt, p. xxvii.

nective serves to intimate that the book so beginning is not a beginning *de novo*, but a resumption of a theme which had previously been treated elsewhere—a continuation of the same inspired record with the books which go before. This is the case even with Ruth and Esther, which do not directly continue the narrative of any preceding book, but nevertheless exhibit the initial and expressive “*and*,” thereby declaring themselves to be additions to the inspired history previously put on record.

A certain measure of formal and external unity is thus given to the entire Old Testament history, which is rendered yet more striking and impressive by the inner spiritual unity which likewise pervades it. The same great ideas animate the whole; the work of preparation for the coming of the Son of God and the Son of man, rolls steadily forward, one divine plan developing in majestic grandeur from first to last. And the spirit of the historians is one throughout. We everywhere meet the same lofty appreciation of the task of Israel, the same abasing of the human, and exaltation of the divine, the same theocratic character estimating everything, not from a merely national or worldly point of view, but from its bearing on the kingdom of God.

All this it is most interesting to note, as showing the oneness of its divine subject and its divine author. But a further examination will soon show that this is a unity in the midst of diversity. It is the work of one overruling and directing Spirit, but wrought by a number of human agents. These various works, though fitted thus together, are yet palpably distinct, as shown by the completeness of each taken singly in its theme and in its execution, and by the diversity of plan prevailing in each. It would require an analysis of each of these books, and an investigation of its plan and structure, to exhibit this in detail. This cannot of course be attempted here. It is sufficient for the purposes of this article to remark, that 1st and 2d Chronicles are not two separate and independent works, but form together one production. This is shown by their unity of plan and the close connection of the parts, and from the incompleteness of either if sundered from the other. It is further certified by the express testimony of tradition. These two books, like the two of Samuel and the two of Kings, were anciently

reckoned one. They were so regarded and spoken of by the Jews; they are so in Hebrew manuscripts. The division was introduced by the Septuagint translators, but was never recognised in the original text, until the time of Bomberg, when it was admitted into printed editions of the Hebrew Bible; and here its modern character still appears, in the circumstance that the masoretic notes occurring at the end of every book, are not found at the end of First, but only of Second Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles.

It may be further remarked, that Chronicles forms a complete work, and is not merely the earlier portion of an historical treatise, of which Ezra is to be regarded as the later and concluding portion. The apocryphal 1 Esdras combines them, as though they were one continuous production, and the identity of the closing verses of Chronicles with the opening verses of Ezra has been thought to indicate that they were originally one, but have been divided in the same way that the two books of Chronicles themselves were divided. But whatever may be the significance of the facts just referred to, they cannot establish the original oneness of Chronicles and Ezra. There is no ancient testimony in its favour; and they are so distinct in plan and method that they must have been independent works.

It has been intimated that the constitution of these various works must be inquired into, as well as their individual extent, as preliminary to a settlement of their date from internal criteria. Are they, as they now stand, the productions each of a single author, so that all its parts date from the same period? or are they to be in each case parcelled among a variety of authors belonging to different ages? A book constituted as the Psalms, for example, must not be dealt with as though it were the production of a single writer. The clearest proof that any given number of the Psalms were prepared by David, would not establish his authorship of the rest, nor the collection of the whole by him. Or, if the hypothesis could be established of the successive compilation of certain books, as some have argued for it in the case of Kings, supposing that different prophets, Isaiah among the rest, wrote portions of it, bringing the narrative down, step by step, until at length it was completed; this would also preclude the possibility of arguing with any con-

fidence from criteria found in one part to the date of any other part or section. Each distinct portion must then be settled, if it can be settled at all, by its own distinct evidence. Or again, if a work be not so much an original production as a compilation from works previously existing, there will be need of caution in distinguishing what belongs to the author of the work before us, from what belongs purely to those writers from whom his materials are drawn, or his extracts are made. Thus, for example, where it is said by the writer of the book of Joshua, that the stones set upon the bed of Jordan are there *unto this day*, Josh. iv. 9, and that Rahab dwelleth in Israel *unto this day*, Josh. vi. 25, we are warranted in inferring that when that book was written those stones were still there, and Rahab was still living; for Joshua is demonstrably one continuous production of a single writer. But it could not be similarly inferred from 2 Chron. v. 9, that Chronicles was written while the ark was still in the most holy place, and consequently the temple was still standing, for this work is professedly compiled from preëxisting writings, whose language it here simply transfers. The work from which that extract was made, was written while the facts were as it describes; but things had changed before Chronicles itself was prepared. If now the question were as to the sources of Chronicles, and what could be learned respecting their character and date, every thing should be carefully collated, which could be shown to belong to them in their original form, and to have been simply extracted without material alteration. As, however, our present question concerns not them, but Chronicles itself, we must draw our inferences from what betrays the author of this production in its present form. The principal criteria which can be relied upon for this purpose are the following, viz.

1. The furthest limit to which the history is continued. Of course the book is subsequent to the latest event which it records; this is the edict of Cyrus, in the first year of his reign, for the restoration of the Jews from captivity. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, 23.

2. The limit of the genealogies. The line of David (Chron. iii.) is, on account of the special interest attaching to it, continued to a further point than any of the others; the proba-

bility is that the writer brings it down to his own time. In vs. 19—21, he mentions Zerubbabel who came up (Ezra ii. 2) with the first colony of returning captives, gives the names of his children, and of the children of Hananiah, and of his sons, the grandchildren consequently of Zerubbabel. The latter part of verse 21 is obscure; after mentioning the names of Zerubbabel's grandchildren, these words follow: "The sons of Rephaiah, the sons of Arnan, the sons of Obadiah, the sons of Shechaniah," and then the descendants of the last named Shechaniah are traced through four generations. Who this Shechaniah and the other persons named with him are, is not said. Some are disposed to give the verse up as unintelligible, and think it an interpolation, or hopelessly corrupt. Others, with the view of bringing down the composition of Chronicles to the latest possible period, make Shechaniah, without a particle of justification from the text of the passage, to be a son of Zerubbabel's grandson previously named, and then claim that we have here the descendants of Zerubbabel traced to the seventh generation, and, consequently, Chronicles cannot have been written until the seventh generation after the return from exile. This conclusion is utterly unwarranted, however. The fact of the case appears to be, that the names introduced at the close of verse 21, without explanation, are the names of other prominent and well-known families connected with the line of David's descendants, parallel to, but not descended from, the family of Zerubbabel. As we cannot identify the heads of these families, and have no means of ascertaining precisely when they lived, they can afford us no criterion of date, unless, as has been suspected, though it cannot be rigorously proved, the Hattush, verse 22, is the same with the Hattush mentioned Ezra viii. 2, as having gone up with Ezra from the captivity in the reign of Artaxerxes I. (Longimanus,) 78 years after the return of the first colony. In that case the genealogy there continued to the grandsons of a brother of Hattush, brings us down to the grandsons of a contemporary of Ezra, a record which could readily be made in the lifetime of Ezra.

3. A criterion of doubtful weight has been sought in the list of names, 1 Chron. ix. 17, 18, and the statement there made respecting them. Certain persons are mentioned as porters, of

whom it is said that they “*hitherto* (עַד הַיּוֹם) *until this time,*) waited in the king’s gate eastward.” Some of these same names reappear, Neh. xii. 25, 26, as porters keeping ward at the threshold of the gates in the days of Nehemiah and Ezra. The only question is, whether the identity of names in two or three instances is sufficient to establish the identity of persons: if so, the time of the writer is fixed contemporary with Ezra and Nehemiah.

4. The mention made of *Darics*, 1 Chron. xxix. 7, (“*drams,*” Eng. ver.) also points in the same direction. The “*daric,*” as is well known, was a Persian coin, and the mention of it in this passage shows that it must have been well known to the Jews at this time, and current among them. They must consequently have been under the Persian government at the time this book was written. This positively refutes the idea that it was written after the Persian empire had been overthrown by Alexander, and the Greek empire had usurped its place, or later still, in the time of the Maccabees, because then Greek coins had been substituted for the Persian, as appears not only from the nature of the case, but from the Apocryphal books which belong to this period, Tobit v. 15, and 2 Macc. xii. 43, where the reckoning is in Greek *drachmas*.

The attempt has been made to convert the mention of this coin to a directly opposite use, and infer from it a date long posterior to the time of Ezra, for the following reasons, viz.

(1.) The word occurs in the enumeration of the sums contributed during the life of David for the building of the temple. This, it is said, betrays gross ignorance on the part of the writer, that he should have supposed this coin to have been in circulation in David’s days; such a blunder could only have been possible when the origin of the coin was no longer known. But admitting that this was the meaning of the writer, the force of the argument is not very apparent. How is such a blunder impossible in the days of Ezra, and yet possible a few generations after? It might prove the writer an ignoramus, but surely does not prove when he lived. It is, however, perfectly gratuitous to fasten such a blunder on the writer. He mentions “ten thousand darics” not as the denomination of coin in which these sums were contributed in David’s days, but

as the gross amount. It was the coin current at the time of the writer, and the amount so stated would be better apprehended by his readers. It is as if an American writer, in giving the amount of the national debt of Great Britain, should reckon it in dollars: it surely would be no fair inference from this, that he was not aware that the British currency was not dollars, but pounds sterling. He merely states a foreign sum in a familiar currency.

(2.) It is said that the "daric" derives its name from Darius Hystaspis, and that some time must have elapsed before it could have found circulation in Judea. Admitting this statement, however, it does not prove the purpose for which it is alleged. Darius Hystaspis ascended the throne of Persia sixty-three years before Ezra came with the band of colonists that he brought up from captivity. The coin had, undoubtedly, circulated by that time into all parts of the empire. It has been admitted that the "daric" derived its name from Darius Hystaspis, because that is the opinion of Grote, Böckh, and other able antiquaries, and it is of no material consequence to us to dispute it. It ought to be added, however, that some eminent scholars, *e. g.*, Prideaux, Keil, Hengstenberg, and others, are not disposed to make that admission, and it does seem, upon an examination of the case, as though it rested upon a very slender foundation. The only direct testimony to the point is that of Hesychius, the Alexandrian grammarian and lexicographer, who lived probably as late as the end of the fourth century after Christ. He says, "Darics were so called, *as some say*, from Darius, king of the Persians." A passage in Herodotus is also appealed to, in which he speaks of Darius Hystaspis introducing a new and pure coinage, but without saying that darics were first coined by him, or derived their name from him. On the other hand, Suidas, Harpocration, and a scholiast upon Aristophanes, unite in saying that the darics were so named, not from Darius Hystaspis, but from an older Darius. Xenophon also, in more than one passage, speaks of "darics" in the time of Cyrus, of course before the time of Hystaspis. Consequently, the scholars above referred to are of opinion that the "darics" either received their name from Darius, the uncle and predecessor of Cyrus, spoken of in

Dan. ix. 1, xi. 1, as Darius the Mede, or else that *Darius*, which is the Persian word for *king*, was a general title of the Persian monarchs, and that *daric* consequently means simply the *royal coin*, and is not derived from the name of any particular monarch; so that the origin of it must be left undetermined. Whatever view be taken of this question, however, our conclusion from the occurrence of the word remains undisturbed: a book in which money is reckoned by "darics" must have been written during the time that the Jews were under the Persian rule; and the Persian empire was overturned within a century after the time of Ezra and Nehemiah.

5. Another word occurs twice in this same chapter, which affords another probable argument of date, viz., בְּרִירָה 1 Chron. xxix. 1, 19, as applied to the temple. This is the word constantly applied in Esther, Daniel, and Nehemiah, to the castle or fortified palace of the Persian monarchs in their capital city Shusan. Nehemiah, in two instances, (ii. 8, vii. 2,) uses this word of a structure in Jerusalem which he erected, but which he in the former passage expressly distinguishes from the temple proper. He means by it the fortification connected with the temple, called at a later period the tower of Antonia, and which Josephus calls *βασις*, by transferring this Hebrew word to the Greek. Now, it is a plausible opinion that the use of this word in the manner referred to in the books of Chronicles, proves them to have been written before the erection of this tower by Nehemiah. After that tower was constructed and called בְּרִירָה, the temple could not have been called by that name without danger of misapprehension and mistake.

6. The history of the canon shows that this book cannot belong to a later period than that of Ezra and Nehemiah, because it is the unanimous tradition of the Jews that the canon was collected by Ezra: Josephus expressly declares that no addition or alteration was made in the canon from that time onward. It is impossible that such statements could have been made, if a book so large as Chronicles had been added at a later period, and especially so late as the time of the Maccabees, to which some critics would refer it.

*7. The last verses of Chronicles are repeated as the opening verses of Ezra. This is an evident proof that Chronicles was

written before the book of Ezra, and as there is every reason to believe that the latter was written by Ezra himself, Chronicles cannot have been written later than the time of Ezra. Some critics have endeavoured to get rid of this argument by alleging that these verses are taken from Ezra by the author of Chronicles, and not from Chronicles by Ezra, and that consequently Chronicles must have been written after Ezra and not before it. It is apparent, however, from a simple inspection of the passage, that this supposition is devoid of all probability, and for the following reasons. (1.) Ezra adopts these verses at the beginning of his book for the sake of linking his narrative with the history that preceded; just as the writer of the book of Judges borrows a few verses, (ii. 6-10,) from the close of the history of Joshua for the same reason. (2.) The book of Ezra begins with the conjunction *and*; this *and* is natural in the connection in which it occurs in Chronicles xxxvi. 22, but is inexplicable at the beginning of a book, unless as implying a connection with the antecedent history. (3.) The reference in these verses to the prophecy of Jeremiah contains an allusion to the antecedent verse (ver. 21,) in Chronicles, where that prediction is spoken of.

The conclusion from the arguments now recited is, that the books of Chronicles *must have been written in the life-time of Ezra*. To this various objections have been brought:

1. The first is derived from the statement made 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21, that the desolation of the land and captivity in Babylon lasted seventy years. This, it is said, is a palpable error; from the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, B. C. 588, to the edict of Cyrus restoring the Jews to their own land, B. C. 536, was only a period of fifty-two years. It could not have been reckoned to be seventy years by a person who lived just after the close of the exile. This error could only have arisen centuries afterwards, when the exact chronology of the period was forgotten or lost sight of, and it was inferred from the prophecy of Jeremiah that this must have been the duration of it. In reply to this it may be said, (1.) That Jeremiah expressly predicted, (Jer. xxv. 11, xxix. 10,) that the captivity at Babylon should continue seventy years; and if he was a true prophet that must have been its duration.

It has been said, indeed, that this is merely intended by Jeremiah as a round number, and that it is not the custom of the prophets to foretell the exact dates of the events which they predict. But there are numerous other instances in which exact dates are given in predictions, *e. g.* Isa. vii. 8, "Within threescore and five years shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people;" xvi. 14, "Within three years, as the years of an hireling, (*i. e.* exactly measured, neither more nor less,) and the glory of Moab shall be contemned;" xxi. 16, "Within a year, according to the years of a hireling, all the glory of Kedar shall fail." Daniel (ix. 24) predicts that there will be seventy weeks of years to the coming of the Messiah. It is also plain that Daniel (ix. 2) expected the fulfilment of Jeremiah's prediction in seventy years. (2.) His prediction is represented as fulfilled, not only by the author of Chronicles, but by Ezra (i. 1) who certainly must have been conversant with the facts. (3.) The prophet Zechariah, who lived just after the exile, expressly says, in two passages, (i. 12, vii. 5,) that the exile lasted seventy years. So that if the reckoning were based on an error, it was an error current in that generation which returned from exile, and not one that arose at a later period. (4.) It can be shown that it is correct. The beginning of the exile is to be reckoned, not from the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, but from the third or fourth year of Jehoiakim, when the city was first taken by Nebuchadnezzar, and the first deportation made, Dan. i. 1, B. C. 606. The exile began with the carrying away of the first captives, and ended with the decree of Cyrus, and the return of the first colony from exile; and the interval was precisely that which Jeremiah had predicted. The carrying into exile was one of successive acts of deportation, just as the return was by successive colonies, at distant intervals; but if we reckon from the beginning of the one to the beginning of the other, we shall have exactly seventy years. Or, if the destruction of the temple be made the point of beginning, and we reckon from that until the temple was once more rebuilt, we shall have again seventy years.

2. The mention of Satan, 1 Chron. xxi. 1. The objection is that the Jews received their idea of Satan from the Persian

doctrine of Ahriman, an evil principle independent from the good, and warring against him.

But (1), even were it to be admitted that the Jewish notion of an evil spirit were derived from this source, it would not answer the purpose for which it is here alleged, of proving a date later than Ezra. The people were at this very time under Persian rule, and were already open to all the influence which we can suppose to have been exerted from that quarter.

(2.) Satan is not only similarly mentioned, Zech. iii. 1, in a book belonging, as is confessed, to this same period, but in the far older book of Job i. 6, etc. And not to mention other proofs of the same thing, the doctrine of an evil spirit is implied in the very first chapters of Genesis, in the account of the temptation and fall of our first parents.

(3.) The Persian notion of an original and independent principle of evil, is, besides, so different from the scriptural doctrine of Satan, a dependent spirit, created holy, but fallen through his own fault, that their common origin is not supposable; even if the very conception of an immediate divine revelation in the Scriptures did not preclude the idea of borrowing tenets from Pagan nations.

3. The manner in which "fasting" is spoken of, 2 Chron. xx. 3. Jehoshaphat, at a time of extreme peril, sets himself to seek the Lord, and with this view proclaims a fast. Now, it is alleged, that when fasting is spoken of in earlier books, it is merely in token of grief; that the idea of the meritoriousness of fasting, and other ascetic practices belongs to a period much later than the exile. But, apart from the fact that this objection tacitly assumes that the writer has falsified the history for the sake of introducing his own ideas into it, the idea of fasting which we find here, is the same which appears universally in the Scriptures. In Judges xx. 26, the children of Israel wept and fasted, as an act of humiliation before God, and to obtain his favour. So in the public humiliation at Mizpeh in the days of Samuel, 1 Sam. vii. 6. David (2 Sam. xii. 16) fasted during the sickness of his child; and that this was not purely from grief, but as a means of obtaining the Lord's favour, appears from verse 20, that upon the death of the child he again ate bread. The prophets also speak of it in the same way, Joel ii.

12, "Turn ye to me with all your heart, and with fasting," &c. Jer. xiv. 12, "When they fast, I will not hear their cry." And during the distresses of the exile, and the period that followed, fasting appears to have been observed with special frequency and strictness, so that this is just the time when we would expect unusual stress to be laid upon that observance; thus Dan. ix. 3, x. 13; Zech. vii. 5; Ezra x. 6; Neh. i. 4.

4. The position of Chronicles as the last book in the canon, instead of standing in the second division of it, along with Samuel and Kings, is also alleged as evidencing the lateness of its date. If this book was in existence when the canon was first collected and arranged, why, it is asked, was it not put along with Samuel and Kings? Why does it stand in a subsequent and entirely different division of the canon, among the Hagiographa, and that, too, the very last book of the Hagiographa? Does this not make it probable that it was not written until long after the other Scriptures were gathered and definitely arranged in a fixed order, which could not be disturbed, so that it was just only possible to add it at the end? We answer, not at all. The distinction between the second and third divisions of the canon is, as has been stated in a previous part of this article, that the second division, called Prophets, consists of books written by those who were by profession, and technically, prophets; those in the third division are written by men equally inspired, but who were not in the strict sense of the word prophets. This is, doubtless, the reason, though we have not the means of showing it in this particular case, why Samuel and Kings are in the second division of the canon; they were written by prophets. Chronicles, on the other hand, belongs to the third division, because it was written by an inspired man who was not a prophet. Its being placed among the Hagiographa has nothing to do with the time when it was written. Neither does its standing as the last book in the Hagiographa prove it later than all the other books in this division of the canon. The contrary is certain in one case at least. It was certainly written before the book of Ezra, as has been shown already, although it stands after it. The fact is, that the Hagiographa are not arranged upon a chronological principle; the Lamentations of Jeremiah stand before Eccle-

siastes, written by Solomon; Esther stands before Daniel, though written after it; and Psalms stands first in the series, though some Psalms contained in the book were not written until after the exile. And those who make use of this objection, do not themselves entertain the opinion that the books of the Hagiographa are arranged chronologically. The objection is therefore palpably devoid of all force.

5. It is alleged that the writer of the books has made mistakes in some of the names which he records, that can only be accounted for in case the books from which he drew his materials were written not in the old Jewish letter, but in the more modern square character; whence it is inferred that these books could not have been written until after the square character was introduced among the Jews. The ground of this allegation is, that certain names are written differently in Chronicles from that they are in Kings, and in earlier books of the Bible; and it is assumed that this difference has arisen from mistaking similar letters: thus \aleph for \beth , Gen. x. 3, Riphath is in 1 Chron. i. 6, Diphath; Gen. x. 4, Dodanim is in 1 Chron. i. 7, Rodanim; \daleth for \beth , Zabdi, Neh. xi. 17, is Zichri, 1 Chron. ix. 15; \aleph for \beth , Harodite, 2 Sam. xxiii. 25, is Harorite 1 Chron. xi. 27; and as the letters thus confounded or interchanged are nearly alike in the more modern or square Hebrew character, the inference is that this was the one in use when the interchange was made and the book written.

But (1.) This objection assumes that whenever the same name appears in two divergent forms, one of them is erroneous, whereas both forms may have been in actual use; this we know to have been the case with regard to some names of frequent occurrence, as the name of *Hiram*, king of Tyre, (so called in Samuel and Kings,) is in Chronicles constantly spelled *Huram*, 2 Chron. ii. 3, etc.; the regularity with which this occurs forbids the supposition of its being a mistake—so the name *Nebuchadnezzar* is also spelled *Nebuchadrezzar*, Jer. xxxix. 1, &c., and *Joshua* is also *Jeshua*, Neh. viii. 17.

(2.) It is assumed that the mistake is always in the book of Chronicles, and always made by the author of the book himself. If a textual error must be assumed, as is not improbable in a few cases, why is it necessarily the book of Chronicles that

is wrong, and why may not the error in Chronicles, or in the parallel narrative, as the case may be, be with greater likelihood imputed to subsequent transcribers? Errors of transcription might very easily arise and be perpetuated in these long lists of names otherwise unknown.

(3.) This objection may be met on its own ground, by the fact that some changes of proper names are more easily accounted for if the old form of the letter was current; thus there is an occasional interchange of ך and ם, which bear no resemblance in the modern square letter, though it is supposable they might be mistaken for one another in the old letter. *Ain*, Josh. xxi. 16, is Ashan, 1 Chron. vi. 44, (Eng. ver., v. 59,) &c. And it should be observed that ך and ם are quite as much alike in the ancient as in the more modern form of the letter; so of some other letters. Also some names are altered by an interchange of letters which are not alike in either the ancient or modern form of the letters.

(4.) The objection proves too much, and consequently proves nothing. No one has ventured to assert that Chronicles is of later date than the time of the Maccabees. But the coins struck in the days of the Maccabees show that the old letter was then in use; and it is probable that the existing form of the letter did not become current until near the time of Christ. If the objection proves anything, it proves that Chronicles was not written until near the time of Christ. But it is well known not only to have existed, but to have been translated into Greek in the LXX. long before that time.

6. The character of the language in the book is said to betray a very late date. This is urged both on the ground that it contains many Chaldæisms, whether in grammatical forms, or in the use of words of Chaldee origin, different from the Hebrew words employed ordinarily by older writers to express the same idea, and also on the ground of the larger use of the vowel letters, the *scriptio plena* being employed where older writers have the *scriptio defectiva*. What is alleged respecting the language of this book, is true to a certain extent; but this is satisfactorily accounted for by assuming that it was written shortly after the termination of the exile. The Hebrew was inclining to the Chaldee even before the exile.

During their captivity the Jews were placed among people speaking the Chaldee; and the Hebrew was either then, or shortly after, supplanted by the Chaldee as the language of the people. The language of Chronicles is on a par with other writings of the same period. It is even purer than some of them, *e. g.*, Ezekiel: Ezra and Daniel, belonging to the same period, are partly written in Chaldee. As to the full and defective mode of writing the vowels, there was no fixed usage at any period of the language; it was in many cases optional to write or to omit the vowel letters, the same word being differently written in the same connection. The general fact is that, on the whole, there is a greater tendency to their employment in the later than in the earlier writers; but this is not the case in Chronicles to a greater extent than in other contemporaneous writings.

It has even been alleged that the writer of Chronicles shows that Hebrew was no longer well understood by his readers, by substituting easier and simpler expressions for those more difficult and obscure; and that he sometimes reveals his own ignorance of the language by himself mistaking its meaning. It is, however, a pretty bold assumption in a modern critic, that he understands the Hebrew better than the author of this book. And the composition of a work in Hebrew has no parallel at a later date than the period immediately following the exile.

7. It is said that the spirit of hostility to the kingdom of Israel revealed in this book, is such as did not exist until the split between the Jews and Samaritans became irreconcilable, and the hatred between them reached its highest point, which it did not do until the Samaritans had built their own temple on Gerizim, in opposition to that at Jerusalem.

This objection is, however, built upon such baseless assumptions, that it is difficult to understand how it could ever have been seriously urged. (1.) There is no hostility to the kingdom of Israel in this book more than in other books of the Bible. It speaks of their schism and their apostasy from God with abhorrence, but these are spoken of elsewhere in similar terms, so that it is nothing peculiar to this book. And if there were evidence of an unusual degree of hostility, as the objection assumes, it would rather be an argument of earlier than of

later date; for the longer we assume the book to have been written after the kingdom of the ten tribes had been overturned and its members carried into exile, the more we might suppose that the bitterness and rivalry, felt so long as the kingdom existed, would have been allayed. (2.) At any rate, bitterness toward Israel has nothing to do with bitterness towards the Samaritans. This objection substitutes the Samaritans for the kingdom of the ten tribes, as though they were identical. But the Samaritans were not Israelites; they were the descendants of heathen colonists introduced into that territory, as appears from 2 Kings xvii. 24. (3.) Even if hostility to Israel was implied in this book, and this was identical with hostility to the Samaritans, this would be no proof of later date. The rise of the Jews' hostility to the Samaritans is, by the objection, referred to a period long subsequent to the exile, when there is the most abundant evidence of this hostility immediately upon the return of the Jews from their captivity. When the Samaritans found that the Jews would not recognise them as Israelites, nor allow them to take part in rebuilding the temple, they did everything they could to hinder them, and the most bitter feud sprang up between them. Ezra iv. 1—5, &c.

8. The last objection to referring these books to the time of Ezra is drawn from what has been styled their mythological character and Levitical spirit. By a mythological spirit, these objectors mean a disposition to record the supernatural. But there are actually fewer miracles recorded in these books than in the books of Kings. So that, even on the infidel hypothesis that miracles are mere legendary fictions, the record of them creates no reason why Chronicles should be referred to a later period than the other books of the Old Testament, many of which record far more, and those of a more stupendous character, than are to be found in these books.

By a Levitical spirit, is meant a high regard for, and earnest attachment to, the ceremonial institutions of Moses. And this does certainly characterize these books in a remarkable degree. There is no subject upon which the writer dwells at greater length, or with more evident interest, than in what he details respecting the public worship of God, the regulations made by pious princes concerning it, and the measures taken for its

restoration, after periods of idolatrous neglect. But the revived interest in religious worship which marked the period immediately following the exile, makes us look to it as above all others the time in which we would imagine such a book as this to have been written. After the long interruption of the exile, the people, sifted and purified by suffering, turned with an eagerness almost surpassing that of any previous period, to the law of Moses, and their ancestral worship. The books of Ezra and Nehemiah bear abundant testimony to the zeal and earnestness with which everything relating to the ritual service was sought out and attended to. The spirit of this book is in this respect precisely the spirit of the returning exiles.

There is no valid objection, consequently, to the conclusion which we have before reached, that the books of Chronicles were written in the time of Ezra. Is it possible to go beyond this and identify the author? The current tradition among the Jews, and the opinion universally entertained by Christian writers down to comparatively modern times is, that Ezra was himself the author of these books, as well as the one that bears his name. Some able students of the Scriptures have been disposed to favour the hypothesis that the books of Chronicles and that of Ezra originally and properly constituted one book, and that the existing division is unauthorized, and ought not to be regarded.

There is much more to favour the hypothesis, that they are distinct works by the same author. (1.) This, as has just been said, has the sanction of tradition. (2.) The identity of the closing verses of Chronicles and the opening verses of Ezra, though, of course, not in itself conclusive, yet agrees very well with this view of the case. (3.) Its probability is further increased by a striking similarity, which has been observed, in style, in the use of words in peculiar senses, and in favourite forms of expression between the books of Chronicles and the book of Ezra. While, therefore, it cannot perhaps be rigorously proved that Ezra is the author of Chronicles, this may be regarded as at least an ancient and not improbable opinion.

ART. VII.—*Paul's Thorn in the Flesh.*

THAT Paul was not a sound man, physically, many expressions in his writings seem to indicate. Something ailed him, either a disease incurable, or a physical defect irremediable. He reminds the Galatians of his "infirmity of the flesh;" and of the temptation which was in the flesh, which so called forth their sympathy. He writes to the Corinthians, "I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling." 1 Cor. ii. 3. "Yet of myself will I not glory, but in mine infirmities." 2 Cor. xii. 5, 9, 10.

We are aware that all these expressions may be explained in a moral and spiritual sense. That the "weakness" spoken of to the Corinthians, was Paul's weakness as a mere man, unbefriended and unprotected; that the "infirmity of the flesh" was a fit of sickness he had, while among the Galatians, or just before he came to them. But while the word translated weakness—*ἀσθενεία*—undoubtedly has a moral signification, it also must be borne in mind, that it is the word invariably employed throughout the Gospels for sickness, disease, and bodily maladies. And, therefore, while *ἀσθενεία* may mean only Paul's weakness as an unbefriended man, it may also refer to disease, or to physical defect of some kind. But in this same Epistle, which speaks of this weakness, are two passages, which may aid us in determining what import that word shall bear. Those disturbers of the peace of the church, who so obstinately opposed Paul, said, in derogation of his authority, "his bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible." 2 Cor. x. 10. This, indeed, was a calumny; but may there not have been a semblance of truth in it, which, however, would not justify the exaggeration; wherein probably the slander consisted?—for calumny seldom fabricates, it mostly perverts facts. According to the criterion of these calumniators, Paul's speech, or style of discourse, was contemptible. It had none of the ornateness and rhetoric which would gratify the Greek scholar. Now this Paul seems to admit. Though I be in "speech contemptible," "rude in speech," 2 Cor. x. 10, and xi. 6. This,

we think, refers to the discourse as to style and finish, and not to its delivery. For Paul, at Lystra, was called Mercurius, because he was the chief speaker. His speeches before Agrippa, and at Athens, produced great effect, which could not be the case if there had been an impediment in his speech, as Doddridge and others assume. A stammering, or defective delivery, would have seriously interfered with his open-air addresses on Mars Hill, and from the steps at Jerusalem. Our idea of Paul, as a speaker, is derived from his written productions. We imagine that the same impetuosity of thought, which often gets disjointed in his Epistles, showed itself in a more marked manner in his speeches. So that, while from the vigour of thought, and earnestness of delivery, a profound impression was produced, yet, judged by the rules of the schools, his style and delivery were very faulty. We know that in all ages critics have decried the eloquence which has enchained the multitude. This, to our mind, is the explanation of many of the expressions found in the Epistles to the Corinthians, where the terms speech and wisdom are used; for it was only in critical Corinth that Paul was thus found fault with.

Now as that portion of the slander which related to Paul's speech had this semblance of truth, may not a similar semblance be detected in the other part of the slander, that his bodily presence was weak? May there not have been something about Paul which rendered his personal appearance unattractive? Indeed, does he not admit as much himself, when he writes, "who in presence (outward appearance) am base or lowly"? 2 Cor. x. 1.

If also we examine the phrase, "infirmity in the flesh," we can scarcely understand it of a moral weakness. It was *in* the flesh, not *of* it; not of the unrenewed nature. Moreover, it was a temptation or trial. Would a moral or mental weakness be regarded as a trial? But to assert that Paul had been sick, and was only partially recovered, is to leap at once into fancy.

That Paul was afflicted physically, finds further confirmation in tradition. This reports that he was bald, small of stature, and bent in form. Though this tradition is not without suspicion, yet it is not altogether unreliable. We incline to the

opinion, that this tradition is at fault in fixing the nature of Paul's defect. Like the slander of the Corinthian agitators, it is based upon a misrepresentation.

It is further noticeable, that Paul speaks of his infirmity and weakness only to those churches which he had founded, and where they knew him personally. He writes nothing of this sort to the Romans, or in Hebrews.

Thinking it quite possible that his infirmity was bodily, let us approach that *questio vexata*—Paul's thorn in the flesh. This is his account of it: "And lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure. For this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me. And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me." 2 Cor. xii. 7—9.

If what we have already premised be true, we are prepared at once to lay aside that class of interpretations which gives also to this thorn a spiritual or moral sense. Indeed, we do not see how it can be referred to the evil suggestions of Satan, as by Luther, Calvin, and a few others; or to a prominent adversary like Philetus or Hymeneus, as by Chrysostom and many of the ancients; or, as some of the Latin Fathers suppose, to an unruly and ungovernable passion. We cannot well understand how Paul could glory in such suggestions, or in such a trial; nor how he could take pleasure in such adversaries, as he does in this thorn.

Almost unanimously commentators agree, that this thorn in the flesh was a painful bodily affection. And they quite as generally differ as to the nature of that affection. Indeed, whatever disease the interpreter was afflicted with, that he attributed to Paul. Baxter supposes the thorn to have been the stone or gravel, from which disorder he was a sufferer. Jerome makes it headache; Tertullian, earache; Rosenmüller, gout in the head. But thus indulging in fancy, we might run through the long list of human ills. The judicious Doddridge ventures an explanation which has more semblance of probability

than the diseases already enumerated. He supposes that the view Paul had of the heavenly glories, in his translation to Paradise, so affected his nerves as to produce a paralytic disorder—stammering in speech, and a distortion of his countenance. This has a show of support in those verses already quoted, (2 Cor. x. 10, and xi. 6.) This opinion has been adopted by Slade, Macknight, Bloomfield, and Benson. Assuming, then, that this thorn was a physical affection, it is evidently idle to indulge in mere conjecture. But, on the other hand, are there any facts concerning Paul, which may furnish a clue to a probable supposition? Do his Epistles, and his history, as partly recorded in Acts, give no hints which, like straws in a sluggish stream, may put us on the right course? Let us not set out with a foregone conclusion, but be perfectly willing to land wherever facts, fairly interpreted, may bring us.

And first, a few words about the term thorn. Paul uses it because it expresses what he wishes to convey. It is figurative, and yet significant. It was a thorn, not a deadly wound; not a viper with a venomous sting; not a cancer gnawing at his vitals. Has this distinction been sufficiently in mind by those who have attempted to explain this difficult point? Hardly would Paul denominate a lust, or impetuous temper, or mental frailty, as a thorn. He would rather call it a besetting sin, a weight, a body of death, a law or power in the members. These he does employ when wishing to express the sins and frailties of human nature. But a thorn conveys a different notion. And,

1. It was distressing, though not fatal. A thorn in the flesh is very painful, but it does not kill one. It may produce more pain than an organic disease. So with this physical disorder of Paul. As far as we know, it did not cause his death. Yet it was an affliction he sorely felt. He prayed often and earnestly, that it might be removed. It was of such a nature that special grace was promised and furnished, that he might be sustained. It was something, too, so annoying or mortifying, that it kept him humble, when he might have been elated at the extraordinary visions and revelations he enjoyed. "Lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger

of Satan to buffet me." He was buffeted; struck in the face by it. Certainly that was humiliating. He calls it an infirmity.

2. It was a messenger of Satan. In Scripture the idea is common, that bodily diseases, at times, are produced by the direct agency of the devil; so that they may be regarded as his messengers. Now this agency of Satan, so far as we have discovered, is never attributed to ordinary disease, or to disease coming in a natural way. Job's disease is ascribed to the permission God gave Satan to afflict him. But that disease was violent and peculiar. Our Lord assigned many disorders, referred to him for cure, to Satanic influence; but the disorders were of a marked kind. The sufferers are mostly called demoniacs. A woman came to him who had been bowed together eighteen years, so that she could not lift herself up. Christ declared, that "Satan had bound her." But this, certainly, was not a common infirmity.

This language, being employed to denote Paul's disorder, intimates that his was not of an ordinary nature, like headache, or paralysis. Or it might be a defect or disorder which, though not very unusual, still was of such a character, that public opinion did not regard it as ordinary ailments were regarded. Blindness would be a case in point. Many of the Jews had imbibed the sentiment from the heathen, that blindness, and a few other distressing ails, were to be attributed to special sins, or to the anger of the Deity. The disciples gave the current notion in their question—"Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" Therefore, we may presume, that Paul's disorder, being "the messenger of Satan," was of that class of disease.

3. While it was a distressing affection of the body, it did not interrupt him in his work. During all those years he was afflicted, fourteen of which had already passed when he wrote these words we are considering, he was Paul the indefatigable. What a vast amount of work he accomplished in various lands during these years! When we read the modest recital of his exposures, perils, and toils, in the 11th chap. of 2 Cor., so reluctantly drawn from him, and then only in self-defence, we are amazed that one man could have endured all. Also on him

rested the care of the churches. How wide must have been his correspondence, and how many the difficult questions submitted to him from the churches he had planted! We admire the tireless activity of Calvin, but he was far outdone by Paul. And yet this infirmity, of whatever nature it was, never interposed itself across Paul's path, in such a way that he could not surmount it. Headache would have shut him up in his room. A half paralytic could not have travelled, as he did, among robbers, across mountain streams, and over seas. What would such an one do "a day and a night in the deep?" The exposures he constantly encountered would have hastened into a fatal termination any ordinary disease. But a man with a thorn in his flesh can work, though it be with pain.

Whatever, then, may be the bodily affection we select as Paul's thorn, it must meet these three conditions. (1.) It must be annoying, if not painful. (2.) It must be a disease out of the ordinary character, either in its violence, or in the manner in which it came; or a disease commonly referred to supernatural agency. (3.) And yet it must not be of such a nature as to seriously interfere with Paul's life-task, preaching to the Gentiles. These conditions reduce to a few, the list of possible physical defects or diseases.

In the further prosecution of this subject, two modes lie before us. First, to take the several disorders which are possible, according to the preceding conditions, and investigate how they agree with circumstances in Paul's life. This, however, would carry us through a tedious search. We, therefore, shall adopt the other mode, which is, to present the result of our own investigation, and leave to our readers to judge whether a better may be found.

Our conclusion is, that if Paul's infirmity was physical, it consisted in a defective eyesight.

This meets the conditions aforementioned. The nerves of the eye might be so affected as to be painful at times. Such an affection is not unknown among physicians. If this caused near-sightedness, certainly it would be very annoying. This would not be a common disease, like headache. Nor would it seriously retard Paul in his work. It would render painful, that which otherwise would be easily accomplished.

But to remove this explanation of the thorn from the domain of fancy, we must corroborate it by facts in Paul's history.

1. Some affection of the eyes would be wholly natural, after that dazzling ray which he encountered near Damascus. He was struck stone-blind, and remained so three days. He received sight by miracle. We are not satisfied that the terms, describing the healing, signify that he was entirely restored. He "looked up," he "received sight." It would be in accordance with the operation of God's laws, both in nature and providence, if the nerves of the eye received such a shock as prepared the way for future disease, or to be so weakened that though total blindness was prevented by Divine power, yet vision was seriously blurred. The miracle would not interfere with such a result. Indeed this would be only another illustration, that God leaves the marks of his people's sins on them all their lives. Paul may have borne to the end of life, in his weak eyes, the scar of that stroke which arrested him in the midst of his relentless persecution. Here then, we have a circumstance in Paul's history which might furnish the occasion, if not the cause, of a partial blindness.

2. There are several peculiarities in Paul's history which are best explained from the point of view we are now occupying, and thus may furnish, at least, circumstantial evidence.

Paul always employed an amanuensis. Seven out of the thirteen Epistles state this fact, either in the closing chapter, or in the postscript. While these subscriptions, at the close of the Epistles, are not reliable, and therefore do not prove the place where they were written, we think they are presumptive of the employment of an amanuensis. Paul's mode seems to have been to secure the services of members of the church, to which he was ministering. In the longer Epistles, as the first to the Corinthians, several are employed. How can we explain this? It is altogether improbable that he was ignorant of the Greek language, so that he could not write it. If he could speak it, certainly he could write it. For in Paul's education no pains had been spared. It has been said, that Paul had not sufficient time to do the writing. But when a prisoner at Rome, and confined to his own house, he did not himself write his Epistles. Besides, scarcely more time would be consumed by writing than

in dictating to another. This explanation, that Paul had not time to write, strikes us most unfavourably. Would you draw a parallel between Paul and Napoleon dictating to a half dozen amanuenses? Shall we imagine that the Epistle to the Romans, Galatians, or Ephesians, was jumbled up in Paul's mind with letters to a half-score of inquirers? Was his mind no more composed than such a state would indicate? If Moses must retire into the clouds of Sinai, and spend forty days there, to receive the tables of the law, shall we imagine that the laws of Christ's house, which are to last to the end of the world, were thrown out in so off-handed a manner? We are offended at any such conjecture. If Paul had not time to devote himself calmly and leisurely to one Epistle, through the Holy Spirit's guidance—what had he time for? Could any more important engagement occupy his hours? But on the supposition that his eyes were weak and near-sighted, we have a satisfactory explanation why an amanuensis was employed.

We now call attention to an incident narrated in Acts xxiii. 1—5. Paul was before the Sanhedrim. Directing his words to the council, he said, "Men and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day." Ananias ordered him to be struck on the mouth for this. Paul retorted on him, as on an ordinary Pharisee, in the council; "God shall smite thee, thou whited wall: for sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?" But when informed who it was that gave the order, he made an apology, "I wist not, brethren, that he was the high priest." This ignorance has been accounted for in various ways. Now, though Paul had been away from Jerusalem, and knew not the high priest, still his seat, his robes, his presiding, would have indicated who he was, to a man with far less information on those matters than Paul had. But if there were an imperfect vision, so that he could not distinguish the dress, nor perceive the motions of the high priest, then Paul's apology is ample, without the props of any suppositions. His language can be taken to mean just what the words import. "I wist not"—I knew not, because I cannot see clearly. By us that explanation is always preferred which lets the words have the sense they give as they read. This is the case with this

explanation, wherein it is decidedly superior to any other. And may not this suggest that the best way to explain difficult texts is to take them as they are, unless they contradict some other passage equally clear.

It is a favourite thought of ours, that as time advances, God's book will be found to need, less and less, the broken reeds of man's exegesis. Uzzah was so anxious for the ark, that he took unlawful means to keep it up, when he thought it was about to fall. And good men, in their zeal, have taken liberties with God's words, when they thought science and philosophy were bearing down the Scriptures. To what shifts did not theologians resort, when astronomy startled the world with its discoveries! But we have settled down to a common-sense understanding of those texts, over which they so sweat and worried.

Dr. Alexander, in his Commentary on Acts, explains this difficult expression: "I wist not," etc.; "I did not know, and do not now know that he is the high priest;" *i. e.*, I do not acknowledge him as such. To us this would be the best solution, if there were nothing else, save this text, to favour the supposition of imperfect vision. But if it can be made probable, from other circumstances and expressions, that Paul was purblind, then we prefer this interpretation, as requiring less to be understood, and as permitting us to accept the words in their most obvious sense.

Another link in our chain of circumstantial evidence, drawn from Paul's history, is, that he was scarcely ever alone when he travelled. Later in life, he did not take the shortest journey by himself. He was conducted from place to place by some of the brethren. In his confinement at Rome he had a companion. The close of each Epistle shows that he had attendants. Does not this favour the supposition of his partial blindness?

3. A third class of proof, substantiating the plausibility of the supposition that Paul's thorn in the flesh was obscured vision, we now present—that which is found in his writings. We read in Gal. iv. 13—15: "Ye know how, through infirmity of the flesh, I preached the gospel unto you at the first. And my temptation, which was in my flesh, ye despised not, nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, even as Christ

Jesus. Where is then the blessedness ye spake of? for I bear you record, that, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out *your own eyes, and have given them to me.*" We have already stated our objection to explaining the infirmity here referred to, as a fit of sickness. It has been common to understand this plucking out the eyes as a figure, by which to denote the great attachment, at first, of the Galatians to Paul. They were willing to make any sacrifice for him. But notice the language, "pluck out your own eyes, and give them to me." Why give their eyes to Paul, if his own were sound? How could such an action be proof of love, unless the supposed gift would supply a deficiency in the apostle? And he introduces this in connection with his infirmity, which they so far from despising or rejecting him because of it, rather would have deprived themselves of their own eyes, to remedy the defect in him. Why should they despise Paul, if his infirmity were an ordinary disease? But a blind man was despised among the heathen. If therefore he came to them under this disadvantage—how rich the sense!—my temptation (trial) ye despised not, nor rejected; but received me, a poor blind man, as an angel of God: yea, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have put them in the place of my half-quenched orbs.*

We read again, in Gal. vi. 11: "Ye see how large a letter I have written unto you with mine own hand." This is near the close of the Epistle, where Paul himself adds a few lines, as seems to have been his custom—*e. g.*, 1 Cor. xvi. 21, Col. iv. 18, 2 Thess. iii. 17. "How large a letter," cannot denote the length of the Epistle, because it is one of the shortest of those addressed to the churches. The word *letter* is now quite generally conceded to mean handwriting; and "how large a letter," refers to the size of the characters in which Paul wrote. The usual hypothesis is, that being accustomed to Hebrew characters, he could not easily write the Greek, but in large and crude letters. And yet, how know we that Paul was not quite as accustomed to the Greek letters as the Hebrew? But if Paul's defective eyesight rendered him nearsighted, we at once see why he should write in large letters. Or, if the expression

* An interesting chapter on this passage in Galatians, may be found in "Spare Hours," by John Brown, M. D., of Edinburgh.

refers to the uncouthness of the handwriting, the passage agrees equally well with our hypothesis. If, also, we accept the explanation given of the passage in chap. iv. 15, there was great propriety in his calling attention to his chirography. You see the large letters, and you know the reason. You are well aware of my infirmity.

We confess that the conviction of Paul's partial blindness grows on us, as we read his history and his writings. We imagine we can find traces of a reference to this infirmity in Eph. iii. 8—"Unto me who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given," viz., to preach the gospel among the heathen. "Less than the least of all saints," is not a mere expression of humility, but the deep-seated feeling of his heart, as he thought of himself, a man almost blind. And well might he wonder at that grace, which should operate through a blind man, in so vast an undertaking as the diffusion of the gospel among the Gentiles—causing the Apostle to the Gentiles to grope his way among them, that by him, from whom nature's light was almost hidden, might shine the light of life.

Is it not also a singular fact that only to those churches where his apostolic dignity was questioned, does he speak of his infirmity? to wit, the churches of Corinth and Galatia; and as he closes the epistle to the latter, in those rude letters, he says, "From henceforth let no man trouble me; for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." These marks are commonly referred to his scourgings and stonings. But if we suppose that a dim vision was caused by that mid-day flash near Damascus, then with power, these words would fall upon that Galatian church, which once would have restored his eyes by sacrificing their own—"Cease, ye calumniators, to question whether I am as apostolic as James or Peter. Think of the mark in my body. My branded eyes show the stroke of Christ, which at once arrested me in my madness, and consecrated me to the apostleship. He has put his mark upon me, that I am his. Doubt no more." For the word marks, *στίγματα*, denotes a brand pricked or burnt upon the body of a slave, to indicate his owner.

This is the evidence which we adduce to confirm the supposition that Paul's thorn in the flesh was an affection of the eyes,

which rendered him partially blind. We know of none which brings such strong confirmations. There is nothing in his history to contradict, and certainly several obscure passages are made clearer when viewed in this light.

Our readers are, of course, aware that this supposition is not original with us. We have mainly collated hints which we have found scattered about. We know not who is the originator of this view, but the earliest trace of it we have found, is in a work entitled "Ministerial Character of Christ, by Charles Sumner, Domestic Chaplain to His Majesty, (George IV.) Published in 1824. London." He was afterward Bishop of Winchester.

Thus regarded, does not Paul appear more noble than ever! Picture that purblind man, with enough eyesight to trace out the altars of Athens, as he passed close to them, but not enough to distinguish the high priest in the dim light of the council-room. See him feeling his way through hostile countries, escorted from town to town by adherents won over, with his faithful Mark, or Silas, or Timothy, or Titus, or Luke, ever by his side. He needs the kind offices of these affectionate companions. Well may he have longed for them, and rejoiced in them—1 Cor. xvi. 17, 2 Cor. ii. 13, 2 Tim. iv. 9 and 21, Titus iii. 12, etc. He remembers their attentions. "Greet Mary, who bestowed much labour on us." Rom. xvi. 6. It is worthy of notice, that in his later travels, Luke "the beloved physician," was his constant attendant, and probably he was with Paul until his martyrdom. 2 Tim. iv. 11. May not Paul's infirmity so have grown upon him, as to require the medical skill of Luke, that Paul might be so braced as to keep on with his duties? And yet among robbers, over mountains, across seas, taking tedious land journeys, passing perhaps even to Spain, he performs his work; stoned, scourged, imprisoned, hungry, thirsty, half-clothed, cold, and then scorched.

In Paul, as thus regarded, we have a noble specimen of what God has often shown the world—a lofty spirit, and a mighty intellect, doing its life-work hampered by a frail body, or encumbered with physical defects. Genius, in a sound body, is undoubtedly the perfection of man; and yet it is the exception. A large number of those to whom mankind is deeply indebted have had physical disorders. Pope was a hunchback.

James Watt, who gave the steam-engine to mankind, was a nervous sufferer, afflicted with tearing headaches. His chest was sunken, and he suffered terribly from depression of spirits. At times he was tempted to suicide, so intolerable did life become. We well know how ungainly was the personal appearance of the celebrated Neander. A rheumatic disease lurked in his system for years. Three years before his death the disease turned upon his eyes, and reduced him almost to blindness. But he toiled on, by the help of readers and amanuenses, in his great work, the *History of Christianity*. Calvin's prodigious labours in that sickly and emaciated body, lend a deeper interest to his history. He was weak by constitution, and frequently disturbed by sickness, yet he worked on as preacher, pastor, and teacher of theology. For years he preached three times a week, besides the Sabbath. His correspondence was immense. He was afflicted with frequent headaches, also with fever, asthma, and gravel. Yet amid all these he pushed on, studying and writing with a dim lamp suspended over his bed. Another notable instance occurs in modern times. The celebrated Dr. George Wilson, Professor of Technology in the University of Edinburgh, was a poor weakly creature physically. Admirably he did his work, though in a condition of almost ceaseless bodily weakness and suffering. He often lectured with a large blister on his chest. His lungs and his entire system were the very poorest that could just retain his soul. Says the author of the "*Recreations of a Country Clergyman*," in an admirable paper, entitled, "*Screws, or the difficulties amid which men do work*," "I know hardly any person who ever published anything; but I have sometimes thought, that I should like to see assembled in one chamber on the first of any month, all the men and women, who wrote all the articles in all the magazines for that month. Some of them, doubtless, would be very like other people; but many would certainly be very odd-looking and odd-tempered samples of human kind."

If space permitted, it would be interesting to run through the long list of noble men who have been blind. Homer and Milton are at once suggested. Of this class was the biblical scholar Kitto. We say the list is a long one, for we find the blind in every age. More eminent men have been defective in

the eyes, than in any other of the senses. Eusebius became blind at the age of five years. So did Didymus of Alexandria. Nicaise of Malines, in the fifteenth century, made great advances in science, and taught publicly at the University of Cologne, both civil and canon law. M. Huber of Geneva, author of the best treatise extant on bees and ants, was blind from earliest infancy. In executing his great work, he had no other help than his domestic, who mentioned to him the colour of the insects, and then he ascertained the form and size by touch. In reading his descriptions we can scarcely persuade ourselves that they are not the productions of a man blessed with remarkable eyesight.

SHORT NOTICES.

Woman and her Saviour in Persia. By a returned Missionary, with fine Illustrations and a Map of the Nestorian Territory. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: G. S. Blanchard. 1863. Pp. 296.

Miss Fiske having spent fifteen years in Persia, gathers the facts and experiences which form the staple of this book. It is written, not in the form of a narrative, but each subject is fully treated by itself. The beautiful illustrations are all new. The information here given may be received with confidence, and cannot fail to interest the reader, and increase his zeal in prosecuting the work of missions.

Our Companions in Glory; or, The Society of Heaven Contemplated. By Rev. J. M. Killen, A. M., Author of *Our Friends in Heaven*. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 683 Broadway, 1862. Pp. 350.

This is an elegant volume. The author has proceeded on the sound principle that all human speculations about heaven are worthless, and therefore has endeavoured to give simply the Scriptural account of the inhabitants of heaven.

The Foundations of History. A Series of First Things. By Samuel B. Schieffelin. New York: Anson G. Randolph, 683 Broadway. 1863. Pp. 264.

The Board of Publication of the Reformed Dutch Church have recently commenced publishing a series of Christian School

books, designed to restore Christianity to its proper place in education. It was in furtherance of this laudable design this work was prepared, and is commended to the Christian public.

The Iron Furnace; or Slavery and Secession. By Rev. John H. Aughey, a Refugee from Mississippi. Philadelphia: William S. & Alfred Martien, 606 Chestnut Street. 1863. Pp. 296.

Mr. Aughey is a Presbyterian minister, a citizen of Mississippi, who adhered to his allegiance to the Union when that State seceded and joined the rebellion. This book contains an account of his experience, and especially of his sufferings consequent on his loyalty.

The Story of My Career, as a Student at Freiberg and Jena, and as Professor at Halle, Breslau and Berlin; with Personal Reminiscences of Goethe and many other distinguished men. By Heinrich Steffens. Translated by William Leonard Gage. Boston: Gould, Lincoln & Co. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard. 1863. Pp. 284.

Steffens was distinguished for his devotion to physical science and mystical philosophy—two widely separated departments. He is an extreme specimen of a certain class of German minds. He wrote a history of his life in ten volumes, covering four thousand pages, which nobody can read. It is the object of this work to sift the wheat from this mountain of chaff, and give to the public, in an available form, what is really important in the career of this singular and interesting man.

Tales and Sketches. By Hugh Miller. Edited, with a Preface, by Mrs. Miller. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: G. S. Blanchard. 1863. Pp. 369.

The contents of this volume are the productions of the earlier years in the life of their remarkable author. The reputation which Hugh Miller afterwards attained in the religious and scientific world will secure attention to any productions of his pen.

The Life, Writings, and Character of Edward Robinson, D. D., LL. D., read before the New York Historical Society, by Henry B. Smith, D. D., and Roswell D. Hitchcock, D. D. Published by Request of the Society. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 683 Broadway. 1863. Pp. 100.

This appropriate tribute to one of the greatest scholars of our country, rendered by his associates, will be received with appreciating gratitude by the numerous friends of its lamented subject.

History of the Reformation in Europe in the time of Calvin. By J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, D. D. Vol. I. Geneva and France, pp. 433. Vol. II. Geneva and France, pp. 475. Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway. 1863.

As long ago as 1818, Neander suggested to the author the idea of writing a History of the Reformation of Calvin. D'Aubigné answered, "that he desired first to describe that of Luther; but that he intended to sketch successively two pictures so similar and yet so different." It was early in life, therefore, that he consecrated himself to the work which he has so successfully accomplished. His History of the Reformation under Luther, included in five volumes, has been one of the most popular works of the day. These two volumes bring down the history of the Reformation under Calvin, to July, 1532. Other volumes are in a state of advanced preparation. D'Aubigné's histories are not merely channels of information as to past events, they are also effective pleas for sound evangelical doctrine, and means of spiritual edification. The Christian public will doubtless greet this new work with the same cordial reception which his former writings so extensively received.

The Sunday Evening Book. Short Papers for Family Reading. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1863. Pp. 186.

This handsome little book contains devout discourses from such eminent writers as Dr. James Hamilton, Dr. A. P. Stanley, Dr. John Eadie, Rev. W. M. Punshon, Rev. Thomas Binney, and Rev. J. R. Macduff.

The Thoughts of God. By the Rev. J. R. Macduff, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1863. Pp. 144.

Dr. Macduff is probably known to our readers as a devotional writer, from his works, "Morning and Night Watches," "Words and Mind of Jesus," &c.

