THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1863.

No. IV.

By Rev. D^r Schaff

ART. I.—*The Anglo-American Sabbath.*

1. *The Anglo-American Theory of the Sabbath.*

THE Sabbath, or weekly day of holy rest, is, next to the family, the oldest institution which God established on earth for the benefit of man. It dates from paradise, from the state of innocence and bliss, before the serpent of sin had stung its deadly fangs into our race. The Sabbath, therefore, as well as the family, must have a general significance: it is rooted and grounded in the physical, intellectual, and moral constitution of our nature as it came from the hands of its Creator, and in the necessity of periodical rest for the health and well-being of body and soul. It is to the week what the night is to the day—a season of repose and reanimation. It is, originally, not a law, but an act of benediction—a blessing and a comfort to man.

The Sabbath was solemnly reaffirmed in the Mosaic legislation as a primitive institution, with an express reference to the creation and the rest of God on the seventh day, in completing and blessing his work,* and at the same time with an additional

* Prof. Fairbairn, *Typology of Scripture*, Vol. II. p. 120, (second edition, 1858,) makes the remark: "It seems as if God, in the appointment of this law, had taken special precautions against the attempts which he foresaw would be made to get free of the institution, and that on this account he laid its foundations deep in the original framework and constitution of nature."

reference to the typical redemption from the bondage of Egypt.* It was embodied, not in the ceremonial and civil, but in the moral law, which is binding for all times, and rises in sacred majesty and grandeur far above all human systems of ethics, as Mount Sinai rises above the desert, and the pyramids of Egypt above the surrounding plain. There the Sabbath law still stands on the first table, as an essential part of that love to God which is the soul and sum of all true religion and virtue, and can as little be spared as any other of the sacred ten—the number of harmony and completeness. Diminution here is necessarily mutilation, and a mutilation not of any human system of legislation or ethics, but of God's own perfect code of morals. Let us remember that the fourth, like every other of the ten commandments, was immediately spoken by the great Jehovah, and that under an overwhelming and unparalleled display of divine majesty; that it was even written by his own finger—written not on paper, like the rest of the Pentateuch, but upon tables of stone—the symbol of durability; that it was preserved in the most sacred place of the tabernacle; that it was emphatically "a sign between Jehovah and his people;"† that it received the express sanction of Christ and his apostles, when they comprehended all the laws of God and the duties of man under the great law of love to God and to our neighbour, and declared that the gospel, far from overthrowing the law, establishes and fulfils it. The Saviour, according to his own solemn declaration, came not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil.‡ He was neither a revolutionist nor a reactionist, but a reformer in the highest sense of the term; he reënacted the law of Sinai from the mount of beatitudes with the fulness of the gospel blessing, as the fundamental charter of his heavenly kingdom; he explained, deepened, and spiritualized its meaning, satisfied its demands, delivered us from its curse, infused into it a new life, and enables us, by his Holy Spirit, to keep it, in imitation of his own perfect example.

Finally, the Jewish Sabbath rose with the Saviour from the grave, as a new creation, on the morning of the resurrection, with the fulness of the gospel salvation, and descended with

* Deut. v. 15. † Ezek. xx. 12. ‡ Matt. v. 17–19. Comp. Rom. iii. 31.

the Holy Ghost from his exalted throne of glory on the day of Pentecost; to be observed as the Christian Sabbath, as "the Lord's day," in his church to the end of time. Its temporary, ritual form was abolished, its moral substance was preserved and renewed. The Jewish Sabbath was baptized with fire and the Holy Ghost—it was Christianized and glorified. Henceforward it was emphatically the commemoration day of the resurrection, or of the new spiritual creation and the accomplished redemption, and hence a day of sacred joy and thanksgiving, "the pearl of days," the crown and glory of the week, and a forctaste and pledge of the eternal Sabbath in heaven.

"A day of sweet refection,
A day of sacred love;
A day of resurrection
From earth to heaven above."

The Sabbath, then, rests upon a threefold basis—the original *creation*, the Jewish *legislation*, and the Christian *redemption*. It answers the physical, moral, and religious necessities of man. It is supported by the joint authority of the Old and the New Testament, of the law and the gospel. It has still a twofold legal and evangelical aspect, and we must keep both in view in order to do justice to its character and aim. Like the law in general, the fourth commandment is both negative and positive, prohibitive and injunctive; it is to all men a mirror of God's holiness and our own sinfulness; to the unconverted a wholesome restraint, and a schoolmaster to lead them to Christ, and to the converted a rule of holy obedience. But the Sabbath is also a gospel institution: it was originally a gift of God's goodness to our first parents before the fall; it "was made for man,"* and looks to his physical and spiritual well-being; it was "a delight" to the pious of the old dispensation,† and now under the new dispensation it is fraught with the glorious memories and blessings of Christ's triumph over sin and death, and of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost; it is the connecting link of creation and redemption, of paradise lost and paradise regained; a reminiscence of the paradise of innocence, and an anticipation of the paradise in heaven that can never be lost.

* Mark ii. 27. † Isaiah lviii. 23.

"It is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it."* Rest in God is the end of all creation†—not the rest of inaction, but the rest of perfection and benediction, which is one with the highest spiritual activity and joy in unbroken peace and harmony. To this rest the Sabbath points and prepares us from week to week; it is—to borrow freely some expressions from an English poem of the seventeenth century‡—heaven once a week; the next world's gladness prepossessed in this; a day to seek eternity in time; a lamp that lights man through these dark and dreary days; the rich and full redemption of the whole week's flight; the milky way chalked out with suns; the pledge and cue of a full rest, and the outer court of glory.

This, in brief positive statement, is the *Anglo-American*, as distinct from the *European-Continental*, theory on the Sabbath, which forms the basis for its practical observance. The difference between the two is general and radical, and strikes the attention of every traveller in its practical effects. There are a few distinguished writers in England, as Milton, Arnold, Whately, Alford, Hessey, who hold substantially the Continental view; as there are, on the other hand, some divines and ministers on the Continent—and their number is increasing—who, with slight modifications, adopt the Anglo-American view, and still more who, while differing from the theory, fully approve of the corresponding practice. But these are the exception, not the rule.

The Anglo-American theory is sometimes called the *legalistic* or *sabbatarian* theory, as distinct from the *Dominican* or *evangelical*, which bases the Sabbath exclusively on the fact of the resurrection of Christ; and from the *ecclesiastical* or *traditional* theory, which bases it on the authority and custom of the church. But we protest against the term, as one-sided and liable to misunderstanding; strictly speaking, it applies only to the Jewish and the Seventh-Day Baptist theory. The genuine Anglo-American theory, as we understand and defend it, is *evangelical* as well as legal; it combines what is true in the other theories, which are wrong, not in what they positively

* Ps. cxviii. 24. † Heb. iii. 11, iv. 1—11. ‡ Henry Vaughan.

affirm, but in what they deny and exclude. It embraces the whole truth of the Sabbath, in its physical, moral, and religious aspects; while the other theories represent merely a fragment of it, and ensure only a small portion of the benefit which emanates from the institution in its integrity and completeness. The Anglo-American theory agrees with the evangelical theory in making the resurrection of the Lord the main—though not the only—basis of the Christian Sabbath or Lord's day; and it agrees with the ecclesiastical theory in honouring the universal custom of the church of all ages—as an additional, though by no means the only or chief, support of its authority. But it differs from both by going back to the primitive creation as the first natural basis of the Sabbath, and in holding to the perpetual obligation of the fourth commandment, as the legal basis of its authority.

2. *Objections answered.*

We will now notice the objections which are urged against the Anglo-American theory, not only from the open enemies of the Sabbath, but also from the champions of the ecclesiastical and evangelical—or rather ultra- and pseudo-evangelical theories. The objections are directed mainly against the legal feature of the true theory, or the alleged perpetuity of the fourth commandment. They would indeed have force, and drive us logically to the alternative of either giving up the Sabbath, or of adopting the view of the Seventh-Day Baptists, if we based the authority of the Sabbath *exclusively* on the decalogue; but this, as already remarked, is not the genuine American view, as held by our leading divines of the present day. We make as much account of the resurrection of the Saviour in this connection, as the strongest champions of the evangelical view can possibly do; only, while holding fast to this New Testament basis, we do not destroy the old foundation, which was laid by the same eternal and unchangeable God, who raised Christ from the dead, and thereby completed the new spiritual creation.

1. It is objected, first, that the fourth commandment alone required a positive enactment, while all the other commandments of the decalogue are coextensive in their obligation with reason and conscience. But a law may be positive, and yet

generally binding. So is the law of monogamy, which is equally primitive with the institution of the Sabbath, and yet was equally disregarded by heathens and Mohammedans, and fell even into gross neglect among the Jews, until Christ restored it in its primitive purity and force. Where is the Christian who would on this account defend polygamy, which destroys the dignity of woman, and undermines the moral foundation of the family?

The fourth commandment, however, by pointing back to the creation, gives the Sabbath at the same time a place in the order of nature. It is not so much a new commandment, as the solemn reënactment of an institution as old as man himself. It antedates Judaism, and therefore survives it; it combines the three elements of a permanent Christian institution, being rooted in the order of nature, enacted by positive legislation, and confirmed by the gospel of Christ.

2. The second objection is derived from the change of day from the seventh to the first, under the Christian dispensation. But this change is at best a mere matter of form, and does not touch the substance of the commandment. The law itself does not expressly fix on the *last* day of the week; it only requires six days for labour, and *every* seventh day, not necessarily *the* seventh day, (dies *septenus*, not dies *septimus*,) for the rest of worship. It undoubtedly establishes the week of seven days as a divine order, and it would be altogether wrong to substitute a decade for it, as the French, during a short period of madness, tried to do and failed. The number seven (three and four) has a symbolical significance throughout the whole Bible, being the number of the covenant, or of the union of God with man, as three is the number of the Divinity, four the number of the world or mankind, ten the number of completeness and harmony. All days, in themselves considered, are equal before God,* and the selection of the particular day of the week for holy purposes depends on divine facts and commandments. In the Old Testament it was determined by the creation and the typical redemption; in the new dispensation by the resurrection and full redemption of Christ. The gospel only changed the ceremonial or ritual form of the Sabbath law, but preserved

* Rom. xiv. 5.

and renewed its moral substance. It is also worthy of remark, that the first Sabbath of the world, although the last day in the history of God's creation, was in fact the first day in the history of man, who was made on the sixth day, as the crowning work of God.

3. A third objection is taken from the general spirit of the Christian religion, which it is said abolished the Jewish distinction of sacred and profane times and places, and regards all time as sacred to God, and every place of the universe as his dwelling. But this argument closely pressed would turn every week-day into a Sabbath, and give us seven Sabbaths for one. This, for all practical purposes, proves too much for the anti-sabbatists. It anticipates an ideal state of another and better world. There is, indeed, an eternal Sabbath in heaven, which remaineth for the people of God. But while we live on earth, we must, by the necessities of our nature, and by God's own express direction, *labour* as well as rest, and do all our work, with the exception of one day in the week, when we are permitted to rest from *our* work, in order to do the work of *God*, and to prepare ourselves for the eternal rest in heaven. Let us by all means give to God as much of the week as we can, and let us do all our secular work for the glory of God, and thus consecrate all our time on earth to his holy service; but let us not, under the vain delusion of serving him better, withhold from him even that day which he has reserved for his special service. Let us raise the week-days, as much as we can, to the sanctity of the Sabbath, instead of bringing down the Sabbath to the level of ordinary work-days. Our theory, far from secularizing the week-days, has a tendency to elevate them, by bringing them under the hallowed influence of the Lord's day; while the pseudo-evangelical theory has just the opposite effect in practice; it cries out, spirit, but with the masses it ends in flesh; it vindicates liberty, but it favours lawlessness, which is death to all true freedom. There is a false evangelism as well as a false legalism, and the one is just as unchristian and pernicious as the other.

As regards *intrinsic* holiness, all times and seasons, as well as all labour and rest, are alike. This we fully grant. How could we otherwise defend the change of the day from the

seventh to the first, or answer the obvious astronomical objections? God undoubtedly fills all time, as he fills all space. But God is also a God of order; he has constituted man a social being, and fitted him for public as well as private worship, which, like every other act of a finite being, must be regulated by the laws of time and space. There is no more superstition in holding to sacred seasons, than there is in holding to sacred places, provided it be not done in an exclusive and abstract sense. Both are equally necessary and indispensable for the maintenance of social and public worship. We all know that the omnipresent Jehovah may be worshipped in the silent chamber, in the lonely desert, and the dark catacomb, as well as in the temple of Jerusalem and on the Mount Gerizim. But shall we on that account destroy our churches and chapels, or desecrate them by turning them into "houses of merchandise"? The objection we have under consideration, falsely assumes, that the consecration of particular days to God necessarily tends to secularize the other days, when just the contrary is the case. The keeping of the Sabbath, far from interfering with the *continual* service of God, secures, preserves, promotes, and regulates it. The meaning of the Sabbath law is, not that we should give to God the seventh part of our time *only*, but *at least*. So we should pray "without ceasing," according to the apostle's direction; but this, instead of annulling, only increases the obligation of devoting *at least* a certain time of every day to purposes of private devotion. It is not by neglecting, but by strictly observing, the custom of morning and evening prayers, that we can make progress towards our final destination, when our whole life shall be resolved into worship and praise.

4. The last and strongest argument is professedly based upon what we all admit to be the highest authority beyond which there is no appeal. Christ and St. Paul, it is urged, give no countenance to the Anglo-American theory, but deny the perpetuity of the Sabbath law.* But if we keep in mind the general relation of the Saviour to the law, as explained especially

* Matt. xii. 1–5, 10–12; Mark ii. 27; Luke xiii. 11–16, xiv. 2–5; John v. 16, ix. 14; Rom. xiv. 5, 6; Col. ii. 16; Gal. iv. 9, 10.

in the Sermon on the Mount,* we cannot for a moment suppose that He should have shaken the authority of any of God's commandments, the least of which he declared to be more enduring than heaven and earth. The passages so often quoted are not aimed at the Sabbath which the Lord hath made, but at the later Jewish perversion of it. They in no wise oppose the proper observance of the Sabbath by works of divine worship and charity, but the negative, mechanical, self-righteous, and hypocritical sabbatarianism of the Pharisees, who idolized the letter and killed the spirit of the law, who strained at a gnat and swallowed a camel, who exacted tithe from the smallest produce of the garden, and neglected the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith; who, like whited sepulchres, appeared beautiful without, but within were full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Wherever the Christian Sabbath is observed in the same spirit, it is an abuse of God's ordinance, and falls, of course, under the same condemnation as the Jewish sabbatarianism of the days of Christ. Christ is indeed "Lord of the Sabbath day."† But in the same sense he is Lord of all the commandments, as the lawgiver is above the law. He is also Lord of life, and yet never weakened the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," but sharpened and deepened it by condemning even the hatred of the heart against our neighbour as murder before God. He uniformly set an example of the right observance of the Sabbath by devoting it to works of worship and charity. He emphatically declared the Sabbath to be made for the benefit of man.‡ He exhorted his disciples, in the extremities of the last days, to pray that their flight be not on the Sabbath day, lest they might be tempted to desecrate it.§ And as to St. Paul, it is certain that while he opposed the *Jewish* Sabbath and the Judaizing mode of its observance, he observed the *Christian* Sabbath by acts of worship,‖ and enjoined its observance by acts of charity upon his congregations.** St. John, the bosom disciple of Christ, the apostle, evangelist, and seer of the New Testament, has sufficiently defined his position on the Sabbath

* Matt. v. 17–19. † Matt. xii. 8; Mark ii. 28. ‡ Mark ii. 27.
§ Matt. xxiv. 20. ‖ Acts xx. 7. ** 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

question by conferring upon the first day of the week the high distinction of the *Lord's Day*.* The apostles in retaining without dispute the divinely established weekly cycle, necessarily retained also the Sabbath, which constitutes and completes the week, and which ceased no more than the weeks to run their ceaseless round. The universal religious observance of Sunday, which we find in the Christian church east and west immediately after the apostles, would be an inexplicable historical mystery without the preceding practice and sanction of the apostles. We conclude, therefore, that they regarded the Sabbath, as it was intended to be, as a *perpetual* sign between Jehovah and his people.†

3. *Characteristics and advantages of the Anglo-American Theory.*

The Anglo-American theory, whatever may be its theoretical merits, has undoubtedly, for all practical purposes for which the Sabbath was instituted, many and great advantages over the Continental European theory, whether it base the Sabbath merely on ecclesiastical authority and custom, or rise higher by deriving it from Christ and the apostles.

1. The Anglo-American theory goes back to the *primitive* Sabbath of the race, given to man as man. It plants it deeply in the original constitution of man and in the order of nature. This is of the utmost importance as a basis for all the temporal benefits of the Sabbath, and for an appeal to utilitarian considerations which must be allowed to have their proper weight upon the world at large, especially on those who cannot be reached by the higher moral and religious considerations. "For godliness is profitable unto all things, and has a promise for this life as well as for that which is to come."

Experience, which speaks louder than argument, comes to the aid of our theory by furnishing abounding proof that the Sabbath rest is favourable and necessary to the body as well as the soul, to the preservation and promotion of health, wealth,

* Rev. i. 9.

† Exod. xxxi. 17: "It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever." (לְעֹלָם, Sept. σημεῖον αἰώνιον.) The reason assigned goes back significantly to the primitive order, "For in six days," etc. Gen. ii. 2. Comp. Ezek. xx. 12, 20.

and the temporal happiness and prosperity of individuals and communities.

It is an undeniable fact that the two nations which keep the Sabbath most strictly—Great Britain and the United States—are the wealthiest and the freest on earth. The philosophy of this fact is plain. Sabbath-rest is the condition of successful week-labour for man and beast, and successful labour is the parent of wealth. The proper keeping of the Sabbath, moreover, is one of the best schools of moral discipline and self-government, and self-government is the only ground on which rational and national freedom can rest and be permanently maintained.

2. The Anglo-American theory retains the *legal* basis of the Sabbath, by teaching the perpetuity of the fourth commandment. It thus secures to the Sabbath the authority of the divine lawgiver, which attaches to all other parts of the decalogue, and appeals to the conscience of man. It raises it far above the sphere of mere expediency and temporal usefulness into the sphere of moral duty and sacred obligation. It can enforce it by an irresistible, "Thus saith the Lord." By strengthening the decalogue in one member we strengthen all the other members, and promote the general interests of morality; while the ecclesiastical and evangelical theories, so called, by taking out the fourth commandment as a mere temporary arrangement, destroy the completeness and harmony of the decalogue, and tend to undermine its general authority. The Anglo-American theory here has an exegetical as well as a practical advantage over the others, as on it alone can the place of the Sabbath in the *moral* law be satisfactorily explained and vindicated.

3. By placing the fourth commandment on a level with the other commandments, and bringing it especially into close contact with the fifth, which enjoins obedience to parents, and with the seventh commandment, which condemns all unchastity in thought, word, and deed, the Anglo-American theory acknowledges the inseparable connection between the strict observance of the Sabbath and the moral welfare and happiness of the *family*. The Sabbath and the family are the two oldest institutions of God on earth, both date from paradise, both look

towards the happiness of man, both flourish and decay together. What God has joined together no man should dare to put asunder.

4. The Anglo-American theory makes more account of the distinction between the *religious* and the *civil* Sabbath than the Continental, and lays greater stress on the necessity of the latter. It regards the civil Sabbath as essential for public morals and the self-preservation of the state. Hence our Sabbath laws, throughout the land, which militate as little against religious freedom and the separation of church and state, as the laws upholding monogamy. On the contrary, they are a support to our civil and political freedom. For freedom without law is licentiousness and ruin to any people. Our separation of church and state rests on mutual respect and friendship, and is by no means a separation of the nation from Christianity. The religious Sabbath cannot, and ought not to be enforced by law; for all worship and true religion must be the free and voluntary homage of the heart. But the civil Sabbath can and ought to be maintained and protected by legislation, and a Christian community has a natural right to look to their government for the protection of their Sabbath as well as for the protection of their persons and property. All good citizens can rally around the support of the *civil* Sabbath from moral and patriotic motives, whatever may be their religious opinions. Such coöperation is not possible on the Continent of Europe, where church and state are inextricably mixed up.

5. But while we hold fast to all these great characteristics and advantages, let us never lose sight of the fact that the Sabbath is *gospel* as well as law, and its observance a *privilege* as well as a duty. It is law to all citizens, gospel to the believers. If we insist exclusively or chiefly upon the legal element, we are in danger of relapsing into Jewish sabbatarianism, and make its observance a burden instead of a joy. Its advent will then not be hailed but dreaded, especially by the youth, and the way be prepared for a successful reaction, which would sweep away both the evangelical and the legal, the religious and the civil Sabbath, with all its great blessings, from our midst. There is a false legalism as well as a false evangelism, and we must keep equally clear from both extremes.

4. *History of the Sabbath.*

The Christian Sabbath, like every other institution and article of faith, has its *history*—a history full of instruction, warning, and precept. It is intertwined with all the fortunes of Christianity. It was frequently obscured, but never abolished at any period, or in any part of the church, except during the mad days of the reign of terror in France, and even this exception only furnished the negative proof for its indispensable necessity as a safeguard for all public and private morality. With one insignificant exception, it is held in common by all Christian denominations, from the oldest to the youngest, from the largest to the smallest.

The Sabbath before the Reformation.

For the first three centuries, when the church was an illegal sect, and persecuted by the state, Sunday was a purely religious institution. With Constantine the Great, the first Roman emperor who professed Christianity, it became a civil institution, recognised and protected by the laws of the state. Civil legislation, it is true, cannot enforce the sanctification, but it can prevent, to a great extent, the public desecration of Sunday; it cannot and ought not to be coërcive and injunctive, but prohibitive and protective. Constantine and his successors prohibited lawsuits and pleadings, theatrical amusements, and physical labour on Sunday, and thus enabled all their Christian subjects to observe the day without disturbance and hindrance.

The Christian Sabbath continued ever since, without interruption, as a religious and civil institution in all Christian lands. But its authority and observance was greatly undermined during the middle ages by the endless multiplication of holy days; each day of the calendar being devoted to the memory of some saint and martyr. This was, at best, a premature anticipation of an ideal state of the future world, when the life of the Christian will be one uninterrupted festival of joy and peace. But the arrangement, in its practical effect on the people, almost inevitably tended to obliterate the distinction between Sunday and the week days, between a day of rest and the days of labour, between one *holy day* of divine appoint-

ment and the many *holidays* of human invention, to promote idleness, the worship of saints, and all manner of superstition, and to obscure the merits of Christ by interposing an army of subordinate mediators and idols between him and his people. We all know to what a fearful extent this perversion and consequent desecration of the Lord's day still prevails all over the Continent of Europe, especially in Roman Catholic countries.

The Sabbath since the Reformation.

We might expect that the Reformation of the sixteeenth century should have remedied the evil and revived the primitive purity of the Sabbath as well as of the general system of Christianity, on the basis of the infallible word of God. Luther, Zwingle, Calvin, and Bucer at first favoured the abolition of all holidays with the exception of the Lord's day. But their general antagonism to the Judaizing legalism and ritualism of Rome, their zeal for evangelical freedom, and their imperfect understanding of the well-known words of Christ and Paul against the negative sabbatarianism of the Pharisees, prevented the reformers from attaining to the proper view of the authority and perpetuity of the fourth commandment. This is especially true of Luther, who sometimes represents the whole law of Moses as abolished, and says of the Sabbath, "Keep it holy for its use's sake both to body and soul; but if anywhere the day is made holy for the mere day's sake, if anywhere any one sets up its observance upon a Jewish foundation, then I order you to work on it, to ride on it, to dance on it, to feast on it, to do anything that shall reprove this encroachment on the Christian spirit and liberty." But Luther must never be judged from a single sentence, but be allowed to interpret himself. In other places he represents the observance of Sunday as "good and necessary," and in opposition to the antinomian views of Agricola, he defends the law of Moses as still binding upon Christians. "He who pulls down the law," he correctly remarks, "pulls down at the same time the whole framework of human polity and society. If the law be thrust out of the church, there will no longer be anything recognized as a sin in the world, since the gospel defines and punishes sin only by recurring to the law." Had the reformers foreseen the base

use which has been made of their free expressions on the subject, they would have been far more cautious and careful.

There has been no radical reform of the Sabbath on the Continent of Europe since the Reformation, but rather a fearful progress of Sabbath-desecration in inseparable connection with a growing neglect of public worship. This crying evil forms one of the greatest obstacles to the spread of vital religion among the people, and can never be successfully overcome except on the basis of a stricter theory on the Sabbath, than that which generally prevails in the greater part of the old world.

The Sabbath in England and Scotland.

It was different in Great Britain. The Church of Scotland was the first among the churches of the Reformation to set the example of a more sacred observance of the Lord's day than had been customary since the days of the apostles. She took from the beginning a somewhat radical position against all the annual festivals of the church, even the ancient commemoration days of the birth, passion, and resurrection of our Saviour, and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, which are certainly innocent in themselves, and may be observed with great benefit to the people. But the loss in this respect was a gain to the weekly commemoration-day of the risen Redeemer. The *First Book of Discipline*, which was drawn up by John Knox and five other ministers, abolishes Christmas, circumcision, and Epiphany, "because they have no assurance in God's word," but enjoins the observance of Sunday in these words: "The Sabbath must be kept strictly in all towns, both forenoon and afternoon, for hearing of the word; at afternoon upon the Sabbath, the Catechism shall be taught, the children examined, and the baptism ministered. Public prayers shall be used upon the Sabbath, as well afternoon as before, when sermons cannot be had." The third General Assembly, which met in June, 1562, resolved to petition the queen for the punishing of Sabbath-breaking, and all the vices which are to be punished according to the law of God, and yet not by the law of the realm. The Assembly of June, 1565, mentions the breaking

of the Sabbath day among "the horrible and detestable crimes" which ought to be punished.

Yet, after all, this was only an approach towards the right view and practice which now prevails in Great Britain. Theoretically John Knox did not differ from his admired friend and teacher, Calvin, on the subject of the Sabbath, and the Scotch Confession of Faith, which he with five others prepared in 1561, makes no express mention of the fourth commandment. The proper Anglo-American theory and practice dates from the closing years of Queen Elizabeth's reign, and took its rise in the Puritan party of the Church of England. It was first clearly and fully set forth in a work of NICHOLAS BOWND, D.D., a graduate of Cambridge, and minister of Norton, in Suffolk, which appeared in 1595, and in an enlarged form in 1606, under the title, "*The Doctrine of the Sabbath, plainely layde forth and soundly proved*," etc.* This book learnedly labours to show from the Scripture, the Fathers, and the Reformers, that the observation of the Sabbath is not a bare ordinance of man, or a merely civil or ecclesiastical constitution appointed only for polity, but an immortal commandment of Almighty God, and therefore binding on man's conscience; that the Sabbath was given to our first parents; that it was revived on Mount Sinai by God's own voice, with a special note of remembrance, fortified with more reasons than the other precepts, and particularly applied to all sorts of men by name; that the apostles by the direction of God's Spirit, changed the day from the seventh to the eighth, (first,) which we now keep in honour of redemption, and which ought still to be kept by all nations to the end of the world, because we can never have the like cause or direction to change it; that the Sabbath should be spent altogether in God's service, in public and private worship, in works of necessity and charity, while we should carefully abstain

* For a fuller account of this work, and the controversy to which it gave rise, we refer to James Gilfillan's book, *The Sabbath viewed in the light of Reason, Revelation, and History*, 1862, republished by the American Tract Society and the New York Sabbath Committee, 1863, pp. 66, etc. Dr. Bownd wrote, besides the Doctrine of the Sabbath, three other works, viz., *The Holy Exercise of Fasting*, (1604,) *A Storehouse of Comfort for the Afflicted in Spirit*, (1604,) and *The Unbelief of Thomas, the Apostle, laid open for Believer*, (1608.)

from all the ordinary works of our calling, and avoid whatever withdraws our heart from the exercises of religion; and that magistrates and princes ought to provide for the observation of the fourth commandment, and compel the people to at least an outward rest, as well as to the keeping of the commandments against murder, adultery, theft, and slander.

The treatise of Dr. Bownd produced a great sensation. "It is almost incredible," says Thomas Fuller, the English historian,* "how taking this doctrine was, partly because of its own purity, and partly from the eminent piety of such persons as maintained it, so that the Lord's day, especially in corporations, began to be precisely kept, people becoming a law to themselves, forbearing such sports as yet by statute permitted; yea, many rejoicing at their own restraint therein. On this day the stoutest fencer laid down the buckler, the most skilful archer unbent his bow, counting all shooting besides the mark; May-games and Morish-dances grew out of request, and good reason that bells should be silenced from gingling about men's legs, if their very ringing in steeples were adjudged unlawful; some of them were ashamed of their former pleasures, like children which, grown bigger, blushing themselves out of their rattles and whistles. Others forbear them for fear of their superiors, and many left them off out of a polite compliance, lest otherwise they should be accounted licentious. Yet learned men were much divided in their judgments about these sabbatarian doctrines. Some embraced them as ancient truths consonant to Scripture, long disused and neglected, now seasonably revived for the increase of piety. Others conceived them grounded on a wrong bottom, but because they tended to the manifest advance of religion, it was pity to oppose them, seeing none have just reason to complain being deceived into their own good. But a third sort flatly fell out with these positions, as galling men's necks with a Jewish yoke, against the liberty of Christians: that Christ, as Lord of the Sabbath, had removed the rigour thereof, and allowed men lawful recreations; that the doctrine put an unequal lustre on the Sunday, on set purpose to eclipse all other holy days to the derogation of the

* As quoted by Gilfillan, p. 69.

church; that the strict observance was set up out of faction to be a character of difference, to brand all for libertines who did not entertain it."

The new theory of the Sabbath, like every great movement in history, had to encounter considerable opposition, and gave rise to the first sabbatarian controversy in the Christian church. But it was ably defended by Greenham, bishop Babington, Perkins, Dod, bishop Andrewes, Dr. Willet, and many others, and soon worked its way into the heart of the English and Scotch people. When in 1603, at the Commencement of the University of Cambridge, the thesis, *Dies Dominicus nititur Verbo Dei*, was publicly maintained, no member of the University put up an *antithesis* in opposition to it. Dr. Twisse, the Moderator of the Westminster Assembly, gives it as his opinion that if the votes of the bishops of England were taken, the major part would concur with the Puritans as touching the doctrine of the Sabbath, rather than against them. The judicious Hooker, whose name is revered by all parties in the Church of England, says: "We are to account the sanctification of one day in seven a duty which God's immutable law doth exact for ever." The Book of Common Prayer bears strong witness to the perpetuity of the fourth commandment, and its binding character upon the Christian conscience, by requiring to each of the ten commandments the response of the people, "Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law." The Puritan theory on the Sabbath penetrated like leaven the churches of England and Scotland, and the strict observance of that day is one of the permanent effects which Puritanism left upon the Anglican church and all its dependencies.

This doctrine was permanently embodied in the Westminster standards, the Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechism, and was thus clothed with symbolical authority for all the churches which embraced these standards. The "Westminster Confession of Faith" gives this clear and strong statement of the doctrine:*

"As it is the law of nature, that, in general, a due proportion of time be set apart for the worship of God; so in his

* Ch. xxi. sect. 7, 8.

word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, binding all men in all ages, he hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto him: which, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week; and from the resurrection of Christ, was changed into the first day of the week, which in Scripture is called the Lord's Day, and is to be continued to the end of the world as the Christian Sabbath.

"This Sabbath is then kept holy unto the Lord, when men, after a due preparing of their hearts, and ordering of their common affairs beforehand, do not only observe an holy rest all the day from their own works, words, and thoughts about their worldly employments and recreations; but also are taken up the whole time in the public and private exercises of his worship, and in the duties of necessity and mercy."

This is the doctrine of the Westminster Assembly, which, next to the Synod of Dort, is unquestionably the most important ecclesiastical Synod held in the history of the Reformed Church, and adorned by such distinguished scholars and divines as Lightfoot, Gataker, Twisse, Henderson, Rutherford, Wallis, Reynolds, and Selden.. On this point there was no dispute between the Independents and Presbyterians. In Scotland the Westminster standards were at once received, and have been adhered to ever since by all the various branches of Scotch Presbyterianism. The Secession church, the Relief church, the Reformed Presbyterian church, the United Original Seceders, and the Free church, agree with the Established church of Scotland, in holding the Westminster doctrine on the Sabbath.

This doctrine, it must be admitted, goes beyond that of any other symbolical book or confession of faith previously issued in the Christian church. But it is none the less true and scriptural in all its essential features. It is one of the noblest contributions which Great Britain has made to the cause of evangelical truth and piety. Far from being a relapse, it is a real progress in the cause of Christianity and civilization. But a progress on the rock of the Bible: for all true growth in ecclesiastical history is not a growth *beyond* Christ, but a growth *in* Christ, and a deeper apprehension and fuller application of his Spirit, word, and work. We now see the doctrine

of justification by faith in every epistle of St. Paul; and yet it was only in the Reformation of the sixteenth century that it was clearly brought out from the mines of the Bible. So we are better prepared now to understand and appreciate the whole Scripture doctrine of the Sabbath, than the church was before the sixteenth century. We have the great test of an experience of more than two hundred years to assist us in taking the right view.

The whole world knows the striking difference between the Continental and the British Sabbath; and every impartial Christian observer must admit the superiority and incalculable benefits of the latter, in the promotion of every public and private virtue. Even the freedom, wealth, and political greatness of England and Scotland may, to a considerable extent, be traced to the strict observance of the Lord's Day. Let us quote but one testimony, and that of a Frenchman, and a zealous Roman Catholic. "Impartial men," says the celebrated Count Montalembert, "are convinced that the political education by which the lower classes of the English nation surpass other nations—that the extraordinary wealth of England, and its supreme maritime power—are clear proofs of the blessing of God bestowed upon this nation for its distinguished Sabbath observance. Those who behold the enormous commerce of England, in the harbours, the railways, the manufactories, etc., cannot see without astonishment the quiet of the Sabbath-day."

The Sabbath in New England.

It is one of the peculiar marks of divine favour to America, that its foundations are deeply laid in religion, and that the Sabbath, as observed in Scotland and England from the beginning of the seventeenth century, was one of the most cherished institutions of the fathers and founders of our Republic. The history of New England commences with the famous politico-religious covenant of the Pilgrim Fathers, signed on board the Mayflower, on the day of its arrival in Cape Cod harbour, on the 11th of November, 1620, which laid the foundation for independent, voluntary, democratic self-government in church and state, and was solemnly inaugurated, on the day following,

by the strict observance of a Puritan Sabbath. During the following weeks of anxious and dangerous explorations for a safe harbour and settlement on terra firma, nothing could prevent the Pilgrims from spending every Sabbath in religious retirement, which invigorated them for the severe work of the week. And when, on the ever-memorable 22d of December (new style, or December 11, old style,) they landed on Plymouth Rock, not even the pressing necessities of physical food and protection, nor the cry of some Indian savages, who threatened, as they thought, with an assault, could induce them to break the first Sabbath in their future home. "They were still without the shelter of a roof. At the sharp winter solstice of New England, there was but

> 'A screen of leafless branches
> Between them and the blast.'

But it was the Lord's hallowed time, and the work of building must wait."*

There this small congregation of pious emigrants, the unconscious bearers of the hopes and destinies of a mighty future, met far away from friends and kindred, in a new and inhospitable clime, in dreary, cold December, on a barren rock, threatened by roaming savages, under the stormy sky of heaven, and, in the exercise of the general priesthood of believers, offered the sacrifices of their broken hearts, and the praises of their devout lips to their God and Saviour, on his own appointed day of rest. The Pilgrims were first true to God, and therefore true to themselves, and true to the world. They made religion the chief concern of life, and regarded the glory and enjoyment of God the great end of man, to which everything else must be subordinate. They reasoned, and reasoned correctly, that all lower goods are best secured by securing the highest. They first sought the kingdom of God and his right-

* See Palfrey's *History of New England.* Boston. 1859. Vol. I., p. 173. This first Puritan Sabbath on the American continent fell on the 24th of December. On Monday the 25th, being Christmas, all were busy felling, sawing, riving or carrying timber. "No man rested all that day," which they regarded as of purely human invention. In this opposition to annual festivals in honour of Christ, and to the whole idea of a church-year, the Puritans evidently went too far. But we may readily excuse their weakness, in view of their eminent services to the Lord's Day.

eousness, well assured that all other things necessary would be added unto them. They knew that the fear of the Lord was the beginning of all wisdom. Their constant sense of dependence on God made them feel independent of men. Being the faithful servants of Christ, they became the true freemen, and the fathers and founders of a Republic of self-governing sovereigns.

The noble example of the Pilgrim fathers was followed by all the Puritan immigrants from Old to New England. The strict observance of the Lord's day was a universal custom in all New England from the beginning, and has continued without interruption to the present day. It was there ably defended in sermons and tracts, from time to time, by the most distinguished divines, as Jonathan Edwards, President Timothy Dwight, Dr. Humphrey, Dr. Justin Edwards, who have enriched the Sabbath literature by contributions of abiding value. It is there interwoven with the whole structure of society—it enters into the sanctuary of every family, it is identified with the earliest and most sacred recollections of every man, woman, and child. The strictness of the New England Sabbath is proverbial, and has only its equal in the Scotch Sabbath. In former days it was no doubt frequently carried to excess, and observed more in the spirit of Jewish legalism than of Christian freedom; but along with these excesses went the innumerable blessings of the day. Its strict observance was an essential part of that moral discipline which made New England what it is to-day, and is abundantly justified by its fruits, which are felt more and more throughout the whole Christian world.

It is unnecessary, even in these days of sectional prejudice, party animosity, and slander, to say one word in praise of New England. Facts and institutions always speak best for themselves. We might say with Daniel Webster, giving his famous eulogy on Massachusetts a more general application to her five sister States: "There they stand: look at them, and judge for yourselves. There is their history, the world knows it by heart: the past at least is secure." The rapid rise and progress of that rocky and barren country called New England, is one of the marvels of modern history. In the short period

of two centuries and a half it has attained the height of modern civilization, which it required other countries more than a thousand years to reach. Naturally the poorest part of the United States, it has become the intellectual garden, the busy workshop, and the thinking brain of this vast republic. In general wealth and prosperity, in energy and enterprise, in love of freedom and respect for law, in the diffusion of intelligence and education, in letters and arts, in virtue and religion, in every essential feature of national power and greatness, the people of the six New England States, and more particularly of Massachusetts, need not fear a comparison with the most favoured nation on the globe.*

But the power and influence of New England, owing to the enterprising and restless character of its population, extends far beyond its own limits, and is almost omnipresent in the United States. The twenty thousand Puritans who emigrated from England within the course of twenty years, from 1620 to 1640, and received but few accessions until the modern flood of mixed European immigration set in, have grown into a race of many millions, diffused themselves more or less into every State of the Union, and take a leading part in the organization and development of every new State of the great West to the shores of the Pacific. Their principles have acted like leaven upon the whole lump of American society; their influence reaches into all the ramifications of our commerce, manufactures, politics, literature, and religion; there is hardly a Protestant church or Sabbath-school in the land, from Boston to

* Dr. Robert J. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, in a patriotic letter to the Hon. Robert C. Winthrop, dated June 25, 1863, thus speaks of New England: "It may be the will of God that the most dreadful changes await our country. If the very worst comes, I look that true and regulated liberty will perish last in New England. In past years I have spoken freely in disapprobation of much that has been felt as an evil influence from New England, as it appeared to me. But I never doubted—and now less than ever—that the roots of whatever produces freedom, equality, and high civilization, are more deeply set in New England than in any equal population on the face of the earth." We are sure that this noble testimony will be heartily responded to by thousands of Christians in the Middle, Western, and even the Southern States, who are able to rise above the passions of the hour, and to subordinate their sectional and denominational interests and preferences to truly national and catholic considerations.

San Francisco, which does not feel, directly or indirectly, positively or negatively, the intellectual and moral power which constantly emanates from the classical soil of Puritan Christianity.

The Southern enemies of our government, who in former years resorted to New England institutions for an education, acknowledge this fact by applying the term *Yankee* reproachfully to the whole people of the North. But it is rather a term of honour, of which no one need be ashamed. The New Englanders have their idiosyncracies and faults, like every people under the sun, and are apt to run into extremes and all sorts of *isms* in politics, philosophy, and religion; but they have counterbalancing virtues of sterling value, which make them a real blessing to the race. Wherever they go, they carry with them their industry and enterprise, their love of freedom and zeal for education, and, what is better than all, their native, traditional reverence for God's holy word and holy day; and this, far from being a weakness, is one of the chief sources of their strength and prosperity, and an unspeakable benefit to the whole country. Let us never forget the debt of gratitude which we owe to New England for the strict observance of the Sabbath.

The American Sabbath.

But the Sabbath, in its strict observance, is by no means a Puritan or New England institution simply: it is truly national American; its sacredness and influence is as wide as the continent from Maine to Georgia, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It enters into the bone and sinew of the American character. It is entrenched in our national habits, embodied in our creeds, and guarded by our civil legislation. It is an essential part of American Christianity and morality, and one of the strongest common bonds which unite the different Protestant denominations. The Episcopalian, whether high, or low, or broad in his views of doctrine or policy, the Presbyterian, both of the Old and New School, the Dutch Reformed, the German Reformed, the Lutheran, the Methodist, the Baptist, the Quaker, unite with the Puritan Congregationalist in sacred zeal for the Lord's day, and in abhorrence of its dese-

cration. The venerable French scholar, Duponceau, after long familiarity with America, made the remark, "that of all we claimed as characteristic, our observance of the Sabbath is the only one truly national and American, and for this cause, if for no other, he trusted it would never lose its hold on our affections and patriotism."

This was so, we may say, from the beginning of our nation. The laws of every colony and State, with the single exception, I believe, of Louisiana, which is owing to its French and Roman Catholic origin, recognise this national sentiment, and protect the Christian Sabbath against abuse and desecration. A kind Providence has watched over our legislation in this important matter with singular care. It was influenced by the truly Christian and patriotic conviction of that eminent judge of the Supreme Court of the United States, expressed in this significant sentence: "Where there is no Christian Sabbath, there is no Christian morality; and without this, free government cannot long be sustained." The earlier legislation of New York, for instance, both under Dutch and English rule, shows the profoundest respect for the civil Sabbath, and the strongest conviction of its public utility and necessity.* Legislation in a republican country like ours always reflects and embodies the ruling sentiment of the community. It is certainly so in this case. It has been asserted by one, especially competent to judge, by long and wide observation,† that "at least nine-tenths of the American-born population, and probably a large majority of the foreign-born, esteem the Sabbath too sacred to be spent as a frivolous holiday. With trifling exceptions, the Christian churches of every name regard the Sabbath as a day to be kept holy unto the Lord, and to be employed in acts of religious worship and charity: so that millions of our citizens are grieved, and justly grieved, as they

* Here belong the Decrees and Ordinances of Peter Stuyvesant, 1647–8, the Acts of the General Assembly of the Colony of New York, passed in 1695, the laws of the State Legislature in 1813, the Municipal Ordinances, 1797–1834, etc. They are conveniently brought together in the first published document of the New York Sabbath Committee, under the title, "The Sabbath in New York." New York. 1858.

† The indefatigable Secretary of the New York Sabbath Committee, the Rev. R. S. Cook, in Doc. No. xi. p. 15.

think, by a systematic perversion of the day into a mere carnival of sensuous pleasure."

It is true that the combined influences of the various denominations of non-Puritan descent, and the flood of the more recent foreign immigration from Europe, have softened the rigour of the Puritan Sabbath, especially in our large cities. But the essential features remain unchanged in the heart of the people. I know of no serious American Christian, of any evangelical denomination, who would for a moment think of exchanging the Anglo-American Sabbath theory and practice for that of the Continent of Europe, or of Mexico, and Central, and South America. All intelligent foreigners, too, who are not open enemies of religion and virtue, after a few months or years of observation in England, Scotland, or America, must see and acknowledge the great superiority of our theory, at least, in all its *practical* bearings and effects upon the individual, the family, and the people. The foreign German population, for instance, in two crowded mass meetings, held at Cooper Institute, New York, the one in October, 1859, the other in March, 1861, have given strong and emphatic testimony to the Anglo-American Sabbath, and pledged to it their moral and material support.*

* Compare Documents No. ix. and No. xvi. of the New York Sabbath Committee, which contain, in the German language, a full account of the two memorable German mass meetings in Cooper Institute. We quote the resolutions heartily and unanimously adopted by the first meeting, which was attended by over fifteen hundred Germans.

"*Resolved*, That we, as Germans, do solemnly protest against the perversion of Sunday from a day of rest and devotion, into a day of noisy excitement and dissipation, which is only too frequent among some of our German countrymen, and brings dishonour on the German name; and that we request our fellow-citizens by no means to charge the fault of many upon the *whole* people and upon Germany, where for many years past noble efforts are successfully making towards the promotion of the better observance of Sunday.

"*Resolved*, That we regard the strict observance of Sunday, which was introduced into this country with the very first settlements of European immigrants, and has ever since been the common custom of the land, by no means as a defect, but on the contrary, as a great advantage and blessing to America, and we will cheerfully assist in keeping it up, and handing it down to future generations.

"*Resolved*, That in the Sabbath laws of this country, as they obtain in nearly every State of our great republican confederacy, we see nothing that conflicts with the cherished principles of civil and religious liberty; on the contrary, we regard them as one of the strongest guarantees of our free insti-

Our theory has stood the strongest of all tests, which the Saviour requires in the words, "By their fruits ye shall know them." Even the excesses of strict Sabbath observance are comparatively harmless, and infinitely less dangerous than the opposite extremes of laxity. There has been much senseless talk against the Judaizing legalism of American Sabbath-keeping from a pseudo evangelical standpoint, which ignores the world as it is, and radically misconceives the essential relation of the gospel to holiness. Daily experience tells us that the great mass of mankind needs the restraint of law as much as ever. The law is still a schoolmaster to lead men unto Christ, and true freedom is not freedom *from* law, but freedom *in* law.

Trials and triumphs of the American Sabbath.

The American Sabbath had its days of trial and temptation, but so far it has manfully and successfully weathered the storm.

1. Its first great trial was the war of the Revolution. War, whatever be its ultimate benefits, is proverbially demoralizing in its immediate effects, by accumulating and intensifying the vices of all classes of society. It is especially regardless of the third and fourth commandments, under the convenient cover of military necessity, and the old bad maxim, *Inter arma silent leges.* But fortunately for the country, the commander-in-chief and the father of this nation, who will ever stand "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen," was a God-fearing man, and issued, August 3, 1776, a general order, which, from a lofty eminence above the passions and strifes of the day, still speaks with telling effect to the armies of the North and of the South, solemnly protesting against the kindred vices of Sabbath-breaking and profanity, as follows:

"That the troops may have an opportunity of attending public worship, as well as to take some rest after the great fatigue they have gone through, the General, in future, excuses them from fatigue duty on Sundays, except at the shipyards, or on special occasions, until further orders. The General is sorry to be informed, that the foolish and wicked practice of

tutions; as a wholesome check upon licentiousness and dissipation, and as a preventive of the pauperism and crime which must necessarily undermine and ultimately destroy the liberty of any people."

profane cursing and swearing, a vice hitherto little known in an American army, is growing into fashion. He hopes the officers will, by example as well as influence, endeavour to check it, and that both they and the men will reflect that we can have but little hope of the blessing of Heaven on our arms, if we insult it by our impiety and folly. Added to this, it is a vice so mean and low, without any temptation, that every man of sense and character detests and despises it."*

When, after the successful termination of the war and the achievement of our national independence, the federal Constitution was formed for the permanent organization of our Union, every thing was carefully avoided which might tend to introduce the evils resulting from a union of church and state in the old world—and that not from disrespect, but from respect for religion, which was regarded by our fathers as too sacred to be subjected to the contaminating influence of political interests and secular control. Yet it is very significant and characteristic that in this very document the authority of the Christian Sabbath is incidentally acknowledged, by exempting it from the working days of the chief magistrate of the country in the signature of the bills of Congress;† and this, with the *Anno Domini* of the date, is the only express indication of the Christian origin of the magna charta of the American Union. Congress has ever respected the national habit, and never meets on Sundays, nor does the nation celebrate its birth-day on the fourth of July when it happens to fall on the sacred day of rest.

2. More recently the American Sabbath had to encounter another and more fearful danger, arising from the increasing tide of foreign Sabbath desecration, with its accumulating crimes and general demoralization. It culminated in New York among the teeming thousands of foreign residents of every nation and tongue. A few years ago the anti-sabbath movement threatened to sweep away the Sabbath alike from our statute books and from our streets, and endangered not only the public morals, but even the material interests of the whole commu-

* Sparks' Writings of Washington, vol. iv. p. 28.

† Constitution of the United States of America, Art. I. Sect. 7: "If any bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (*Sundays excepted*) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law," etc.

nity. But just in the time of the greatest danger, in 1857, God raised up the New York Sabbath Committee, and through their quiet and unobtrusive, but faithful and persevering labours, saved the Sabbath, shut the new flood-gates of drunkenness and crime, restored order and security to the metropolis, secured the coöperation of the better part of the foreign population, enriched our Sabbath-literature by valuable tracts and sermons, and so influenced the legislature and the judiciary of the Empire State, that they not only maintained the old Sunday laws, but committed themselves more strongly than ever in favour of the maintenance of the civil Sabbath.* In every one of the successive suits for the violation of the Sunday theatre act, the question was decided in favour of the constitutionality of laws for the protection of the Christian Sabbath as a civil and political institution, which in the State of New York, as in all other States, exists as a day of rest, by common law, and without the legislative action to establish it, so that all that the legislature attempt to do in the Sabbath laws is to regulate its observance and to protect it from desecration. The opinions of the different courts on this controversy, especially the opinion of Judge Allen of the Supreme Court,† are extremely valuable

* Compare for details the *Documents of the New York Sabbath Committee*, published from 1858 to 1863, which will always fill an important place in the history of the American Sabbath. Also an excellent article on the *Perpetual Observance of the Sabbath*, partly in review of these documents, by Professor Egbert C. Smyth, in the *American Theological Review*, for April, 1862, pp. 296–327. Prof. Smyth thus sums up the results of the labours of the New York Sabbath Committee: "A score of Sunday theatres have been closed, the liquor traffic greatly restricted, Sunday news-crying abolished, much useful labour expended among the foreign population, documents in English and German prepared and distributed in great numbers, a manifest advance secured in the popular apprehension of the claims and benefits of the civil Sabbath, the legal right of every man to a weekly season of repose and worship vindicated; and, in brief, a Sunday characterized by traffic, noise, drunkenness, and vice, made to give place to 'a Sabbath marked by refreshing stillness and sobriety,' and an impulse given to similar reformatory movements in other large cities in this country, and also across the Atlantic. Such results are a sufficient proof of the wisdom and energy with which the efforts of the Committee have been conducted. They shed light also upon the true method of prosecuting reformatory measures under a free government."

† It is published in the Series of Reports of the Supreme Court of New York, and in an authorized abridgment, as Doc. No. XVIII. of the Series of the Sabbath Committee.

as a basis for all needful legislation, and a bulwark against future attempts to overthrow or evade the laws of the land.

3. But our cherished institution had hardly been vindicated from the deadly grasp of foreign enemies, when it had to face a more dangerous domestic foe. The severest trial through which the American Sabbath, in common with our whole national Government and Union, with its principles of republican self-government, ever had to pass, or is likely to pass in future, is the civil war which has now been raging with increasing fury for more than two years. The desecration of the Sabbath, together with profanity and intemperance, soon after the outbreak of the war, increased at a most alarming rate, and threatened the people with greater danger than the rebellion itself. But fortunately there was an organization at hand which understood its duty; and rising from a metropolitan to a national importance, elicited from the highest military and civil authorities of the land a testimony in favour of the Sabbath, even more explicit and direct than ever issued from a professedly Christian government.*

Soon after assuming supreme command of the Army of the Potomac, Major-General George B. McClellan issued the following admirable order:

(General Orders No. 7.)

"HEAD-QUARTERS, ARMY OF THE POTOMAC,
WASHINGTON, Sept. 6, 1861.

"The Major-General commanding desires and requests that in future there may be more perfect respect for the Sabbath, on the part of his command. We are fighting in a holy cause, and should endeavour to deserve the benign favour of the Creator. Unless in the case of an attack by the enemy, or some other extreme military necessity, it is commended to commanding officers, that all work shall be suspended on the Sabbath; that no unnecessary movements shall be made on that day; that the men shall, so far as possible, be permitted to rest from their labours; that they shall attend divine service after the customary Sunday morning inspection; and that officers and men shall alike use their influence to insure the utmost decorum

* See Document No. XIX. of the New York Sabbath Committee, "A Plea for the Sabbath in War."

and quiet on that day. The General commanding regards this as no idle form. One day's rest in seven is necessary to men and animals,—more than this, the observance of the holy day of the God of mercy and of battles is our sacred duty.

"GEORGE B. MCCLELLAN,
Major-General Commanding.

"*Official:* A. V. COLBURN, Assistant Adjutant-General."

"HEAD-QUARTERS, ARMY OF THE POTOMAC,
WASHINGTON, Nov. 27, 1861.

"The Sunday morning company inspections, prescribed by Article Thirty, Revised Army Regulations, will hereafter be made at eight o'clock, A. M. Congress having by law provided for the employment of chaplains for the army, it was no doubt designed, and the General commanding directs, that no officer place obstacles in the way of a proper exercise of the functions of their office. It is therefore ordered, that in future the Sunday morning services will commence at eleven o'clock, unless manifest military reasons prevent. Commanding officers will see that all persons connected with their commands, when not on guard or other important duty requiring their constant attention, have the opportunity afforded them of attending divine service.

"The Second Article of War earnestly recommends all officers and soldiers diligently to attend divine service, and attaches a penalty for irreverent behaviour while at the place of worship.

"Chaplains will at all times be permitted to visit the camps, quarters, and hospitals within the limits of the commands to which they are attached, to hold free and uninterrupted intercourse with the officers and soldiers off duty. Chaplains will not in future be required to appear at reviews or inspections, as it is believed their time and services may be more profitably employed elsewhere.

"It is enjoined upon all persons connected with the army, to preserve at all times a respectful deportment towards chaplains, and to give them a hearty coöperation in their efforts to promote and improve the moral condition of the army.

"By command of Major-General MCCLELLAN.

"S. WILLIAMS, Assistant Adjutant-General."

Still more important is the order of the President of the United States, issued in consequence of an interview with a deputation of the New York Sabbath Committee, which were accompanied by the Secretaries of War and the Navy, and Rear-Admiral Foote, and introduced by Governor Morgan, of New York.*

"EXECUTIVE MANSION, WASHINGTON, Nov. 15, 1862.

"The President, Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, desires and enjoins the orderly observance of the Sabbath, by the officers and men in the military and naval service. The importance for man and beast, of the prescribed weekly rest, the sacred rights of Christian soldiers and sailors, a becoming deference to the best sentiment of a Christian people, and a due regard for the Divine will, demand that Sunday labour in the army and navy be reduced to the measure of strict necessity. The discipline and character of the national forces should not suffer, nor the cause they defend be imperilled, by the profanation of the day or name of the Most High. 'At this time of public distress,' adopting the words of Washington, in 1776, 'men may find enough to do in the service of God and their country, without abandoning themselves to vice and immorality.' The first general order issued by the Father of his Country, after the Declaration of Independence, indicates the spirit in which our institutions were founded and should ever be defended:

"'*The General hopes and trusts that every officer and man will endeavour to live and act as becomes a Christian soldier, defending the dearest rights and liberties of his country.*'

ABRAHAM LINCOLN."

These orders, which were read by millions of people on the very day of their publication, and translated into the German, French, and other tongues, have become part of our national history, and will remain a precedent to our rulers as long as our nation shall endure.

Thus God has overruled even the fearful profanation of the Sabbath, for its defence, by those who represent and reflect his authority in our land.

* See the facts of the interview, in Document No. XXIII.

Conclusion.

But the danger is by no means overpast. Notwithstanding the noble orders from the highest civil and military authorities of the land, and the thrilling sermons of the Almighty God of battles, there is still a most shocking amount of the kindred vices of profanity and Sabbath-breaking in our army, which fills every Christian and patriotic heart with sorrow and grief, and makes it tremble for the future. Unfortunately too many of our officers, even high in command, set the worst possible example to the soldiers. Eternal vigilance is the price not only of our liberty, but also of our Sabbath. Let all the friends of the good cause lift up their hearts and stretch out their hands for the rescue of one of the most conservative and benevolent institutions of the land. An immense work is before them. Even after a successful military settlement of the present gigantic struggle, there remains the still more difficult task of a political and social solution of our national difficulties, and in this work of reconstruction, Christianity and humanity, wisdom and charity, must take the lead. We have every encouragement to labour in this cause. We have on our side the laws of the land, the traditions of our fathers, the national tastes and habits, the dearest interests of our families and firesides, and the authority of God's word, which is more powerful than all armies and navies.

The Sabbath, like every institution of God intended for the benefit of man, must be either a great blessing, or a great curse, a savour of life unto life, or a savour of death unto death. This is especially the case with us. We need the Sabbath more than any other nation on earth. With us Christianity must stand on its own independent merits, and be rooted and grounded in the affections of a free people. It can never look to the secular power for direct support. Hence the surpassing value of pious national habits and customs, among which the reverent observance of the Sabbath is one of the most important. It stands not isolated and alone, but implies our most sacred rights and privileges, and all the blessings which emanate from public worship. Our energy and restless activity as a nation, our teeming wealth and prosperity, and our very liberty, makes

the Sabbath a special necessity for us; for it is a powerful check upon secularism and the degrading worship of the almighty dollar, and upon radicalism and licentiousness, which is death to all true freedom.

The loss of the Sabbath, with all its conservative, purifying and ennobling influences, I do not hesitate to say, would be a far greater disaster to our people North and South, than a permanent separation of the Union—this cherished idol of every loyal American heart. Take away the Sabbath, and you destroy the most humane and most democratic institution which in every respect was made for man, but more particularly for the man of labour and toil, of poverty and sorrow. Take away the Sabbath, and you destroy a mighty conservative force, and dry up a fountain from which the family, the church, and the state receive constant nourishment and support. Take away the Sabbath, and you shake the moral foundations of our national power and prosperity: our churches will be forsaken, our Sunday-schools emptied, our domestic devotions will languish, the fountains of public and private virtue will dry up; a flood of profanity, licentiousness, and vice, will inundate the land; labour will lose its reward, liberty be deprived of its pillar, self-government will prove a failure, and our republican institutions end in anarchy and confusion, to give way, in due time, to the most oppressive and degrading military despotism known in the annals of history. Yea, the end of the Sabbath would be for America the beginning of the unlimited reign of the infernal idol-trinity of Mammon, Bacchus, and Venus, and overwhelm us at last in temporal and eternal ruin.

But we confidently hope and believe that, under the protecting care of the Lord of the Sabbath, and the watchfulness of his people, it will survive the shock of this terrible civil war, and the attacks of all its foreign and domestic foes. The Sabbath will mitigate the horrors of war as long as it may last, and when it shall have spent its fury and given way to an honourable and lasting peace, it will be one of the means to remedy its evils, to heal its wounds, to build up its desolations, to cement the Union, and to regenerate the whole nation on a sound and permanent moral and religious foundation. It will continue its weekly testimony to the world at large that our freedom rests

in law and order, that we are independent of human tyranny, because we feel dependent on our God, and bow in sacred reverence before the majesty and authority of the Lord of lords and God of gods. It will continue to be one of our most cherished and sacred traditions, an essential characteristic of American Christianity, an intellectual educator, a feeder of public and private virtue, a school of discipline and self-government, a pillar of civil and religious liberty, a bond of union among all Christian denominations, and a "sign" between us and our God as long as this nation shall endure. If we honour the Lord of the Sabbath, he will honour us, sanctify and overrule our present calamities for our own good, and make us a shining light and example among the nations of the earth.

"Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord, and the people whom he hath chosen for his own inheritance."

Rev. J. C. Moffat D.D.

ART. II.—*The historically received Conception of the University, considered with especial reference to Oxford.* By EDWARD KIRKPATRICK, M. A., Oxon. Williams & Norgate, London, 1857.

IT is apparent from the structure and bearing, as well as the title of this work, that it was undertaken with a view to promote reform in the University of Oxford, and that it gradually and naturally expanded into a treatise upon university education in general. It opens with an account of the state of Oxford from the eleventh to the middle of the fourteenth century, showing the influence of that institution upon the scientific speculation of that epoch, and upon the early political life of England; the relations in which it stood to the church, and what led to the decline of its mediæval greatness. The distinctive principle of university instruction is then briefly unfolded, and the historical origin and progress of university study, from the earliest traces of its existence in Greece, until the revival of classical learning in the west of Europe. The inferences drawn from the narrative are applied chiefly to the

present degenerate condition of Oxford, but are equally just as respecting the whole subject of university instruction. This naturally leads to remarks on the German universities, in the course of which their great defects as educational institutions, their utter neglect of all means of interesting the individual student, or even of ascertaining whether he profits or not from what he hears, and their cold and utter separation between the professor and his class, are distinctly stated; while due praise is awarded to the high merit of their system, as adapted for promoting the advance of science. And the conclusion of the work returns to the subject of English university reform, and urges the benefits which are to be expected therefrom to English character generally.

The author is a native of the United States, who, after receiving a good education in his own country, went to Europe, and spent many years at the universities of Berlin and of Oxford, in the latter of which he received his master's degree, and held a fellowship for some time. In the preparation of this treatise he has enjoyed many facilities, and has executed the task in an able and scholarly manner. His particularity of reference to Oxford has, likely, confined his readers to the friends and opponents of that university; and among them he will hardly be viewed with favour by the more conservative; but the principles which he defends have nothing in their nature to limit them to one country, or one institution, more than another. They lie at the foundation of all university instruction, conducted as it ought to be.

Education, in modern times, has long been looking to and approximating towards a completeness which it has nowhere yet attained. Mediæval schools enlarged into universities, without ceasing to be primary schools. Universities they were in a sense which is nowhere in use at the present day; and, in the subsequent breaking up and remodelling of them, imperfect conceptions were still very imperfectly realized. In the United States, we behold in many places a process going on similar to that which marked the growth of the educational system of Europe. We have had, as it were, to go back to the beginning and commence anew; and in some cases have seen almost the old mediæval combinations revived. Especially in

the Western States, force of circumstances has constrained to such beginning and such course of development as greatly to resemble what belonged to early times in Europe. The history of the latter is full of instruction for us; not that we should copy by-gone facts, but avail ourselves of the truth thereby demonstrated. Nor ought we to suffer ourselves to be shackled by questions of name and of original condition. It is not these we have now to deal with, but present practical division of labour and profitable discharge of duty to society.

Modern education is the outgrowth of mediæval schools; and for both its planting and culture, through many successive centuries, is chiefly indebted to the church.

When the thousandth year of the Christian era had fairly passed by, as well as the millennial anniversary of the Saviour's passion, and the earth was found to have survived the dreaded crisis, and human life and property to be not less secure than before, the long-despondent and drooping nations of the west began to take heart, and set about the enterprises of this life with renewed activity. But the first succeeding generation had to pass off the stage, before the effects of reviving hope began to appear. Recuperation declared itself feebly at first, but with increasing energy, and, before the close of that eleventh century, with a narrow, but concentrated power, which has left its mark upon history to this day. The revival of monachism upon a more civilized basis, under the auspices of Clugny, the revival of the papacy by Hildebrand, followed by the first Crusade, were movements which determined the character of society, of government, and of warfare, for many hundred years. At the same time, a new activity began to appear in the schools, which, although diminished in number and reduced to the baldest rudiments, had never, even in the tenth century, entirely ceased to exist in some religious houses.

The new nations, which, in the time of Charlemagne, had been constrained to retain their places upon the lands then occupied by them respectively, and to accept peaceful organization, now gave birth to youth whose intellectual activities, no longer occupied fully by war, demanded some other employment. In the church, a new field of ambition and of enterprise had opened, where some little learning was indispensable to

success. The few existing schools began to receive increase of students, and others were established or revived. Wofully scanty was the instruction afforded in their regular classes, and improvement was made slowly. To supply the deficiency, in connection with some of them, lectures were given on the theological questions of the day. The growing demand for instruction attached an importance to those lectures, far above their real merits; and numbers assembled in the schools where they were delivered, for the sole purpose of hearing them. For a time, intellectual effort was misdirected thereby. Improvement of primary education was overlooked. Youth crowded to hear lectures, without being properly qualified to profit by them. The notoriety of the evil, in course of time, called attention to its remedy; and during the twelfth century, the elements of instruction in the schools received important additions. Something had already been done for mathematics by importation from the Moorish schools of Spain. Now the logic of Aristotle, coming through the same channel, gave a new impulse to the rising rhetorical and dialectic tendencies.

Still it was the lectures which constituted the attraction of the schools in those days, and both supplied the demand for mental culture and incited to it. The lecturers became the intellectual heroes of Europe; lecturing the channel of literary ambition. Theology furnished the subject-matter, and the Aristotelian logic pointed out the method.

The Romish church had come into the inheritance of the western authority of imperial Rome, and every question of popular interest was concerned with it or its dogmas. Theology was the all-absorbing subject of discussion among educated men. With but rare exceptions, the scholastic lecturers treated of no other. Taken under the patronage of Rome, they defended, with all their ingenuity, her dogmas and practices.

A singular literature was that of the schoolmen. Addressed not to the popular ear, not to the taste of wealthy patrons, but to students—students of theology alone. To the more or less educated, who attended the schools, or who had enjoyed their instructions, it had no view to either popular edification or entertainment; it was truly, as commonly called, scholastic.

Latin had long ago ceased to be vernacular, and few wrote it any longer in its purity; but it was the only language of letters in the west of Europe; and some degree of education was involved in obtaining such an acquaintance with it, as to read and speak it fluently, and understand lectures delivered in it. In church service, the retaining of Latin completely defeated the purposes of instruction—was a pall hung over public worship, concealing its meaning from the uneducated people. But in the schools it became a stimulus, and created a necessity for a degree of labour, and of consequent mental training, which otherwise would not have existed. By this means, a separation was made between the educated and uneducated, greater perhaps than had ever been known in the world before.

The most beautiful efforts of Cicero could be understood by all who heard him, ignorant of letters though they might be; for his language was also theirs. The speeches of Demosthenes, and the dialogues of Plato, were in the idiom spoken in the streets of Athens. Even the inspired utterances of the Hebrew prophets were meant for instruction of the people, and used the language in which the poorest son of Israel conducted his daily business, and exchanged opinions with his neighbours. And hence, although formal instruction in letters was far from universal in any of those nations, their city populations were comparatively well informed. They lived in the atmosphere of language pervaded with intelligence, and their public speakers were continually urging new facts and arguments upon their attention. But now a state of society had arisen, in which the language of the people had parted company with intelligence. Latin still retained its inheritance of letters and instruction; but the people knew it not, and their own speech was a jargon. It was the condition to produce the lowest degree of popular ignorance—to impair the true ambition of the scholar—to make him content with, and even vain of the most superficial attainments; and yet to make a difference between him and the uneducated, greater than ever existed in the history of civilization at any other time. To a general or promiscuous public, the schoolmen, in their writings, had no view whatever; but such was the multitude of students who attended upon the

lectures of some of them, that many of the effects of a great popularity were exerted upon their own minds, while the assembled youth were a public to themselves, and a general quickening of intellect resulted in the case of both.

Other eminent scholastics laid out their efforts in improving the regular instruction and discipline of the schools, and in procuring endowments for them. The one class coöperated with the other. While under Berengarius, Lanfranc, Anselm, Robert Puleyn, and others, the schools of Tours, Bec, Paris, Oxford, and elsewhere, received more thorough organization and better tuition, Roscelin of Compeigne, William of Champeaux, and Peter Abelard, threw around them attractions for the maturer intellect, and gathered within their precincts multitudes, which both added to their reputation and furnished a species of intellectual culture which the recitations of the class could never provide. The church also adopted measures for the encouragement of learning. By the third Lateran council, which sat in 1179, it was decreed that, "Since the church of God, as a pious mother, is bound to provide that opportunity for learning should not be withdrawn from the poor, who are without patrimonial riches, in every cathedral there shall be a master to teach both clerks and poor scholars gratis." Another decree, of a similar import, was issued in the latter part of the pontificate of Innocent III., (1215) and others at other times.

In the old cathedral and conventual schools, the person who had charge of the preliminary branches, was called the *scholasticus*, and the teacher of theology the *theologus*. The course went no further; and some of the poorer institutions had only the preparatory branches.

In some places youth were brought together by the reputation of illustrious teachers of law, as at Bologna; or of medicine, as at Salerno, constituting schools less directly under control of the church. Consequently, from at least as early as the eleventh century, there were two classes of great schools, the theological and the scientific. The former prevailed in the north and west, including the German empire, the countries on the Baltic, England and Paris; the latter in Italy and France, except Paris.

By such means there were assembled at some seats of learning, from the twelfth century, such numbers of students as find no parallel in any such places at the present day. And with increase of numbers, the regularity of classification and of discipline became more imperative. The students were arranged, or arranged themselves, according to the houses in which they lodged; every such house having its own internal government, and all the houses, departments of study, and stages of progress were grouped together under one head of general legislation, by the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. And the term *universitas* was applied to the corporation embracing the whole.

A few such seats of learning made more illustrious name than the rest, and reached maturity sooner. Paris was at the head of all the theological universities, and next was Oxford, a rival, who followed fast, and sometimes outstripped her senior in the race. Through all the thirteenth century, those two great institutions maintained their position far in advance of every other. The numbers in attendance upon their classes and lectures varied greatly from time to time; occasionally reduced by disaffection and rebellion to a few hundreds, and again swelled by some tide of popularity to more than as many thousands. In process of time, the theological universities adopted also the faculties of law and of medicine; and theology was introduced into Bologna.

We cannot count the constitution of the universities, as such, from an earlier date than the middle of the twelfth century; but so rapid was their growth, that in the thirteenth century they had reached the full tide of prosperity; the very prime of their mediæval style.

A mediæval university, of the theological type at least, was simply the aggregate of all the departments taught, and all the different stages of progress in education, as conducted in one city, from the primary school up to the doctor's degree. The expansion of the schools had been the work of circumstances, not the effect of preconceived design; and every addition and improvement was accumulated upon the original basis, and still grouped under one head; and the resultant whole still held the position of its basis. Thus Oxford was at once the chief gram-

mar school of England, the great free school for the poor, the seat of liberal culture, and of professional education for students of theology, and in its best days, also of law and of medicine.

The routine of school study had previously consisted of two series—one literary, consisting of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, and called the *Trivium;* the other scientific, consisting of four branches—arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, and called the *Quadrivium.* Both were now extended, but especially the *Trivium;* because logic belonged to it. And logic now assumed supreme importance, as the instrument of the new speculative philosophy. The *Quadrivium*, for a time, sank relatively to the position of a preparatory course. Out of the further development of these original studies grew the faculty of arts, and out of their dialectics, the new philosophical theology, with its faculty. Upon the introduction of law and medicine, two new faculties were formed, one of which, namely, that of medicine, had its affinities more directly with the *Quadrivium;* thereby leading to the improvement, and enhancing the estimate of that branch of the arts. Thus arose the four faculties, namely, of the Arts, of Theology, of Law, and of Medicine—*facultas*, in the first instance, signifying the ability to teach in any one branch; and then, afterwards, being "applied to the authorized teachers of it collectively."

In respect to their internal government, those institutions were more or less republican. The University of Bologna was a corporation of students, who had come together for the purpose of attending upon the instructions of certain eminent teachers of law, resident in that city; and its earliest statutes were compacts entered into by the students for mutual support and assistance. They elected their own officers, and maintained their own order. The University of Paris, on the other hand, was an association of teachers connected with the ecclesiastical schools in that place. But much of the democratic element of the Italian universities prevailed there also, regarding the body of teachers and students as a *demos.* And the same spirit extended to others, which followed the example of Paris. This was eminently the case in Oxford, which exhibited more than usual of the turbulence of democracy.

Mediæval universities formed a community among themselves, speaking a common language, having a common occupation, recognising in greater or less degree the authority of one church; and united with the stronger attachment to each other, that they were separated from the people of the different countries in which they were planted. The universities of Paris and of Oxford were not confined in their influence to the bounds of France and of England. They belonged to the church. Paris was as free to Englishmen as Oxford to Frenchmen, or to scholars from any nation in Europe; and students would migrate from one to the other by thousands. The Italian universities continued to be less ecclesiastical, their tendency more legal and practical. Their principal model was that of Bologna; while Paris and Oxford were the head-quarters of the speculative theology, and the models of the ecclesiastical universities.

As time rolled on towards the middle of the fourteenth century, the scholastic philosophy began to decline, and the revival of classical learning to enlist that zeal of youth which had so long been absorbed by the war of dialectics. But the old universities were slow to admit the classics to a corresponding place in their course of studies. Consequently, the attendance upon them rapidly fell off, and continued to be comparatively small through most of the fifteenth century, while other institutions of learning were being built up elsewhere, to meet and promote the growing desire for a classical and æsthetical culture. But although slowly, yet ultimately the old universities submitted to the change, whereby the ancient classics and a new philosophy were substituted for scholasticism. And as the sixteenth century dawned, most of them could present eminent professors, teaching the liberal views and improved scholarship of the time, and even broaching the question of an improved theology. But that again prepared the way for another ordeal through which they had to pass.

The Reformation was a tremendous shock to the universities. For it was out of them that its principal agencies proceeded. By them had the world been prepared to accept that revolution,

and out of their halls stepped the men who conducted and sustained it. From the University of Paris came the demand for papal reform, as early as the fourteenth century. In the University of Oxford, in the latter part of the same century, did Wyckliffe commence the war upon long-persistent abuses. The University of Basle led the way to réformation in Switzerland. In the University of Wittenberg, Luther and Melancthon were professors. From that of Paris went forth Farel, and Viret, and Calvin. In the universities of England were prepared the theologians of the reign of Edward VI., and there did Bucer and Peter Martyr find refuge, and in the University of St. Andrews did the reformation of Scotland open its career, and offer up its first martyr, and there were prepared for their work and their suffering, Hamilton, Buchanan, and Knox. The Reformation was, under Providence, emphatically the offspring of the universities. And most of them suffered severely from the conflict which it involved. It was inevitable that the seat of war should be most deeply agitated by the strife. And when they emerged into peace at its close, it was to find themselves broken and divided, some having triumphed and maintained their place on the side of the Reformation, and others having been repulsed from the ground once occupied, and driven back towards the position of the middle ages. But the good effected ultimately redounded to the benefit of all. Enlarged and enlightened intellect was addressed to their improvement in more distinct separation and classification of the work of the old universities, and in the establishment of new upon improved principles. From all of them, at one time and another, the preparatory schools were separated, and set up by themselves at various places over the country.

The university course, as retained, still consisted of two distinct departments, the liberal and the professional. Four years, or thereby, were devoted to the studies of the *Trivium*, and such additions as had been made thereto, at the end of which the student was entitled to the degree of Bachelor of Arts. Three years more were given to the *Quadrivium*, as improved and enlarged, which, together with the foregoing course, constituted the curriculum of the arts, upon the com-

pleting of which, the student received the degree of Master of Arts.*

So far, the studies pertained entirely to liberal culture. The next course was that of professional education, occupying a different number of years according to the profession selected. In Oxford, by the Laudian statutes, the course of legal study was six or seven years, after taking the Master's degree; the medical course was seven years, and the theological eleven years from the Master's degree. At the close of his professional course, the student was honoured with the title of Doctor, in law, in medicine, or in theology, according to the profession he had studied. Those degrees were then not mere honours. They signified real degrees of attainment. The Baccalaureate signified that the student had finished the *Trivium*, as improved, and the other degrees were certificates and licenses to teach or to practice the professions to which they were attached.

The latter part of the sixteenth century saw the rise of the Dutch universities, those benign fruits of the Reformation, which continued to be the highest seats of learning for the next two hundred years.

In the course of the eighteenth century, and especially in the latter part of it, the German universities began to take the place of precedence which they now hold. Their position was taken upon the principle of more perfect separation of departments. Not only was the grammar-school left off, but the college also, including most of those studies required for the Bachelor's degree. The Master's course was made coördinate with the professional, and assigned to the faculty of arts, or of philosophy, in the university, with its analogous degree of Doctor in philosophy.

Consequently there was a trial of education established, and carried out with more or less precision in the different German states, consisting of the School, confined to preparatory discipline; the College, under one name and another, assigned to liberal culture alone; and the University, provided with professional instruction, as well as with the means of further pur-

* Oxford University Commission Report, page 56.

suit of liberal education for those whose leisure and taste dispose them thereto.

The proper and distinctive work of the university, as thus defined, is professional instruction in all professions requiring a basis of previous liberal culture.

In the French Revolution of last century, the University of Paris, together with all the other universities of France, was entirely swept away. Public instruction was organized on a new plan by Napoleon I. That plan was abolished by Louis XVIII., who attempted one of his own, which was defeated by Napoleon's return from Elba. Upon the reconstruction of the government, after the battle of Waterloo, the subject of education was put into the hands of a commission, under the presidency of the illustrious Royar Collard, who adopted, substantially, the ideas of Napoleon. According to the method then preferred, and still pursued in France, it is held that "the university is nothing else than government applied to the universal direction of public instruction." First in the series of institutions are the common schools, of different grades; then the colleges and lyceums, both pertaining to the department of liberal culture, and highest in rank are the academies, which are local divisions of the university, and distributed over France to the number of twenty-seven. The central authority over all, and head of the university, is at Paris. It is, in brief, the plan of the mediæval university distributed systematically over the whole of France.

As long as the universities retained their mediæval type, those of England, namely, Oxford and Cambridge, maintained their position among the first; but they have not kept up with the progress of improvement. Their mediæval course and professions are no longer practical, and no adequate provision has been made for supplying their place; and to model Oxford or Cambridge to the proper shape and for the proper functions of a university, as now defined, would require a thoroughness of reform which Englishmen of the present day are slow to make. Meanwhile, the teaching of the great universities of England has been suffered to degenerate—the professorships have become virtually sinecures—the regularly constituted teachers have ceased to teach—lectures on the standard studies of pro-

fessional preparation are almost silent, and the only thing belonging to the recognised system, which continues really in force, is the order of examinations. The best part of an English education is that which belongs to the collegiate schools, such as Eaton, Harrow, and Rugby. As far as pertains to teaching, the universities of Oxford and Cambridge have become merely establishments where young men prepare, as best they can, for examination. Their practical course only carries forward to a higher point the work of the school, and answers, to some degree, the purposes of liberal culture: that is, the work done is of the nature of that which belongs to the college, but is executed in a manner having no claim to superiority, being left to the hands of tutors, who are generally youth recently graduated, without depth of learning or tested skill in teaching. The tutor is hired by his pupils, and is their sole instructor in all branches—the proper work of the university those institutions have ceased to perform. Intelligent friends of education in England are making efforts to improve them, both as to substance and style of teaching, with what effect, it will take many years to demonstrate.

American universities are not so narrow as the English, but they are shallower. They are more liberal in the range of study, better supplied with experienced teachers, and their professional course is a reality; but they are more hampered by the brevity of time as compared with what is attempted to be done, and by the general poverty of school preparation. They too come short of that clearness of discrimination which would assign them to their proper functions. Invariably they retain the college as a part of their course, and constitute it their faculty of arts. Consequently they have nothing which corresponds to the second course in the arts, and the Master's degree is a mere empty title. At the same time, the attempt to combine the college with the university always produces an incongruous hybrid. The two parts will not cohere. They cannot properly be governed on the same principle. The university is a place of study for men of minds well cultivated by liberal education, where they learn the professions to which they propose to devote their lives. And it is as desirable that they should be completely separated from the college, where

immature youth are trained in the liberal arts, as it is that these latter should be separated from the grammar-school, where boys are drilled into the elements. Each one can conduct its own work better alone.

In America, the best university is that which is established, in various places over the country, in law schools, medical schools, normal schools, and theological seminaries. Unencumbered by any connection with colleges, these institutions conduct their own work, after their own proper manner, in the most effective way. Nor are we aware of any important advantage to be derived from assembling them all at one place, while much is to be secured by each one selecting the locality most suitable for itself.

The university, as distinguished from the school and college, is the professional part of a complete education; and its pupils are liberally educated men, already trained to a manly freedom, and to recognise its proper limits, and determined to their respective purposes in life. Its internal government must be addressed to the ends of maintaining order by eliciting voluntary coöperation, bringing out the approval of judgment, and the action of conscience. Its peculiar restraints, over and above those of general society, are such as belong to a voluntary association for the attainment of a common end; and it consists of various coördinate branches having their own respective regulations, appropriate to the end in view, as theology, law, medicine, philosophy, teaching.

The methods of instruction proper to the university, are such as to aid the independent studies of mature minds, as lectures, conversation on the subject of books assigned to be read; demonstrations by means of drawings, models, maps, charts, or of the actual subject; experiments, examinations, and practice in the formal processes of the designed profession. For the purpose of compelling attention, and training imperfectly educated minds, in small classes, the best method is that of assigned reading, and special examination thereupon. But lecturing is the most generally useful in the university, being the best for awakening interest in a subject, for presenting broad views of it, for generalization, and indispensable for statement of new discoveries and new views, for demonstrations and

experiments, and for cases in which adequate text-books do not exist.

The original and fundamental method of teaching was that of dictating what was to be learned, making the pupil commit it to memory, and afterwards examining him upon it, to test his understanding of it, correct his errors, and fix the whole in his mind. According to that method, as the class advanced, dictation expanded into the freer and broader current of lecture, in which a more matured capacity of apprehension was assumed, and called into exercise. By the introduction of text-books, the whole course was greatly improved, but especially its early stages. Dictation can now be laid aside, although still practised to some extent with profit. The student can generally, in the part of his education to which that method originally belonged, do better for himself in mastering passages assigned to be read, if he is afterwards thoroughly examined thereupon. But, at the stage of progress where anciently dictation ripened into lecture, there is still nothing which can entirely take the place of the old method. For the use of lecture is not all summed up in supplying the lack of books. It has still to serve that purpose on many points; but is now far more needed, on account of the unmanageable number of books.

It is profitable to have a person to present us with the substantial teaching of all that pertains to our subject of study. One man may thereby save as well as direct the time and efforts of many. Many do the work for one hundred as well as they could do it for themselves; and, if properly equipped with the gifts of a teacher, a great deal better. The time which it cost him to read and digest, is saved to the one hundred, who can verify the whole in comparatively brief time, and have so much more to spend upon some other branch of their profession; or starting from the point to which they have thus been taken, can carry forward the work of exploration in the same field. They are also thus initiated into a subject with all the advantages of a general view. A broad foundation is laid for future improvement, and a skeleton map spread out, upon which every additional item can be afterwards jotted down in its proper place.

To master the literature of a profession, and the substance of all its instructions, is the work of a lifetime; and, in some professions, is too much for the longest human life. But one man, by devoting his whole attention to a single branch, may be able to present at least the amount of what is to be found in that branch, in a course of lectures not too prolonged for a place in the preparatory studies of the profession. And thus a corps of professors, each confining himself to his own department, and labouring assiduously therein, can furnish, within a few years, an amount of information which no one of themselves, in his whole life, could collect and digest. It is of no little benefit to feel the influence proceeding from a mind kindled by enthusiastic pursuit of one department of science, and of deep insight into its laws. To catch a portion of that enthusiasm, may be worth more than the instructions of a three years' course.

In all professions, the power of correct and rapid observation, and assignment of things to their classes, is of inestimable value. And there is no better discipline of mind to that end, which education can propose, than the habit of listening to didactic lectures, with a view to being examined on them. It is an exercise tending to the highest intellectual maturity, to control attention to such a lecture, to apprehend truly its particular statements, its general plan and purport, while it is in the course of delivery, and to retain and marshal the whole in mind for future use.

It is certainly pleasant to follow a teacher who is able to enlist attention and retain it; but it is of far more educational value for the student to command his own attention to whatsoever his duty requires. The former is only to yield to the mastery of another; the latter is an act of self-control, going to render a man master of his own powers. The habit of mind formed by being entertained is superficial, never dares to penetrate beyond the outward effects of anything. To the solid basis of the beautiful and entertaining it never reaches. And consequently can never produce that excellence which it admires, and is ever helplessly dependent upon the labours of others. It will be delighted with the colours and garniture of a lecture, but reluctates against the analysis which would detect

and comprehend its structure, and learn how the work was done. It will be entertained with a narrative, but never discern the philosophy whereby it was made entertaining. Such a habit of mind can hardly be said to take hold of any thing, it is rather led captive at the will of others. It is not a result of education, except in as far as the capacity to enjoy certain objects goes. To be able to take interest in objects of science and art, and their nice discriminations, to be impressible by the finest shades of beautiful affection, does certainly belong to the best fruits of mental culture; but the mere capacity to be entertained does not. The least educated are the more easily entertained, and at the least expense: none so easily as a child. It is a source of much pleasure to oneself, but cannot make one useful to others. It can never enable a man to work—to produce any of the effects which an educated man is expected to produce for the benefit of society. On the other hand, to be able to command one's attention to any given subject, is one of the most valuable fruits of a good education. Nothing more distinguishes the educated from the uneducated, the well educated from the poorly educated. And where it exists by nature, it is the stamp of a superior order of intellect.

Such a disposition of mind is not merely attracted by the flowers of discourse. It inquires also whence they grow, and follows to the roots whence their nutriment is drawn, examines how they are planted, and learns to reproduce and diversify them. It studies and masters the frame-work and details of a beautiful edifice, until, if not able to construct another such, it is prepared to take a higher kind and degree of enjoyment in seeing it done.

A man, in acquiring this power over his own attention, secures also power over the minds of others. All persons who do not possess it, have a natural tendency to lean upon him who does. And every educated man ought to be such as his uneducated neighbours can have recourse to, as not only better informed touching his profession, but also as better able to turn all the powers of his mind with effect to any emergency which may arise among them.

The young commit a serious mistake who attach themselves exclusively to that which is entertaining among their studies.

It is not to be rejected where occurring naturally, but by far the most profitable to them is that intellectual effort whereby they take hold of and master what is unattractive. To be able to do that, is the best sign of their real progress. And that student is earning the most glorious triumphs, who, pushing through the outworks of an uninviting science, fighting his way manfully with every obstacle, at length reaches a point where the symmetry of the whole lies before him, and the delight of conquered knowledge dawns upon his heart. That is the man who will make an impression on the society in which he lives, if not upon the broader world, to be remembered long.

The effort of properly attending to lectures is one which requires a considerable degree of mental training, such as is seldom found short of the higher classes in college, and there only in the case of those who have been faithful to their previous studies. How often has the teacher been pained, even in his highest classes, to find upon examination, in the case of some of his pupils, that what he had laboured to make plain has been entirely misunderstood, the very words he uttered not heard aright, the meanings of plain English missed, scattered fragments put into incongruous connection, and his whole aim uncomprehended, from sheer imbecility of attention. Youth in the latter part of their college course ought to be trained and practised in the art of listening to lectures. It is a most desirable practical power, and should be acquired before reaching the university. For lecturing constitutes, and always must constitute, the principal means by which to aid men of liberally educated minds in the studies of their profession; and the habit of correctly hearing, and scrupulously reporting, is of incalculable profit for every day of a man's life.

Popular lecturing is necessarily a different affair, inasmuch as, in that case, a mixed audience is addressed, and mental preparation cannot be presumed upon. The popular lecture must take the character of entertainment—must be light, sketchy, illustrative, making as little demand as possible upon that attention, which is felt to be an effort, and must be of the nature of popular oratory. It belongs to the head of amusements, takes its place with the theatre and dramatic readings, and consequently has little to do with the subject of education.

The tutorial method of instruction is that which is best suited to boys at school, and for the earlier part of college training; the lecture is best for aiding the studies of mature minds, and ought to be combined with recitation in the more advanced part of the college course; while in the university it becomes necessarily the prevailing method. In college, the grand objects in view have reference to self-culture, to formation of habits of attention, of diligence, of reading, command of the natural faculties, and regular and constant application. Of course, it is of no little importance what the material of study is, but much more is the intellectual discipline which it furnishes. In the university, on the other hand, the great concern is the subject matter of study. The student, it is presumed, is already imbued with liberal culture, and is now to apply himself to his life's work, and what he needs is introductory information and direction of habits thereto.

Conversation, or examination, making of abstracts and epitomes, or writing of essays on the subject, should always attend upon a course of lectures, as helpful, if not indispensable, to the digesting and assimilating of the instruction received. Taking of notes during the delivery of a lecture is undoubtedly best for the majority of students; and yet it argues an imperfect preparation of mind. It were better to grasp the whole discourse, as a unit, by one continuous effort of attention. The notes should be written when the student returns to his study.

It is in the university especially that the instructor ought, as far as practicable, to be the friend and companion of his pupils. At that stage of education, there is much to be learned from a man of experience in the profession, which can be acquired in no other way than by associating with him; much which he would never think of putting into a lecture, much which he is himself not aware that he possesses. He must be a scanty thinker in his profession, who, after he has put down all that he deems worthy of being mentioned, has not still much more that might be added, and which, to others less versed in the subject, may be of as much value as what he has written. There is a certain indescribable facility imbibed from such free and informal intercourse. Of what inestimable profit must it have been to the young minister of the gospel to have enjoyed the

social hours, and accompanied the pastoral labours of him who wrote "A Pastor's Sketches," or of the author of the work on "Religious Experience"? As touching the latter, we do know that those so highly favoured recur to it with even more evident felicitation than to his public instructions, highly as those latter were esteemed.

On this point the example of antiquity is worth considering. It was that branch of education, which corresponds to the university, which in Greece was taught almost entirely by means of social intercourse with the teacher. It was not grammar nor the elements of mathematics that students sought from Protagoras, Prodicus, Gorgias, Socrates, Plato, or Aristotle; but that instruction which was to be directly addressed to their profession, and their only idea of attendance was that of associating with whomsoever they selected as a teacher. The example of the schools of the prophets looks in the same direction. And in the ministry of our great Master and exampler, he has left us an explicit and unmistakable lesson. Although he occasionally delivered formal addresses before his disciples and the people, his regular and every-day method in preparing his followers for their work was that of associating with them. Of course, in following the example of Christ, in those respects in which he is presented as an object of imitation, we cannot forget that the model is perfect, and any human approximation must be very distant. Moreover, there is much in the varying conditions of society which goes to modify the style of social intercourse, and both students and professors have much study-work to do, which ought to set limits to the time spent in social intercourse. Of all these things both parties should be prudently thoughtful. But, after all deductions, it still remains true that free social intercourse between student and teacher is an invaluable element of university education. And so it seems to be recognised by the practitioners of law and of medicine. In those professions, while students are required to attend lectures, it is also the custom for each student to put himself under the private tuition of some experienced practitioner, and to attend upon him through all the details of his business, and learn to apply his attainments by assisting in the easier cases.

Why young ministers of the gospel do not seek a similar

way of spending their vacations, is perhaps to be accounted for solely from the fact that it is not exacted of them, inasmuch as, although it was at one time the sole method of ministerial education, yet since the establishment of theological seminaries, it has been too rashly assumed that the whole work can be done in the lecture-room. There is profit in colportage and school-teaching, but not so directly to the purpose as would be the spending of some part of the vacation in society with a faithful pastor, in witnessing his method of conducting pastoral labour, and in assisting therein; provided also, that the pastor do not exact more help of his student than lawyers and physicians are wont to exact of theirs. Some pastors are very thoughtless in this respect, and merely to relieve themselves of a little labour, will urge a young man prematurely into the most arduous duties, sometimes much to his mortification, if not greater injury; as bold swimmers will throw one who cannot swim into deep water, in the expectation that he will instinctively strike out to save his life. Nor would this be so detrimental, were they as ready or expert as such good swimmers generally are to rescue those who prove unable to sustain themselves. We have known a pastor to make very unkind remarks upon a pulpit performance, which but for his own urgency would have been held back for further preparation. Students, in such cases, are still to be treated as students—as learners—with care and tenderness, and not obtruded upon the congregation in the light of pretenders, to be mortified.

Advantages of education are to be found in the theological seminary, which no private tuition can supply. The fact of being set apart from other society for the express purpose of study, of itself fixes the attention upon the work. The presence of others similarly employed, and the laudable emulation thereby created, are a generating source of intellectual energy. And the interchange of thought among many engaged on the same subjects, goes to quicken, enlarge, and diversify the ideas, as no solitary reading ever can. And the benefit derived from intercourse with a number of youth zealous in the love of the Lord, is a torch to a cold and laggard heart, while the spiritual influence reciprocally established between a faithful teacher and an attentive class, confers upon both a degree of power,

which otherwise neither could attain unto. And the combined zeal of a large number kindles into an enthusiasm, which could never arise betwcen two or three. But while such is the case, on the other hand, the homely familiarity with actual work, which is to be acquired by associating with a pastor in his daily duties, ought not to be entirely neglected.

With the university the course of education divides into several channels, according to the different pursuits contemplated in life. The preparatory work of school, and liberal culture of college, are equally necessary to all educated men; but at the close of the college curriculum the field expands and prcsents a prospect of still further expansion without end. It is no longer practicable for one person to cultivate the whole. Every man, at this point, must choose some one portion of it, to which he will devote his life. If he errs in selecting, he can correct his error only by turning back to the common starting point, and beginning anew. To change the figure, the roads henceforward to be pursued, diverge as they pass through the gates of the university, and although never losing sight of each other, and throughout holding interesting mutual relations, they never come together again.

This divergent character of the different courses of university education, was recognised in a crude but decided manner in the great institutions of the twelfth century. Originally each university had some single professional aim. Paris, for example, had a view to theology alone; Bologna to law, and others, as Salerno, to medicine. They were solely theological, legal, or medical universities. It was an error of later times, when all the faculties were assembled in each of the greater of those institutions, to conceive of the whole as one course, and as merely the continuation of liberal culture. Recent improvement tends to more distinct segregation of the different branches, with a view to professional ends.

Youth do not assemble in the university as in a college, merely to improve their minds, nor to enjoy themselves in the pursuits of literature and science for their own sake, but expressly and specifically for the purpose of preparing to execute the work to which their lives are to be devoted. A liking should, by all means, be cultivated for study, for the subjects

of knowledge and for the exercises which belong to the profession; little will be effected if the heart is not engaged in the work; but the university is not the place to yield oneself to impractical speculation, objectless reading, or dilettanteism of any kind. Here begins the definite and hard work of life. The question, how will this promote my professional usefulness, which was utterly out of place in school and college, becomes, in the university, the true—the only question. As in a camp of instruction, here every exercise should have direct reference to future duties.

Upon the whole, the great aim of the university is to instruct, promote, and direct professional enterprise. The school is a system of constraints, the college of mingled constraints and inducements, designed to guide to correct independent action; the university is a commonwealth of minds already committed to their own responsibility. Its work is fully to equip, and furnish the circumstances for the full equipment of professional talent and enterprise, and the effect of that work upon society has always, when faithfully executed, been progress in improvement, and conservatism of privileges once attained: it has been general diffusion of that higher intelligence, which originates public measures, which moderates impulses, and sustains and gives weight to the authority of law, and creates and expounds a healthy public sentiment. The best service a man can render his country is generally in the line of his profession, but there is also an indefinable influence for good or evil wielded by every respectable professional man through his intercourse with society, and which increases in power and extent with his professional reputation. Consequently, a common duty, belonging to all educated men, is that of guiding public sentiment aright; that is, in a manner conducive to the good order of the community, to the support of enlightened patriotism and the cause of God.

All the professions, and the educated in general, are under obligation to this duty; but in an especial manner does it rest upon ministers of the gospel. Their principal work is to address the public—all ranks and classes of the public, without exception—for the very purpose of affecting sentiment and opinion; and the doctrine of Christ which they proclaim is,

more than all others, of a nature to influence both the heart and understanding of those persuaded to accept it. By the Spirit of God it is carried to the convictions of men one by one; but the office of the preacher is to publish it abroad to every creature, to proclaim it alike in public and in private, to the largest congregations he can assemble, and to the single hearer whom Providence puts in his way. No other profession is so directly concerned with the formation of public sentiment; and the model with which it is furnished being the gospel, no other profession has the means of usefulness so largely and purely to the common end of all the highest culture. This, even if our profession extended to nothing higher, is enough to give it transcendent importance in the eyes of all who contemplate the best ends of education.

Another feature belonging to all professions upon their widely divergent paths, which is also to all of them an indispensable condition of success, is freedom of enterprise. No factitious restraints must be suffered to limit investigation, experiment, or expression. Progress in intellectual pursuits, and defence of the truth as known, requires all the liberty, in this respect, which the law of God confers. Freedom of enterprise is the arena of man's highest usefulness, and we ought not to be satisfied with less than the whole of it. The natural and most effective opponent of despotic power, there is no other which violence is more prone to repress, and none which it behoves the friends of human well-being more jealously to guard. God, in his word and by creation, has assigned its proper bounds, and men ought to accept no other. While, on behalf of the uneducated, they defend the freedom of labour, educated men are interested, for their own sake, in maintaining the unshackled freedom of enterprise. The cause is one. Without freedom of labour, enterprise dies in embryo, and when enterprise is extinguished, the labour of the hands becomes the task-work of slaves.

They are the studies of the university which have no natural termination. The work of the school comes to an end, when its pupils are adequately prepared for college, or have so mastered the elements as to be able to prosecute their studies by themselves. The work of the college ceases when its classes

have finished the curriculum assigned for liberal culture, and are thereby properly qualified to take up the studies of the university; but the work of the university initiates men into that career which, as long as they are useful to the world, has no end. In an especial manner may this be asserted of that branch of university instruction which pertains to the gospel ministry; inasmuch as that profession, while addressing itself to the whole breadth of the present life, is chiefly concerned with the interests of eternity. The work upon which the theological student enters, is no longer that of mere self-culture, to terminate when he emerges from the walls of the seminary. It is the work of his life, whereby he is to be useful to the world, in the service of God. Its aim is not the excellence of literature, of learning, or of philosophy, except as means to an end; is not the honours of scholarship, but the duties of his profession, singly, simply, and alone. And that profession demands the time as well as the energies of the whole temporal being. The theological student has enlisted in a service from which there is no honourable discharge, as long as God shall grant the ability to labour in his name.

Up to the end of their college course, youth receive education for their own sake; in the university they learn to be useful to others. And although that end is to be attained in a thousand different ways, yet in the main it is through the channel of professional effort. The work of education becomes the more solemn and catholic as it advances; and the more closely it draws the bonds of every-day business around the scholar, in his proper calling, the wider is the influence which it awards him in society. From the liberal culture of the individual, it descends to his professional duties, in order that through professional duties it may rise towards the liberal culture of the race.

By Lyman Atwater D.D

ART. III.— *Witherspoon's Theology.*

THE Rev. George Duffield, D. D., of Detroit, Michigan, makes the following statement in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, for July, 1863. It occurs in the article entitled "Doctrines of the New-school Presbyterians," on page 598.

"The writings of Drs. Hopkins, Bellamy, Emmons, Dwight, Woods, Taylor, and other New England divines, have had more or less influence among both the Old and New-school Presbyterians. But few, if any, have had greater authority, or done more to put a distinctive stamp upon the theological views of New-school Presbyterians, on the subject of regeneration especially, than the renowned, learned, and patriotic Dr. John Witherspoon, President of Princeton College, and a member of Congress and signer of the Declaration of Independence."

This novel and interesting piece of intelligence can hardly fail to attract attention. For its novelty is surpassed only by its importance. Writings which have exercised a commanding and decisive influence in moulding the "distinctive" principles of so large and influential a body of Christians, certainly deserve, and if this be true of them, will unquestionably receive, an attention which for the last half century has not been accorded to them. It will assist in understanding the import of the foregoing statement, if we quote, for the benefit of our readers, some passages from Dr. Witherspoon's works, on the points chiefly controverted between Old and New-school Presbyterians, and from their peculiar views regarding which, the latter receive their distinctive characteristics. We therefore ask attention to Dr. Witherspoon's views of some leading issues between the two schools.

1. *Of Original Sin.*

One great difficulty with many of our New-school brethren has been in reference to admitting the federal headship and representative character of Adam; the consequent imputation of his sin to his posterity, whereby they are reckoned to have sinned in him, and are treated and punished accordingly, so that their abandonment, on the part of God, to depravity and

corruption, is the penal effect of that sin. On these points Dr. Witherspoon uses the following language:

"It appears that Adam, in the covenant of works, was to be considered as the federal head and representative of the human race, as he was then the natural head. By the manner in which the human race was to descend from him, the punishment inflicted upon him must of course descend to them." *Witherspoon's Works*, Vol. IV., p. 93.

"As to the effect of Adam's sin upon his posterity, it seems very plain that the state of corruption and wickedness which men are now in, is stated in Scripture as being the effect and punishment of Adam's first sin, upon which it will be sufficient to read the Epistle to the Romans, chapter five, from the 12th verse and onward. And, indeed, when we consider the universality of the effects of the fall, it is not to be accounted for any other way, than from Adam's being the federal head of the human race, and they sinning in him and falling with him in the first transgression."

"The first and chief of these effects is the corruption of our nature—that man now comes into the world in a state of impurity or moral defilement." *Id.*, p. 96.

In Vol. I., p. 262, he asserts, "that all the posterity of Adam are conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity."

"Now that all mankind are by nature in a state of guilt and condemnation, is evident from the whole strain of the Holy Scriptures." Again: "Thus I have laid before you what the Scripture teaches us on the sinfulness of our nature, including all the posterity of Adam, without exception." *Id.*, p. 411.

"That we are, by nature, in a state of sin, alienated from God, transgressors of his law, and liable to his wrath. If this were not the case, a *Saviour* would not be necessary; *salvation* would be a word without force, and even without meaning." *Id.*, p. 455.

It is thus put beyond all doubt, that Dr. Witherspoon held and taught that Adam was the federal head of our race; that, as such, his descendants sinned in him, and fell with him, in his first transgression; that his sin is therefore so counted their sin, that they are regarded and treated as having committed it; and that in punishment of this sin, they are abandoned of

God, and, as a consequence, are all born in a state of moral defilement, which is, in this manner, the punishment of this sin. That this affords the only solution of the universal corruption and degradation of our race, inasmuch as it is the penalty and effect of Adam's first sin.

2. *Inability.*

It is not denied nor questioned, that our New-school theologians have found most formidable difficulties in accepting the doctrine of inability, in the sense of a real inability, irremovable by the sinner's own powers. This is the real issue. Does the sinner labour under an inability to do works spiritually good, which divine power only can remove? Holding the distinction of natural and moral ability and inability, decides nothing in this behalf, because these terms are used by different men in different senses. Some mean by natural ability, plenary ability, in the full Pelagian sense; others mean, a partial, or gracious; an Armenian, or Semi-Pelagian ability. The orthodox, however, use it, if at all, simply to denote the natural faculties of understanding, desire, and will, which are essential to moral agency and responsibility, and belong to man, as such, whether unfallen, fallen, or renewed by grace. So, by moral inability, the former class mean merely an aversion or unwillingness which the sinner can remove by his own will. The old Calvinists mean by moral inability, that indeed which characterizes fallen man; but still that which is real, which the subject of it cannot, while the Almighty power of God can, remove. The question is not, then, whether Witherspoon held to this distinction of natural and moral ability. Turrettin recognised it also, so far as there is truth in it. So far as Old-school Presbyterians have objected to it, they have been influenced by the convenient ambiguity of these terms, under which plenary Pelagian ability has so often disguised itself as a phase of inability. But what did Witherspoon hold? He says:

"From this metaphor, 'EXCEPT A MAN BE BORN AGAIN, HE CANNOT SEE THE KINGDOM OF GOD,' and other parallel expressions in the holy Scriptures, we may learn that the change here intended is SUPERNATURAL. When I say it is a supernatural change, I mean that it is what man cannot by his

own power effect without superior or divine aid. As we are 'by nature' in a state of enmity or opposition to God, so this is what we cannot, of ourselves, overcome or remove. The exercise of our own rational powers, the persuasion of others, the application of all moral motives of every kind will be ineffectual, without the special operation of the Spirit and grace of God." Vol. I., p. 126.

"Do you give credit to the Scriptures? Do you form your opinions without partiality or prejudice from them? Then you must receive it as truth that man, in his natural state, can do nothing of himself to his own recovery, without the concurrence of superior aid. If there is any meaning or propriety in Scripture language, we must yield to this. What more could be said than this, we are 'dead' in sin? What more incapable of action than one who is entirely deprived of life?

"But lest there should be any remaining exception, the thing is asserted in plain and explicit terms, without any metaphor, by the apostle John, from our Saviour's own mouth: 'No man can come to me except the Father, who hath sent me, draw him.'" Pp. 127—8.

"Let us therefore settle it in our minds, that though we are of ourselves utterly unable to produce a change in our hearts, 'nothing is impossible with God.' He first made them, and he is able to reform them. On a conviction of our own inability, one would think we should but the more humbly and earnestly apply to him who is all-sufficient in power and grace. The deplorable naturally helpless state of sinners does not hinder exhortations to them in Scripture; and therefore takes not away their obligation to obey. See an address, where the strongest metaphors are retained, the exhortation given in these very terms, and the foundation of the duty plainly pointed out. 'Wherefore he saith, awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.' From which it is very plain that the moral inability under which sinners now lie, as a consequence of the fall, is not of such a nature as to take away the guilt of sin, the propriety of exhortations to duty, or the necessity of endeavours after recovery." *Id.* p. 134.

3. *Regeneration.*

While Dr. Witherspoon's views of inability are involved with his views on regeneration, so as either to intimate or express them, yet there are one or two points of great perplexity to our New-school brethren, on which he declares himself explicitly, and which therefore deserve attention.

Dr. Duffield, in the article from which we quoted the introduction to our remarks, says of the New-school Presbyterian, that when called "with Dr. Owen and the old Calvinists to speak of original or indwelling sin (moral corruption) as a *principle*, or SOMETHING which *has the efficiency of cause*, and which exists in man *anterior to any acts performed by them*, he demurs and resists such a trespass on his liberty in Christ." P. 590.

And yet it is one of the illustrations furnished by this, as well as other like efforts, of the inherent, self-affirming power of the truth, that in the next page but one, Dr. Duffield gives the following as an authoritative expression of New-school doctrine. "We say of men in general that they are sinful; because of the manifestation of SOMETHING wrong or sinful in the state of mind and heart, the passions, affections, habits, and purposes *which determine* their choices and conduct." The italics and small capitals are ours.

This intense repugnance to the idea of a principle in the soul, back, and causative of, acts whether sinful or holy, he manifests, not only as related to original sin, but to the effect of regeneration in the soul, in implanting a principle of spiritual life. He says, "This is the theology of Old-school Presbyterians on the subject, who talk of implanting or infusing into the soul a principle of spiritual life." P. 595.

What says Witherspoon "on the subject?"

"Regeneration, then, is communicating this new principle, and giving it such force as it may obtain, and preserve the ascendancy, and habitually govern the will." Vol. I., p. 138.

"But regeneration consists in the principle being implanted, obtaining the ascendancy, and habitually prevailing over its opposite." P. 149.

"Another excellent and useful evidence of regeneration, is the sanctification of natural and lawful affections. There are,

perhaps, few either more sure or plain evidences of real religion than this. Regeneration does not consist in giving us new souls, new faculties, new affections, but in giving a new tendency and effect to those we had before. There are many persons to whom we bear naturally an affection, and it is far from being the design of religion to destroy this affection; but to regulate it in its measure, to keep it in its proper channel, and direct it to its proper end." P. 159.

We are very sure that many of our New-school brethren understand sufficiently, that an inward moral disposition or principle means a state of the moral faculties, involving facility and aptitude for, and tendency to, a given sort of exercises; that men have moral dispositions or principles, by nature, such as are sinful, or lead to acts of sin; that, by regeneration, these are taken away, and holy principles or dispositions, (that is, an inward state disposing to holy exercises,) are implanted in their place. Many of them so express themselves, in accordance with reason, scripture, their own experience—all fact. What else can be meant in scripture by "the heart of stone," and "the heart of flesh," the "new heart," the "new creature," the "good tree," and the "corrupt tree," the "old man which is corrupt according to deceitful lusts," and the "new man which, after God, is created in righteousness and holiness"? We confess that few things have amazed us more than the formidable embarrassments in which another class of our New-school brethren find themselves involved, when they come to deal with facts so simple, so obvious, and fundamental; especially, when they cannot discuss consecutively this and correlate topics, without inadvertently expressing or implying what they array in spectral horrors on almost every page! Can it be denied that there is a "SOMETHING" in the state of the soul, by nature, which distinguishes the unregenerate from the regenerate? and a "SOMETHING" supernatural wrought in the soul in regeneration, which distinguishes the saint from the sinner? or that this something, in the former case, is a disposition to sin; and, in the latter, a disposition to holy living? or that this disposition is a moral disposition or principle? Why then, such toilsome mystification of the subject, as if all this involved some "physical," in the sense of "material," quality;

or required for its removal or production the interposition of something styled "physical omnipotence," in distinction from pure and simple Divine Omnipotence? Is not the following analysis of the nature of "principle," as given by Edwards, simple, clear, incontrovertible?

"This new spiritual sense, and the new dispositions that attend it are no new faculties, but new principles of nature; I use the word principles for want of a word of more determinate signification. By a principle of nature in this place, I mean that foundation which is laid in nature, either old or new, for any particular manner or kind of exercise of the faculties of the soul; or a natural habit, or foundation for action, giving a person ability and disposition to exert the faculties in exercises of such a certain kind; so that to exert the faculties in that kind of exercises, may be said to be his nature. So this new spiritual sense is not a new faculty of understanding, but it is a new foundation laid in the nature of the soul, for a new kind of exercises of the same faculty of understanding. So that the new holy disposition of heart that attends this new sense, is not a new faculty of will, but a foundation laid in the nature of the soul, for a new kind of exercises of the same faculty of will."—*Religious Affections*, Sect. 1.

4. *Divine Justice, and Christ's Sufferings as related to it.*

One of the radical questions in issue respects the nature of that justice in God which punishes sin, and is displayed and vindicated by Christ's death. Is it mere benevolence, or what some writers call "general justice," meting out rewards and penalties solely on principles of expediency, for the benefit of the universe, and providing for the remission of sin on the same principles? Or is it distributive justice, an unalterable disposition to allot to each one his due—his "just recompense of reward," and inflexibly visiting upon sin its merited penalty, either in the sinner's own person, or that of an accepted substitute? Dr. Witherspoon says:

"When we consider the controversy about the justice of God, and what it implies, we shall see the greatest reason to suppose what is called his vindictive (vindicative—vindicatory) justice, v. 12, or disposition to punish sin, because it truly merits it,

even independently of any consequence of the punishment, either for the reformation of the person, or as an example to others. The idea of justice and guilt carries this in it, and if it did not, there would be an apparent iniquity in punishing any person for a purpose different from his own good." *Works*, Vol. I., p. 105.

"God is merciful, but he is also just. And as there is nothing more inseparable from the idea of sin and an accusing conscience, than merited punishment; so there is nothing more essential to the idea of justice in God than a disposition to inflict it. This the Scripture everywhere declares, and the conscience of the guilty, who dreads his Maker's presence, ratifies the truth." Vol. I., p. 475.

The next question is, were Christ's sufferings strictly in satisfaction of divine justice demanding inexorably the punishment of sin?

Says Dr. Witherspoon,

"The covenant promises Christ, the Mediator, to make satisfaction to divine justice, by his sufferings and death." Vol. IV., p. 112. This is in a lecture, the whole object of which is to prove the reality and necessity of such satisfaction.

Were Christ's sufferings penal? New-school divinity denies this. It pronounces them a mere governmental expedient, to promote the highest welfare of the universe—a symbolical manifestation of God's abhorrence of sin. But it strenuously denies that they are penal. What says Witherspoon?

"Now, Christ appears in Scripture as 'the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world;' as 'giving his life' for his people; as 'bearing their sins in his own body on the tree.' And indeed every expression is used that could well be imagined to signify a propitiatory sacrifice, an atonement for sin, or the punishment of an innocent person in the room and stead of the guilty." Vol. IV., pp. 270—1.

"The second question upon the satisfaction is, whether it was just and proper to admit the substitution of an innocent person in the room of the guilty? This is what the Socinians combat with all their might. They say it is contrary to justice to punish an innocent person; that God must always treat things as they really are, and therefore can never reckon it a

proper atonement for sin, to punish one that never committed any sin. Before I state the reasoning in support of this fundamental doctrine of the gospel," &c. Vol. IV., p. 105.

These passages need no comment.

5. *Justification by the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness to the Believer.*

The difficulties of our New-school brethren with imputation, whether of Adam's sin or Christ's righteousness, are too familiar to need repetition here. It is easy to show that Dr. Witherspoon was a stranger to them.

"And therefore he raised up for them a Saviour, Jesus Christ, who, as the second Adam, perfectly fulfilled the whole law, and offered himself up a sacrifice upon the cross in their stead; and that this his righteousness is imputed to them as the sole foundation of their justification in the sight of a holy God, and their reception into his favour." Vol. I., p. 43.

"Another circumstance in the plan of redemption through Christ, which will afford matter of wonder to the celestial spirits, is the free justification of sinners, and their acceptance with God, through the imputed righteousness of Christ. If it appears astonishing that God, who distributes favour and punishment with most perfect equity, should punish the innocent, it appears equally so, that he should show favour to the guilty; that he should forgive their sins, accept their persons, and visit them with his loving-kindness, and all this for the merit and obedience of another." Vol. I., p. 514.

In his charge to Mr. Archibald Davidson, as one of the ministers of Paisley, Scotland, he says:

"It is ordinary to meet with serious persons who complain much, that from many pulpits they hear little or nothing of the doctrine of the grace of God, that the grand and leading truths of the gospel are either flatly contradicted, or kept entirely out of view, or something else substituted in their place. I am far from saying that this is indeed the case. On the contrary, I tremble to think that it should be but barely possible; for all these doctrines are clearly contained in the Confession of Faith, which every minister in Scotland has subscribed.* If there-

* And no less, at this present, every minister of the Presbyterian Church of the United States.

fore there be any among us who doth not preach the doctrine of original sin, of Christ's imputed righteousness, justification by free grace, the necessity of regeneration and the operations of the Spirit, he is guilty of perjury of the worst kind, for which I know no excuse." *Id.* p. 347.

6. *The Value and Extent of Christ's Atonement.*

On this subject Dr. Witherspoon sets forth his views under three heads, which we shall now present to our readers. In regard to the first and third, there is little controversy among Old and New-school, or other evangelical Christians. In regard to the second, God's design as to the extent of the atonement, or the persons for whom Christ died, our New-school brethren avow a most vehement and unrelenting antipathy to a definite atonement, and particular redemption. We have only to say, that (exegesis aside,) the following views of Witherspoon are essentially coincident with our own, and those of Old-school Presbyterians generally.

"1. The obedience and death of Christ is of value sufficient to expiate the guilt of all the sins of every individual that ever lived or ever shall live on earth. This cannot be denied, since the subjects to be redeemed are finite, the price paid for their redemption is infinite. He suffered in the human nature, but that nature intimately and personally united to the divine; so that Christ the Mediator, the gift of God for the redemption of sinners, is often called his own and his eternal Son: Rom. viii. 32, 'He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him freely give us all things?' Such was the union of the divine and human nature in Christ, that the blood which was the purchase of our redemption, is expressly called the blood of God. Acts xx. 28: 'To feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.' This is the great mystery of godliness, God manifested in the flesh, in which all our thoughts are lost and swallowed up.

"2. Notwithstanding this, every individual of the human race is not in fact partaker of the blessings of his purchase; but many die in their sins, and perish for ever. This will as little admit of any doubt. Multitudes have died who never

heard of the name of Christ, or salvation through him; many have lived and died blaspheming his person, and despising his undertaking; many have died in unbelief and impenitence, serving divers lusts and passions; and if the Scripture is true, he will at last render unto them according to their works. So that if we admit that the works of God are known to him from the beginning of the world, it can never be true, that, in his eternal counsels, Christ died to save those, who after all that he hath done, shall be miserable for ever. 'He is a rock, his work is perfect.' His design never could be frustrated; but, as the apostle Paul expresses it, Rom. xi. 7, 'The election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded.' But,

"3. There is in the death of Christ a sufficient foundation laid for preaching the gospel indefinitely to all without exception. It is the command of God, that this should be done. Mark xvi. 15, 'And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.' The effect of this is, that the misery of the unbelieving and impenitent shall lie entirely at their own door; and they shall not only die in their sins, but shall suffer to eternity for this most heinous of all sins, despising the remedy, and refusing to hear the Son of God. Heb. x. 26, 27, 'For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.' Let us neither refuse our assent to any part of the revealed will of God, nor foolishly imagine an opposition between one part of it an another. All the obscurity arises from the weakness of our understandings: but let God be true, and every man a liar. That there is a sense in which Christ died for all men, even for those who perish, is plain from the very words of Scripture: 1 Tim. iv. 10, 'For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe.' 1 Cor. viii. 11, 'And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?' Thus it appears that both in a national and personal view, 'Christ is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for those of the whole world.'" Vol. I., pp. 479—481.

Dr. Duffield shows his confused, self-contradictory conception of the views of Old-school Presbyterians, on this, as elsewhere, throughout the whole circle of points known as old Calvinism, in the following representation:

"This Old-school view of the definite nature of the atonement is felt, by many besides the New-school, to throw embarrassment in the way of the free and universal offer of salvation in the preaching of the gospel. It is but just, however, to say, that all Old-school Presbyterians do not deny the indefinite nature of the atonement. Some believe and preach its availability for all, affirming its infinite sufficiency, as in itself adequate to the whole human race, though not designed by God to be actually applied to all." P. 624.

The ground on which *some* of our ministers are thus relieved from the charge of throwing "embarrassment in the way of the free and universal offer of the gospel," applies to all. This ground is said to be their holding to the "infinite sufficiency" of the atonement for all men, in itself considered, although it is "designed" only to be applied to the elect. But this ground of exemption from this charge applies to all the ministers of our church—the exceptions, if any, requiring no notice. They do not limit the atonement as to its intrinsic sufficiency, or the universality of its offer in good faith to all men; but solely as to the design of its application. It is in this design as to the persons for whom this atonement was intended, and in this alone, that they hold it to be definite. And in this sense, those described by Dr. Duffield, as well as others, do "deny the indefinite nature of the atonement."

After the published declaration from so high an authority, that Dr. Witherspoon had so largely moulded the theology of New school Presbyterians, we have felt that an exhibition of his doctrines on the cardinal points in issue between us and them, was imperiously demanded. All know the celebrity and authority of his name, while few have access to his works, which are now, unfortunately, nearly out of print. It is enough for us to say, that while we do not undertake to be sponsors for all that Dr. Witherspoon or any other man has said on theological subjects, his theology is radically and essentially that of Old-school Presbyterians, and of the Catechisms and Confessions

common to both branches of the church. This we think has undeniably been made to appear. And it would be a great gratification to us, if we could in justice to the truth, leave our summation of the whole matter here, without any qualifying statement to mar this delightful appearance and foretokening of doctrinal concord.

We are bound, however, in candor to say, that the type of theology advocated by Dr. Duffield, and by him represented to be that of New-school Presbyterians as a body, is widely dissonant from ours and Witherspoon's, notwithstanding all the moulding influence over his communion, attributed by Dr. Duffield to the latter. Indeed, if Dr. Duffield has done justice to his brethren, they are further from Dr. Witherspoon's theology than we had the happiness to believe, before reading his article. He stands very nearly on the precise ground of the New Divinity theologians a quarter of a century ago. He not only retains their peculiarities and innovations very nearly intact, but most of their injurious prejudices and misconceptions of Old Calvinism. He also revives and makes prominent the partisan views and feelings in regard to the causes and incidents of the disruption, and the course of the Old-school relative thereto, which have so long lost their life and power, and disappeared from the stage, that, on being now arrayed before us, they appear less like living things than as ghosts of the departed. We do not think the cause of truth or charity will gain by our reëntering a field of by-gone controversy, which is without any living issues, doctrinal, ecclesiastical, or practical, and can yield little fruit but crimination and recrimination. At all events, we can well afford to waive all correction and refutation of minute historical errors, when, in regard to all the great issues involved—the mixture of the Congregational with Presbyterian discipline by the famous "Plan of Union," and doing the church-work of missions and ministerial education by voluntary societies, instead of ecclesiastical agencies—they have been led substantially to our ground, and repudiate them almost as strenuously as ourselves. Of course, this eliminates a great cause of difference between us, which would obstruct the way to future union.

And we would fain hope, nay, we confidently believe, that

the doctrinal differences between us are narrowing down more than would appear from Dr. Duffield's representations, honest and well-intended as they doubtless are. We do not doubt that, with reference to the conflicts of thirty years ago, Dr. Duffield is a representative champion of the New-school, and so speaks by authority. But twenty, or even ten years, often bring about momentous changes. How has it been with the ecclesiastical questions to which we have adverted? And may it not have been so, in greater or less measure, in regard to doctrine which is apt to sympathize more or less with ecclesiastical order? The opinions which are gaining ground in any communion, may be largely determined by the doctrinal proclivities of its younger ministers. The formative forces and deep under-currents which determine these, sometimes elude the notice of the veterans, who live largely in the conflicts of a previous generation, in which they were leading actors. Certainly, unless we are greatly mistaken, the type of doctrine now working into the minds of the younger ministers of the other branch of the church, is quite different from that which led to the trial of some of its great leaders for heresy in past days. We must remember that a race of ministers is coming upon the stage who were then unborn. The representatives and guides of their opinions speak in a different dialect from these former leaders. Some among them have published to the world their emphatic rejection and able refutation of some of those doctrinal innovations, which were of such potent efficacy in rending our church in twain. We need not be more explicit now and here. He who runs may read. We may advert to the undeniable fact, that the two oldest and largest theological seminaries of the other branch of the church have each selected a professor from our own body, whom we were reluctant to spare.

For these and other reasons, we trust that Dr. Duffield is an inadequate expounder of the doctrines now rising to the ascendency in the New-school body. We hope the doctrinal divergence between the two bodies is less than his paper would indicate. But it is no less certain, that his article proves that things are not yet ripe for re-union, and that, for the present, peace and amity will be best preserved by remaining as we are.

We trust that it will not always, or even long, be so. But union will be delayed, or frustrated as to all good effects, by attempting to force it prematurely. It will yield only an abortion, or an Ishmael, instead of the real child of promise.

By J. Addison Alexander D.D.

ART. IV.—*Micah's Prophecy of Christ.*

THE quotation contained in the sixth verse of the second chapter of Matthew is admitted, on all hands, to be taken from the first verse of the fifth chapter of Micah. As to the Greek and Hebrew text, there is no doubt or dispute. The only emendations which have been proposed are purely conjectural. Venema, for example, proposes to omit the words *γῆ Ἰούδα*, on account of the unusual and difficult construction; and Fritzsche, instead of *τοῖς*, reads *ταῖς ἡγεμόσιν*, agreeing with *πόλεσιν* understood, and meaning *among the chief cities of Judah*, in order to avoid the supposed incongruity of calling Bethlehem *the least*, *ἐλαχίστη*, i. e., *ἐλαχίστη πόλις*, *the least town*, among the *princes* or *governors* of Judah. But these emendations are entirely unnecessary. The *γῆ Ἰούδα*, which distinguishes the Bethlehem here meant, from a place of the same name belonging to the tribe of Zebulon,* is elliptically used, in accordance with a common Hebrew idiom (בֵּית־לֶחֶם יְהוּדָה,) and with our own, when we connect the name of a town with that of the state in which it lies, without an intervening preposition, as in *Princeton, New Jersey*. As to the other case, the explanation of the seeming incongruity, if indeed so slight a solecism needs an explanation, is, that the address is to the town of Bethlehem, not as such, or on its own account, but in allusion to the person who was to come out of it, and who is therefore here compared with the *princes* of Judah, though the adjective agrees in gender with the town itself.

But though the preliminary questions are thus easily disposed of, when we come to compare the quotation with the

* Joshua xix. 15.

Hebrew text, we are met at once by several remarkable discrepancies. Let us examine them in juxtaposition.

Καὶ σὺ, Βηθλεὲμ, γῆ Ἰούδα, οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαὸν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

And thou, Bethlehem, land of Judah, (i. e., *in the land of Judah,*) *art by no means least among the chiefs of Judah; for out of thee shall come forth a leader,* (*chief or governor,* ἡγούμενος,) *who shall feed my people Israel.*

וְאַתָּה בֵּית־לֶחֶם אֶפְרָתָה צָעִיר לִהְיוֹת בְּאַלְפֵי יְהוּדָה מִמְּךָ לִי יֵצֵא לִהְיוֹת
מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וּמוֹצָאֹתָיו מִמֶּדֶם מִימֵי עוֹלָם׃

And thou, Béthlehem Ephratah, too small to be among the thousands of Judah, out of thee shall come forth to me (or for me) *one* to be a ruler in Israel, and his going forth (or the *places of his going forth*) *are from antiquity, the days of eternity.*

The last words are added to complete the sentence, and because of their importance to the exegesis of the passage in Micah. They are not included in the quotation, as will be seen more clearly afterwards, because the point in question was the *place* of the Messiah's birth, and not his preëxistence.

It is evident, at first sight, that the points of difference between these passages are too great to admit of our regarding one as an exact translation of the other. And the question thus arises, whether the disagreement is in sense and substance, or in the mere external form in which the same thought is exhibited. In order to determine this, it will be necessary to take up the variations *seriatim*—with one exception, in the order of the text itself.

1. To the בֵּית־לֶחֶם אֶפְרָתָה of the Hebrew corresponds the *Βηθλεὲμ γῆ Ἰούδα* of the Greek, in explanation of which difference an eminent writer upon biblical geography* suggests, that Ephratah was the district in which Bethlehem was situate, and therefore included in the larger term employed by Matthew. The difference would then be nothing more nor less than that between the phrases, *Princeton, New Jersey*, and *Princeton,*

* Bachiene, ii. 2, p. 7.

Mercer County, or, to take a more distinguished illustration between *London*, *Middlesex*, and *London*, *England*. But this geographical hypothesis appears to rest on no foundation, and is, in this case, perfectly unnecessary, since the seeming discrepancy is at once removed by referring to Gen. xxxv. 19, where it is said that "Rachel died and was buried in the way to Ephrath, which is Bethlehem." *Ephrath* and *Ephratah* are slightly varied forms of the same name. And as we find the two names thus identified in Genesis, so in the book of Ruth (iv. 11) we find the two combined in a sort of proverbial parallelism: "Do thou worthily in *Ephratah*, and be famous in *Bethlehem*." Now as there was at least one other Bethlehem, the purpose of distinction was effectually answered by the addition of a second name which was not common to both places. *Bethlehem Ephratah* means nothing more, then, than the Bethlehem belonging to the tribe of Judah, which idea is the very one expressed by the form of the Greek version. Why the form was varied, is a question which depends upon another to be afterwards considered, as to the origin and the design of the translation which appears in Matthew. It will here be sufficient to quote Hengstenberg's suggestion,* that the prophet, instead of the more common designation (Bethlehem-Judah) uses one borrowed from the thirty-fifth of Genesis, because there are several other allusions to that chapter in the context, and because he intended an allusion, at the same time, to the etymology of both names, as denoting plenty. But when the prophecy was quoted, these considerations had no force, and as the end of the quotation was to point out Bethlehem in Judah as the place of the Messiah's birth, the common and explicit form was naturally used instead of the more allusive and obscure one, which had, no doubt, become obsolete in Matthew's time. More than enough has now been said to show that notwithstanding the diversity of form, as to the first point, the same idea is expressed in both cases.

2. The next point of difference is in the אַלְפֵי of the Hebrew, as compared with the Greek ἡγεμόσιν, the one denoting *thousands*, and the other *chiefs* or *governors*. This diversity has led to a

* Christologie, Th. 3, p. 294.

conjectural emendation of the Masoretic text, by which the pointing of the אַלְפֵי, *thousands*, would be changed as to read אַלּוּפֵי, *dukes, captains, governors.** But in addition to the total want of all external evidence, it has been well objected, that אַלּוּף is used in the general sense of *ruler* only by the later Hebrew writers,† while in earlier times, it was employed as a peculiar title of the Edomitish chieftains, just as *Czar*, though a derivative of *Cæsar*, is confined in usage to the Emperor of Russia. The true solution of the difficulty lies in the consideration, that *the thousands of Judah* does not mean the multitudes, the numerous population of that tribe, but its branches, subdivisions, or great families, with evident allusion to the decimal arrangement, both of tribes and armies, which has been usual in Oriental countries, since the days of the patriarchs, and with reference to which, the chiefs of the Hebrew tribes are more than once called *the heads of the thousands of Israel.*‡ Now the prophet, though he formally addresses Bethlehem itself, may be supposed to address it in the person of its chief or representative, in consequence of which the Hebrew adjective and pronoun (צָעִיר and אַתָּה) are in the masculine form, although the names of towns are generally feminine. And hence it is that the comparison, instead of being made between the town referred to and the other towns of Judah, is between that town, as represented by its chief, and the other chiefs, or *heads of the thousands* of Judah; and ἡγεμόσιν, though not a strict translation of אַלְפֵי, conveys substantially the same idea.

3. Another difference of less importance is the omission of the phrase *to me* in Matthew's version. The reason of this may be, that the לִי is expletive or pleonastic, like לְךָ in לֶךְ־לְךָ, *go thou*, literally *go to thee*,§ a similar idiomatic use of *me* being common in old English after certain active verbs. But if the phrase has an independent meaning, it is not to be explained, as some suppose,‖ that the prophet uses it in application to himself, as representing the whole people—*out of thee shall come, for me, for my benefit, for that of Israel*—but rather that

* J. D. Michaelis. Justi on Micah.
† See Jer. xiii. 21. Zech. ix. 7; xii. 5, 6.
‡ Num. i. 16; x. 4. Josh. xxii. 21, 30.
§ Gen. xii. 1. ‖ J. H. Michaelis. Rosenmüller.

the words are those of God himself—*out of thee shall he come forth to me, for me*—in execution of my purpose, in obedience to my call, for the promotion of my glory.* Thus understood, this phrase is certainly no unimportant part of the original passage; but its omission does not vitiate the version, any more than that of the momentous clause, with which the sentence, in the Hebrew, closes; and for this one reason, in both cases, that the end of the quotation was to identify the *place* of the Messiah's birth, which might be done, and is done, without introducing every thing which stands connected with that fact in the prediction, although these accompanying circumstances, in themselves, may be no less important than the one to be established.

4. To the words מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל, *a ruler in Israel*, corresponds the Greek clause, *ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ, who shall feed my people Israel.* The comparison of kings and other magistrates to shepherds, as it must have had its origin in times of primitive and pastoral simplicity, is often met with in the oldest heathen writers, as in Homer, who familiarly describes his royal heroes as the *shepherds of the people*, while in Scripture we can trace it, not to the habits of the patriarchal ages merely, but to a divine declaration made to David: *and the Lord said to thee, thou shalt feed my people Israel, and thou shalt be a captain over Israel.*† The noun translated *captain*, (נָגִיד) and the verb translated *feed* (תִּרְעֶה) correspond exactly to the Greek *ἡγούμενος* and *ποιμανεῖ*, which are in fact the very terms employed in the Septuagint version of the text in Samuel. So it seems, that in departing from the *ipsissima verba* of the prophet, the evangelist has introduced a striking allusion to another passage, while, at the same time, he conveys the sense of Micah in a form implying the peculiar character of the Messiah's kingdom and relation to his subjects. In this case, there is neither deviation nor omission, but amplification and elucidation of the prophet's language.

5. We have reserved the last place for that point of difference which seems, at first sight, the most serious of all, and to a superficial reader, may appear to be incapable of any explana-

* Calvin. Hengstenberg. † 2 Samuel v. 2.

tion, which will reconcile the Greek and Hebrew text, without impugning the authority of either. And yet it will be found to be a signal instance of the paradoxical but certain fact, that forms of speech which, in themselves considered, seem directly contradictory, may be legitimately used for the expression of the same idea. The difference to which I now refer is this, that while Micah speaks of Bethlehem as too small to be among the thousands of Judah, the very same object is addressed, in the quotation, as *by no means* the least among the princes of Judah, the Greek apparently denying what the Hebrew most explicitly affirms.

To escape this seeming contradiction, it has been proposed to read the first clause as a question: And thou, Bethlehem (in the) land of Judah, art thou least?* &c.; but from the necessity of this unnatural and forced construction we are happily relieved by the facility with which the two apparently discordant forms admit of being reconciled by paying due regard to the design and scope of the original passage. When the prophet says that out of Bethlehem the promised Ruler was to be expected, why does he speak of its small size and insignificance at all? For the purpose, evidently, of contrasting its external meanness with the moral grandeur which was to invest it. Or, in other words, he means to say, that although small in one sense, it was in another to be great, and might prospectively be looked upon as great already. It is only by supposing this to be the prophet's meaning, that the mention of the outward insignificance of Bethlehem is rendered at all relevant to his design. And this is precisely what the Greek translation makes the prophet say; while in the Hebrew, he asserts directly the external littleness of Bethlehem, and indirectly intimates its future greatness by foretelling the event from which that greatness was to spring; the former circumstance is, in the Greek translation, merged in a direct assertion of the latter. While the original says, Bethlehem is small in one sense, but a certain thing shall happen, which will make the place great, in another and a higher sense; the version says, Bethlehem is great because that same thing is to happen.

* Paulus, quoted by Hengstenberg, (Chr. Th. 3, p. 324,) who denies Paulus' assertion that the text is so construed in the *Pirke Elieser*, c. 3.

There is here no contradiction, any more than if we should address a poor man thus: 'You are very poor in outward things, but you are rich in faith;' and he should report my words in this form: 'You are rich, for you abound in faith.' Whoever can discover in these forms an inconsistency, much more a contradiction, may be pardoned for imagining a similar discrepancy between the text of Micah and the paraphrase of Matthew.

From this detailed comparison we may draw these two conclusions, 1. That between the version and original there is not any disagreement, as to substance, and in form no discrepancy that argues any other difference between the writers than a difference of their immediate purpose in the utterance of one and the same truth. In both, the birth of the Messiah, and the place of that event, and the distinction which the place would thus acquire, are distinctly and harmoniously displayed to view; while all the changes in the manner of expression, which are found in the quotation, are of such a nature as to make it clearer, and precisely such as might be looked for in the application of a prophecy long after it was given.

2. The second conclusion is, that notwithstanding this agreement in the scope and import of the passages, the variations in the form are such as to preclude the supposition that the one was ever meant to be, in strictness of speech, a translation of the other; and as the Greek retains the prominent idea of the Hebrew, but omits some words, and exchanges others for more full and clear expressions, it deserves to be regarded, not as an incorrect translation, which would have changed the sense and made the language more obscure, but as an intentional and admirable paraphrase.

Now the Septuagint version often deals in paraphrase, and since that version was in common use among the Jews in Matthew's time, the question here occurs whether this quotation was derived from that source. On comparison, however, you will find, that the Septuagint version of the Hebrew text, in this case, is remarkably exact and literal. It is as follows: *Καὶ σὺ, Βηθλεὲμ οἶκος Ἐφραθὰ, ὀλιγοστὸς εἶ τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλίασιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ μοι ἐξελεύσεται τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἔξοδοι αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐξ ἡμερῶν αἰῶνος.* Twenty-four

manuscripts read ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ, which makes the agreement with the Hebrew still more perfect. The only material deviation from the Hebrew text consists in the insertion of οἶκος before Ἐφραθά, which Fritzsche regards as a marginal gloss introduced into the text, while Hengstenberg supposes that Ephratah, the name of a place, was confounded by the Greek translator with Ephratah, the name of Caleb's wife, who is mentioned in the first book of Chronicles,* and that he inserted οἶκος merely to denote that the Ephratah depended, in construction, on the foregoing *Beth-lehem*, which means the *house of bread.* It may be, however, that, through mere inadvertence, the original word בֵּית was first transcribed and then translated. But be this as it may, it is certain that the Septuagint version is, with this exception, rigidly exact, and cannot therefore be made use of to explain the paraphrastic form of that employed by Matthew.

There is another explanation, which some writers have adopted, and which rests upon the supposition that the version of the prophecy here given is in no sense that of Matthew, who contents himself with telling what the chief priests and the scribes replied to Herod's question, without attempting to correct the obvious faults of their quotation. But as that quotation coincides with the original in every point which could have had the slightest bearing upon subsequent events, it is certainly not easy to conceive why Matthew should have introduced it, if it was erroneous in minor points, instead of giving a correct translation, or referring to the prophecy without transcribing it. Another argument against this supposition has been urged, with no small ingenuity and force, in Hengstenberg's Christology,† viz., that Matthew in his whole account of Christ's conception, birth, and childhood, had it constantly in view, as a chief end, to point out the events in which prophecy had been fulfilled. Hence the number of quotations from the prophets found in the beginning of his book, and hence, too, the omission of some striking facts in our Saviour's early history, such as his mother's previous residence in Nazareth, and the occasion of her being in Bethlehem when he was born. All this is omit-

* 1 Chron. ii. 19; iv. 4. † Th. 3, pp. 317—323.

ted, while the fact that he was born there, is prominently stated, for the sake of introducing the fulfilment of this prophecy. The same design and rule in the selection of his facts is traced by Hengstenberg throughout the first two chapters, with a clearness which constrains us to believe that Matthew could not, in consistency with his design and his peculiar method, have adopted this quotation from the scribes, without intending to adopt it as his own. And when it is considered that the scribes, no doubt, did what any Jewish rabbi would do now, in any quarter of the world, if questioned by a Jewish ruler, that is, quote the prophecy itself in Hebrew, the most probable conclusion is that Matthew is the sole and independent author of the Greek translation, and that its paraphrastic form came from his intention to explain the text as well as quote it. Now, to us, who are believers in his inspiration, this, so far from impairing the authority and genuineness of the Greek translation, on the contrary enhances it; and we enjoy the very great advantage of an apostle's comment on a prophet's text.

Having finished our comparison of the quotation with the passage quoted, it remains to be considered whether the sense put upon the text in the quotation is the sense of the original. By sense is here meant, not the meaning of the words, but the drift and application of the sentence. Let us glance at the circumstances of the case. Magi, or wise men from the east, had come, directed by a star, to find the new-born King of the Jews, and Herod, upon hearing their inquiries, calls upon the official expounders of the law to say where Christ, or the Messiah, should be born, and they, in answer, quote this passage, which they introduce by saying, *οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ προφήτου, for this it has been written by the prophet.* It is clear, from this view of the context, and from what has been already said, that the priests and scribes regarded this as a prediction of Messiah, and that Matthew looked upon it as accomplished in the birth of Jesus Christ. There is here no room for the favourite hypothesis of mere accommodation or poetical allusion, and to that of false or mistaken application we cannot subscribe, without renouncing our belief in Matthew's inspiration. It remains then to be seen, whether the prophecy in Micah really relates to the Messiah, and if so, whether it

relates to him exclusively, or to another person, in its first and lowest sense, and then to the Messiah in its last and highest.

A very slight inspection of the prophecy of Micah will suffice to show that it displays, in an unusual degree, that characteristic feature of prophetic composition, which consists in the abrupt and frequent alternation of encouragements and threatenings. The book contains a series of predictions with respect to the downfall both of Israel and Judah, each succeeded and relieved by an exhilarating view of that auspicious period when all should be restored, enlarged, and beautified, and placed beyond the reach of subsequent vicissitudes. Thus the first two chapters, which contain a clear prediction of captivity, are closed by the assurance that *the breaker is come up before them*, i. e., *a breaker-down of prison-doors, that they have broken up*, and is abruptly closed with this remarkable assurance: I will gather, I will gather even all of thee, O Jacob, I will gather the remnant of Israel; I will put them together as the sheep of Bozrah, as a flock in the midst of its pasture, they shall make a great noise from the multitude of men. The breaker comes up before them, (*i. e.*, a breaker-down of prison-doors;) they break down, they pass through the gate, they go out by it, and their King passes before them, and Jehovah at their head.

This encouraging assurance of deliverance, beheld in prophetic vision as already past or present, is immediately succeeded by another melancholy picture of corruption and calamity, in which the prospect closes with a distant view of Zion ploughed as a field, and of Jerusalem in heaps. But here, by as sudden a transition as before, the prophet shifts the scene and introduces that remarkable prediction of the future exaltation of the church and aggregation of the Gentiles, which is also found at the beginning of the second chapter of Isaiah, but is here pursued further till it closes with the coming of the kingdom to the daughter of Jerusalem. And then begins another gloomy strain, in which Babylon is introduced by name, and the subsequent oppressions of the Syrians and Romans not obscurely intimated, one of the most prominent and striking features in the picture being the cessation of the monarchy, and the unworthy treatment of the Jewish magistracy by their foreign enemies, a circumstance

which will prepare the way for the prediction, which is quoted by Matthew in the case before us, and which sets in contrast with the downfall of the monarchy, and the oppression of the Jewish rulers, the appearance of a prince, whose goings forth had been from everlasting, though the place of his nativity should be the small and unimportant town of Bethlehem.

Now the simple question, in relation to this prophecy, is that asked by the eunuch in relation to another: "Of whom speaketh the prophet thus?" and this is almost answered by another: Of whom can he even be supposed to speak, if not of the Messiah? That the ancient Jews applied the words of Micah thus exclusively, is clear, not only from the Chaldee Paraphrase—*from thee shall the Messiah come forth before me*—but from the answer of the scribes to Herod—and the question asked by the people at the feast of tabernacles—*Hath not the Scripture said, that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem where David was?* After the birth of Christ had taken place at Bethlehem, and that fact was appealed to as a proof of his Messiahship, it came to be an object with the unbelieving Jews to do away with the prediction as specifically fixing the locality, and this they undertook to do, by making it mean merely that his origin was there, because he was descended from the family of David, which resided at Bethlehem, and after all Jews were forbidden to reside there by the Roman emperor, and thus the birth of the Messiah in the place foretold became impossible, they changed the application of the prophecy itself from the Messiah to Zerubbabel, in which they have been followed by no less a man than Grotius, who admits, however, that the passage was intended, in a higher sense, to be applied to Christ. But why resort to the embarrassing expedient of a double sense, when the exclusive application to Messiah is not only possible, but sanctioned by the uniform tradition of the ancients, until after the fulfilment of the prophecy itself; and when the first fulfilment of the promise in Zerubbabel must certainly have put an end to further expectation, which we find, however, from the answer of the scribes to Herod, hundreds of years afterwards. All this would be conclusive against Grotius's opinion, even if the terms

of the prediction had been applicable to Zerubbabel, but how much more when they are utterly inapplicable to a man who was not born at Bethlehem, and of whom it never could be said that his goings forth had been of old, from everlasting—that he was born at Bethlehem, because he was descended from the house of David, and that the last clause of the verse in Micah was intended merely to set forth the great antiquity and consequent distinction of his race, are mere expedients to escape the obvious interpretation, and expedients which would never have been thought of, but for men's unwillingness to see that the Messiah was eternal, and that his incarnation was to take place in a literal and outward sense at Bethlehem in Judah. The same thing may be said of the effect, though not of the intention, of an exposition given in the Targum and approved by Calvin, which applies the last clause of the verse in Micah to the purpose and decree of God respecting the Messiah, and not to his actual existence in eternity. To all such ingenious and refined evasions stands opposed the simple, obvious, most ancient, and most natural interpretation, which has been approved not only by the Jewish Sanhedrim and the apostle Matthew, but by the impartial though unfriendly testimony of the unbelieving German critics of the present day, who, having cast off all belief in inspiration, have no longer any motive for denying that the prophet Micah evidently did expect a superhuman person to be born at Bethlehem, and that Matthew no less evidently did believe that this prediction was fulfilled in the nativity of Jesus. It is true that both the prophet and apostle are supposed by the writers now referred to, to have been the subjects of a mere delusion; but from what do they infer this? from the false assumption that neither miracle nor prophecy is possible or capable of proof by any evidence whatever. But we who know better, through the grace of God, may profit by the frank concession which their premises afford us, while we throw away their impious and false conclusion with the scorn which it deserves. While we boldly and indignantly deny that either Micah or Matthew was in error, because one believed that Christ was to be born in Bethlehem and the other that Jesus of Nazareth was he, we may accept with gratitude,

and use with profit, the admission of these learned unbelievers, that the prophet and evangelist did so believe, and have so written.

In this case, if in any one, the maxim is obligatory:

Fas est ab hoste doceri.

By Lyman Atwater D.D.

ART. V.—*Report on Infant Baptism to the General Association of Connecticut.* 1863.

IT is one healthful and cheering symptom of the present state of Protestant Christianity, that there is a general and growing attention to the church relations of the children of the covenant. In pedo-baptist communions this increasing interest shows itself in the form of earnest and searching discussions and inquiries relative to the neglect of infant baptism, its causes, extent, and remedies; the precise relation to the church of baptized children; the respective duties and privileges of all the parties thereto; and the effect of a due recognition and understanding of these things, both theoretically and practically, in promoting youthful piety, and therein the whole cause and kingdom of Christ in the world. Most of our readers are familiar with the extent and influence of the discussion on these topics in our own church within the few past years. The mind of our ministers and people has been steadily gravitating in one direction—that is, towards the exact ground taken on this subject in our standards. There is a constant struggle to regain what we have lost, and bring back, not only our thinking, but our practice, to the requirements of our Confession of Faith and Directory. This is evinced in the utter refusal of the church to abate one jot or tittle of the stringency of the Book of Discipline, in the premises. She would sooner bear all the evils of the clumsy and awkward judicial proceedings prescribed in the old book, than admit that baptized children are not so strictly members of the church as to be "subject to judicial prosecution." It is not likely that all who opposed this pro-

posed innovation were equally clear and correct in the detailed reasons of their opposition. But there is no doubt that they were all actuated by one common desire, in no way to loosen, and in every way to strengthen, the bond which links children to the church and its Head. This universal desire in our communion needs no vindication, and is not only most salutary in its present influence, but full of promise for the future.

It is not, however, our own church alone that is exercised on this momentous subject. The agitation is showing itself in greater or less degrees in all the chief Christian communions. Of this, the able and valuable pamphlet before us is one demonstration. It has importance, not simply as the well-considered production of its author, the Rev. Robert G. Vermilye, Professor of Theology in East Windsor Seminary, but as the Report of a Committee to the General Association of Connecticut, and by that body ordered to be printed and circulated with its Minutes.

After showing, by a careful collation of ecclesiastical statistics, the strong probability that, in the Congregational churches of Connecticut, not more than two children out of every five entitled to baptism, actually receive it, he proceeds to inquire into the causes of this portentous fact. These are mainly ignorance or erroneous views, or a lack of appreciation with regard to the meaning of the duties, privileges, and benefits of the ordinance. It is enough to bring any rite into disuse, when it comes to be regarded as meaningless and profitless. Or if, short of this, there be incertitude and confusion of mind about it, or if its practical significance and consequent duties, though not wholly unknown, be substantially ignored or forgotten, the sign will vanish with the thing signified, the seal with the stipulated benefits it ratifies to us.

Dr. Vermilye cogently observes:

"Uncertainty in regard to the position of baptized children in the church, is doubtless one great cause of inattention to the ordinance. If infant baptism be an ordinance of divine appointment, a sign and seal of covenant relations, it confers some privileges, indicates some blessings, and implies some obligations. What are they? If it be an ordinance of the church of Christ, administered by it under its authority and

sanction, it must bring the subject into some relation to that church. What is that relation? It implies some duties, binding on all who are parties to the transaction. What are those duties? We do not stop to answer these questions. But it is not strange that the ordinance should go into decay, if improper views are entertained on these points. If all its meaning and power are exhausted in the moment of its administration,—if there is no difference between children who are baptized and those who are not baptized,—if the minister and the church have no care and provide no nourishment for these lambs of the flock, any more than for others,—if parents themselves look upon their children as having no more relation to the covenant of God and the church of Christ, than children born out of the covenant and never baptized, if this be our theory and practice, we must not be surprised at a growing inattention to this sacrament. The question will arise in many minds, to what purpose is it administered to children? Why bring children to an ordinance in the church, of which the church herself makes nothing, when it is over? If our children are precisely in the same position as others, why baptize them? Other advantages of the ordinance,—the conviction that it is somehow of divine authority, and will somehow be of service, the yearning of heart on the part of the parent to give up the child to God and invoke his blessing upon it,—will doubtless keep the practice alive among many. But many also will be affected by the opposite view. Now what are the facts in the case? We fear there is as much inconsistency and neglect on the part of the church, towards those who are baptized, as there is on the part of parents in presenting their children for baptism. Our children are baptized. How much are they taught as to the peculiar privileges the ordinance implies, and its peculiar obligations? How often are they, in any way, separated from others by a reference to this distinction? How much care do they suppose the church has for them? How often are they appealed to, by their baptismal vows and duties? How much is this made a means of Christian influence and culture in their younger years? What recognition is made of their baptismal relation, at any subsequent period of their Christian, or their natural life? If our baptized children are practically neglected,

as such, by the churches,—if they are as much as others, aliens to the commonwealth of Israel,—strangers and outcasts from the special love and care and watchfulness of the church,—if they have no part nor lot in her,—if their baptism is ignored practically, until they come to make a public profession of their faith,—here is one reason for the decline of the ordinance. An ordinance which means nothing, does nothing, effects nothing, —why it may as well be postponed, until its administration can signify and accomplish something. If the church disregards her own ordinances, why should she wonder that they sink into neglect, or even contempt?"

The following, among several passages that might be selected, shows the writer's sound scriptural insight into this great subject, in its momentous bearings, alike by explicit statements, and suggestive implications.

"And it is worth while to see, how this view of the covenant sweeps over the whole ground included in the doctrine of baptism. Baptism symbolizes the blessings of the covenant; regeneration by the Spirit, and holiness of heart, without which no man can see the Lord. The true view of baptism as a sign and seal of the covenant, takes away all ground for the dogma of baptismal regeneration; while it signifies the true cleansing by the divine Spirit. The covenant puts the parents in the proper position, for while pressing them with the most serious responsibility, it gives them something to lay hold of as a plea, and a ground of encouragement, something to expect, sealed with God's promise. It puts the children in the proper position; within the pale of the covenant, by their descent from godly parents, baptism indicates and seals upon them their duties, furnishes a tender appeal to them to become followers of Christ, and publicly marks their introduction into that visible society in which the covenant is embodied. A proper view of the covenant puts the church in the right position. It imposes upon her some responsibilities for those who are by the divine will admitted to her ranks, and who are, presumptively, heirs of eternal life. Rightly viewed, it would save her from the inconsistency of marking her lambs with the sign of the kingdom of Christ, and then turning them forth amid the wolves of the world. It would make her feel that she, as well as the

parents, has something to do, in training up a generation who will serve the Lord, from their youth upwards."

The necessity for the continued discussion of some sides of this subject is not yet wholly superseded among ourselves. If the *fama clamosa* of the recent rejection by one of our Presbyteries, of a candidate, otherwise giving unexceptionable evidence of piety, because he could not tell the time and circumstances of his conversion, be not wholly unfounded, as we trust it will prove to be, it is the most flagrant among various indications, that the precious truths of Scripture relative to the children of the covenant and early piety, should be set forth in repeated inculcations, and manifold forms, "line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little." We propose to offer a contribution in this behalf, by showing the interest which the children of the covenant have in the Lord, and the tendency of duly recognising that interest to promote the prevalence of pure religion, from the point of view (to which we have seldom seen reference made) in which it is presented in the book of Joshua xxii. 21—25, in the terms following: "Then the children of Reuben, and the children of Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh answered, and said unto the heads of the thousands of Israel, The Lord God of gods, he knoweth, and Israel he shall know; if it be in rebellion, or if in transgression against the Lord, (save us not this day,) that we have built us an altar to turn from following the Lord, or if to offer thereon burnt-offering or meat-offering, or if to offer peace-offering thereon, let the Lord himself require it; and if we have not rather done it for fear of this thing, saying, In time to come your children might speak unto our children, saying, What have ye to do with the Lord God of Israel? For the Lord hath made Jordan a border between us and you, ye children of Reuben and children of Gad; ye have no part in the Lord: so shall your children make our children cease from fearing the Lord."

The import and bearing of this will be more evident if we take into view the circumstances and surroundings in which it was uttered. From the context it appears that the two and a half tribes, when separated by the river Jordan, from their brethren of the other nine and a half tribes, built a large altar

to the Lord. It was, of course, natural for their brethren to take for granted that this structure was built for the uses appropriate to it: for the offering of sacrifices to propitiate the favour of God in worship. This would have been setting up a rival altar and worship in competition with those already established on the other side of Jordan, among the more numerous tribes—the only one owned and blessed by the Most High. To set up another and competing worship, unauthorized and unblessed of God, was virtually to introduce heathenism and idolatry into the nation, and expose them to the wrath of Heaven. In this aspect of the case, the other tribes sent a great delegation to their brethren across the river, to expostulate with them against a procedure so heaven-daring and perilous. The latter were not offended at the rebuke and remonstrance. Had their purposes in erecting the altar been what their brethren naturally supposed, they admit that the aversion manifested towards it would have been perfectly justifiable. But they explain that they had no such intent in the measure, as was so very naturally ascribed to them. They call God to witness that they designed to offer neither burnt-offering, peace-offering, nor meat-offering thereon. And in further solemn disavowal of all purpose to do this, or otherwise "turn from the Lord," they imprecate God's vengeance upon them, if they in the smallest degree entertained such a design. On the contrary, their object in building the structure was to prevent the apostacy of their children from the true God. How? And according to what principle? They designed to make this a perpetual monument and witness to their posterity, that, although separated from the other tribes by the river Jordan, they were not divided from them as the covenant people of God; but with them were bound to the service, and entitled to the blessings stipulated in the covenant with Abraham their common parent, and for this purpose their federal head and representative. They were afraid that, in the absence of any such monumental token, the children of their brethren having the altar on their own side of Jordan, in future time, would deny the common interest of their own children in the covenant, and their rank among the people of God, and the community of duty and privilege thence resulting. They were consequently

afraid of the effect of this non-recognition of their children's covenant interest and place among God's people, by their brethren across the river, who had the visible institutions and public ordinances of religion exclusively amongst themselves. They apprehended it would lead them to forget and forsake God; to sink into irreligion and apostacy; in their own words, "to cease from fearing the Lord." They appeal to God if they "have not rather done it, for fear of this thing, saying, in time to come, your children might speak unto our children, saying, What have ye to do with the Lord God of Israel? For the Lord hath made Jordan a border between us and you, ye children of Reuben and children of Gad; ye have no part in the Lord: so shall your children make our children cease from fearing the Lord." This explanation not only satisfied, it "pleased" the deputies sent by the other tribes, and the whole people of Israel. It shows, therefore, that the reasons assigned for the building of the altar, and the principles implied or expressed in those reasons, were conclusive, and of undisputed validity, with all God's ancient people, especially with those most jealous of his honour, glory, and religion. What were these principles? Undeniably these:—To deny or refuse to recognise the "part in the Lord," *i. e.*, the interest in divine promises, privileges, and endowments, which is the peculiar prerogative of the children of the covenant, is to promote irreligion and apostacy: conversely, to recognise this interest, and act conformably to such recognition, tends greatly to promote piety, and prevent fatal lapses in the offspring of the pious.

We have thus brought to view the immense importance to the welfare of religion, of duly apprehending and appreciating the covenant interest of the children of the church, in the Lord; and of their being treated accordingly by their parents, guardians, teachers, and the church, in their training and nurture.

What we now aim to set forth will be comprised under the following heads.

1. What is the peculiar "PART," or interest in God, which his covenant bestows on the seed of his servants.

2. The extent to which it has been denied, forgotten, or ignored; together with the causes and consequences thereof.

3. The practical applications of the subject to the various classes whom it concerns.

1. This part which the children of the covenant have in their covenant-keeping God, is set forth with unmistakable distinctness in the very terms of the original covenant itself. And this all later statements and representations do but confirm, explain, and apply. It is "to be a God to thee, and thy seed after thee." Over and above all that was local and temporary, with regard to their entrance into Canaan, the express stipulation of this "everlasting covenant" was, "And I will be their God." Can there be any mistake about this? Was it anything less than the covenant of grace and salvation in Christ, precisely the same as made to Abraham and his seed? Can God promise more for any, than to be their God? If any doubt could exist as to this interpretation, the New Testament comments of the apostle Paul place it beyond all doubt. Describing to his own countrymen (see Heb. viii. 10) the new covenant, he thus recites the promise of the Lord: "I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people." So in 2 Cor. vi. 16, he says: "Ye are the temple of the living God: as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." Moreover, circumcision is expressly pronounced "a sign and seal of the righteousness of faith;" and realizes its true meaning and intent, when it is "that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." Rom. ii. 29. It is past all doubt, therefore, in view of these, out of countless other testimonies of Scripture, that the covenant which embraces the children of believers with them, is the covenant of grace and salvation through Christ; the same precisely which their parents have embraced.

It is, however, sometimes alleged that this covenant which embraces children with their parents in its ample reach, is confined to the Old Testament dispensation, and that, under the New Testament, children are not included in its scope. No opinion, however, can be more groundless. For, 1. It is not the genius of the New Testament to restrict the blessings of the gospel within narrower limits than the Old. Contrariwise, it

enlarges them as to their fulness and subjects, extending them from the narrow precincts of a single nationality, to every nation and kindred under the whole heaven; and rendering them not more difficult, but more easy of attainment. 2. This constitution which obtained expression in the original covenant of grace with Abraham, is founded not in anything peculiar to any one dispensation, but in the nature of man, and in necessities which are equally urgent under every administration. These necessities are, that parents should represent and act for their children, while as yet they are unable to act for themselves; and, at the same time, train them to act aright when they shall reach the age of discretion or responsibility at which they must act for themselves. This necessity exists in regard to the civil and social *status* of the child. In these respects the parent chooses for himself and the child; his children are identified with him, so far as their age permits, in rank and condition. If the former migrates, and becomes a citizen of any commonwealth, his children thereby enter it, and, without any act of their own, are, according to their years, invested with its privileges and responsibilities. So, if the parent degrade himself to poverty or crime, his children share his degradation, until, in maturer years, they are able to retrieve their position by their own efforts. Now this principle, according to which, in every other sphere, the parent represents and acts for the child during his minority, always making him a partaker of his own privileges, as well as of his disabilities, is it be excluded from the sphere of religion? Shall it confer on children every other sort of advantage and disadvantage, while it is not allowed to make the child share in the religious privileges of a godly parentage? Shall this be made a channel for conveying everything to children but the blessings of salvation, the redemption of their spiritual and immortal nature, glory, honour, immortality, eternal life? Believe it who will. But it contradicts all scripture and providence. In the very first trial of our race in Eden, our first parents acted for their posterity. This was certainly so with Noah and his descendants, Abraham and his children; with them and their children, and children's children. Indeed, how could religion be preserved and increased among men, unless, by this blessed economy, which includes

children with parents in the church, thus ensuring Christian nurture and training for each successive generation of children, during that plastic period of childhood and youth, when the character usually takes on its impress for time and eternity? Is it not thus, that in the place of the fathers come the children, and is it not through the children thus taking the place of their fathers, that the church is mainly replenished, perpetuated, and enlarged, from generation to generation? Do not the elements that compose our churches show that it is, more than all else, because God fulfils his promise, that he will not take his word out of the mouth of his servants, nor out of the mouth of their seed, nor of their seed's seed, that they thus live, and flourish, and multiply, from generation to generation?

2. The principle is clearly recognised and indubitably asserted in the New Testament. Not only in the implications of these passages, in which Christ bids little children to come unto him, for of such is the kingdom of heaven; and tells us that out of the mouth of babes and sucklings God hath perfected praise; but in the explicit announcement to those whom Peter called to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins; "For the promise is unto you and to your children, and unto all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Acts ii. 39. In the baptism of households, as of the jailer, Lydia, and Stephanas, on the profession of the parent and head; (for it cannot be denied that baptism is a sign and seal of the blessings of salvation, and a badge of the Christian profession, equally with the bloody circumcision it supplanted.) Preëminently is all this affirmed in 1 Corinthians vii. 14, when the apostle declares, "the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife by the husband, else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." Doubtless *holy* here means set apart for God, as included in the covenant which we have been considering. Less than this it cannot mean. It means a state or relation sacred to God, conveyed by covenant through pious parentage; and that it is conveyed in such a liberal measure, as to be transmitted upon the faith of one of the parents, and not stopped in its transmission by the unbelief of the other,—who, so

far as is requisite to such transmission, is sanctified by his connection with a believing partner. That this oneness of parents and children in the covenant of grace enters into the constitution of the Christian church is therefore undeniable.

How much then precisely does it mean or involve?

1. It does not mean that all and singular the children of pious parents, are or ever become real children of God by regeneration, and, on coming to moral agency, by faith and repentance unto life. It does not mean that all of them really have God for their God, or are finally saved. We know that the contrary is true of vast numbers. They live and die without hope and without God in the world, strangers to that "holiness without which no man shall see the Lord."

2. Equally distant is it from the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, which, in the mildest possible explanation of it, means that regeneration is bestowed upon all recipients of baptism at the hands of a duly authorized minister, at the time of its administration. The protestant and scriptural doctrine is, that baptism is not tied to the benefits it signifies and seals, either as to subjects or time. Circumcision, in whose place it comes, is, in the case of Abraham, expressly declared to be a sign and seal of the righteousness of that "faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised." Rom. iv. 11. On the other hand, to the breaker of the law, circumcision becomes uncircumcision, to him who keeps it, uncircumcision becomes circumcision. Rom. ii. 25, 26. Not only so, but the condition required for baptism, as shown in the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles, was faith. The Christian converts believed and were baptized. When baptism was sought, the answer was, "if thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest." Acts viii. 37. Faith, then, with all the gifts of grace to which it is linked, was, in the case of adults, a condition precedent to baptism, which, therefore, though it signifies and seals these blessings, is not infallibly linked to them. Moreover, in respect to the baptized, even still more emphatically than in the case of the children of the pious, the argument from fact for ever annihilates the theory in question. Vast numbers of the baptized are, in fact they live and die, irreligious and unbelieving; therefore unregenerate;

therefore, there is no truth in the theory of baptismal regeneration.

3. It is to be further noted, that this covenant has three parties, viz., God, the parents, and the child. As in all other compacts, the failure on the part of the promisee to fulfil his part of the contract, releases the obligation of the promiser to fulfil his part. Now this promise to be a God to the believing parent and his seed, supposes that such parent thus accepts God as not only his own, but his children's God; that acting for the child, he makes a profession, and, if opportunity presents, a formal sacramental recognition of such acceptance in the baptismal dedication of the child to God; that conformably to this, he will bring him up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and teach and train him to live as one who is the Lord's; whom the Lord visibly recognises as one who is to be regarded and treated as such, by setting his seal upon him. Where this condition is duly complied with by the parent, is his faith often tried by seeing his child die in his sins, however wayward he may be for a time?

But the child is also a party to this covenant. On reaching the age of responsible action, he too may break the covenant. He may abjure the grace it stipulates, and refuse to receive and acknowledge God as his God; Christ as his Saviour; the Holy Spirit as his Sanctifier. This, however, we do not believe would be a frequent result, did parents fully apprehend the intent and fulness of the covenant, and, with due fidelity and wisdom, train up their children in conformity to its spirit and scope. If they fully realized that "part in the Lord," which the covenant gives, and brought their children to the due consciousness of it, and taught them to think, and feel, and act in accordance therewith, would their children so often be "kept from fearing the Lord?" The promise, "train up a child in the way in which he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it," assures us of the contrary. Yet not so, that it is proved false, if some children even then prove recreant to their covenant privileges, and disown the God of their fathers thus tenderly seeking to be their God. For it is not meant that all and each of those trained aright will never

go astray; but it is meant to declare, as in other general maxims in the book of Proverbs, the ordinary tendency and effect of such training: just as when it is said that the "borrower is servant to the lender;" "a soft answer turneth away wrath;" "the hand of the diligent maketh rich." While these maxims are true as representing a general law or tendency, they are not falsified by more or less exceptions. It will not do to say that every poor man is a sluggard, because "the hand of the diligent maketh rich;" that every man who has failed to turn away wrath, has answered with hard and irritating epithets; or that every Christian who is agonized with recreant children, has been of course specially delinquent in his teaching and discipline.

In stating what this covenant does not mean, we have made a partial suggestion of what it does mean. It means that the children of believers, by virtue of the divine covenant made with them through their parents, and accepted in their behalf by their parents, are to be regarded and dealt with as presumptively one with their parents in their relation to God, his kingdom and salvation; as having in their parents professed Christ, and by baptism put on the seal and badge of such profession; as being, according to their capacities, and in a manner suitable to their years, entitled to all the privileges, and bound to all the duties of Christians, of those to whom God is their God; who, being baptized into Christ, have so far forth presumptively and in appearance put on Christ; and, therefore, are expected to walk, after the manner of childhood, as befits the children of God and followers of Christ. They are to be reckoned and dealt with as those who are visibly of the community of God's people, members of the visible church. Their position is to be reckoned that of those who make God what he covenants to be, their God, until the contrary shall be made to appear by their deliberate rejection of him, or their contamination with heresies and scandals, tantamount to a rejection of him, on their reaching those years of discretion, when it is put upon their personal responsibility to accept or reject God in Christ, to ratify or repudiate the professions and vows made in their behalf by their parents in their infancy, while as yet they were incapable of acting for themselves. In short, they are,

in a manner which comports with their years, members of the visible church of Christ's visible people, invested with all the privileges and subject to the duties of that position, until they disown their birthright—thus making themselves aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, strangers to the covenants of promise, without hope and without God in the world. Such we understand to be their "part in the Lord."

Now the blessed peculiarity of this part is, that it befits the very position in which they are placed, that they should lead a Christian life, according to their years; that they should be taught and trained accordingly; that it alone consists with the place God has assigned them, that they should think, and feel, and live, and act as becomes the children of God. To this view the whole teaching and training of them should be conformed. They should be taught and trained to act aright towards God, man, and themselves, because such conduct alone becomes Christians, the followers of Christ, and the children of God. They should be taught to avoid wrong, not only for other good and sufficient reasons, but because it is unchristian, inconsistent with fealty to God and Christ, whose they are by covenant, whom they are bound to serve, and whose favour is theirs, if they do not repel it by apostacy from their high position, exalted as it is to heaven in point of privilege, and set in heavenly places in Christ. The right to this sort of training for God, Christ, and heaven, is included in the "part" which the children of the covenant have in the Lord.

And contrasted with the want or privation of it, it is an element of prodigious power in the promotion of youthful piety. According to the mode of thinking and acting towards covenant children which has very widely supplanted this, they are not warranted in ranking themselves, parents are not warranted in ranking them, among the visible people of God, or as entitled to assume the attitude, claim the privileges, cherish the feelings, the sympathies, and hopes, or held to the duties of the children of God; they are rather outsiders and aliens to the church; they take their places with heathens and publicans; they are to cast their lot and their associations with the world of the irreligious and wicked. However faithfully they may be taught the principles of Christianity, so far as their life

is concerned, they are really expected "to walk in the counsel of the ungodly, to stand in the way of sinners, and sit in the seat of the scornful," until they can give some account of a conscious change which is requisite to reclaim them from these worldly and wicked associations to the fold of Christ in which they were born. This is what is conceived to belong to the proprieties of their position. And how difficult it is to reclaim them, when once they have formed, and long been inured to these perilous associations, many tearful parents, and all ministers who watch for souls, know too well! And how many are lost beyond recovery on these dark mountains, we know, alas! too well. And of those so reclaimed we know how much less symmetrical, thriving, and consistent Christians they often are, than those whose habits of heart, soul, and body, from infancy or earliest childhood, have been moulded by Christian associations; by a conscious union and sympathy with the people of God; by the practical exemplification in heart and life, according to the measure of their age and of the gift of God, of the great principles of Christian doctrine and practice.

But, it may be asked, can any one be saved, or have true Christian feeling and practice without the new birth? And shall he assume to have them before he has them? If we could not answer these questions without running into some logical labyrinth which we could not see through, this is no reason for neutralizing the covenant of God, and despoiling it of its gracious power. But there is no real difficulty here. Of course there can be no spiritual life without the regeneration and indwelling of the Spirit. But this fundamental truth of Scripture and Christian life is perfectly consistent with the principles already advanced. It is a cardinal doctrine, that the work of the Spirit is known to the subject of it, and to other men, only by its effects; its fruits of faith, repentance, love, and holy obedience. But as to the time or manner of that inworking of the Spirit which generates this new life, this is not in itself, but only in its effects, a matter of consciousness—"The wind bloweth where it listeth, and none can tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth; even so is every one born of the Spirit." John iii. 8. Suppose such a recognition and training of the children of the covenant as is here indicated; should we

not expect the Spirit, by his renewing and sanctifying energy often silently to intermingle with and vitalize this Christian nurture; so that, as in the case of personal professors of religion in maturer years, when taught to think and feel, and act and live, as becomes the children of God, they would be enabled and disposed by his almighty grace so to think, feel, live, and act? And will not this, in a multitude of cases, so occur, as pastors constantly find it occurring, that no particular time is remembered when the subject first began to be conscious of such experience, or that the subject of it is unable to give any historic account of his change? "So is the kingdom of God," says our Saviour, "as if a man should cast seed into the ground, and should sleep and rise night and day; and the seed should spring up and grow, he knoweth not how. For the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." Mark iv. 26—28. It is a great mistake to suppose the genuineness of religious experience depends on our being able to give an account of the time of its origin. The great question is, what is our present experience? What are our present feelings and views? Are they scriptural and evangelical? If so, that is enough. And they are none the worse, if the Spirit, having been vouchsafed at or before our earliest consciousness, does not permit the memory to go back to any period when they did not exist, at least in some rudimental form. All that is needful is, not that we should be able to tell how and when vision first opened, but "whereas I was blind, now I see." Are we not told in Scripture of Johns, Samuels, Timothys, sanctified from the womb, from childhood knowing the Holy Scriptures? of children learning to fear the Lord? Some of the most exemplary Christians we have ever known, have assured us they did not remember the time when they did not fear God, and try to follow Christ. It is clearly not our commission to limit the Holy One of Israel in the administration of that Spirit which "divideth to each one severally as he will."

It is to be observed withal, that the Scriptures recognise no other education of the children of the covenant than such as accords with the principles we have advanced. They not only direct us to *teach* them how they should go hereafter, *after*

some perceptible excitement has stirred them, but to *train* them in the way in which they should go; *i. e.*, to form the habit of walking in it. Was not the like education of his household by Abraham an indispensable condition of the fulfilment of the covenant on the part of God? For, says the Most High, "I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him." Gen. xviii. 19. The realization of the blessings of the covenant, therefore, is suspended on their children being enjoined, instructed, and trained to "keep the way of the Lord."

The same thing is the clear teaching of the New Testament, as is shown not merely from our Saviour's tender welcome of little children to himself, "since of such is the kingdom of heaven;" from the apostles in their first proclamation of the gospel, declaring to the children of the covenant which God made with the fathers in Abraham, that God sent his Son Jesus to them FIRST, "to bless them in turning away every one of them from their iniquities," (Acts iii. 25, 26;) not merely from the baptism of households in the profession of their respective heads; or the accounts given of devout men fearing God, with all their houses, and of churches in households; from the designation of the children of believers as "holy," which means nothing less surely, than that they are so among the people of God, that they are recreant to their position and privileges if they live unholy. Not only is the great truth we are considering, proved by inference from these and like portions of the New Testament, but it is directly and unambiguously taught in the practical exhortations of the Pauline Epistles. Not only is the charge solemnly laid on parents to "provoke not their children to wrath, but to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," (Eph. vi. 4;) which means not merely to instruct them in the truths and duties of Christianity, but to strive to mould them to habits of obedience to the divine command. But children are charged to obey their parents in the Lord. "In the Lord" observe, *i. e.*, not on any merely natural principles, but as in believing obedience to the Lord Jesus Christ. Moreover, to what sort of persons

is the epistle in which this occurs addressed? Surely to the "saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus." So that to the Colossians, in which similar language occurs, is addressed to "the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse." Now among the particular classes into which the apostle distributes these, for purposes of special admonition suited to their respective conditions, such as husbands, wives, servants, masters, parents, is children; children in their minority; children whose prime duty is to "obey their parents in the Lord." And what does this imply? That all and each of these children are actual Christians, really regenerate? By no manner of means; any more than addressing the whole as "saints and faithful in Christ Jesus," implies that each and every parent, servant, and master, who was by profession, visibly a member of those or any other churches, is really regenerate. He is constantly indicating that among the churches so addressed there are those who in words profess Christ, and in works deny him. But this much is clearly implied in respect to all alike, that obedience to the Lord, in an exemplary walk and conversation, is that which alone befits their position, as professing, in themselves or through their parents, the religion of Christ; that this is what is to be looked for as presumptively true of them, until they dispel this presumption, and forfeit their high privileges by the express rejection of them, or by heresies and scandals equivalent thereto; *i. e.*, by apostacy.

The doctrine thus clearly deduced from Scripture, has been the doctrine of Christendom, with insignificant exceptions—leaving out of view those ritualists who take the still higher and unwarrantable ground of baptismal regeneration. It is expressly incorporated in the symbols of all the Reformed churches, and in the practice of some of them is pressed to a dangerous ultraism, while a few, including many of our American churches, in recoiling from the extreme which made this precious truth a cover of formalism, have swung to the opposite and no less perilous extreme; and have wholly or partially lost sight of the covenant privileges and obligations of our children, whereby they, the church, and religion, have suffered inestimable loss. But, whatever may have been our degeneracy

in practice, there is no doubt that the Presbyterian standards fully and emphatically assert the principles we have advanced. They declare that "the visible church, which is catholic and universal under the gospel, (not confined to one nation as before under the law,) consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation." This does not mean that all that profess the true religion, or their children, actually possess it; or that even pious children should come to the Lord's table till they are old enough to discern the Lord's body; but it means that they are to be regarded and treated as those who, under such appropripriate Christian regimen as befits their position, may reasonably be expected to exemplify these professions, and live and act as becomes the members of the family of God, till they manifest the contrary. That this is its practical meaning and intent, as to the appropriate recognition, training, and church relation of the children of the covenant, is put beyond all doubt by the explicit practical interpretation given in the Directory for Public Worship, in the following words:

"Children born within the pale of the visible church and dedicated to God in baptism, are under the inspection and government of the church; and are to be taught to read, and repeat the Catechism, the Apostles' Creed, and the Lord's Prayer. They are to be taught to pray, to abhor sin, to fear God, to obey the Lord Jesus Christ. And, when they come to years of discretion, if they be free from scandal, appear sober and steady, and to have sufficient knowledge to discern the Lord's body, they ought to be informed it is their duty and privilege to come to the Lord's Supper."

There can be no doubt that these symbols assume all in regard to the children of the church which has been claimed in this article. They afterwards speak of covenant children as "young Christians." But this is not intended to encourage any but real believers to come to the Lord's supper. Else where the minister is instructed to "warn the ignorant, profane, scandalous, and those who secretly indulge in known sins, not to approach the holy table; while those sensible of

their lost and helpless estate, depending on the atonement of Christ for pardon and acceptance with God, who desire to renounce their sins, and are determined to lead a holy and godly life, are to be invited to it. See *Directory for Worship*, viii. 4.

Whether children or mature professors be concerned, all are not Israel that are of Israel. The attempt to exclude from the visible church all but the actually regenerate, must inevitably prove a failure. The attempt to extirpate *all* tares will inevitably extirpate the wheat. No stringency in terms of admission to the Lord's table can exclude all unworthy partakers. Not all who in the judgment of charity, for purposes of human treatment, must be recognised as members of the church visible, are therefore members of the church invisible; although their position in the visible church is upon the presumption that they are and will prove those chosen of God, who constitute the church invisible, unless they dispel it by acts and professions contradictory thereto. "He is not a Jew that is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew that is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." Rom. ii. 28, 29.

The truth thus developed is of immense importance and interest to the church, her ministers, and office-bearers. Let them not put the lambs of Christ out of that fold in which he, in the amplitude of his love and grace, has placed them for due nourishment, protection, and growth. Let them cherish, and feed, and guard them by all the appliances of Christian instruction, discipline, and watchfulness; and by abundant prayer, for the Holy Spirit to be shed upon them, for the service of Him who claims them as His own, that so they may be prepared for the full duties and privileges of mature Christians, when they reach the years of discretion; and for the ratification of the vows, and the assumption of the professions made for them in baptism, by their parents in infancy, by a believing approach to the Lord's table, and paying their vows to God in the presence of all his people, on reaching a suitable age. Let parents and children be duly instructed in their duties and privileges in the premises, and can there be a doubt that the church would be

rapidly replenished, not by mere external aggregation, but by development from within; by the multiplication of those vigorous and accomplished Christians who, sanctified from the womb or from childhood, have been trained to a holy facility and aptitude in the service of God; who, being planted in the house of the Lord, shall flourish in the courts of our God, and shall be still praising him, both on earth, and when transplanted to the heavenly paradise.

While this exalts the privileges of the children of the covenant, it in no manner detracts from, it rather augments the privileges of those that are without. The promise is to them also, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. To these also the gospel sounds in tones of sweetest music: "Ho, every one that thirsteth; come ye to the waters; come, buy wine and milk, without money and without price!" "And him that cometh I will in no wise cast out." The more of the children of the covenant that flock to Christ, as clouds and as doves to their windows, the stronger are the heavenward currents that environ all others, and set them towards Christ and salvation; and the greater will be the number of converts from among them. In the most remarkable outpourings of God's Spirit which we have known, the power was felt at first, and chiefly among the children of the covenant, who had been religiously trained, but it soon extended itself from them to others, until infidels even came to seek the Lord.

Parents should be persuaded to enter into the full meaning of the covenant, claim its privileges, and train their offspring according to its meaning and intent—as belonging to the Lord; those to whom he has promised to be a God. Let them bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, that they may feel that they are recreant to their position and privileges, if they do not abhor sin, fear God, and obey Christ; and even before reaching their majority, come to the Lord's table as humble believers upon, and penitent followers of Him.

And shall the children of the covenant, the covenant of the Most High to be their God, repel him when he thus comes to them? Will they spurn their heavenly birthright for the beggarly elements of this world! Will they sink from their high position as members of the church of Christ to the

place of worldlings, the seat of scorners, and the doom of unbelievers? With the seal of God upon their brow, will they go from the commonwealth of Israel to the everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels; from the home of piety, the nurture of the Lord, the baptismal font, the communion table, spread to welcome their approach, and feed them with the bread of heaven, to the realms of outer darkness, the blackness of darkness for ever? God forbid. Do any say that they are too young to exercise faith? Oh dreadful mistake, often made by parents and children! The first step on the part of adults, even the most learned philosophers, is to become as little children; otherwise they cannot exercise saving faith, or enter the kingdom of heaven. He who has any higher than childlike wisdom in practical religion, must forthwith unlearn it, if he would be a disciple of Christ.

By Rev. S. M'C. Anderson.

Art. VI.—*Miracles.*

This is a subject of great importance, because miracles lie at the foundation of a religion which quickens the hopes and directs the energies of the best men among the most powerful nations of the earth. Are they a reality, and is faith in them an intelligent exercise of the understanding? Or would it remove a blot from our rational nature, and add strength and purity to our moral character, if they were banished to the lumber-rooms of superstition? To accomplish this result, infidelity has long been straining all the resources of reason and ridicule. Let us see whether these efforts are worthy of success.

The idea of a miracle cannot be determined either by the signification or usage of the word. Any event out of the common order of things, and suited to excite wonder, is called a miracle in Scripture. The only method of fixing the meaning of the term definitely, is ascertaining the characteristics of that class of events which it is intended to discriminate as miracu-

lous. There are certain events which are distinguished from all others. 1. By being effects produced in the external world. 2. Whose occurrence involves some departure from the laws of nature, or suspension of those laws. 3. Which are to be referred to the direct agency of God as their immediate cause. It is not every event, therefore, produced immediately by divine power, that is a miracle; because regeneration is such a work, and yet is not a miracle. That is, it does not belong to the same category as the healing the sick, raising the dead, opening the eyes of the blind, by a word. It is, of course, expedient to have a separate word for this class of events. The immediate agency of God may be evinced by suspending some natural law, as when Christ walked upon the water. It may be manifested by employing an instrumentality known to have no tendency to produce the result; as the use of clay on the eyes of the blind; or it may be shown by omitting all instrumentality, as when Christ healed, by simply speaking a word. But by whatever means manifested, it is the immediate agency which constitutes the miracle. It is this alone that evinces God's presence—the most important fact in these signs.

Miracles are physically possible. We can imagine but two classes who can consistently deny this. Atheists deny God, and, of course, that which does not exist cannot work. Pantheists deny any God distinct from matter, and such a being could not act, independently of the matter with which he is identified. In these cases, the first absurdity is logically followed by the second. But those who believe in a personal God, by whom matter has been created and fashioned into all its diversified forms, must admit, that he is able to interfere *immediately* among his own works. Did creation exhaust his power, and is he now the helpless spectator of the world? Common sense, with resistless power, declares, If God created all animal forms, he could bring flies or frogs upon Egypt. If he created all water, he could give springs in the desert. If he made man from the dust, who can deny his power to quicken the dead?

Miracles are morally possible. Some would deny all miracles, because it would imply imperfection on the part of God, if he should ever alter or interfere with the laws which he has established. The *a priori* method of reasoning is very seduc-

tive to the understanding. First, because it is so easy. While the inductive philosopher may spend his whole life in observation and experiment, and die without having made any considerable approach to the solution of his problem, the man of speculative genius will assume one or two principles, and weave out, by the force of "remorseless logic," an entire system in a few days. Then, this system of reasoning begets much complacency, as it seems to accomplish so much in a short time, at which others have toiled so long and in vain. But it may weaken our confidence in these speculative conclusions. 1st. To see how speedily they perish, and are succeeded by others. 2d. To see how easily, from obviously true premises, the most plausible conclusions may be drawn, which contradict facts. To illustrate; let it be granted that God is infinitely good, as well as wise and almighty, from these premises to decide what kind of a world he would create and sustain. If this problem were given to a person having no knowledge of the facts with which we are familiar, would he sketch a world having the evils, sins, and sorrows abounding on this planet? We have no faith in any man's honesty who would answer in the affirmative. With infinite goodness to prompt, perfect wisdom to direct, and almighty power to execute, he would exclude evil and suffering from his plan. How would such speculations compare with the facts of our world?

But whatever might have been the case a century ago, it is now as easy to bring the speculation against miracles to the test of facts, as to compare any theory as to the world God would make, with the one he has created. Geology, which has furnished so many objections against the Bible, has given us facts in favour of miracles. It testifies, that many times since organized life was established upon the earth, God has put forth immediate energy, producing results which would not have flowed from existing forces, acting according to established laws. If there is one thing upon which geologists are agreed, it is that the different strata of the earth contain plants and animals generically differing from each other. The chain of being began with the lower forms of life, and as the earth became prepared for that which was higher, the old died out, or perished by some convulsion of nature, and the new were

created. If there has been any creation, there have been many epochs when divine power was thus exerted. If to speak of miracles is to charge God with imperfection, then his own works make the charge. From the deep, rocky chambers of the earth, where priest-craft and king-craft have never come, where prejudice and bigotry are unknown, are brought forth mighty volumes, written all over with the record of miracles, on a scale of stupendous magnificence, in comparison with which the wonders of Egypt, the wilderness, and Canaan, are as nothing. But this testimony of geology is especially valuable from the light which it throws upon the plan of God. It was not completed at once, but it is progressive. And who will say, what neither science nor revelation indicates, that it is now complete. But we will return to this again. In view of this record of facts, it may seem strange to ask, "Can miracles be proved?" Yet, since the days of Hume, it has been an axiom of infidelity, that no amount of evidence can render a miracle credible.

We do not intend to enter upon a minute analysis of this argument, but to make a few brief remarks upon it in passing. The statement that we have a *universal experience* of the uniformity of natural laws, is very far from the truth. The laws of nature have been going on, in air, and earth, and sea, in every part of the world, by night and by day, for many thousands, if not millions, of years, yet Hume had an *intelligent* experience only of a few hours of the day, for a few years, mostly confined to his sitting-room or study, but occasionally extending to a few events in the community where he chanced to be. We wish to be understood literally when we say, his experience had not the ratio to universality, which a drop has to all the water in all the oceans. Nor is there a universal testimony to their uniformity. Many, in all ages, have testified, that on solemn important occasions, they have been superseded by God's immediate agency. But if it should be claimed that the great majority of mankind have experienced a uniformity in the operation of natural forces, this is just what the doctrine of miracles supposes. Indeed, if the laws of nature manifested many and great irregularities, miracles would be useless, as it would be difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish them from

abnormal phenomena in nature, and they could, therefore, never prove the presence of God. But the argument would be worthless, even if there were an absolutely universal experience in favour of uniformity in the operation of natural forces, unless the existence of a personal God is denied. As Hume, no doubt, was an atheist, his argument may have appeared perfectly sound to his own mind. To illustrate its fallacy: suppose we saw a tower rising in solitary magnificence, where no voluntary intelligent agent could come, to which no elemental strife could approach; after having seen it stand thus, unchanged for centuries, we would be justified in discrediting any story of its modification. But if we knew such a tower to be inhabited by intelligent voluntary agents, of sufficient power to change its structure; though it had stood unchanged for ten thousand years, yet upon hearing a report that its form had been modified, we would feel that it was possible. If we knew of a worthy end that might be accomplished by the change, we would not only esteem it possible, but probable, and all the more so, if we knew that, the end being accomplished, the tower would return, without the least injury, to its original form, strength, and beauty. If, then, we believe the universe to be filled with a living mighty presence, by whom it was made, is upheld, and can be modified; and if we knew of some noble, worthy purpose, that could be secured by a temporary interference with its established laws, which would not in the least prevent the future harmony of their action; then such an interference, instead of being incredible, becomes in the highest degree probable. We expect it, just in proportion to the goodness of the end, and our faith in the wisdom and benevolence of God.

We now rise to a higher level. These are considerations, which, in advance, would lead us to expect immediate divine interference in the affairs of the world. It is not intended that the premises enable us to say that God *must* interpose, but they do create an antecedent probability in favour of such immediate agency. This probability arises, 1st. From the progressive plan, apparent in the affairs of the world. We have already seen, that the physical history of the earth discloses an order advancing toward perfection. It has been brought to its

present condition through many progressive states. Plants and animals of a low order were first created, and then these were followed by others more perfect. Thus the Creator has many times changed the inhabitants of the earth, but always advancing. Now there is nothing in the material or moral condition of the world which would indicate that its plan has been brought to a full period of perfect completion. But why should not the Great Worker advance his purpose by the same means which he has already used—his own immediate agency.

To say that it would imply imperfection if he should put forth his power, immediately altering the common order of nature, is to take for granted, that his plan is completed. A traveller passing through a foreign country might come upon a magnificent edifice. He is struck with wonder. He walks around its walls and admires the size and polish of its stones, its lofty columns, the rich cornice, and the exquisite sculpturings. He enters and beholds the noble halls, saloons, and chambers. He goes out and sees no workmen, and concludes the plan is completed. If he had learned the name of the architect, and knew his skill to be perfect, he might afterward refuse to believe a report, that men were at work upon the building. On his foregone conclusion that the plan was finished, it might seem like a charge of imperfection, that he was adding to or altering his work. But how stupid it would be to reason thus, when it was shown that with all its beauty and grandeur, the structure was only in a state of progress towards completion. Instead of pronouncing any change incredible, if we were wise, we would be prepared to expect it. Having, then, seen, that "He who built all things," accomplished what is done by successive advances, and seeing no evidence that the plan is finished, but many that it is still in progress, we are prepared not to disbelieve, but to expect the immediate working of God.

2. But the intervention of God is probable from the condition of the world. It needs the presence of a controlling rectifying power. It is not a logical necessity to inquire, whether the disorder existing in the world results from the necessary imperfection of the incipient stages of the Creator's plan. Or whether it is the consequence of the rebellion of voluntary

accountable creatures from the law of their Maker. The fact is patent, that disorder and misery abound in the world. This we cannot deny, unless we believe that drunkenness, violence, theft, profligacy, and murder, with all the fearful sufferings which flow from them, both to the innocent and guilty, are results which the system of the world was intended to produce. Must we believe that the profligate in the den of infamy, the robber on the highway, and the murderer stained with blood, as much as the models of purity, justice, and humanity, are well-pleasing servants of the Almighty? *Miracles are much more credible than this.* However they took their rise, sin, misery, and disorder abound. And there is no provision in the natural forces of the world, extending the term so as to comprehend all the powers of instinct, intellect, and conscience, as well as the properties of matter, to deal efficiently and equally with these evils. There may be penal suffering which flows from natural causes upon the commission of sin; but it manifestly does not deal equally with the moral character of mankind. The man of few sins often suffers an hundred-fold more than one whose crimes are open, manifold, and enormous. There may be checks on sin, which to some extent restrain the wicked and limit evil; but they are not sufficient to prevent sin, to recover the erring to paths of uprightness, or equally to punish the incorrigible. In what heathen country has any or all of these forces reformed, purified, or elevated a people from a condition of vice into one of commendable virtue. But the contrary result is of common occurrence—nations begin with comparative virtue, but sink into total corruption of manners and morals. There are provisions which in some measure protect the innocent, but they do this very inadequately. If we suppose the evils in the world have resulted from the necessary imperfection of the incipient steps of the Creator's plan, is it not probable that he will carry it on until these imperfections disappear? But if the evils have resulted from the voluntary rebellion of intelligent creatures, who, being made upright, have sought out inventions of sin, is it not equally worthy of God, and therefore inherently probable, that God would interfere to correct the evil? If man has voluntary power to sin, and mar the Creator's work, must he sit still and behold the evil with-

out daring to interfere? We can conceive of few things more incredible, than that God should create beings having powers which they might apply to evil, to the extent of entirely defeating his purpose of goodness, but whom he could not check or control. This is certainly to charge him with grave imperfection. We know of an almost endless variety of insects and animalculæ. How insignificant they appear! We know not whether any one, left without the light of facts, would *a priori* have concluded that divine power would have stooped to plan and originate such infinitesimal atoms of being. But he has done it. It was once said to the immortal spirits of men, "Ye are of more value than many sparrows;" and surely, no scepticism can deny its truth. As man then exceeds a fly, so it is more probable that God would interfere to correct the sins of men, than to create a race of insect life. Let no one say, that this is reviving the question of the schoolmen, concerning the comparative worth of a possible angel and an actual fly. On the contrary, it is rather a question between an actual immortal man and a possible insect. We speak not of what either has a *right* to claim at the hand of God. Neither insect nor sinner has a right to demand either existence or restoration to favour. But if God will act from his own good pleasure, then it is more probable that he will exert immediate agency to recover man than create insects. Indeed, so great was this probability in the estimation of some of the best heathen, that they expressed a hope that such an interposition would be made to instruct and recover man.

3. There is a great probability of an immediate intervention of the Creator amid the forces of nature, from the voluntary character of man. It is no reflection on infinite wisdom and almighty power, that they cannot accomplish impossibilities, or do things which are contradictory. But there is not a greater contradiction between life and death, than between sin and holiness. We may here take for granted that the sin existing in the world is not from God. That he is not the author of sin, and hence, man as made by him, was innocent. Of course the order of nature about him would be adapted to a condition of virtue. Now, who is able to show, that any wise system, adapted to creatures in a state of holiness, could be made,

which would develope, by its own forces, into a system adapted to creatures in a state of sin? When men would choose the evil, it is impossible to say that the wants of their condition could be met, except by immediate interference. It is a circumstance of strong probability in favour of the miracles of revelation, that they introduce such a remedial system. But beyond this, in the government of the world, the problem is, to adapt its phenomena to the moral character of men. We do not forget or deny the omniscience and omnipotence of God; but from the innumerable and direct contradictions, resulting from the voluntary character of man, no one can show that a system of uniform natural forces could be so combined as to develope into phenomena suited to the character of creatures, acting sometimes from reason, at others from caprice; sometimes prompted by conscience, at others goaded by passion or prejudice. It is much more probable that God should interfere among these forces, arranging them to meet the conduct of accountable creatures, or controlling their minds according to his purpose.

4. Miracles are probable from the universal activity which belongs to intelligent beings. We have no glimpse of intellectual creatures anywhere, but activity is a law of their being. It is the condition of our own life and happiness. It is necessary to the acquisition of all excellence, to the preservation of health, and the enjoyment of physical or intellectual pleasures. It is not only favourable to virtue, but the best men have their purest enjoyments in its connection. It seems, therefore, peculiarly the condition of innocent and happy beings. It may justly be regarded as the testimony of nature, that we are made in the likeness of God, in respect to our intellectual and moral nature. It would then be a rational conclusion, that the activity, which he has made the condition of all intelligent life, is the law of his own nature. But this is the teaching of facts. All the glimpses which we catch of the starry worlds, and the voluminous records written in the bosom of the earth, testify that during inconceivably long periods of time, He has been a constant worker. There is then, from this, an antecedent probability that he will continue a constant worker, as the wants of his kingdom may require.

We now make the statement that the miracles of the Bible possess a verisimilitude strongly recommending them to belief. It may here be proper to make a passing remark on the sceptical proposition that miracles cannot prove the truth of a doctrine. Let it be remembered that a miracle is a result produced immediately by divine power—"a work which no man can do, except God be with him." The work may be ministered by man, but every such minister would join with Peter and John in disclaiming the credit of the miracle: "Why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk." The miracle may be ministered by man, but it is wrought by the immediate power of God. If any man, having this conception of a miracle, will go on and say that it may be attached to false doctrines, then he certainly cannot believe that God's moral character is perfect—that he will not lie. If God be true and just, then we know that everything to which he applies the seal of his almighty power, to testify his presence and approbation, must also correspond with his character in truth. This verisimilitude is seen in the harmony of the miracles with the doctrines of the Bible. They are not like the flagitious prodigies of mythology. They have a sound healthy influence on moral character. The statements of the Bible concerning man's guilt, the evil of his sin, the means and end of his recovery, and the miracles by which this revelation is confirmed, reciprocally correspond with each other, and with the character of God, as shown in his works. But it is seen again in their harmony with the miracles recorded in the rocky volumes of the earth. They cluster around epochs. When the earth had advanced in its preparation, so as to be fitted for a higher order of plants or animals, then Almighty power appeared with its miracles of creation, and more perfect types of life were originated and placed upon the earth. The work of redemption is progressive, and the miracles of revelation gather themselves around its epochs. There were a few in the days of Abraham. Then they burst forth with splendour at the exodus from Egypt, the journey through the wilderness, and the conquest of Canaan. There are a few during the judges. They brighten at the times of Elijah, but with a few at the Babylonish captivity, they pale to burst forth in glorious displays of divine power at the time of

Christ and his apostles. It was just at these times that miracles had a significance and value as seals of the divine presence and will. They confirmed the faith of Abraham in the covenant made with him; so that it was more precious to him and his posterity. In the time of Moses and Joshua they illustrated the character of God as a moral governor, both to Israel and the surrounding nations; and confirmed the faith of the nation in the system of moral and typical institutions established. The great apostacy at the time of Elijah needed the miracles which were wrought, to resist its spread; while the miracles at Babylon both encouraged the faith of Israel in their national heritage, and secured them respect with the heathen. And the gospel was planted and spread because the "Lord confirmed the word by signs following." It would be interesting to trace out the bearing of each "mighty work;" but we have only glanced at the subject, enough to see that it was only when the redemptive work, so worthy of God, required to be carried on, that miracles evince his immediate presence and approbation to that work. We have always felt that Augustine brought a resistless argument against the miracles and gods of heathenism, when he so repeatedly urged the fact in his "City of God," that none of their deities had ever given a moral law to their worshippers. But the mighty works of revelation fulfil a necessary work in establishing a system of religion which has advanced the standard of morality in all civilized nations, Christian and heathen; and bids fair, in time, to accomplish the promised redemption of the world.

We notice a few objections against miracles. 1st. Much is said about the necessity of uniformity in the laws of nature. This is a general truth. But when a recent writer declares that all certainty in the result of human efforts is destroyed, and physical science is impossible, the moment a miracle is admitted, it becomes ridiculous. Will any one believe, that because its maker can turn the index of a chronometer backward or forward, or stop its running, that therefore any knowledge of its laws of motion is impossible, and it becomes worthless as a measure of time from the moment he altered the index? From the very nature of miracles, as caused by the *immediate* power of God, it is impossible that they should produce the

shadow of a doubt concerning the uniformity of natural laws in cases where that energy is not put forth. What husbandman ever lost his faith in the earth's yielding fruit in response to cultivation, because he believed that Christ had multiplied the loaves of bread? Did any one ever leap overboard, expecting to finish his journey in the belly of a fish, rather than in the ship's cabin, because he believed the story of Jonah?

It is often objected to miracles, that they are recorded as performed in ages of superstition, and among people not advanced in learning and culture. The *fact is*, they challenged the greatest learning of their times. Egypt was at the head of ancient civilization, and there they had a formal trial, in presence of the king. Rome was at her zenith at the time of Christ, and if there were not many Romans in Judea, the gospel did not fail to go to Rome, and win its trophies under the shadow of the imperial palace. But let it be granted, that the world was then less scientific, less cultured, than now. Are miracles for that reason less credible? If it were even possible for the great thinkers of the present, to discover the way to reconciliation with God, to virtue, and happiness, was it not worthy of him to bring relief to the millions, who, for long generations, succeeded each other to the sad inheritance of sin and woe? Or would it have better become the fatherhood of God, to have left them in helpless degradation, because they could not speculate about the "absolute" and "unconditioned," distinguish between the "ego" and "non ego," or discuss "entity" and "quidity," than to have given them a revelation with the only seal of his presence and will which they could understand—a miracle. This was perfectly within their capacity, and suited to their habits of thought. Abraham could know the reality of the fire which descended and consumed his sacrifice, with as much certainty as the most learned philosopher that ever penetrated the mysteries of nature. But the supposition is gratuitous, for there is no indication that our "irrepressible science" has cast one ray beyond the grave, or elevated the moral character of men in the present.

But why should there be such opposition to the idea of God's immediate presence in his works as is implied in the doctrine of miracles and a special providence? It cannot be said that

science has disproved either. We have seen that it has discovered the most decided testimony in favour of miracles; and if it has discovered secondary causes, in the arrangement of providence, where formerly none were known, it has still left a world of impenetrable mystery in their combination, where the immediate hand of God is busy arranging the events of life. Is this unworthy of God? Let our conception be of a being who has originated a system of multitudinous and complex forces and checks, which unfolds itself to meet future contingencies as they arise, (though no one can show that this is possible, amid the many conflicting opposites of the world,) and then retires, leaving his machine to grind out its destiny, unmindful of the result. Let another conception be of a being who has originated a system, simple in its structure, but flexible in its application, which the maker observes, and as each contingency arises, by a touch adapts it to the desired end. Which of these corresponds best with the known simplicity of nature, the essential activity of all intelligence, and the condition of rational, voluntary, accountable creatures? Which has most restraint upon sin, encouragement for virtue, and consolation for sorrow? It is no imperfection, that God is a living mighty intelligence, present in the midst of his works. To assert this, would just be as if some one had said to Phidias, when he was finishing the statue of Minerva, the crowning glory of the Acropolis, that it would be a great imperfection if he should add to it the powers of life. But who does not feel, that if this were an imperfection in the statue, it would be a great improvement in the goddess—that she might hear and act as a present virtuous and mighty protector to all her worshippers. So it may seem an imperfection in that statue-like divinity, which some are fond of chiseling out of thin marble philosophy, that God either knows, cares for, or can interfere with the destiny of man. But certainly it is a great improvement in the idea of God, as a moral governor, or that higher, more blessed conception of him, as "Our Father in heaven."

By J. Packard, Esq.

ART. VII.—*The Beautiful Things of Earth.*

WHILE wars and rumours of wars are absorbing so large a share of public attention and sympathy, may it not be a seasonable relief to turn the eye to the quiet and peaceful scenes of nature, and to some of the most common and obvious of her works, which solicit our admiration, and contribute to our enjoyment? A very dear friend of ours, doomed in the early years of womanhood to the seclusion of a sick-chamber, received, one morning, a beautiful bouquet. She took it into her emaciated hand, looked at the flowers a moment, and then, with a sweet smile, expressive at once of gratitude and adoration, faintly said, "It *is* a beautiful world!" Yet how few of the multitudes who spend a life among its beauties, recognise them, or realize how much they minister to human happiness? It has been said that he whose eye is so refined by discipline that it can repose with pleasure upon the severe outline of even a beautiful form, has reached the purest of sensational enjoyment.*

If at the accomplishment of the work of creation an angel had been summoned to behold this beautiful world, before a moving creature had been introduced, could he have doubted that it was framed, fitted up, and adorned for beings who should have organs of sense and capacities of exquisite enjoyment in the use of them? Indeed may it not be questioned whether the view of the Creator's handiwork, which drew from the angelic hosts shouts of joy, was not taken while it was yet such an unoccupied theatre of divine wisdom and skill? The airy vault beneath which our globe revolves, the deep, restless sea, the giant mountains, the flowing river, the impenetrable forest, and the trackless desert, independent of all animation, present a spectacle of unrivalled grandeur and sublimity.

It is our present purpose to direct the thoughts of the reader to two or three of the most simple and common phenomena of the outer world, and to persuade some hitherto uninterested

* Robertson.

spectator to avail himself of such an unfailing source of personal enjoyment. It is not every one, however, who can relish a beautiful object in nature or art. Were a savage from the wilderness to be suddenly transported from his wigwam to the foot of the Horse-shoe Fall, he would be likely to gaze for a moment at the "show," and then, without betraying the slightest emotion, turn away and seek to hide himself in the forest. But there comes another, whose eye never grows weary of beholding, and who knows too well the poverty of words to express the awe and wonder with which the scene fills his mind. These both have organs of sense alike, but they have not both the power to enjoy.

Some men walk abroad in the fields on a June morning, and trample unconsciously upon flowers, the beauty and fragrance of which fill another with delight. The miller's son looks out upon the broad sea, and considers how many thousand ponds like his father's could be pumped out of it, while his school-mate may regard it as the great highway of the commerce of the world—the bond that unites the family of nations. "It has wonders for instruction," says a quaint writer of a former age, "a variety of creatures for examination, and diversity of accidents for admiration. It brings health to the sick, delightful refreshment to the weary, and fertilizing moisture to the thirsty earth. It entertains the sun with vapours, the moon with obsequiousness, and the stars with a natural mirror, and is itself made subservient to the wealth and glory of the world by that art of arts—navigation."

One of the first thoughts that will occur to us as we walk abroad among the beautiful things of earth, is their wide diffusion—their boundless affluence. "Wherever there is a patch of earth there is likely to be a patch of wild flowers. If there is a crevice in the rock wide enough to admit the edge of a knife, there will the winds carry a few grains of dust, and there, straight up springs a flower. In the lower part of the Alps they cover the earth with beauty. Midway up the mountains they meet you again, sometimes fragrant, and always lovely. Where the larch, and the pine, and the rhododendron, (the last living shrub,) are no longer to be seen, when you are just about to tread upon the border of perpetual snow, there still

peep up and blossom the forget-me-nots, the Alpine ranunculus, and the white and blue gentian, the last of which displays a blue of such intense and splendid colouring as can scarcely be surpassed by the heavens themselves. It is impossible not to be affected at thus meeting with these unsheltered things at the edge of eternal barrenness."

"Spake full well in language quaint and olden,
One who dwelleth by the castled Rhine,
When he called the flowers, so blue and golden,
Stars that in earth's firmament do shine."

Even the homely potato has a beautiful blossom, and the graceful cornstalk is adorned with tufts of the softest silk.

Sweetly has one of our popular poets* given speech and language to these dumb orators.

"Your voiceless lips, O flowers! are living preachers,
Each cup a pulpit—every leaf a book,
Supplying to my fancy num'rous teachers
From loneliest nook.

Floral apostles! that in dewy splendour
'Weep without woe, and blush without a crime,'
Oh, may I deeply learn, and ne'er surrender,
Your love sublime.

'Thou wert not, Solomon, in all thy glory
Arrayed,' the lilies cry, 'in robes like ours;
How vain your grandeur, alas! how transitory
Are human flowers.'

In the sweet-scented pictures, Heavenly Artist!
With which Thou paintest nature's wide-spread hall,
What a delightful lesson thou impartest
Of love to all.

Not useless are ye flowers, though made for pleasure,
Blooming o'er field and wave, by day and night,
From every source your sanction bids me treasure
Harmless delight.

Ephemeral sages! what instructors hoary,
In such a world of thought could furnish scope,
Each fading calyx a *memento mori*,
Yet fount of hope.

* Horace Smith.

Posthumous glories! angel-like collection,
Upraised from seed or bulb interr'd in earth,
Ye are to me a type of resurrection
And second birth.

Were I, O God, in churchless lands remaining,
Far from all voice of teachers and divines;
My soul would find in flowers of Thine ordaining,
Priests, sermons, shrines."

This universal diffusion of one class of beautiful objects is, with some limitation, characteristic of all; but the present reference, so far as natural objects are concerned, we shall restrict to such as are beautiful for *sound*, *colour* or *motion*.

(1.) The variety of agreeable *sounds* is an impressive feature of the outward world. There are birds of the sea, of beautiful plumage and motion, but they are not songsters. These fill only the inhabited parts of the world, wherever there are ears to be regaled with their music. Many a time have we strolled through a southern forest, towards evening, and endeavoured to distinguish the chief performers in a bird-concert, but such was the variety and yet similarity of notes, and so harmoniously did they blend with each other, that, with two or three exceptions, the attempt was vain. Now and then a distinct strain could be heard, independent of the grand chorus, to which we paid involuntary deference. No combination of musical sounds heard among men, could equal the sweetness, softness, and harmony of these choral symphonies.

Close observers of birds have, as we know, interpreted their songs with no little ingenuity, and have thus imparted to them an interest much beyond that of unmeaning sounds, however musical. One may easily fancy a dialogue with some sociable individual of the feathered race. A little happy creature perches himself upon a post, a bush, or the limb of a tree, and after casting a quick glance around, and adjusting his dress for a moment, opens his pipes, and out comes a little dulcet music. He stops; cocks his tiny head, and seems to listen. We say—"Thank you, little friend, your notes are very melodious to the ear. We seldom hear any that we like so well. Could we not tempt your little throat to try another strain?" As this little flattering speech occupies about as much time as he usually

pauses, he is all ready at its close to pipe up again, and then we tell him how sorry we are that bad boys ever trouble him or his family, or that he has any annoyances in the world where he is trying to do all the good he can, and not willingly hurting anybody. And this seems to tickle his vanity a little, and forthwith he entertains us with another strain, which he scarcely completes when something diverts him, and off he flits to gratify other listeners, or perhaps to sing where only birds and insects will hear him.

Beautiful as is the music of the woods and fields, in itself, it is doubly so if we can suppose it to be a medium of social intercourse between the musicians themselves—their every-day conversation set to music. That there really is a meaning in bird notes, defined and intelligible among themselves, we are assured by those who narrowly watch the sounds, and the movements which accompany or follow them.

Let the incredulous go out into the meadows on a summer's morning, and say if there could be put in print a more urgent and yet courteous suggestion of duty to a delinquent debtor, than our American ornithologist bears in the dunning song of Robert-of-Lincoln, (familiarly Bob-o-link.) "Bob-o-link! Bob-o-link to Tom Denny. Tom Denny, come, pay me the two-and-six-pence, you've owed me more than a year and a half now! 'Tshe 'Tshe 'Tahe, 'Tsh 'Tsh 'Tshe!" then suddenly diving down into the grass, as if to avoid any altercation.

It is difficult to account for the peculiar variations in the songs of birds, says a naturalist, except on the hypothesis that their notes have some significance among their own tribe. For example, the blue-bird, at the opening of Spring, seems to call in a subdued winning tone. Is it for a mate? Soon the note changes to a soft warbling trill. Is it a token of requited love? If one whistles in close imitation of these sounds, in their proper accent, the bird responds. In the autumn the same bird utters a plaintive note while he passes, with his flitting tribe, over the fading woods. Is it a requiem?

There is that little cunning, impudent fellow, the wren, who will be content with a nest in an old hat nailed up on the side of the shed, or in the pocket of an unused carriage—has his song, "so loud, sprightly, and tremulous," no meaning?

He seems to strain every muscle of his little body, and his throat is opened as if he would swallow himself, so anxious does he seem to sing so loud that all the world shall hear. At the sultry hour of noon, when most of the musicians of the air seek repose and shelter from the heat, the shrill pipe of this "sylvan elf," is wide open; and when two or three other birds are excited by his notes to sing, we can scarcely persuade ourselves that there is not some understanding among them, that favours us with an aerial concert, of which the ear never tires.

It has been said that "every variety of animated beings possess some means of intelligible communication. Each creature, by peculiar sounds or signs of correspondence, has a language understood by its own kind, and sometimes learned by others. Emotions of caution, affection and fear; of joy, gratitude and grief, are disclosed by simple tones of voice or impressive gestures, to signify feelings, strictly comprehended and often answered. Insects, birds, fishes and beasts thus express themselves in distinct languages,—signs spoken and sung, seen, heard and felt."*

Some birds, especially those of the gregarious and migratory tribes, (as the crane, martin, wild duck and goose,) have a peculiar note, which is called "the gathering cry." The swallow has it also. His usual song is a soft melancholy twitter, but when about to enter upon their annual migration, these birds are summoned to their general rendezvous by a peculiar and uniform note. Crows will sail above and around a carcass for a long time, if there is no tree to alight on, and will give a signal of the approach of an enemy. When the feast begins, one of the flock selects a post of observation from which he can descry danger, and in due time another relieves him, that he may take his share in the repast. Such a process indicates some sort of intercommunication.

We were once walking on the tow-path of the Lehigh Canal, when a solitary duck waddled along before us. Whether it was love of mischief or love of the duck we do not know, but something prompted us to drive her into the water, and pass on. At the distance of one hundred rods or more, we came across

* Dr. Gibbon before The Society for the Advancement of Science, Boston, 1858.

the rest of the flock, and drove them in also. Some token interchanged between them must have attracted their attention, for a clump of trees intervened to prevent their seeing each other. As the stray duck approached the rest, they first paddled faster, and then flew towards each other and (as nearly as ducks could) into each others arms. Once fairly together, they flapped their wings joyously, settled quietly down upon the glassy water, and began to quack with an energy such as they would be likely to display were they chatting familiarly about the land-lubber who had been so ungracious to them, and the fears they had felt that they should never quack together again.

But it is at early dawn, when darkness flees away and the light reveals the dim outlines of the forest and mountain, that the bird-concert is heard to the greatest advantage. It seems like a universal congratulation—a shout of praise and thanksgiving for the gift of a new day. The lark bears the gladness of earth upward to the skies; others stay below and chant their morning hymn; and all this is independent of man. The eagle would have screamed on the summits of the cliffs, and the nightingale would have sung its song in the forest, without waiting for a human audience. The robin's mate and its rival songsters only might hear its melody, or for its own enjoyment it might sing, but sing it must.

There are many sounds which convey pleasant impressions, though they have no such distinct character and charm as the music of birds. It has been said that the most unmusical sound in the world is the lowing of a cow; and yet it contributes so essentially to the agreeable associations of country life, that —in that gem of English poetry, Grey's "Elegy"—it is made the signal of placid repose:

> "The curfew tolls the knell of parting day,
> The *lowing* herd winds slowly o'er the lea."

And to one lost in the woods, (as some one has observed,) such a sound, indicating as it does the proximity of a human habitation, is so welcome, that the wanderer would almost throw his arms around the neck of the brute in token of his gratitude.

There are sounds which become musical by association. The

first croak of the frog, as a token of the breaking up of winter, falls agreeably upon the ear. Why so disparaging a term should be applied to the sound he makes, is not known. Querulous and ill-boding people are called "croakers," but the frog is always happy when he croaks; it is his expression of security and enjoyment. The raven has always been regarded by superstitious people as a bird of ill-omen:

> "The hoarse raven on the blasted bough,
> By *croaking* from the left, presaged the coming blow."

But the abused frogs are cheerful and buoyant. "Nature is never melancholy," says Coleridge, and adds a writer in Blackwood, "as Wilkes was no Wilkesite, so frogs are no croakers."

"In the month of April," says an enthusiastic lover of nature, "what is finer than a symphonious frog-pond?" The renowned Dr. Livingstone, who found in Africa "a splendid esculent frog, nearly as large as a spring chicken," (which it resembles when cooked,) says, "its music was always regarded as the most pleasant sound that met the ear, after crossing portions of the thirsty desert; and I can fully appreciate the sympathy with these animals shown by Æsop, (himself an African,) in the fable of the 'Boys and the Frogs.'"

The *cricket* is not to be despised as a musician, nor indeed to be reckoned an inferior acquisition to the grand orchestra of nature. He has generally been regarded as a cheerful songster. Milton says:

> "Far from all resort of mirth,
> Save the *cricket* on the hearth."

Implying that the little fellow is of a mirthful turn. It is to be observed, however, that the music he makes is not vocal but instrumental; being caused, as naturalists tell us, by the friction of the superior pair of his wings, one against the other;—a contrivance quite as ingenious and effective as our modern cymbals, which are merely two circular metallic plates, the edges of which are brought into contact, to produce not so agreeable a sound.

But there are beautiful sounds which are involuntary. They are without effort or seeming purpose. Such are the

sounds of gurgling waters, and the mysterious winds. Not rural sights alone, but rural sounds

> "Exhilarate the spirits, and restore the tone
> Of languid nature. Mighty winds
> That sweep the skirt of some far-spreading wood
> Of ancient growth, make music not unlike
> The dash of ocean on his winding shore,
> And lull the spirit while they fill the mind."

"What makes things musical? Action, said the little stream. I lay still in my mountain cradle for a long while; occasionally the shadow of an eagle swept across me with a wild cry, but generally from morning till night, I knew no change save in the shadow of my rocky cradle, and the shadows of the clouds; but rocks and clouds are very silent. The singing birds did not venture so high, and the insects had nothing to tempt them near me, because no honied flower-bells bent over me there; nothing but little mosses and grey lichens, and these, though very lovely, are quiet creatures, and make no stir. I longed to have power to wake the hills; but I should have found it more monotonous had I not felt that I was growing, and should flow forth to bless the fields, by and by. Every drop that fell into my rocky bason I welcomed, and at last the spring rains came, and all my rocks sent me down little rills on every side, and the snows melted into my cup, and at last I rose beyond the rim of my dwelling, and was free! Then I danced down over the hills, and sang as I went, till all the lonely places were glad with my voice; and I tumbled over the stones like bells, and crept among the cresses like fairy flutes, and dashed over the rocks and plunged into the pools with all my endless harmonies. 'Action makes me musical,' said the stream."

Take your straw hat or sun-bonnet, on some sultry day, and walk leisurely down to that little clump of trees at the foot of the lawn; seat yourself on the clean, dry log, or smooth rock, which you will find there, and "be silent that you may hear."

Your ear is greeted with the dull insect hum, and now and then there is a note from the sparrow or the thrush, but you will soon find that the sweetest music of that spot is made by the gentle quiet flow of water. The old logs, the mossy rocks, or a wisp of straw and sticks, obstruct its passage, and occasion

a miniature fall; and as some of these obstructions occur in deeper currents, and others at the shallower edge of the brook, it comes to pass that the fall is here an inch or two, and there as many feet. Some mingle with the flowing stream at once, and others liking a little truant frolic, take a circuitous route through the tall grass, and fall into the current below; so that altogether there is an indescribable combination of agreeable sounds inviting to meditation and repose. The constancy of the current gives you the impression of an active onward movement, while the gentleness and softness of its murmurs, is irresistibly suggestive of rest.

In our Western wilds the weary traveller is often entertained during his wayside-meal, by the music of one of these sporting brooks, in a manner that puts quite in the back-ground the performances of expensive bands, with horns, and hautboys, and clattering drums, at public festivals. So that it may not be always that

> "Pure gurgling rills a *lonely* desert trace,
> And waste their music on a *savage* race."

But there are inexhaustible harmonies in the winds also. A friend said to us the other day, "I never went into the woods, even when I was a boy, without an instinctive inclination to pray." One of our popular American poets* tells us of

> "The sacred influence
> That from the stilly twilight of the place
> And from the gray old trunks, that, high in heaven,
> Mingled their mossy boughs, and from the sound
> Of the invisible breath that sway'd at once
> All their green tops, stole over him and bowed
> His spirit with the thought of boundless power
> And inaccessible majesty."

And it is not strange that the silence which reigns in these deep shades, and the exclusion from them of all that jostles and annoys us in the busy world, should beget a feeling of awe and veneration. But it is with sound, not silence, that we are concerned. It is said that "the wind is a musician at birth. We extend a silken thread in the crevice of a window, and the wind

* Bryant.

finds it, and goes up and down the scale upon it, and poor Paganini must go somewhere elsewhere for honour, for lo! the wind is performing upon a single string! It tries almost everything there is upon earth to see if there is any music in it. It persuades a tune out of the great bell in the tower, when the sexton is at home and asleep—it makes a mournful harp of the giant pines, and it does not disdain to try what sort of a whistle can be made of the humblest chimney in the world. And what a melody it sings when it gives a concert with a full choir of the waves of the sea; and how fondly it haunts old houses, moaning under the eaves, sighing in the halls, opening old doors without fingers, and singing a measure of some old song around the fireless and deserted hearth."

II. We now pass to the beauty and variety of *colours* which adorn our world, and which are so profusely spread over every province of it. And what first meets the eye is the gorgeous carpet of grass which is spread over the larger part of its solid surface. There are few objects more grateful to the sight than a lawn, in the early spring, upon which the tender grass has attained just height enough to give it a uniform robe of green. The softness, richness, and purity which we behold, as the silver light gleams over it, completely satisfies the ideal of verdure. So when the crop has been removed, and the newly mown meadow presents itself to view, with gladsome birds feasting themselves on seeds and insects which can no longer be concealed, the passer-by is prompted to exclaim, How beautiful!

If we would appreciate this matter of colour, we have only to suppose that the grass, and trees, and plants, had been red, blue, or yellow, and that a green thing were as rare in the gardens, fields, and woods, as a red, blue, or yellow thing is now. The eye rests with satisfaction on the field of golden wheat interspersed in the landscape, but if the grass, and corn, and leaves were of the same complexion, it would seek relief from the sight. So, too, were everything green, the sky, the water, and the ripe grain, the effect would be most ungrateful to the sense.

In the various departments of the floral world we will find an endless variety of colour, as well as of form. If we select, for example, the family of roses, it would be difficult to name

any colour or shade which is not represented. Roses are found, it might almost be said, wherever man is found. There are supposed to be more than three thousand varieties, or nearly the number of the known languages and dialects of the globe. Except in Australia and South America, they are believed to be universal. And in these countries they have such a profusion of other flowers, and of beautiful birds not found elsewhere, that they can afford to dispense with roses.

The delicate tints which distinguish some species of flowers seemed designed to compensate for the absence of fragrance. The family of the Dahlias belong to this class, and also the Japonica and the Fuchsia. No one can fail to notice a singular contrast in the colours of the leaf of many shrubs and trees. The upper surface is of a dark, rich, glossy green, while the lower is nearly a dull white. When moved by the wind these surfaces seem to be mingled, and as they receive the light at different angles, one might look upon them as a multitude of animated beings, vieing with each other in the exhibition of their beauties. Perhaps no feature of animate nature is more striking than the richness and variety of colours which birds display, and as it would seem to be no source of pleasure or occasion of pride to them, we must suppose that it is to gratify us that they are so adorned. In many of the finny race also, as the salmon, trout, and the goldfish, we see a gorgeous array of colours.

And it is not the richness and variety of these colours only that charm the eye, but the exquisite blending of them, especially in the flower-world, and the harmony of their colour with the season and climate in which they are seen. In tropical regions, the most brilliant colours prevail in the plumage of birds and in the productions of the forest and flower-garden. This harmony is traced, by some admirer of nature, in eloquent terms:

"As winter departs, the modest violet first blooms beneath a veil of leaves, which radiate back upon the fragrant little flower all the heat that departs from it. As the snows disappear, blossoms of other flowers open, which display themselves more boldly; but they are blanched, or nearly so. In the passage from the last snows of winter to the first blossoms of spring, the harmony of colour is preserved,—hill-sides and orchards

are laden with delicate white, varied rarely by the pink upon the almond-tree. Petals of apple-blossoms floating on the wind mimic the flakes of snow that were so lately seen. As the warm season advances, colours deepen, until we come to the dark crimson of autumn flowers, and the brown of autumn leaves. This change is meant not only to be beautiful—it has its use. Why are the first spring flowers all white, or nearly white? Because when the winds are still cold, and when the sun is only moderately kind, a flower would be chilled to death if its heat radiated from it rapidly. But radiation takes place most freely from dark colours—from black, from the strongly-defined greens, and blues, and reds. In hot weather, flowers and leaves so coloured cool more readily at night, and form upon their surface the healing dew. The delicate spring flowers are, therefore, of a colour that is at least ready to encourage radiation. For the same reason—because white substances give out least freely the heat that they contain or cover—arctic animals are white as their native snows. For the same reason, too, the snow itself is white. When cold becomes severe, snow falls, and hangs like a fur mantle about the soil. If snow were black, or red, or blue, it would still let some of the heat escape which is retained under its whiteness. In regions subject to a cold almost incessant, a short summer produces flowers of extremely vivid colouring. The summer, although short, is fierce, and the plants radiate fast, that they may escape destruction. The dark verdure of the northern pines would cause them to lose heat with great rapidity. For compensation, they are made to grow in pyramids, that catch a cone of snow so cleverly as to form an overcoat during the hard weather. Birch trees that grow in the same forests rise among the pines like silver columns; and they are not shaped to catch the snow, because they do not want it. They have their own light clothing of a brilliant whiteness."

III. If we turn our thoughts now to the beautiful things of MOTION, with which all nature abounds, we shall find no lack of interest. Take first the falling snow. Who has seen anything more graceful than the crystal flake descending, with more or less rapidity and directness, but with steady certainty, to the lap of earth? A puff of wind puts the pure, white,

glistening little strangers into a frolic, and they race about in the air as children in their nursery, and yet so noiselessly and gently do they indulge their sport, that the face of the earth, for hundreds of miles in extent, may be found covered a foot or two deep with them, during the silent watches of a single night, without so much sound as is made by the breathing of a healthy infant.

"Silently gentle, softly slow,
With buoyant fluttering,
Flake upon flake, the feathery snow,
Rests upon everything.

The rough strong branch; each twig and spray;
Smooth leaf of holly-tree;
Grass, hedgerow, housetop, busy way;
All white as white can be.

How all God's doings manifold,
His power and wisdom teach,
Sunshine and rain, and heat and cold,
A loving kindness each.

And all this gently falling snow
Has symbol sweet to me;
How, without pause, his mercies flow,
Silently, tenderly."

From the beauty of *motion* in the falling snow we cannot easily separate the beauty of the substance itself. The falling of soot, or the floating of thistle down, were it equally graceful, would not be equally agreeable. The very purity of it, as it comes down from the vault of heaven, is fitted to make one's thoughts pure. It was a rude, but scarcely a fantastic notion of the Barbadoes girl, who, seeing snow for the first time, thought it must be angels emptying their beds of down upon the earth.

We will venture to say that few persons could watch without admiring the career of the wind attending or succeeding a fall of light snow. Perhaps the black massive clouds are still upon the skirts of the horizon, or the sun may have come forth and turned every crystal flake into a glittering gem. But suddenly the wind rises, and the air is soon filled with eddies of the pure white snow, or gathered in crested drifts by the roadside and along the borders of the fields. A beautiful descrip-

tion of such a scene we have from old *Roger Ascham*, Secretary of State under three successive British sovereigns. From the glare of courts and the turmoil of politics he turned not unwillingly to note the humours of the wind and its gambols with the snow.

"To see the wind with a man's eye it is impossible—the nature of it is so fine and subtle; yet this experience of the wind had I once myself. I rode in a highway, being somewhat trodden before by wayfaring men. The fields on both sides were plain, and lay almost a yard deep with snow. The night before had been a little frosty, so that the snow was hard and crusted above; so, as the wind blew, it took the loose snow with it, and made it so slide upon the snow in the fields, which was hard and crusted by reason of the frost over night, that thereby I might see very well the whole nature of the wind as it blew that day; and I had great delight and pleasure to mark it. Sometimes the wind would not be past two yards broad, and so it would carry the snow as far as I could see. Another time it would sweep over half the field at once. Sometimes the snow would tremble softly—by and by it would fly wonderful fast. And this I perceived also, that the wind goeth by streams, and not all together—sometimes slowlier, sometimes swifter; sometimes broader, sometimes narrower, so far as I could see. And then it flew not straight, but sometimes this way, and then that way; and sometimes it ran round about in a compass; and sometimes the snow would be lift clear from the ground up in the air; and by and by it would be all clapt to the ground as though there had been no wind at all. And again I could hear the wind blow in the air when nothing was stirred on the ground; and then, all at once, it would lift up the snow again wonderfully. This experience made me more marvel at the nature of the wind than it made me cunning in the knowledge of it."

Perhaps few objects are more beautiful for motion than *running water*. There is a wild brook flowing along the base of one of the mountains that overhang Mauch Chunk, Pennsylvania, which we have followed with inexpressible delight. Its fall, in the course of three or four miles, may be several hundred feet, while no single fall is more than five or six inches.

Our first glimpse of it is as it lies motionless in a little shady nook, where it seems to have been arranging the plan of its expedition. It sets out with wonderful glee, sparkles in the sunlight for a few rods, and then, seeming to be seized with a sudden fit of timidity or modesty, retires within a thick-leaved arch, but soon shows itself again, though with more calm and sedate manners, flowing on with scarcely a gurgle or a ripple. By and by some little obstruction impedes and excites it, when forthwith it pitches and tumbles its little volume hither and thither, over this and that, and then slipping triumphantly along upon a bed of smooth stones, seems to forget its struggles. And now it frolics in sunshine and shade; sometimes quiet, and then restless and noisy; and we follow it as we would a frisky companion, with a mixture of curiosity and anxiety, to see what the end of its wild career will be.

"By thirsty hills it hurries down,
Or slips between the ridges;
By twenty thorps*—a little town—
And half a dozen bridges.

It chatters over stony ways
In little sharps and trebles,
Or bubbles into eddying ways,
And babbles on the pebbles."

The motion of the *sea* is not more grave than beautiful. The ebbing and flowing tides give us the idea of power and grandeur, but the motion of the waves that of beauty. Unlike the brook and the river—its tributaries—the waters of the sea are at rest. The series of ridges and hollows, which we call waves, seem to us to advance towards the shore, till they break with a dash of spray upon the beach, but it is a mere appearance. The water may be perfectly composed except this surface-motion, and the mighty billows, so lofty as to hide from each other's view the largest vessels when only a few rods apart, are merely bodies of water at rest, as it regards horizontal motion, and only depressed on one side and elevated on the other by the action of the wind.

"The wave behind impels the wave before."

* Hamlets.

The motion of a vessel upon this undulating surface is surpassingly beautiful. With inimitable grace she sits upon the treacherous throne, descending upon the falling and rising upon the ascending wave; and now and then, as if to show off, she gently reclines, first on one side and then on the other, while her snow-white sails, proudly bent, "receive the humble service of the winds."

And while by the sea-side, we may notice that in air as well as upon water, are objects conspicuous for beauty of motion. The fish-hawk poises himself in mid-heaven, sails slowly and serenely round and round for minutes together, flapping his wings but once or twice, and ending his graceful gyration by suddenly darting to the surface of the water, and with almost unerring certainty seizing his scaly prey.

The *branches of trees*, so graceful in their form and position, are beautiful in motion. There is a stateliness and grandeur in the lofty forest tree, independent of motion, which strikes the observing eye, leading the fancy of the poet to conceive of those

"Green-rob'd senators of mighty woods—tall oaks."

But the seeming animation with which motion endues them, is a source of constant pleasure. We have known an invalid lady, whose tedious hours of confinement were inexpressibly relieved by watching the movements of a young maple, which grew at the distance of several rods from her window. The topmost twigs only were visible above the roofs of intervening houses, and yet their motions were various and beautiful enough to delight the weary eyes that gazed upon them.

But perhaps the *clouds* may be regarded as among the most beautiful of all natural objects, so far as *motion* is concerned. We suppose biblical critics will be slow to allow such an interpretation, but we sometimes think the passage, "he that regardeth the clouds shall not reap," might perhaps intimate to us, among other things, that the observation of their endless shapes and beautiful motions would so absorb a contemplative or imaginative husbandman, if he should give himself up to it, that he would forego his labour, and so lose his harvest.

The clouds furnish the sacred poets and orators with some of

their most sublime and impressive images. Among the achievements of Omnipotence it is said, "He bindeth up the waters in his thick cloud, and the cloud is not rent under them." By another the clouds are represented as the "chariots of the Almighty," and by a third, as "the dust of his feet." Beautiful indeed are these gigantic masses of vapour that force themselves above the earth, and carry in their bosom the treasures of animal and vegetable life.

"When the lofty and barren mountain was first up-heaved into the sky," says a legend of India, "and from its elevation looked down on the plains below, and saw its own valley and the less elevated hills around it covered with verdure and fruitful trees, it sent up to Brahma something like a murmur of complaint, 'Why am I thus barren! Why these naked and scarred sides exposed to the eye of man!'

"And Brahma answered, 'The very light shall clothe thee, and the shadow of a passing cloud shall be thy royal mantle. With more verdure there would be less light. Thou shalt share in the azure of heaven, and the youngest and fairest cloud of a summer sky shall nestle in thy bosom. Thou belongest half to us.'

"So was the mountain dowered, and so have the loftiest minds of men in all ages been dowered. To lower elevations have been given the pleasant verdure, the vine, and the olive. Light! Light alone, and the deep shadow of the passing cloud, these are the gifts bestowed on the prophets of the race."

"The sky," says a popular writer,* "is the part of creation in which nature" (or nature's God) "has done more for the sake of pleasing man, more for the sole and evident purpose of talking to him and teaching him, than in any part of her" (his) "works, and it is just the fact which man regards with least attention. Every essential purpose of the sky might be answered, so far as we know, if once in three days, or thereabouts, a great ugly black rain cloud were brought up over the blue sky, and everything well watered, and then all left blue again till next time, with perhaps a film of morning and evening mist for dew. But instead of this, there is not a moment

* Ruskin.

or day in any of our lives when nature" (or her God) "is not producing scene after scene, picture after picture, glory after glory, and working still upon such exquisite and constant principles of the most perfect beauty, that it is quite certain it is all done for us, and intended for our perpetual pleasure. Yes, the sky is for all. Sometimes gentle, sometimes capricious, sometimes awful—never the same for two moments together—almost human in its passions, almost spiritual in its tenderness, its appeal to what is immortal in us is as distinct as its ministry of chastisement or of blessing to what is mortal in us, is essential."

To a few the revelations of the sky are full of meaning and interest. Here and there one can see,

> "Underneath the young grey dawn
> A multitude of dense white fleecy clouds,
> Wandering in thick flocks among the mountains,
> Shepherded by the slow, unwilling wind,"

but to most it appears only as the reservoir of light and vapour, from which men receive supplies in common with the worm and the weed. "In moments of utter idleness and vacuity, we turn as a last resort to the sky, and one says it has been warm, another, it has been wet, and still another, it has been windy. But who saw the chain of tall white mountains that girded the horizon yesterday? Who saw the narrow sunbeam that came out of the south, and smote upon their summits, till they blended, or melted away in a dust of blue rain? Who saw the dance of the dead clouds when the sunbeams left them last night, and the west wind blew them before it like withered leaves?"

If we turn from these specific objects of grace and beauty, to the phenomena with which our daily life is most intimately concerned, we shall find new and higher claims upon our admiration. Think for a moment of the succession of day and night. We awake from sleep (the mysterious image of death) with invigorated powers of body and mind. Our nerves and muscles at once obey our will, and the inexplicable functions of heart, and mind, and conscience, are resumed. We throw open our window, and inhale the fragrant and bracing air of a new

morning. And it is all literally NEW. "The scene to every individual man, woman, and child, shifts with every rising and setting sun. To-day is like no day which has ever been before, or ever shall be again. The position of all the heavenly bodies is changed as it respects the earth. There is a new condition of the whole vegetable world." All the human family have taken a long step in life's journey. Nothing is exactly as it was yesterday, or as it will be to-morrow. Thousands leave, and other thousands enter upon this stage of action, between every sun-rising and setting. Does not this idea of vast, unceasing, universal change, challenge our admiration? Not a blade of grass, not a flower, not an insect, not a living creature, is at rest. "The clouds now sailing over the deep blue sky were never there before. To beasts and birds, who borrow no thoughts or cares from yesterday or to-morrow, each day is the beginning of a new life." The dew-drops that sparkle in the sunbeams this morning, are as fresh, and pure, and new, as those which decked the garden of Eden.

The succession of seasons is superlatively grand and beautiful. There is the autumnal decay of living nature, its burial during the cheerless winter, and its upspringing into life and gladness to meet the vernal sun. Eloquently has it been said, "that every green thing loves to die in bright colours. The vegetable cohort marches glowing out of the year in flaming dress, as if to leave this earth were a triumph, not a sadness. It is never nature that is so sad, but only we, who dare not look back on the past, and that have not its prophecy of the future in our bosoms. But there is quite as much of life as of death in autumn—as much of creation and youth as of passing away. Every flower has left its house full of seeds. No leaf has dropped till a bud has been born to it. Already another year is hidden along the bough, another summer is secure among the decaying flowers. Along the banks the green, heart-shaped leaves of the violet, tell me that it is all well at the root, and on turning the soil, I find those spring beauties that died are only sleeping. What earth has once owned and had, it shall never lose. There is resurrection-hope not alone in the garden sepulchre of Christ. Every leaf, and tree, and root, is an annual prophet,

sent to affirm the future and cheer the way. Thus as birds, to lead their little ones to fly, do fly first themselves to show the way, and as guides that would bring the timid to venture into the dark-faced pool, do first go back and forth through it, so the year and its mighty multitude of growths walk in and out before us, to encourage our faith of life by death; of decay for the sake of better growth. Every seed and every bud whispers to us, to secure while the leaf is yet green, the germ that shall live when frosts have destroyed both fruit and flower."

But the beautiful things which are obvious to sight and sense are not worthy to be compared with those that are appreciable only by our moral faculties. Into the magnificent temple of light, and life, and beauty, which rose to the view of the sons of the morning, when the Creator "spake, and it was done," an intelligent immortal being enters, to admire and adore; but there is a higher sphere of contemplation suited to its higher and holier sympathies. There is something in the heroism of the champions of truth and right; in the stern moral conflicts with "the world, the flesh, and the devil," and in the signal victories which are won over self and sin, that excites a very different class of emotions. Who reads of that noble tribute of filial gratitude to which, in the old age of chivalry, a company of lordly knights listened, without inexpressible admiration? The walls of the old castle resounded with sounds of mirth and song. Each knight had pledged his lady by name in the flowing cup, when St. Leon's turn came,

"'I drink to one,' he said,
'Whose image never may depart—
Deep graven on this grateful heart,
Till memory is dead.
To one whose love for me shall last,
When lighter passions long have past,
So holy 'tis, and true;
To one whose love both longer dwelt,
More deeply fixed—more keenly felt—
Than any pledged to you.'

Each guest upstarted at the word,
And laid a hand upon his sword,
With fiery flashing eyes.

And Stanley said, 'We crave the name,
Proud knight! of this most peerless dame,
Whose love you count so high.'
St. Leon paused, as if he would
Not breathe her name in careless mood,
Thus lightly to another;
Then bent his noble head, as though
To give that word the reverence due—
And gently said—'My Mother!'"

What in the wide world is more beautiful than that little creature, with its tiny, clean, plump hand, grasping the fold of its mother's dress? What fearless confidence does that little hand, full of frail silk or cotton, inspire, and what is it but the incipiency of a faith, which, in its maturer growth and diviner virtue, gave birth to "the glorious company of the apostles, the goodly fellowship of the prophets, and the noble army of martyrs." Well would it be, if as that little hand grows larger, and leaner, and stronger, the soul that animates it could grasp with equal confidence other objects of faith revealed with the advance of years.

What beauty of the stars or flowers—what grandeur of mountain or ocean scenery, stirs the soul like the spectacle of a little wee thing—the daughter of the lighthouse-keeper—who, in the unexplained absence of her father, braves the fury of the storm; with toil and peril climbs the lofty tower, and sends the light flashing out far off upon the foaming waters!

But our limits forbid any further expatiation, and our object is accomplished if we have invested with new interest but one of the many beautiful objects that are familiar to every-day life. In times like these, when the wail of sorrow and woe comes to us on the wings of every wind, and we are prone to brood over the "ills that flesh is heir to," we do well to take lessons of cheerfulness and confidence from the beautiful things of earth. The hand that contrived, upholds, and controls the well-ordered frame of the material universe, distributes with more than royal munificence the gifts of his bounty. There is no valley so deep, or dwelling so dark, that no beam of sunshine can penetrate it. The faith of the lost traveller has been nerved by beholding the exquisite structure of a tuft of moss, and the dreariness of a captive's cell has been made cheerful by the

presence of an insect. The show of nature is all open. The poorest and meanest have the freest access and largest liberty. There is no limit to the hours of admittance; no rising and falling curtain, except as one of the most beautiful and sublime features of the exhibition. There are no reserved seats—no privileged boxes. The language of the whole spectacle to the whole race of intelligent creatures is—

> "Praise God in the sanctuary;
> Praise him in the firmament of his power;
> Praise him for his mighty acts;
> Praise him according to his excellent greatness.
> Let every thing that hath breath praise the Lord."

"There is a rapture," says one, "in the beholding of this wondrous world. There is a joy in contemplating the manifold forms in which the All-Beautiful has concealed his essence, and the living garment in which the Invisible has robed his mysterious loveliness. In every aspect of nature there is joy; whether it be the purity of virgin morning, or the sombre grey of a day of clouds, or the solemn pomp and majesty of night." But all this is the *finite* beautiful—it is the *transient*, not the *eternal*.

> "There's not a leaf within the bower,
> There's not a bird upon the tree—
> There's not a dewdrop in the flower,
> But bears the impress, Lord, of thee.
> Thy hand the varied leaf designed,
> And gave the bird its thrilling tune;—
> Thy power the dewdrop's tints combine,
> Till like a diamond's blaze they shine."*

The eye rises with the heart from these majestic mountains; this boundless expanse of waters; these beautiful objects which delight and refresh the sense and the mind; to the firmament above us, and by the power of religious faith we penetrate the veil and behold the infinite and eternal One—the Creator, Upholder, and Ruler of all. To be the object of His love and favour; to be adopted into his family; to be like Him; to be with Him—must be "joy unspeakable and full of glory."

* Mrs. Opie.

By Charles Hodge D.D.

Art. VIII.—*Relation of the Church and State.*

This is an exceedingly complicated and difficult subject. There are three aspects under which it may be viewed.

I. The actual relation which at different times and in different countries has subsisted between the two institutions.

II. The theory devised to justify or determine the limits of such existing relation.

III. The normal relation, such as should exist according to the revealed will of God, and the nature of the state and of the church.

Before the conversion of Constantine, the church was of course so far independent of the state, that she determined her own faith, regulated her worship, chose her officers, and exercised her discipline without any interference of the civil authorities. Her members were regarded as citizens of the state, whose religious opinions and practices were, except in times of persecution, regarded as matters of indifference. It is probable that much the same liberty was accorded to the early Christians as was granted by the Romans to the Jews, who were not only allowed, in ordinary cases, to conduct their synagogue services as they pleased, but to decide matters of dispute among themselves, according to their own laws. It is also stated that churches were allowed to hold real estate before the profession of Christianity by the Emperor.

When Constantine declared himself a Christian, he expressed the relation which was henceforth to subsist between the church and state, by saying to certain bishops, "God has made you the bishops of the internal affairs of the church, and me the bishop of its external affairs." This saying has ever since been, throughout a large portion of Christendom, the standing formula for expressing the relation of the civil magistrate to the kingdom of Christ.

According to this statement, it belongs to the church, through her own organs, to choose her officers, to regulate all matters relating to doctrine, to administer the word and sacraments, to

order public worship, and to exercise discipline. And to the state to provide for the support of the clergy, to determine the sources and amount of their incomes, to fix the limits of parishes and dioceses, to provide places of public worship, to call together the clergy, to preside in their meetings, to give the force of laws to their decisions, and to see that external obedience at least was rendered to the decrees and acts of discipline.

And this, in general terms, was the actual relation between the two institutions under the Roman emperors, and in many of the states which rose after the dissolution of the Roman empire. But it is easy to see that the distinction between the internal affairs which belonged to the bishops, and the external, which matters belonging to the civil ruler, is too indefinite to keep two mighty bodies from coming into collision. If the magistrate provided the support of the bishops and sustained them in their places of influence, he felt entitled to have a voice in saying who should receive his funds, and use that influence. If he was to enforce the decisions of councils as to matters of faith and discipline, he must have some agency in determining what those decisions should be. If he was to banish from his kingdom those whom the clergy excluded from the church, he must judge whether such exclusion was in itself just. And on the other hand, if the church was recognised as a divine institution, with divinely constituted government and powers, she would constantly struggle to preserve her prerogatives from the encroachments of the state, and to draw to herself all the power requisite to enforce her decisions in the sphere of the state into which she was adopted, which she of right possessed in her own sphere as a spiritual, and, in one sense voluntary, society.

Simple and plausible, therefore, as the relation between the church and state, as determined by Constantine, may at first sight appear, the whole history of the church shows that it cannot be maintained. Either the church will encroach on the peculiar province of the state, or the state upon that of the church. It would require an outline of ecclesiastical history, from Constantine to the present day, to exhibit the conflicts and vacillations of these two principles. The struggle though protracted and varied in its prospects, was decided in favour of

the church, which, under the papacy, gained a complete ascendency over the state.

The papal world constituted one body, of which the Pope, as vicar of Christ, was the head. This spiritual body claimed a divine right to make its own laws, appoint its own officers, and have its own tribunals, to which alone its officers were amenable, and before whom all persons in the state, from the highest to the lowest, could be cited to appear. All ecclesiastical persons were thus withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the state; while all civil persons were subject to the jurisdiction of the church. The church being the infallible judge of all questions relating to faith and practice, and it being the obvious duty of all men to receive the decisions and obey the injunctions of an infallible authority, the state was bound to receive all those decisions and enforce all those commands. The civil magistrate had no judgment or discretion in the case: he was but the secular arm of the church, with whose judgments, no matter how injurious he might regard them to his own prerogative, or to the interests of his people, he had no right to interfere. The church, however, claimed the right to interfere in all the decisions of the civil power; because she only could judge whether those decisions were or were not inimical to the true faith, or consistent with the rule of duty. Hence arose what is called the indirect power of the church in the temporal affairs of the state. Even without going to the extreme of claiming for the Pope, by divine right, a direct sovereignty over the Christian world, moderate Romanists of the Italian school claimed for the Pope this indirect power in the civil affairs of kingdoms; that is, power of deciding whether any law or measure was or was not hurtful to the church, and either to sanction or to annul it. And in case any sovereign should persist in a course pronounced by an infallible authority hurtful to the church, the obligation of obedience on the part of his subjects was declared to be at an end, and the sovereign deposed.

In most cases, the actual relation between the church and state is determined historically, *i. e.*, by the course of events, and then a theory invented to explain and justify it; but in the case of the papacy, it is probable the theory preceded and produced the actual relation. On the assumption of the external

unity of the whole church under a visible head, and of the infallibility of that visible body when speaking through its appropriate organ, the relation of the church to the state, which Gregory strove to realize, and which did for ages subsist, is the normal relation; and it is therefore, at the present day, the very theory which is held by the great body of Romanists.

In practice, however, it was found intolerable, and therefore, especially in France, and later in Austria, the kings have resisted this domination, and asserted that as the state no less than the church is of divine origin, the former has the right to judge whether the acts and decisions of the church are consistent with the rights and interests of the state. The kings of France, therefore, claimed indirect power in the affairs of the church, and exercised the right of giving a *placet*, as it was called, to acts of the church; that is, they required that such acts should be submitted to them, and receive their sanction before taking effect in their dominions.

II. As the Reformation involved the rejection of the doctrine of the visible unity of the church under one infallible head, it of necessity introduced a change in the relation between the state and the church. This relation, however, was very different in different countries, and that difference was evidently not the result of any preconceived theory, but of the course of events. It was, therefore, one thing in England, another in Scotland, and another in Germany.

With regard to England, it may be said, in general terms, that the Reformation was effected by the civil power. The authority by which all changes were decreed, was that of the king and parliament. The church passively submitted, subscribing articles presented for acceptance, and adopting forms of worship and general regulations prescribed for her use. This fact is so inconsistent with the high-church theory, that every effort is made by advocates of that theory, to evade its force, and to show that the change was the work of the church itself. It is admitted, however, by episcopal writers themselves, that in the time of Henry and Edward, the great majority both of the clergy and the people, *i. e.*, the church, was opposed to the reformation.

Henry rejected the authority of the Pope, though he adhered

to the doctrines of Romanism. He declared himself by act of Parliament the head of the church, and required all the bishops to give up their sees, suspending them from office, and then made each take out a commission from the crown, in which it was declared that all ecclesiastical power flowed from the sovereign, and that the bishops acted in his name, and by virtue of power derived from him.

The six articles were framed by his authority, in opposition to Cranmer and the real Reformers, and enacted by Parliament, and made obligatory under severe penalties, upon all the clergy. These articles affirm all the distinguishing doctrines of Romanism.

The clearest proof that they rested on the authority of the king is, that as soon as he died they were discarded, and a doctrinal formulary of an opposite character adopted.

Under Edward the Sixth, the actual practice was for the crown to appoint a certain number of the clergy to prepare the requisite formularies or measures, and then these, if approved by the king, were published in his name, and enforced by act of Parliament. The convocation and the clergy then gave their assent. It was thus the Prayer Book was prepared and introduced. Thus, too, the Articles of Religion were, under Edward, the act of the civil power alone. They were drawn up under Cranmer's direction, and with the assistance of other divines, but they were not the work of the Convocation, as their preamble would seem to imply; nor were they set forth by any authority but that of the crown. *Short*, § 484. Under Elizabeth they were revised by the Convocation.

The actual relation of the church to the state in England, is sufficiently indicated by these facts. The king was declared to be the supreme head of the church; *i. e.*, the source of authority in its government, and the supreme judge of all persons and causes ecclesiastical, of whatever kind. The clergy were brought with great difficulty to make this acknowledgment, and therefore it cannot be said to be the spontaneous act of the church. It was rather an usurpation. It is said that the acknowledgment was made with the saving clause, *quantum per Christi legem licet*, with regard to which, there is a dispute, whether it was in the first acknowledgment. The prepon-

derance of evidence, so far as we know, is against it; and certain it is, it is not now in the oath. And it can make little difference, because the very end of the oath was to declare that Christ did allow the king the power which he claimed and exercised.

The king then, as head of the church, changed the form of worship, introduced new articles of faith, suspended and appointed bishops, visited all parts of the church to reform abuses, issued edicts regulating matters of discipline, granted commissions to the bishops to act in his name, and by act of Parliament declared that all jurisdiction, spiritual and temporal, emanates from him, and that all proceedings in the episcopal courts should be in his name.

These principles have ever been acted on in the church of England; though with less flagrancy of course in the settled state of the church than at the Reformation. All the proceedings, however, of Elizabeth; all the acts of James I. against the Puritans; of Charles I. in Scotland, in the introduction of episcopacy into that country; of Charles II. at his restoration, and even of William III. at the Revolution, when the non-juring bishops were excluded, were founded on the assumption of the absolute power of the state over the church. And every thing still rests on that foundation. The king still appoints all the bishops, and has the legal right to suspend them; all the binding authority of the Articles and Prayer Book rests on acts of Parliament. No man can be refused admission to the church, no matter what his opinions or character, against the will of the state; and no man can be excommunicated but by civil process; and the ultimate decision, even in the trial of a bishop for heresy, is rendered by the king in council. *Whiston.*

Different theories have been devised to justify this entire subordination of the church to the state. The early Reformers, Cranmer especially, were thoroughly Erastian; and held that the king was intrusted with the whole care of his subjects, as well concerning the administration of the word, as in things civil and political; and as he had under him civil officers to act in his name, so he had church officers, the one class being assigned, appointed, and selected by the authority of the king, as much as the other. Cranmer did not even hold to the necessity of any ordination by church officers, considering the

king's commission all-sufficient. This whole theory rests on an exorbitant notion of the regal power.

A second theory supposes that there is no difference between a Christian state and a church. A church is a people professing Christianity, and they may adopt what form of government they please. This supposes not only that the details of church government are not prescribed in Scripture, but that there is no government in the hands of church officers at all ordained by Christ; but in whatever way the will of the sovereign power, *i. e.*, of the people, is expressed and exercised, is, as to its form, legitimate; and hence the best and most healthful form of church government is that which most fully identifies the church with the state. This is the doctrine of Dr. Arnold. Though this theory, if sound, might justify the existing state of things in England, it cannot justify the Reformation; for that was not carried on by the people, *i. e.*, the church in its state capacity, but by the civil authority, in despite both of the clergy and the people.

High-churchmen take different grounds. Some admit the irregularity in the mode of proceeding under Henry and Elizabeth, but justify it on the ground of necessity, or of extraordinary emergency, calling for the exercise of extraordinary powers. Others, as Mr. Palmer, deny that the church is responsible for those acts, or that she is to be judged by the preamble of acts of Parliament, or by the claims or acts of the crown, but exclusively by her own declarations and acts. And he endeavours to show that all the leading facts of the Reformation were determined by the church. To do this, however, he is obliged to maintain that what the king did on the advice of a few divines, was done by the church, which is as unreasonable as to refer the sanatory or legal regulations of a kingdom to the authority of the physicians or lawyers who may be consulted in drawing them up.

Mr. Palmer falls back on the theory suggested by Constantine, which assigns the internal government of the church to bishops, and the external to the king. He accordingly denies that the king can, either by himself or by officers deriving their authority from him, pronounce definitions of faith, administer the word or sacraments, or absolve or excommuni-

cate. He may, however, convene Synods, and preside in them; sanction their decisions, and give them the force of laws; he may refuse to sanction them, if contrary to the doctrines of the catholic church, or injurious to the state; he may receive appeals from church-courts; preserve subordination and unity in the church; prevent, by civil pains and penalties, all secession from her communion, and found and endow new bishoprics.

This doctrine rests on the assumption, 1. That it is the design of the state, and the duty of its officers, to promote and sustain religion by civil pains and penalties; 2. That the church is a divine institution, with a prescribed faith and discipline; and 3d. That the marks of the true church are so plain that no honest man can mistake them.

The only point in which this system differs from the papal doctrine on this subject is, that it allows the civil magistrate discretion whether he will enforce the decisions of the church or not. This difference arises from the fact that tractarians do not pretend that provincial synods are infallible; and with such only has the king anything to do; whereas Romanists maintain that the Pope, speaking *ex cathedra*, is infallible. There is room, therefore, for discretion in reference to the decisions of the former, but none in reference to those of the latter.

Mr. Palmer, however, is far from maintaining that the actual state of things corresponds with his theory, and most tractarians are loud in their complaints of the bondage under which the church in England is now groaning.

III. *Lutherans.* In Germany the course of the Reformation was very different from what it was in England, and consequently the relation between the church and state received a different form. The movement took its rise, and was guided in all its progress, in the former country, by Luther and his associates, and was sanctioned cordially by the people. He did not wait to be called up by the Elector to denounce the errors of popery, or to reform its abuses. He did both, and the people joined him. They besought the civil authorities to sanction these changes, and to protect and aid them in carrying them out. And the Electors slowly and cautiously granted their sanction. The Reformation here, therefore, did not proceed

from the state, but really and truly from the church, *i. e.*, the clergy and people, and the state sanctioned and joined it. Had the bishops generally coöperated in the work, it is probable, from the frequent declarations of Luther and Melancthon, they would in Germany, as in Sweden, been allowed, not as a matter of right, but of expediency, to retain the executive power in their hands. But as they had not only greatly neglected all discipline in the church, and finally sided with Rome, the Reformers called on the electors to appoint *consistories*, to be composed, as they expressed it, "of honest and learned men," to supply the deficiency. These bodies were at first designed simply to administer discipline. They were to be church courts, for the trial and punishment of spiritual offences. As, however, the bishops withdrew, the powers of the consistories were enlarged, and they became on the one hand the organ of the church in the examination and ordaining of ministers, and on the other of the state in the management of the external affairs of the church. As the members of these consistories are appointed by the state, and as they are the organs of administering both the internal and external affairs of the state, the prince is, in Lutheran countries, the real possessor of church power, *i. e.*, it is regarded as inhering in him. The whole administration of its affairs are in his hands, and whatever changes are introduced, are made by his authority. Accordingly, the union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches and the introduction of a new liturgy, was the act of the late king of Prussia. At first it was only advisory on his part, but he subsequently began to coerce compliance with his will. This extreme exercise of authority, however, met with great opposition, and was, by a large part of the church, considered as transcending the legitimate power of the state. The present king disclaims such power, and says he wishes to know the mind of the church, and stands ready to carry out her wishes, if consistent with his conscience.

The actual power of the state in Lutheran countries was the result of the Reformation, and not of a theory of what ought to be the relation of the church and state. Different theories have been suggested, in order to give form and intelligibility to this relation. The most common is, that the prince is there, and,

by the will of the church, heir to the power of the bishops. His power is therefore called an episcopate. This theory includes the following points. 1. Civil and ecclesiastical government are distinct. 2. The object of church government is mainly the preservation of the truth. 3. Church power belongs by the ordinance of God to the church itself, and to the prince as the highest member of the church, and since the religious peace, by the legal devolution on him of the power of the bishops. 4. This authority is, however, only external, a *potestas externa*, in the exercise of which he is bound to act according to the judgment of the clergy, and the people have the right of assent or dissent. This is the doctrine of the three orders, as it is called, that is, that church power belongs to the church as composed of prince, clergy, and people.

5. Hence the Prince possesses civil and ecclesiastical power in different ways and on different subjects. This is considered the orthodox, established doctrine of the Lutheran church on the relation of church and state. It is the doctrine of all the older, eminent theologians of that church. *Stahl's Kirchenverfassung*, p. 20. The other theories are the Territorial, *i. e.*, Erastian; the collegiate (voluntary union) and the Hegelian—that the state is God's kingdom; the church but a form of the state. The prince, the point of unity; having the full power of both. He appoints, (not merely confirms bishops,) prescribes liturgies, and gives the contents as well as the binding form to all church decisions. *Stahl*, p. 125.

IV. *Reformed Church.*

According to the Reformed Church of Geneva, Germany, France, Holland, and Scotland, the relation of the state and church is taught in the following propositions as given and sustained by Turrettin. Lec. 28, Ques. 34.

1. Various rights belong to the Christian magistrate in reference to the church.

2. This authority is confined within certain limits, and is essentially different from that of pastors. These limits are thus determined. *a.* The magistrate cannot introduce new articles of faith, or new rites or modes of worship. *b.* He cannot administer the word and sacraments. *c.* He does not pos-

sess the power of the keys. *d.* He cannot prescribe to pastors the form of preaching or administration of the sacraments. *e.* He cannot decide on ecclesiastical affairs, or on controversies of faith, without consulting the pastors.

On the other hand, *a.* He ought to establish the true religion, and when established, faithfully uphold it, and if corrupted, restore and reform it. *b.* He should, to the utmost, protect the church by restraining heretics and disturbers of its peace, by propagating and defending the true religion, and hindering the confession of false religions. *c.* Provide proper ministers, and sustain them in the administration of the word and sacraments, according to the word of God, and found schools as well for the church as the state. *d.* See that ministers do their duty faithfully according to the canons of the church and the laws of the land. *e.* Cause that confessions of faith and ecclesiastical constitutions, agreeable to the Scriptures, be sanctioned, and when sanctioned adhered to. *f.* To call ordinary and extraordinary synods, to moderate in them, and to sanction their decisions with his authority.

The question, "whether the state can rightfully force its subjects to profess the faith," is answered in the negative. The question, "whether heretics should be capitally punished," is answered in the affirmative, provided their heresy is gross and dangerous to the church and state, and provided they are contumacious and malignant in the defence and propagation of it.

The Westminster Confession, as adopted by the Church of Scotland, taught the same general doctrine. The 23d chap. of that Confession contains the following clause: "The civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the word and sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, yet he hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order that unity and peace be preserved in the church, that the faith of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline be prevented or reformed, and all ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed; for the better effecting whereof he hath power to call synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God."

When this Confession was adopted by our church in 1729, this clause was excepted, or adopted only in a qualified manner; and when our present constitution was adopted in 1789, it and the corresponding passages in the Larger Catechism were omitted. It has, however, always been part of the Confession of the Church of Scotland, (and was, it is believed, retained in the Cambridge and Saybrooke Platforms as adopted in New England.)

In words, this clause seems to cover all the ground taken by Mr. Palmer. History shows, however, that the church in Scotland has ever been, in a great measure, independent of the state, and for generations in conflict with it. The practical interpretation, therefore, of the doctrine here taught, has been to deny to the civil magistrate any real control in ecclesiastical affairs.

The late Dr. Cunningham, in one of his tracts, occasioned by the recent controversies, thus expounds the doctrine of this passage.

1. He says, by the civil magistrate is to be understood the supreme civil power; and that the Confession merely teaches what the civil ruler will find to be his duty when he comes to the study of the word of God.

2. That the rule of all his judgments is the word of God.

3. That the Confession denies to the civil magistrate all right to the ministration of the word and sacraments, or to the power of the keys, that is, to the management of the ordinary affairs of the church of Christ; and states, that as it is the duty of every private person to judge for himself whether the doctrines, discipline, and decisions of a church, are according to the word of God, and if so, then to receive, obey, and promote them; so also it is the duty of the civil magistrate, in his sphere, and in the exercise of his legitimate authority and influence, to do the same.

In that branch of the Reformed church which was transported to this country by the Puritans, and established in New England, this same doctrine as to the duty of the magistrate, and relation to the church and state, was taught, though under a somewhat modified form. The New England theory was more that of a theocracy. All civil power was confined to the

members of the church, no person being either eligible to office, or entitled to the right of suffrage, who was not in full communion of some church. The laws of the church became thus the laws of the land, and the two institutions were in a measure merged together. The duty of the magistrate to make and enforce laws for the support of religion, for the suppression of heresy and punishment of heretics, was clearly taught. John Colton even wrote a book to prove that persecution was a Christian duty.

The theory on which this doctrine of the Reformed church is founded, is, 1. That the state is a divine institution, designed for promoting the general welfare of society, and as religion is necessary to that welfare, religion falls legitimately within the sphere of the state. 2. That the magistrate, as representing the state, is, by divine appointment, the guardian of the law, to take vengeance on those who transgress, and for the praise of those who obey; and as the law consists of two tables, one relating to our duties to God, and the other to our duties to men, the magistrate is, *ex officio*, the guardian of both tables, and bound to punish the infractions of the one, as well as of the other. 3. That the word of God determines the limits of the magistrate's office in reference to both classes of his duties; and as, under the Old Testament, there was a form of religion, with its rites and officers prescribed, which the magistrate could not change, so there is under the New. But under the Old, we find with this church government the kings were required to do, and in fact did do much, for the support and reformation of religion, and the punishment of idolaters; so they are now bound to act on the same principles, making the pious kings of the Old Testament their model.

V. *Relation between the church and state in this country.*

The doctrine current among us on this subject is of very recent origin. It was unknown to the ancients before the advent. In no country was religion disconnected with the state. It was unknown to the Jews. The early Christians were not in circumstances to determine the duty of Christian magistrates to the Christian church. Since the time of Constantine, in no part of Christendom, and by no denomination,

has the ground been assumed, until a recent period, that the state and church should be separate and independent bodies. Yet to this doctrine the public mind in this country has already been brought, and to the same conclusion the convictions of God's people in all parts of the world seem rapidly tending. On what grounds, then, does this novel, yet sound, doctrine rest? This question can only be answered in a very general and superficial manner on the present occasion.

1. In the first place it assumes that the state, the family, and the church, are all divine institutions, having the same general end in view, but designed to accomplish that end by different means. That as we cannot infer from the fact the family and the state are both designed to promote the welfare of men, that the magistrate has the right to interfere in the domestic economy of the family; so neither can we infer from the church and state having the same general end, that the one can rightfully interfere with the affairs of the other. If there were no other institution than the family, we might infer that all the means now used by the church and state, for the good of men, might properly be used by the family; and if there were no church, as a separate institution of God, then we might infer that the family and the state were designed to accomplish all that could be effected. But as God has instituted the family for domestic training and government; the state, that we may lead quiet and peaceable lives, and the church for the promotion and extension of true religion, the three are to be kept distinctive within their respective spheres.

2. That the relative duties of these several institutions cannot be learned by reasoning *a priori* from their design, but must be determined from the word of God. And when reasoning from the word of God, we are not authorized to argue from the Old Testament economy, because that was avowedly temporary, and has been abolished; but must derive our conclusions from the New Testament. We find it there taught,

(1.) That Christ did institute a church separate from the state, giving it separate laws and officers.

(2.) That he laid down the qualifications of those officers, and enjoined on the church, not on the state, to judge of their possession by candidates.

(3.) That he prescribed the terms of admission to, and the grounds of exclusion from, the church, and left with the church its officers to administer these rules.

These acts are utterly inconsistent with Erastianism, and with the relation established in England between the church and state.

3. That the New Testament, when speaking of the immediate design of the state, and the official duties of the magistrate, never intimates that he has those functions which the common doctrine of the Lutheran and Reformed churches assign him. This silence, together with the fact that those functions are assigned to the church and church officers, is proof that it is not the will of God that they should be assumed by the state.

4. That the only means which the state can employ to accomplish many of the objects said to belong to it, viz., pains and penalties, are inconsistent with the example and commands of Christ; with the rights of private Christians, guarantied in the word of God, (*i. e.*, to serve God according to the dictates of his conscience,) are ineffectual to the true end of religion, which is voluntary obedience to the truth, and productive of incalculable evil. The New Testament, therefore, does not teach that the magistrate is entitled to take care that true religion is established and maintained; that right men are appointed to church offices; that those officers do their duty; that proper persons be admitted, and improper persons be rejected from the church; or that heretics be punished. And on the other hand, by enjoining all these duties upon the church, as an institution distinct from the state, it teaches positively that they do not belong to the magistrate, but to the church. If to this it be added that experience teaches that the magistrate is the most unfit person to discharge these duties; that his attempting it has always been injurious to religion, and inimical to the rights of conscience, we have reason to rejoice in the recently discovered truth, that the church is independent of the state, and that the state best promotes her interests by letting her alone.

By Rev. J. H. Wright.

Recent Explorations in Africa.

(ADDITIONAL NOTE.)

IN the April Number of this *Review*, in giving some account of recent explorations in Africa, mention was made (p. 288) of the discovery of Lake Nyanza by Captain Speke, and his impression that it was one of the sources of the Nile. At the time of writing the above, we had no idea that a confirmation of this opinion was so near at hand. But it seems that Captain Speke, confident of the justice of his theory, went back to Africa, and, accompanied by Captain Grant, determined to solve a question which has perplexed geographers from the days of Ptolemy to the present. It is now ascertained by these travellers, who returned to England a few months since, that this lake is the principal source of the Nile. Let us briefly recapitulate the main facts, so far as they have come to our knowledge, respecting this discovery.

As in his previous explorations with Captain Burton, his point of departure was from Zanzibar, now an important trading post on a small island off the coast, in latitude six degrees south. From the coast they kept the same route until they reached Kazeh, the settlement occupied by Arab merchants, about six hundred miles inland. From this point their course was more northward, bringing them into the region between Lake Tanganyika and Lake Nyanza. This is a hilly, broken country, forming the eastern limits of the Mountains of the Moon, that is, if that range extends across the continent. Isolated peaks are found ten thousand feet in height, and still further to the east, Kilimanjaro is described by other travellers as rising into the regions of perpetual snow. Lake Nyanza is in the midst of this mountainous region, elevated three thousand five hundred feet above the level of the sea, having feeders reaching still further south and west. Rain is abundant in this region, for in 1862 Captain Speke says there were two hundred and thirty-three days which were more or less wet days. The southern limit of Nyanza is in lat. 2° 24′ south, and it extends

to twenty miles north of the equator. The escape of its waters is by two or three channels which unite in the course of one hundred and fifty miles. Only one of these was visited by the travellers. The water falls over rocks twelve feet high, and the breadth of the stream is one hundred and fifty yards. The Nile is described as a succession of long flats and long rapids, receiving tributaries on either side. They succeeded in visiting it, for two degrees of latitude north of the equator. There the river makes its great bend to the west, to pass through the Luta Nzige Lake, and Captain Speke was obliged to travel along the chord of the bend a distance of seventy miles. From thence onward the Nile is a navigable stream, at least when in flood. Its whole length, in a straight line is over two thousand miles, the last seventeen hundred of which it receives no affluent.

The Mountains of the Moon not only give rise to the Nile, on their northern side, but it is more than probable that Lake Tanganyika is supplied by streams from the north, and that it has an outlet at its southern extremity, uniting it with Lake Shire and Nyassa of Livingstone. This point has not, however, been settled by actual observation.

This high region, which is the source of so many large lakes and rivers, is represented—at least in that portion of it between Nyanza and Tanganyika—as a delightful country of hills, and a climate throughout the year equal to the summer of England. Vegetation is prolific and abundant. "Nothing that will not grow." "Acres upon acres of banana, which is the staple food of the inhabitants; coffee, (chewed as a stimulant.) The date grows wild, also peas, beans, sugar-cane, tomato, tobacco, &c.—all abundant, but extravagant."

The natives of this region are no less interesting than the country in which they dwell. Captain Speke supposed that they were descended from the ancient Abyssinians, who came down gradually from the north, and founded the great kingdom of Kittara, which is now split into several minor kingdoms through internal wars. Of these kings he found the chief of Karagwe the most civilized. This and the adjoining kingdom of Uganda, both lying to the west of Lake Nyanza, are the most interesting of any through which they passed. They are better cultivated and better governed than any other. The people are described

as the "French" of these parts, from their sprightliness, and good taste in behaviour, dress and houses. Their ruler is absolute in power, and some of the slightest misdemeanours are punished with death. Fortunately, he treated the travellers with great kindness, and even affection.

On going north from this region, they found the natives much more barbarous and their language different. The South African family of languages is such that they were able to converse with the nations through which they passed from the east coast, until they reached the more barbarous tribes north of Lake Nyanza.

The account of these travellers would lead us to suppose that this lake and mountainous region of Central Africa is among the finest portions of that vast continent. The country is finely diversified with mountains, lakes, and rivers. It is exceedingly fertile, and we should judge not unhealthy, at least in the higher portions. The natives are represented as a superior race. Their rulers are arbitrary, and unlimited in power, but in some degree enlightened, and favourably impressed with notions of European art and civilization. Though split up into small kingdoms, their language is similar. The country also is populous. In fact, it is from this region, extending south to the Nyassa and Shire, that slaves are brought to Zanzibar. The number exported from there annually is reported, on good authority, to be from sixteen to twenty thousand. Captain Speke says they have no religion, and do not believe in a soul. But closer observation will doubtless prove him mistaken, as travellers before him made similar mistakes in reference to the tribes of South Africa. It is, however, as before remarked, virgin soil for missionary effort. It was expected that the mountains of this region would have proved auriferous, but there is no evidence of this. Had they been, how soon would the track of these travellers have been followed by adventurers in search of gold? How long will it be before an effort is made to save their more precious souls?

SHORT NOTICES.

An Essay on Professional Ethics. By George Sharswood. Second edition. Philadelphia: T. & W. Johnson & Co. 1860.

Although published some time ago, this little volume has lost none of its freshness and value. The subject discussed is one of extreme difficulty and importance. It has seldom been discussed with any thoroughness. Judge Sharswood, in this work, has thrown much needed light upon many of the ethical questions which embarrass the legal practitioner. It is replete at once with evidences of learning and culture, and of great legal and casuistical acumen. The subject discussed is of such high practical moment, that we hope to have an opportunity to give it more adequate attention in some future number.

The Logic of Sir William Hamilton, Bart., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh. Reduced and prepared for use in Colleges and Schools. By Henry N. Day, D. D., LL.D., author of the "Art of Elocution," "Rhetorical Praxis," etc. Cincinnati: Moore, Wilstach, Keys & Co. 1863.

The Logic of Sir William Hamilton is, in our judgment, his most original, complete, and satisfactory work. No one can fail to detect in all his works the tread of a giant in intellect and learning, in many respects peerless among his contemporaries. Yet there are few readers of his works who have not felt tantalized with the incomplete and fragmentary character of his "discussions" and lectures on philosophy, notwithstanding the overpowering light they flash on particular sides and angles of subjects, and the ponderous blows which they deal out to his adversaries. Moreover, as has been shown at large in our pages, with many masterly defences of precious truth, he has advanced some serious errors, which are no less than the germs of the Kantean philosophy. Indeed, he appears to have been caught and held in the adamantine web of Kant's dialectics, in the very effort to burst it. All this detracts seriously from the value of his other works, valuable as they are. But his Logic in a complete, continuous scientific exposition of his subject, evolved from first principles. It is an important contribution to the science. It disburdens it of irrelevant complications with which most writers have encumbered it, and deals with it, first as pure Logic, or the science of the formal and necessary

laws of thought, then as applied to Logic which shows the application of these laws to thinking on actual subjects.

The reduction and adaptation of this great work to the actual capacities of teachers and pupils in our schools and colleges, is a great desideratum. Few are more competent to this task than Professor Day, if we may judge from the success of his text-books in the departments of Rhetoric and Oratory. We regret that we did not receive it in season to give it that examination which would enable us to judge of the author's success in this effort. One thing we can say with some confidence. If it is mainly an abbreviation, it is so far forth a failure. Hamilton's style of presenting such subjects is too formidable for juvenile study. He requires to be liquefied, diluted, and clarified in the alembic of other minds, either through the text-book, or by oral teaching, before our youth can properly "read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest" him. We presume a reading of this volume will show that it has met this requirement.

An Address delivered before the Alumni Association of the College of New Jersey, June 23, 1863. By John S. Hart, LL.D. Published by request of the Alumni Association and of the Board of Trustees.

This scholarly and eloquent address is well fitted to sustain its author's high reputation. It is a glowing tribute to his Alma Mater, and a persuasive appeal to her graduates and friends to complete promptly the effort now in progress for her endowment, which is so essential to her stability and prosperity. But we will let Dr. Hart speak for himself. After showing what this oldest Presbyterian college has done, and the illustrious names she has given to the church and the state, and how Harvard and Yale have been endowed, he asks:

"And how is it with Princeton, historically the fourth on the list of American Colleges? What are her means for sustaining a competition with her two illustrious seniors? What are her endowments? She has her grounds and buildings, her libraries and cabinets, and some small sums in the shape of scholarships for the support of indigent students, yielding annually, in tuition fees, about two thousand dollars. She has also endowments appropriated directly to sustentation purposes, yielding annually about two thousand dollars more. This is the whole story. All her resources, direct and indirect, for keeping the institution agoing, apart from tuition fees and room-rent, amount to four thousand dollars a year, all told. On the other hand, since the breaking out of the war, her revenues, partly from the loss of students, chiefly those from the Southern States, and partly from diminished productiveness of investments, have

fallen off fully eight thousand dollars a year, and the professors are consequently in the humiliating position of having to be sustained by special contributions. The simple, naked, mortifying fact is, notwithstanding stringent retrenchments, the income of the college has to be supplemented to the amount of five thousand dollars a year by private subscriptions, and these subscriptions the professors themselves have to solicit. Does it require any sagacity to see in what this must end?

"Fellow Alumni, shall these things be? Shall Princeton fall back into the rank of a third or fourth rate college? Shall all her garnered wealth of honourable fame, all the power of her prestige, and of her venerable traditions, be lost to society, and lost to the church? Have not Presbyterians, who owe so much to Princeton, been especially delinquent in this behalf? What has New Jersey ever done for the institution which bears her name, and which has done more towards the advancement of her sons, and more to give rank and character to the State itself, than any other one cause—I had almost said, more than all other causes combined? What has New Jersey done for the College of New Jersey? What has this broad belt of Middle States, lying south of New England, done? Princeton has sent them governors, statesmen, jurists, physicians, divines, able administrators in every walk of civil life. She has been the mother of their vigorous young colleges. She has helped to maintain through all their borders a high and noble culture. Has she no claim on them in the hour of her need? Is it not important to every great social and religious interest of the community, throughout this whole middle region of the United States, to maintain here a strong representative college, such as Princeton is? Surely, it would be a burning shame and disgrace, to let a historic name like Princeton disappear, or even wax dim in the firmament.

"But I hope better things for this brave old college. We have all been delighted to see, within the last few months, the evidences of an orderly and resolute effort being made to place our institution at last in a position of permanent security. The appeal which has been made has thus far been responded to promptly and nobly; and if the effort is only followed up persistently and wisely, there seems good reason to hope that before our next commencement the trustees will be able to announce that Princeton has at length been placed in that position of honourable security to which she is entitled by her age and her historical associations."

We are happy to learn that, as we now write, the subscription to the endowment here alluded to, is approaching

sixty thousand dollars. It becomes binding when one hundred thousand dollars is reached. We cannot doubt that this will be speedily secured. And yet, in order to this, it becomes those friends who are able to lend their aid, to consider that the last part of such a subscription is usually far more difficult than the beginning—and to let their gifts and sacrifices be in proportion.

The Presbyterian Historical Almanac and Annual Remembrancer of the Church, for 1863. By Joseph M. Wilson. Fifth Vol. Philadelphia: Joseph M. Wilson, No. 111 South Tenth street.

Mr. Wilson has spared no pains to make this work both attractive and useful. It contains nineteen well executed portraits of distinguished clergymen, eight engravings of churches and institutions of learning, the history of seven congregations, and of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, and upwards of one hundred biographical sketches of ministers and elders. All this is merely accessory to the main body of the volume, which contains a full account of the proceedings of the General Assemblies and Synods of the Presbyterian churches of Scotland, Ireland, the United States, and of British America. This general statement, though not exhaustive of the contents of this volume, is enough to show the labour required for its preparation, and to convince our readers of its very great value. It is a storehouse of important information not easily accessible in any other quarter. We sincerely hope Mr. Wilson may obtain patronage sufficient to encourage and enable him to continue the publication of his Almanac from year to year.

The Young Parson. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., No. 23 North Sixth street. 1863. Pp. 384.

This is a work of fiction. "It is," says the *American Publishers' Circular*, "a series of sketches and stories, the groundwork of all which is real life. The sketching is done faithfully and keenly, but benevolently." The book is got up in the usual good taste which characterizes the publications of Messrs. Smith & English.