THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1864.

No. III.

Art. I.—*The Donatist Controversy.*

1. *The External History.*

Donatism was by far the most important schism in the history of the ancient church, and involved important principles and measures concerning the true nature and discipline of the church, which reappear from time to time in active conflict, although under ever new forms and aspects; since history never repeats itself except in its general laws of Divine appointment and under providential control, and in its general tendencies of human nature and Christian life. For a whole century this schism divided the Christians of North Africa into two hostile camps. Like the earlier schisms in the preceding age of Cyprian, during the middle of the third century, it arose from the conflict of the more rigid and the more indulgent theories of discipline in reference to the restoration of the lapsed. But through the intervention of the nominally Christianized state since Constantine, it assumed at the same time an ecclesiastico-political character. The rigoristic penitential discipline had been represented in the previous period, especially by the Montanists and Novatians, who were still living;

while the milder principle and practice had found its most powerful support in the Roman church, and, since the time of Constantine, had generally prevailed.

The beginnings of the Donatist schism appear in the Dioclesian persecution, which revived that controversy concerning church discipline and martyrdom. The rigoristic party, favoured by Secundus of Tigisis, at that time primate of Numidia, and led by the bishop Donatus of Casæ Nigræ, rushed to the martyr's crown with fanatical contempt of death, and saw in flight from danger, or in the delivering up of the sacred books, only cowardice and treachery, which should for ever exclude from the fellowship of the church. The moderate party, at whose head stood the bishop of Mensurius and his archdeacon and successor Cæcilian, advocated the claims of prudence and discretion, and cast suspicion on the motives of the forward confessors and martyrs. So early as the year 305 a schism was imminent, in the matter of an episcopal election for the city of Cita; but no formal outbreak occurred until after the cessation of the persecution in 311, and then the difficulty arose in connection with the hasty election of Cæcilian to the bishopric of Carthage. The Donatists refused to acknowledge him, because in his ordination the Numidian bishops were slighted, and the service was performed by the bishop Felix of Aptungis, or Aptunga, whom they declared to be a *traditor*, that is, one who had delivered up the sacred writings to the heathen persecutors. In Carthage itself he had many opponents, among whom were the elders of the congregation (*seniores plebis*), and particularly a wealthy and superstitious widow, Lucilla, who was accustomed to kiss certain relics before her daily communion, and seemed to prefer them to the spiritual power of the sacrament. Secundus of Tigisis and seventy Numidian bishops, mostly of the rigoristic school, assembled at Carthage, deposed and excommunicated Cæcilian, who refused to appear, and elected the lector Majorinus, a favourite of Lucilla, in his place. After his death in 315, Majorinus was succeeded by DONATUS, a gifted man, of fiery energy and eloquence, revered by his admirers as a wonder-worker, and styled THE GREAT. From

this man, and not from the Donatus mentioned above, the name of the party was derived.*

Each party endeavoured to gain churches abroad to its side, and thus the schism spread. The Donatists appealed to the emperor Constantine—the first instance of such appeal, and a step which they afterwards had to repent. The emperor, who was at that time in Gaul, referred the matter to the Roman bishop Melchiades (Miltiades) and five Gallican bishops, before whom the accused Cæcilian and ten African bishops from each side were directed to appear. The decision went in favour of Cæcilian, and he was now, except in Africa, universally regarded as the legitimate bishop of Carthage. The Donatists remonstrated. A second investigation, which Constantine intrusted to the Council of Arles (Arelate) in 314, led to the same result. When the Donatists hereupon appealed from this ecclesiastical tribunal to the judgment of the emperor himself, he likewise declared against them at Milan in 316, and soon afterwards issued penal laws against them, threatening them with the banishment of their bishops, and the confiscation of their churches.

Persecution made them enemies of the state whose help they had invoked, and fed the flame of their fanaticism. They made violent resistance to the imperial commissioner, Ursacius, and declared that no power on earth could induce them to hold church fellowship with the "rascal" (nebulo) Cæcilian. Constantine perceived the fruitlessness of the forcible restriction of religion, and, by an edict in 321, granted the Donatists full liberty of faith and worship. He remained faithful to this policy of toleration, and exhorted the catholics to patience and indulgence. At a council in 330 the Donatists numbered two hundred and seventy bishops.

Constans, the successor of Constantine, resorted again to violent measures; but neither threats nor promises made any impression on the party. It came to blood. The Circum-

* "Pars Donati, Donatistæ, Donatiani." Previously they were commonly called "Pars Majorini." Optatus of Mileve seems, indeed, to know of only one Donatus. But the Donatists expressly distinguish Donatus Magnus of Carthage from Donatus a Casis Nigris. Likewise Augustine: Contra Cresconium Donat. ii. 1; though he himself had formerly confounded the two.

celliones, a sort of Donatist mendicant monks, who wandered about the country among the cottages of the peasantry,* carried on plunder, arson, and murder, in conjunction with mutinous peasants and slaves, and in crazy zeal for the martyr's crown, as genuine soldiers of Christ, rushed into fire and water, and threw themselves down from rocks. Yet there were Donatists who disapproved this revolutionary frenzy. The insurrection was suppressed by military force; several leaders of the Donatists were executed, others were banished, and their churches were closed or confiscated. Donatus the Great died in exile. He was succeeded by one Parmenianus.

Under Julian the Apostate, the Donatists again obtained, with all other heretics and schismatics, freedom of religion, and returned to the possession of their churches, which they painted anew, to redeem them from their profanation by the catholics. But under the subsequent emperors, their condition grew worse, both from persecutions without and from dissensions within. The quarrel between the two parties extended into all the affairs of daily life; the Donatist bishop, Faustinus of Hippo, for example, allowing none of the members of his church to bake bread for the catholic inhabitants.

2. *Augustine and the Donatists—Their Persecution and Extinction.*

At the end of the fourth century, and in the beginning of the fifth, the great St. Augustine, of Hippo, where there was also a strong congregation of the schismatics, made a powerful effort, by instruction and persuasion, to reconcile the Donatists with the catholic church. He wrote several works on the subject, and set the whole African church in motion against them. They feared his superior dialectics, and avoided him wherever they could. The matter, however, was brought, by order of the emperor in 411, to a three days' arbitration at

* "Cellas circumientes rusticorum." Hence the name *Circumcelliones*. But they called themselves *Milites Christi*, or *Agonistici*. Their date and origin are uncertain. According to Optatus of Milevi, they first appeared under Constans, in 347.

Carthage, attended by two hundred and eighty-six catholic bishops, and two hundred and seventy-nine Donatist.*

Augustine, who, in two beautiful sermons before the beginning of the disputation, exhorted to love, forbearance, and meekness, was the chief speaker on the part of the catholics; Petilian on the part of the schismatics. Marcellinus, the imperial tribune and notary, and a friend of Augustine, presided, and was to pass the decisive judgment. This arrangement was obviously partial, and secured the triumph of the catholics. The discussions related to two points: 1. Whether the catholic bishops Cæcilian and Felix of Aptunga were traditors; 2. Whether the church loses her nature and attributes by fellowship with heinous sinners. The balance of skill and argument was on the side of Augustine, though the Donatists brought much that was forcible against compulsion in religion, and against the confusion of the temporal and the spiritual powers. The imperial commissioner, as might be expected, decided in favour of the catholics. The separatists, nevertheless, persisted in their view; but their appeal to the emperor continued unsuccessful.

More stringent civil laws were now enacted against them, banishing the Donatist clergy from their country, imposing fines on the laity, and confiscating the churches. In 415 they were even forbidden to hold religious assemblies, upon pain of death.

Augustine himself, who had previously consented only to spiritual measures against heretics, now advocated force, to bring them into the fellowship of the church, out of which there was no salvation. He appealed to the command in the parable of the supper, Luke xiv. 23, to "compel them to come in;" where, however, the "compel" (*ἀνάγκασον*) is evidently but a vivid hyperbole for that holy zeal in the conversion of the heathen, which we find, for example, in the apostle Paul.

New eruptions of fanaticism ensued. A bishop, Gaudentius, threatened that, if the attempt were made to deprive him of his church by force, he would burn himself with his congrega-

* Augustine gives an account of the debate in his Breviculus Collationis cum Donatistis. (Opera, tom. ix. p. 545—580.)

tion in it, and vindicated this intended suicide by the example of Rhazis, in the second book of Maccabees, chap. xiv.

The conquest of Africa by the Arian Vandals in 428, devastated the African church, and put an end to the controversy, as the French Revolution swept both Jesuitism and Jansenism away. Yet a remnant of the Donatists, as we learn from the letters of Gregory I., perpetuated itself into the seventh century, still proving in their ruins the power of a mistaken puritanic zeal, and the responsibility and guilt of state-church persecution. In the seventh century, the entire African church sank under the Saracenic conquest.

3. *Internal History of the Donatist Schism—Dogma of the Church.*

The Donatist controversy was a conflict between separatism and catholicism; between disciplinary rigorism and disciplinary latitudinarianism; between the idea of the church as an exclusive community of regenerate saints, and the idea of the church as the general christendom of state and people. It revolved about the doctrine of the essence of the Christian church, and, in particular, of the predicate of holiness. It resulted in the completion by Augustine of the catholic dogma of the church, which had been partly developed by Cyprian in the conflict with a similar schism.

The Donatists, like Tertullian in his Montanistic writings, started from an ideal and spiritualistic conception of the church as a fellowship of saints, which, in a sinful world, could only be imperfectly realized. They laid chief stress on the predicate of the subjective holiness or personal worthiness of the several members, and made the catholicity of the church and the efficacy of the sacraments dependent upon that. The true church, therefore, is not so much a school of holiness, as a society of those who are already holy; or at least of those who appear so; for that there are hypocrites, not even the Donatists could deny, and as little could they in earnest claim infallibility in their own discernment of men. By the toleration of those who are openly sinful, the church loses her holiness, and ceases to be the church. Unholy priests are incapable of administering sacraments; for how can regeneration proceed

from the unregenerate, holiness from the unholy? No one can give what he does not himself possess. He who would receive faith from a faithless man, receives not faith but guilt.* It was on this ground, in fact, that they rejected the election of Cæcilian—that he had been ordained bishop by an unworthy person. On this ground they refused to recognize the catholic baptism as baptism at all. On this point they had some support in Cyprian, who likewise rejected the validity of heretical baptism, though not from the separatist, but from the catholic point of view, and who came into collision, upon this question, with Stephen of Rome.

Hence, like the Montanists and Novatians, they insisted on rigorous church discipline, and demanded the excommunication of all unworthy members, especially of such as had denied their faith, or given up the holy Scriptures under persecution. They resisted, moreover, all interference of the civil power in church affairs; though they themselves at first had solicited the help of Constantine. In the great imperial church, embracing the people in a mass, they saw a secularized Babylon, against which they set themselves off, in separatistic arrogance, as the only true and pure church. In support of their views, they appealed to the passages of the Old Testament, which speak of the external holiness of the people of God, and the procedure of Paul with respect to the fornicator at Corinth.

In opposition to this subjective and spiritualistic theory of the church, Augustine, as champion of the catholics, developed the objective, realistic theory, which has since been repeatedly reasserted, though with various modifications, not only in the Roman church, but also in the Protestant, against separatistic and schismatic sects. He lays chief stress on the catholicity of the church, and derives the holiness of individual members and the validity of ecclesiastical functions from it. He finds the essence of the church not in the personal character of the several Christians, but in the union of the whole church with

* Aug. contra literas Petil. l. 1. cap. 5 (tom. ix. p. 208): "Qui fidem a perfido sumserit, non fidem percipit, sed reatum; omnis enim res origine et radice consistit, et si caput non habet aliquid, nihil est."

Christ. Taking the historical point of view, he goes back to the founding of the church, which may be seen in the New Testament, which has spread over all the world, and which is connected through the unbroken succession of bishops with the apostles and with Christ. This alone can be the true church. It is impossible that she should all at once disappear from the earth, or should exist only in the African sect of the Donatists.* What is all that they may say of their little heap, in comparison with the great catholic christendom of all lands? Thus even numerical preponderance here enters as an argument; though, under other circumstances, it may prove too much, and would place the primitive church at a clear disadvantage in comparison with the prevailing Jewish and heathen masses, and the Evangelical church in its controversy with the Roman Catholic.

From the objective character of the church as a divine institution flows, according to the catholic view, the efficacy of all her functions, the sacraments in particular. When Petilian, at the Collatio cum Donatistis, said: "He who receives the faith from a faithless priest, receives not faith but guilt," Augustine answered: "But Christ is not unfaithful (perfidus), from whom I receive faith (fidem), not guilt (reatum). Christ, therefore, is properly the functionary, and the priest is simply his organ. My origin," said Augustine, on the same occasion, "is Christ, my root is Christ, my head is Christ. The seed, of which I was born, is the word of God, which I must obey, even though the preacher himself practise not what he preaches. I believe not in the minister by whom I am baptized, but in Christ, who alone justifies the sinner and can forgive guilt."†

* Augustin. ad Catholicos Epistola contra Donatistas, usually quoted under the title: De unitate ecclesiæ, c. 12 (Bened. ed., tom. ix. p. 360): "Quomodo cœptum sit ab Jerusalem, et deinde processum in Judæam et Samariam, et inde in totam terram, ubi adhuc crescit ecclesia, donec usque in finem etiam reliquas gentes, ubi adhuc non est, obtineat, scripturis sanctis testibus consequenter ostenditur: quisquis aliud evangelizaverit, anathema sit. Aliud autem evangelizat, qui periisse dicit de cætero mundo ecclesiam et in parte Donati in sola Africa remansisse dicit. Ergo anathema sit. Aut legat mihi hoc in scripturis sanctis, et non sit anathema."

† Contra literas Petiliani, l. i. c. 7. (Opera, tom. ix. p. 209): "Origo mea Christus est, radix mea Christus est, caput meum Christus est." . . . . In the

Lastly, in regard to church discipline, the opponents of the Donatists agreed with them in considering it wholesome and necessary, but would keep it within the limits fixed for it by the circumstances of the time and the fallibility of men. A perfect separation of sinners from saints is impracticable before the final judgment. Many things must be patiently borne, that greater evil may be averted, and that those still capable of improvement may be improved, especially where the offender has too many adherents. "Man," says Augustine, "should punish in the spirit of love, until either the discipline and correction come from above, or the tares are pulled up in the universal harvest."* In support of this view, appeal was made to the Lord's parables of the tares among the wheat, and of the net which gathered together of every kind. (Matt. xiii.) These two parables were the chief exegetical battle-ground of the two parties. The Donatists understood by the field, not the church but the world. According to the Saviour's own exposition of the parable of the tares,† the catholics replied, that it was the kingdom of heaven, or the church, to which the parable referred as a whole, and pressed especially the warning of the Saviour not to gather up the tares before the final harvest, lest they root up also the wheat with them. The Donatists, moreover, made a distinction between unknown offenders, to whom alone the parable of the net referred, and notorious sinners. But this did not gain them much; for if the church compromises her character for holiness by contact with unworthy persons at all, it matters not whether they be openly unworthy before men or not, and no church whatever would be left on earth.

On the other hand, however, Augustine, who, no more than

same place: "Me innocentem non facit, nisi qui mortuus est propter delicta nostra et resurrexit propter justificationem nostram. Non enim in ministrum, per quem baptizos, credo; sed in eum qui justificat impium, ut deputetur mihi fides in justitiam."

* Aug. contra Epistolam Parmeniani, l. iii. c. 2, § 10—15. (Opera, t. ix. p. 62—66.)

† Breviculus Collat. c. Don. Dies tert. c. 8, § 10. (Opera, t. ix. p. 559): "Zizania inter triticum non in ecclesia, sed in ipso mundo permixta dixerunt; quoniam Dominus ait, *Ager est mundus.*" (Matt. xiii. 38.) As to the exegetical merits of the controversy, see Trench's *Notes on the Parables*, p. 83, seq. (9th Lond. edit. 1863,) and Lange's *Commentary on Matt.* xiii.

the Donatists, could relinquish the predicate of holiness for the church, found himself compelled to distinguish between a *true* and *mixed*, or merely apparent, *body of Christ;* forasmuch as hypocrites, even in this world, are not in and with Christ, but only appear to be.* And yet he repelled the Donatist charge of making two churches. In his view it is one and the same church which is now mixed with the ungodly, and will hereafter be pure, as it is the same Christ who once died, and now lives for ever, and the same believers, who are now mortal, and will yet put on immortality.†

With some modification we may find here the germ of the subsequent Protestant distinction of the visible and invisible church; which regards the invisible, not as another church, but as the ecclesiola in ecclesia, (or ecclesiis,) as the smaller communion of true believers among professors, and thus as the true substance of the visible church, and as contained within its limits, like the soul in the body, or the kernel in the shell. Here the moderate Donatist and scholarly theologian, Tychonius,‡

* Corpus Christi *verum* atque *permixtum*, or *verum* atque *simulatum*. Comp. De doctr. Christ. iii. 32, as quoted below in full.

† Breviculus Collationis cum Donatistis, Dies tertius, cap. 10, § 19 and 20. (Opera, ix. 564): "Deinde calumniantes, quod duas ecclesias Catholici dixerint, unam quæ nunc habet permixtos malos, aliam quæ post resurrectionem eos non esset habitura: veluti non iidem futuri essent sancti cum Christo regnaturi, qui nunc pro ejus nomine cum juste vivunt tolerant malos. . . . De duabus etiam ecclesiis calumniam eorum Catholici refutarunt, identidem expressius ostendentes, quid dixerint, id est, non eam ecclesiam, quæ nunc habet permixtos malos, alienam se dixisse a regno Dei, ubi non erunt mali commixti, sed eandem ipsam unam et sanctam ecclesiam nunc esse aliter tunc autem aliter futuram, nunc habere malos mixtos, tunc non habituram . . . . sicut non ideo duo Christi, quia prior mortuus postea non moriturus."

‡ Or Tichonius, as Augustine spells the name. Although himself a Donatist, he wrote against them, "qui contra Donatistas invictissime scripsit, cum fuerit Donatista," (says Aug. De doct. Christ. l. iii. c. 30, § 42.) He was opposed to re-baptism, and acknowledged the validity of the catholic sacraments; but he was equally opposed to the secularism of the catholic church and its mixture with the state, and adhered to the strict discipline of the Donatists. Of his works only one remains, viz. *Liber regularum* or *de septem regulis*, a sort of Biblical hermeneutics, or a guide for the proper understanding of the mysteries of the Bible. It was edited by Gallandi, in his Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum, tom. viii. pp. 107—129. Augustine notices these rules at length in his work, De doctrina Christiana, lib. iii. c. 30, sqq. (Opera, ed. Bened. tom. iii. p. 57, sqq.) Tychonius seems to have died before the close of

approached Augustine; calling the church a *twofold body of Christ*,* of which the one part embraces the true Christians, the other the apparent.† In this, as also in acknowledging the validity of catholic baptism, Tychonius departed from the Donatists; while he adhered to their views on discipline and opposed the catholic mixture of the church and the world. But neither he, nor Augustine, pursued this distinction to any clearer development. Both were involved, at bottom, in the confusion of Christianity with the church, and of the church with a particular outward organization.

Art. II.—*Modes of Evangelization.*

It has come to be a question of no small interest, and one the importance of which will increase as the activities of the church are aroused, What is the proper method of directing these activities, or in other words, what is the proper mode of evangelization? It is manifest that much of the efficiency of our efforts must depend on the manner in which they are carried on. It is not sufficient to attempt to do a thing—we must know how to do it. We may, with the best desires, take hold of any reform, and accomplish but little, simply from wrong plans, just as one might wish to heal a sick person, and labour with the best of motives, and yet be of no service. Knowledge

the fourth century. Comp. on him Tillemont, Memoires, tom. vi. p. 81, sq., and an article of A. Vogel, in Herzog's Real-Encyclopædie, vol. xvi. pp. 534—536.

* "Corpus Domini bipartitum." This was the second of his rules for the true understanding of the Scriptures.

† Augustine objects only to his mode of expression, De doctr. Christ. iii. 32, tom. iii. 58: "Secunda [regula Tichonii] est *de Domini corpore bipartito:* non enim revera Domini corpus est, quod cum illo non erit in æternum; sed dicendum fuit de *Domine corpore vero* atque *permixto*, aut *vero* atque *simulato*, vel quid aliud; quia non solum in æternum, verum etiam nunc hypocritæ non cum illo esse dicendi sunt, quamvis in ejus esse videantur ecclesia. Unde poterat ista regula et sic appellari, ut dicertur de permixta ecclesia." Comp. also Dr. Baur, K. G. vom 4—6 Jahr., p. 224.

is necessary as well as the disposition. In manual labour knowledge contrives the best method of expending its strength. A machine simplifies and magnifies the result. In mental and moral labour a plan is of the same advantage as a machine in physical labour. It sets the labour in motion in the right direction, and with the most advantage to secure the result. The advantage of some well-contrived plan is more manifest the larger the object to be secured. A sickle and a scythe did very well around the rocks and in the small farms of New England, but when prairies were to be reaped and armies fed, then the harvest needed to be more speedily gathered, and with less expenditure of human strength. So in ordinary cases the care of the sick can be left to individuals and families, but when a battle leaves its thousands on the field, then the hospital, and all the efficiency of directed and organized labour are needed. In efforts, likewise, for the good of others, individuals may do their part, but when long-continued and wide-extended efforts are necessary, there must be some combination to set the right agencies at work, and in the most efficient manner.

The three distinct methods, into one or the other of which all plans of evangelization may be classed, are, 1. Where the work is carried on by individuals; 2. By societies organized for the purpose; or 3. By the church under its own organization.

The first of these has the advantage of promptness and dispatch. There is no necessity of waiting for the movement of others. Its basis also is good, that every individual should be active, and seek to accomplish all he can for the benefit of others. And in no case, and under no plan, should the responsibility of individual exertion and influence be lost sight of. In many cases also, if a man is alone, it is necessary for him to act alone. If the church around him is dead, if those who should coöperate with him will not, then there is no other resort but to act single-handed. Perhaps this may account for those individual agencies in Germany, such as that of Wichern in his Rough House, and of Gossner in his foreign missionary efforts. The wonderful success which has attended these and similar efforts, shows what men single-handed may

do.* If the right sort of a man takes hold of an enterprise, it is often carried forward with earnestness and dispatch. There is uniformity of plan. The disadvantages, however, are serious. There is a lack of responsibility. One man may abuse the power and means put in his hands, as he could not do if his actions were reported and open to the scrutiny of others. Important plans, too, are made to hang upon the life of a single individual, and upon his death are liable to serious interruption, if not entirely broken up. The confidence reposed in the founder of some institution, which perhaps has been the fruit of a long and laborious life, is seldom transferred to a successor. But the most serious objection is, that it is not in harmony with the idea of an active church, which supposes fellow-labourers and a common share in the work of evangelization. These disadvantages are so great, that this method is seldom adopted in a work of any magnitude, except in isolated cases in other countries, where men, feeling certain wants deeply themselves, and not finding others ready to coöperate with them, have been obliged to go forward alone.

A second method is to organize societies. A necessity is felt for a given reform, or to carry on some scheme of benevolence, and individuals associate themselves together for that purpose. This seems a simple and obvious method, and has often been resorted to with abundant success. It may indeed be questioned whether so great a degree of activity could, in the early stages of Christian zeal, have been imparted to the church on any other plan. Certain it is, that it has been almost universally adopted. Whether it is or ought to be outgrown and superseded, is a question which we wish to consider. This will be determined by the character of the objections, and by the fact whether there is any better plan. One obvious objection to this plan is, that the machinery of evangelization becomes multiplied and complicated. A society for every reform and project makes their number endless. Another more important objection is, that it connects the idea of Christian activity, not with the body to which it properly belongs,

* Those interested in evangelistic work in Germany, as it has been carried on by individuals, will be well repaid by reading "Praying and Working," by Stevenson of Dublin, and republished by the Carters.

but with some other organization. Our interest and affection naturally flow out for the object for which we labour; and the society-room and its work often take the place of the church. Persons are active not as members of some church, but as members of some society. It is not felt as an indispensable part of our connection with Christ's visible body, that we are to be zealous for him, but as something which we may take up or not, as it suits us, by uniting with some other organization.

A full consideration of this objection involves, however, a consideration of the third method of evangelization. This considers the church as organized with this object, among others, to direct and control the activities of its members. The great object or design for which the church exists, is the work of evangelization. It was intended, of course, to embrace the body of believers; but the object of their being united together is not merely to observe the ordinances and hear the word, but also to teach and disciple others—to be the light of the world, the salt of the earth. The Old Testament church was intended to preserve and keep alive the truth in the Jewish nation, until, in the fulness of time, Christ should come in the flesh. Then, and after that, the great object of the New Testament church, according to Christ's great commission, was to scatter the truth abroad, to proclaim the glad tidings to every creature. The primary object of the special outpouring of the Holy Spirit was to endue them with power from on high, that they might be witnesses for Christ in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth. That this is the work of the church may not be questioned, but a doubt may exist in the minds of some, whether it was intended that it should be done by the church in its organized capacity. This is precisely the point which we wish to present, that the church was organized for the work of evangelization, and that its Divine Head intended that it should act through its own organization for this purpose.

In attempting to establish this position, we may learn a lesson from God's dealings with the church under the old dispensation. The children of Israel came up out of the land of Egypt an undisciplined multitude. They went out in haste, very much, we may suppose, as the inhabitants would rush out

of a city when suddenly attacked, without any order, each one seeking to secure his own person and goods. This motley host was to be reduced into an army of invasion. The very first step towards such an end was organization. A year was spent in its accomplishment at the foot of Mount Sinai. The centre of that organization was the church, or the tabernacle and its worship. This, and the temple afterwards, or Jerusalem, was the centre of the old economy, showing the place which the church should occupy in the world and among the nations, as the centre of attraction and influence. In this organization, the worship and the service to be performed were not left to the discretion and choice of each individual or family; but a tabernacle was set up, which was to be made after the pattern shown in the mount. Particular persons were assigned to take charge of the sacrifices and ceremonial ritual. While the main service was to be performed by the priests, yet the Levites were to assist; and when they came to go forward in their journeys, the carrying of the tabernacle and its furniture was assigned to different heads of families, or elders, in which work the princes of the tribes assisted by their offerings of wagons, and the whole nation, now an organized host, instead of a promiscuous crowd, marched as they encamped, with reference to their position about the tabernacle.

These facts, which are given with great minuteness, are evidently written for our instruction. They teach that organization was necessary; that the centre of it was the church; that its duties were to be performed by its own officers, and not left to the choice or plan of men; that there was a complete division of labour, so that the work, as well as the honour, was shared by one whole tribe, and through them by the whole nation. It is important to notice that this Divine method was to be adhered to; not only was this positively enjoined, but departure from it was punished. Thus David, in the reëstablishment of the old economy, found that the prescribed plan was to be strictly followed. When he first attempted to bring up the ark to Jerusalem, it was not carried by the Levites, but put into a cart, as the Philistines had done; and when the oxen stumbled, and Uzzah put forth his hand to hold it, God smote him that he died. On the second attempt, David called

upon the Levites to sanctify themselves, and to bring up the ark, "for," he says, "because ye did it not at the first, the Lord our God made a breach upon us, for that we sought him not after the due order."

When the time came for another change and expansion of the outer visible church, in order to adapt it to its more enlarged sphere, organization was as necessary as before. No sooner did Christ enter upon his ministry, than he chose twelve apostles, who, by their number, connected the foundations of both dispensations. The two sacraments which represented and were connected with the sacrificial and the cleansing rites of the old economy, were also instituted. In the work of establishing his kingdom, Christ did not labour alone, though so infinitely superior in his qualifications to those whom he called to assist him. Besides the twelve, he appointed other seventy also, who were to go before him; and called upon them, in view of the greatness of the harvest, to pray for more labourers. After the ascension of our Saviour, the apostles began the work of organization by completing their own number; and as occasion demanded and the work increased, other officers were added—the idea never seeming to depart from their minds that the work of the church was to be done by the church, through its appointed officers. Of this organization, the Apostle writes, "God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers; after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." (1 Cor. xii. 28.) Again, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, the organization of the church is spoken of as one of the ascension gifts of our Saviour, necessary for the perfection of his body. "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." (Eph. iv. 11.) One great object to be accomplished by organization, is here stated to be the perfecting and the unity of the church itself; but as necessary to this, comes first the gathering of the church, or the work of

evangelization. This object Christ exemplified in his own labours. The distinction between the old and new dispensations was manifest in passing from John the Baptist, the last of the Old Testament prophets, to Christ. John preached in one locality, the people flocking unto him; Christ went about doing good, visiting all the cities of Galilee, setting the example which is to be followed by his people, of scattering abroad the seed. In accordance with this fundamental idea, the twelve disciples were called *apostles*, or those *sent forth*. The great commission settled this object or duty of the church definitively; and the labours of the apostles and early Christians, as recorded in the Acts, show how it is to be obeyed. We find, then, that the New Testament church was organized by God or Christ, and the distinct work or duty of evangelization committed to it. The inference, therefore, is too strong to be overlooked or disregarded, that the *church, through its own organization*, is the divinely appointed plan for evangelizing the world.

If this is the divinely appointed plan, then certainly it ought not to be departed from, except for the clearest and plainest reasons. God of course greatly prefers activity and zeal in any form, to coldness and deadness. While he loves order and regularity, mere formality his soul abhors. Phinehas, in his zeal for the Lord, when defection seemed universal, acted promptly as an individual, taking the law into his own hands, and was commended for it. Moses refused to forbid those that prophesied in the camp, instead of about the tabernacle. He would have rejoiced to have seen all the Lord's people prophets. So also a greater than Moses would not heed the wish of his disciples, who would forbid those who cast out devils in their Master's name, and yet followed him not. Just so now, there may be circumstances justifying a departure from the appointed method. It may be necessary for an individual to act alone, if the church cannot be aroused to do its duty; or there may be duties to be performed which cannot be reached so well by individual churches, or those associated together in one denomination; in any such case, where obedience to the spirit is better met by going beyond the letter, then we are to use the liberty which God grants to his children. But in all

ordinary cases, and as a general rule, we are, as David found to his cost, to seek God after the due order. God's work is best carried out according to his own plan. It is certainly to be expected that he would adapt the church in its external organization for the work which it is to perform; and it would be strange if man should make any improvement on that method. If we rightly judge, the ordinary and constant departure from this method has been of great damage to the church. To a great extent, the appropriate work of the church has been taken out of its hands by societies of various descriptions; and the result has been that, as two bodies cannot occupy the same space at the same time, coldness and indifference have crept into the church. Activity and zeal have been divorced from the church as an organization; and those who unite with it often act as though their only object in that connection was to secure safe transportation to the heavenly shore. They wish to get aboard to ride quietly as passengers, without a thought of the responsibility resting upon them. But the ark, though in one sense a correct representation of the church, is not the only one. Even the church in the wilderness was to prepare itself to act as an army of invasion; and under the new dispensation, it is most frequently compared to something which represents life, as a body, or a vine and its branches. Christ is the living head, and the church is his body, which, in its external organization, should conform to the representations made of it, as a living, active, fruitful church. But in practice we separate the two. The ministry are chosen not for zeal, experience, or wisdom, as leaders of God's people, but often solely from their supposed ability to please a popular audience. Church officers are frequently known to most only as those who carry around bread and wine on communion Sabbaths, and perhaps they never meet together except for the purpose of admitting or dismissing members. This observation might be extended to higher church courts, which often sit as though their only object was to dispatch, as quickly as possible, a dull routine of business, instead of also seeking, as our constitution requires, "to enter into common measures for promoting knowledge and religion, and for preventing infidelity, error, and immorality." (*Form of Government*, chap. 10, sect. 1.) The

church, through its officers, is not expected to have any direct right or share in the work of evangelization; and this idea, reacting upon the church itself, leads to the almost total neglect of the duty. Certainly no more effectual method could be devised of reducing the church to a mere form, without any life, than by giving it nothing to do.

Let us, however, suppose a return to, and an acting out of, the method of the early church, in carrying on the work of evangelization through its own officers, and by its own organization, and we should have as our result, life and activity connected with the body to which it properly belongs. Christ required of his followers that they should seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness. They were to bring forth fruit, to be the light of the world. They were to be living branches of the true vine. This being the normal condition of his followers, why should not this idea be expressed in their organization? Shall it be required of each individual to be active, and yet the body itself be dead? Is there to be no way or method by which this life can express itself? Are we not to suppose that the church, in its external form, would be shaped to suit this internal vitality? Certainly it is not in accordance with God's usual method, if the church is not fitted to manifest the life and activity which are required of its members. He fits the instrument for the work to be accomplished by it—the external form of everything in the world around us for the kind of life which it is to contain. And so we believe of the church. It is fitted for the work which God organized it to perform. And it is putting dishonour on him who established it, not to use his method. And though it should even seem foolishness, yet the foolishness of God is wiser than men.

Another result would be increased activity on the part of church members. Now, though the propriety and necessity of zeal be pressed upon men, yet they know not how to act or what to do. Many are backward in devising schemes themselves, but if a plan is made for them and their part assigned, they are ready and willing to bear their share. Besides, organization gives a person authority. He goes not in his own name, but in that of the church, and many a one will go

where he is sent, and it is made his duty, when he would not go alone. Just as a man might, as an individual, desire to quell a tumult, and yet hesitate, but if made his duty as a civil officer, would go forward at once, and without fear. His directions, too, would be more heeded. So, in its own sphere, those who act under the authority of church organization would be emboldened to undertake that which they might hesitate to do as individuals, and their words would be better heeded by those to whom they were addressed.

The duty here is reciprocal. Let each one, when he takes the vows of God upon him, feel that he has something to do for God, and let the church through its officers give each one something to do. And Christian activity will be no fitful transient thing, but a power in the church which will make its influence and its progress irresistible. It is as yet a latent power, but organized and set in motion, it will be like the change in an undisciplined host to an army with banners—like the change of the children of Israel fleeing from Egypt, and the same people marshalled with their men of war around the ark of God, and ready to take possession of the promised land.

Another result, we doubt not, will be the blessing of God. If God has chosen and ordained certain methods, it is disobedience and dishonouring him when we do not follow them. We may say our plan is good—that it is just as well to carry the ark in a cart as on men's shoulders, but David and all who sincerely wish God's favour will inquire as to the due order, and find it not only best adapted to secure the desired end, but the path also of promised blessing. Just as some may say, what is the use of joining the church? why not be a Christian without? so it may be said, why make the church the channel of Christian activity? To both it is a sufficient reply, that it is God's method. This is the place where the Christian and the outflow of Christian life belong. We do not say that there is no salvation out of the visible church, neither do we say that God will not recognise deeds of charity not in connection with church organization. But this we do say, that the full measure of God's blessing can only be properly expected when we comply with his requirements, and seek to carry out his plans.

This method of action would also tend to place the church in its proper position as the great central agency in the work of evangelization. God has promised to honour and exalt the church, as the bride, the Lamb's wife, as the body of which Christ is the head. It may be said that these promises belong to the church invisible. This is doubtless true in their highest meaning. But how is the church invisible to be honoured, at least here on earth, except through the church visible? Though it is convenient and necessary to make the distinction, yet the two are often blended. The church as the body of Christ, the church to whom were given apostles, prophets, teachers, &c., is to be organized and built up until it comes to a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. The church is to be exalted with Christ its living head. It is to be the grand centre, just as the tabernacle was in the wilderness. All the tribes were to be pitched around it. So the church is to be the centre of attraction and influence to all nations. It is not to be the influence of a mere name, but of a power acting upon the world, and which will one day be seen and acknowledged. This influence will be the more powerful, the more it is organized and put in service. The church needs to be marshalled for aggressive work. It must not only be pure in doctrine and fair in graces, but irresistible in its might. As Solomon looks forward to her in her glory, "Who is she that looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners?" When, like an army, she gathers her members and organizes them for the work, more irresistible will be her progress than that of any army the world has ever seen. Then she will properly be the church militant, and not until after that takes place, can we expect to see here the church triumphant—that is as a victorious power here on earth.

The question will doubtless arise, How is the church to go to work? and what is she to do as an organization? This, of course, can only be answered in the general. The work which God calls each church to do is determined partly by his providence. The fields of labour are not all alike. There are, however, some features in which they are similar. The first

thing is to organize,* feeling that there is a work to be done. How it is to be done will require much thought and prayer. Let us briefly indicate, in general, the method which might be taken. Of course it is necessary to its success, that the officers of the church, and its members, feel that a responsibility rests upon them, as well as their pastor, in building up Christ's kingdom; and with this there must be a disposition to work in harmony, and with united council. Let the pastor, then, as the under-shepherd, apportion to the elders their part of the work; as, for instance, let the congregation be divided into districts, with one elder for each district. If meetings or Sabbath-schools are to be held in these districts, let the elders have the oversight. Where there is only one Sabbath-school, let not that be a separate organization, independent of the church, but under the direct control of its officers, who should take charge of its government and instruction. We see not why, also, the work of visitation should not be performed in some measure by the elders. In connection with visitation might be associated the circulation of religious books or tracts and papers, especially such as would give information of the advance of Christ's cause, with which, as a necessary consequence, could be introduced giving, or collections. Effort should also be made in every church to reach the unevangelized, and this effort should be reduced to some system, or it will be neglected. No church is thoroughly aggressive until harnessed for the war. The work, as thus indicated, will require labourers. The officers of the church will find it necessary to associate others with them. It is, in fact, doubtful whether we have the number and variety of church officers which they had in the New Testament churches. Besides apostles, workers of miracles, and those who spoke with tongues, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, are distinguished; also helps and governments. Whether there were deaconesses or not, we do not stop now to inquire; but the

* This is not meant *de novo*, for our Presbyterian system we believe to be not only scriptural, but admirably adapted for fulfilling the duties required; but simply to use this organization, giving it vitality and force, and filling up its outlines, as we believe the Scriptures warrant us in doing, by appointing additional officers and assistants if required.

apostle speaks "of those women which laboured with him in the gospel," (Phil. iv. 11,) and in the sixteenth chapter of Romans we find the names of several who thus laboured mentioned. So also they followed our Lord, ministering to him of their substance, (Luke viii. 3.) Their labour and assistance are as important now as then. But whatever be the precise plan for distributing this labour, it must be seen that the work is too vast and arduous for the ministry ever to hope to overtake it alone. As Moses's father-in-law said to him, when he saw him bearing the burden of the people alone, "The thing that thou doest is not good. Thou wilt surely wear away;" and he advised him to "provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness; and place such over them, to be rulers of thousands, and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens." This advice was followed, and was incorporated in the whole economy. Christ and his apostles also laboured not alone. And if it were possible for the ministry to accomplish this work alone, it is certainly not desirable. The officers of the church and its members need to feel that this is their work, as well as belonging to the ministry. They are to be co-workers with them, as they are with Christ. And if co-workers, they must have something to do. It is scarcely right to find fault with the inactivity and sloth of a church, until some method has been devised for putting its energies into action. If we would have labourers work in a vineyard, we must tell them what we want done, and in what way. Until we do this, the blame of their idleness rests upon us, after that, upon them. So, doubtless, it behooves the officers of the church to devise plans and methods by which its members may act, before they bring the charge of idleness and want of interest. If this was done, we even question whether it would be necessary to find fault with want of attendance at the prayer-meeting. The interest excited by labour would be manifest in increased desire for the progress of Christ's kingdom, and in prayer for the influences of the Holy Spirit, through whom alone we hope for any permanent good. Labour leads to prayer, and prayer to labour. They are inseparable in a true Christian life. And if we would

increase the earnestness and life of prayer, we shall find no way so direct as by an increase of activity.

There are two objections to the method of action which we have here proposed, which we will in conclusion briefly notice. One is, that we have not in our churches the persons qualified or at leisure to undertake this work. There is no doubt that it will require time, labour, and self-sacrifice. And we never knew anything good or important that did not. Possibly some may be so situated as not to command the leisure. But in most cases, if any one really desires it, he can redeem portions of time for the Lord's work, even though it be but an hour or two a week. And even that amount, properly directed, would tell upon the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom. Usually, where there is the will there is a way. And all need to be reminded that they are to seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness; that is, they are not only to seek to enter, but also to promote the interests of that kingdom as the first and weightiest obligation binding upon every man. But the objection may be urged, we are not qualified. How can we converse with the impenitent? How can we pray with the sick? Certainly no one can till he tries. How does the ministry learn? They have to go through the same ordeal of inexperience. And the way to begin is to take first the more simple and easy steps; go as collectors for good objects, to gather children into Sabbath-schools, or older persons into the house of God, and inquire after and visit those who attend. In some way begin, and go on, praying for wisdom and strength. How do men learn to be soldiers but by submitting to the drill, and then, as they become proficients, they are advanced. The way is, to begin by entering the ranks and submitting ourselves to be guided, saying, here am I, send me. Jeremiah felt that he was but a child, and yet God qualified him to be a prophet. The apostles were only fishermen, but divine instruction and practice made them proficients in their work. In Germany they have taken to educating colporteurs, and deacons and deaconesses. If there is no other way to raise up lay-helpers, we had better do it also. But as we have been able in this country to raise up a citizen army, we know not why we may not citizen labour-

ers in Christ's vineyard. Already scattered through the churches can be found those in the humbler and less educated walks of life, who have proved themselves valuable labourers. Harlan Page was a carpenter, never having enjoyed anything but the advantages of a common-school education, and yet he became wise in winning souls. Such instances ought not to be rare. All, young and old, need to feel that in their sphere, with or without education, they are to exert all the influence they can for Christ.

Another objection is, that it will tend to increased sectarianism, instead of that unity which is so desirable in the church. We are not of those, however, that suppose that because a church is active and seeking to do good, it is necessarily bigoted, or seeking to injure the prosperity of others. But suppose a prosperous church excites the jealousy and envy of others, what is to be done? Are we to go to sleep because others sleep? Are we to let our vineyard run to waste because others fail to cultivate theirs? This would indeed be a pleasant device of the adversary. Nay, rather let them be provoked to zeal and good works. Let each denomination be zealous against the common enemy, and the others rejoice and be glad, for the sooner will the world be converted.

But it may be said, we withdraw from united common efforts to take up sectarian action. We say Yes, by all means, when we can, not because we do not love our neighbour, but because we think the work will be done more effectually, and because there will be less quarrelling about the results. If a township was to be settled in common, or divided up among the several families occupying it, we should say, by all means divide it among the families. It would promote harmony and good feeling in the end. It would do away with hard-feeling and quarrelling about the proceeds. So in churches, the proper labour of evangelization is in most cases best conducted, and harmony best secured in the end, by each attending to his own work. If there is any encroaching, agree upon a boundary line, and religiously observe it. Beyond the proper sphere of each church, there are abundant opportunities for kind and neighbourly acts and for united action in measures which can only be properly carried on in that way.

We are fully persuaded that the unity of the church is not

best promoted by ignoring its organization. That was given, as before said, "for the perfecting of the saints, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith." The Apostle here declares the officers which Christ gave to the church necessary to its perfection and unity. If so, it will not do to disregard them, and place them and the organization which they represent in the back-ground, for some other method which we hope will more rapidly melt different denominations together. It will only serve to retard, instead of hastening the wished-for result. There are, however, two methods in which we may suppose the unity of the church will be advanced: 1st. By acting more against the common enemy. Minor differences will seem less important as we struggle more earnestly against the kingdom of darkness. "Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim. But they shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines toward the west; they shall spoil them of the east together." (Isa. xi. 13.) 2d. There will be a gradual approximation to a similarity of views—a thing which cannot be forestalled. As long as Christians do not see truth in the same light, there will be differences of opinion, causing different denominations. No force of argument has been able to break down these differences. They are doubtless wisely ordered for a time. But the time we trust is hastening when all shall see eye to eye. God will bring it about in his own way. When and how we know not. In the mean time, and as the best means of hastening that end, we are to seek to make the church fruitful, vigorous, and active; and if that end can be best secured through its own organization, then we are to seek to make that branch of it which we believe to be nearest the truth, and as, indeed, we would have all the branches to be, living, faithful representatives of Christ's living body, until we come "to a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," which stature is "the fulness of Him that filleth all in all."

It will be seen that we have attempted to present no new scheme for developing the activities of the church, but simply a return to and carrying out the plan devised by the great Head of the church, and which, if followed out, would greatly tend to promote its spiritual life and activity, and help to hasten its extension throughout the world.

ART. III.—*History of Civilization in England.* By HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE. Two volumes. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1860, 1861.

WE read this work very shortly after the appearance of its second volume, and though we cannot say that the reading of it was a waste of time, yet we confess that it did not satisfy us, and that its treatment of its subject did not appear to us to be at all adequate, just, true, or scientific. But we have since found many persons who have read it, and formed a much higher estimate of it than we had done, and this led us to a second reading of it. We have read it again with much care, and been confirmed in our first impressions of it; and therefore, even at this late day, we venture to think that a discussion of its merits may not be unprofitable to our readers.

These two volumes contain dissertations on the proper method of treating the main subject; on various physical, moral, and intellectual aids and hindrances to the process of civilization; and on the opinions, institutions, ages, countries, and authors, which have had a noteworthy part in that process. They profess to be the commencement of the Introduction to the History named in the title of the book; and, as the author is now dead, his readers are of course compelled to accept these volumes as the unfinished Introduction to a work that can never appear. No one can complain of this fact, however unusual it is for authors to write their Introduction before they have completed the main work, and ascertained its exact character, and thereby discovered what preliminary explanations are proper in order to facilitate the reading and understanding of his work. No one, we say, can complain of this, because the book bears on its face the profession that it is only an Introduction.

But a complaint may very well be made, that it is not, in any proper sense of the word, an Introduction to a History of English Civilization; but a series of essays and criticisms on a great variety of subjects, which, so far as they are connected with English civilization, ought to have been reserved for the

body of the work; and, so far as they have no such connection, ought to have been laid aside altogether, or merely used by way of illustration, so far as they were proper for that purpose, in the main work. No man can study any subject well, who starts with a contempt for it; and if our author had carefully and respectfully studied the process of English civilization, so as to discover all the active elements which entered into that process, and the various forces which they displayed at different epochs of the nation's growth, and attributed to each its proper share in the work, and shown for the result that degree of respect to which a nation's social, and moral, and intellectual struggles are entitled, he would never have thought of writing such an Introduction as this.

These volumes may be called an Introduction in the sense that they are intended to prepare the author's intelligence for the great work which he had in view. His youthful ambition had planned for itself a flight to which his breadth and strength of wing were entirely inadequate; and we might take these essays as a sort of preliminary practice, intended to assure himself of the force and skill necessary for his grand design, were it not that their boldness and even recklessness rather seem intended to convince his readers of his competence for the task, by the exhibition of his own confidence in his powers. We confess that our experience has made us cautious about trusting ourselves, our interests, or our opinions, to the guidance of boastful spirits, who either do not know, or wish to hide their own weaknesses; and that we are much more trustful of that modesty which secures careful investigation and reflection, especially when it is accompanied by proper energy. The mental energy displayed in these volumes tends to give us hope; but their boastings tend to suppress it. It is a very good saying, though it is very old: "Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off;" and we should have been saved from some prejudice against this work, if its boastings had been kept for its conclusion.

We do not object to a confident spirit; for that is essential to all brave action. Nor do we object to any one speaking or writing with all the confidence he feels on any proper subject; for this is both natural and necessary. But we do object, as

a matter of taste at least, to an author who commends his own perspicacity and genius, by a continual display of supercilious contempt for the leading opinions of the world, and of its most eminent men, by pointing to the "indolence of thought," "natural incapacity," "narrow views," "miserable deficiencies," "degrading superstition," and "contemptible subservience" of others; and to the "comprehensive views," "large generalizations," "exhaustive analyses," "great mental grasps," which he knows so well how to appreciate. Such expressions as these, and many others, showing the same spirit of undue self-esteem, and of consequent disrespect for others, abound all through the work, and of course incline us to expect a mere exposition and advocacy of the cherished opinions of the author, and not at all a scientific or philosophical investigation of the laws and principles of any great natural phenomena. He has got his leading opinions from his associations, and he studies and writes to maintain them.

Much of the vanity, pride, and censoriousness of the world arises from people taking their own opinions or systems, that is, themselves, as the standard by which the acts, opinions, and systems of others are to be measured; and, as very few can stand this test, of course the sentence of condemnation is easily arrived at. What falls short of the standard, is condemned for deficiency, and what goes beyond, is condemned for excess; and the self-satisfaction of the judge remains unimpaired. Such sentences are necessarily accurate conclusions from the premises; and it is only the assumed and subjective standard that is wrong. If each man were to take his own foot as the standard foot, there would be no end to the quarrels we should have about our lumber bills; and the more careful each would be in his measurement, the more sincere and confident would each be in their different assertions of the true quantity, and the more censorious of the other's want of accuracy or honesty, unless they should happen to discover that each had innocently assumed a different standard. This author's facility and confidence in judging others, in all past generations, convinces us that he has not discovered any other standard than this subjective one—his individual conscience—which is always ready for application. If he had any other, he ought to have told us

what it was, so that we too might have the same standard in judging his judgments, which are exceedingly numerous. He does not do so.

That he has no other standard, becomes very apparent from the manner in which he speaks of previous historians; none of them, in his opinion, have been able to "grasp their subject." Those who came near doing so are "extremely rare," not over "three or four" in Europe. According to him, "for all the high purposes of human thought, history is still miserably deficient, and presents that confused and anarchical appearance natural to a subject of which the laws are unknown, and even the foundation unsettled." He therefore condemns the standard or standards by which society has always heretofore judged of the value of historians, and gives us, instead, a standard of his own, of very imposing dimensions. His historians must be skilled in political economy, law, ecclesiastical and doctrinal history, statistics, and physics generally; so that they may "concentrate them upon history, of which they are, properly speaking, the necessary components." He afterwards includes many other sciences.

All this is new enough, and this work abounds in such novelties. Youthful thinkers and writers are very apt to make them the principal part of their stock in trade, or at least to place the highest price upon them, and to become very obtrusive and even fanatical in their advocacy of them. We should incline to imitate Horace, in saying to them, *nonumque prematur in annum;* lay your piece by nine years before you publish it, and you may, by that time, find it to be worthless, or learn to improve it. No doubt such novelties, especially when, as here, presented in a bold, earnest, and lively style, and varied and illustrated at every step by historical narratives, and confident criticisms, are very interesting to hasty readers, who have not time to stop and question the book upon each of its principles, and on the relevancy of their illustrations, or upon the sources of all the express and implied premises upon which the argument of it is founded. They are constrained to read some books as a means of saving them the labour of thought, and they do often get new and valuable thoughts in this way. If any suppose they have got such thoughts in this way from this

book, we advise to try those thoughts in their fundamental principles, and by their fitness for society, before they allow them to germinate and grow in their own minds: there are very few of them that can produce any thing else than mere weeds.

When a man takes his own opinions of any kind of excellence as the standard by which he judges and condemns the opinions and acts of others, he can be doing nothing else but giving us his own opinions, and asking us to adopt them as the standard by which we are to form our judgment, and to take him as authority in such matters; and this is what our author quite unconsciously does. We say unconsciously, because it is apparent that he was ignorant that that was the standard by which he was judging, and that there was any necessity to have any standard to judge by. And then he has a very great abhorrence of all respect for authority, that is, for standards; and therefore he is quite inconsistent with himself, when he expects us to accept his opinions as our guide; and that is the very purpose for which his book was written, and his whole manner shows his expectation. He would have written no such things, if he had first ascertained a true objective standard before he began his work.

We cannot suppose that our author is so reckless in his hatred of authority as to reject the authority of ordinary usage in language as the instrument of thought and expression, though this would be a legitimate consequence; and therefore we must regard his frequent departures from the ordinary usage of literary men in the use of terms as proceeding from ignorance of well-settled distinctions. What we have quoted above shows, that he confounds history either with the philosophy of history or with social science, and his book throughout involves the same confusion. The functions of the historian are, like those of an observer in any other department of knowledge, to record as well and truly as he can all the material facts relating to the object of his study, and thus lay up a store of materials for the use of philosophy, when the time for philosophizing comes. In so far as he goes beyond this, and developes the causes and principles of social phenomena, he becomes himself a philosopher, and most historians now-a-days

very properly do this to some extent. If the author had recognized this distinction, existing in the very nature of knowledge and clearly inscribed in language, he would not have called biographers, genealogists, and chroniclers "those babblers of vain things, who lie in wait at every corner, and infest this the public highway of our national literature." If he had ever recognized his own process, he could not have spoken so contemptuously of them; for, in his attempt at philosophizing, he is continually calling upon them for his evidence and his facts.

This makes it apparent that the author has a theory of his own, by which he is continually measuring the performances of others. He is not content that science and philosophy shall grow out of evidence and observation, but these must be moulded by them; we must become philosophers before we become observers. It is under the influence of the same prejudice that he declares it to be "the business of the historian" to show "that the movements of nations are perfectly regular, and that, like all other movements, they are solely determined by their antecedents." Yet this is not the business of anybody. It is the business of the historian to record the facts; and then the philosopher, naturally presuming that there must be some fundamental order in those facts, and that they grow out of some causes, sets himself to discover this order and these causes.

But the philosophical inaccuracies scattered through this work are so numerous, that it would weary the patience of our readers if we should attempt to correct them all. The author's industry and unreflecting spontaneity is so great that he has produced them so abundantly that we find even the notes we have taken of them in the course of our reading are very embarrassing to ourselves. We must therefore lay aside our notes, and refer only to such errors as will naturally find a place in our discussion of his leading errors.

We concede to our author an extraordinary industry in his search for historical illustrations of his theories; and we have often thought that it was these illustrations, rather than the truth of his theories, that have rendered his book so attractive to many minds; and no doubt its attractiveness is increased by the fact that these theories serve as hooks in the memory, to

hang his illustrations upon in some sort of order, though it may not be the true order; just as the Ptolemaic system of astronomy answered this purpose until we found a better one. We have even doubted whether he has not displayed such a superabundance of instances, and detailed them with so much minuteness, as to embarrass the thought of his readers in applying them, and to dim his conclusions in the very splendour of the learning that surrounds them. He thinks the civilization of the Brazilians was prevented by the very fertility of their soil, and by the gorgeous magnificence of the vegetable and animal nature around them, by which the ground was obstructed and the very heavens obscured, and their efforts of cultivation embarrassed and foiled; and we incline to the opinion that his own views of truth have been darkened, and his inquiries embarrassed, by the abundance of the materials which he has accumulated, and which he has not taken time to digest and assimilate.

We freely concede also the earnestness which he displays throughout his work, and have no right or disposition to doubt his honesty; but earnestness, and even honesty, are quite compatible with the absence of caution, and with very hasty conclusions; especially if we have not learned that honesty demands caution in all investigations wherein the interests and rights of others depend upon our actions or conclusions. Minds impartially and however earnestly inquiring after truth, and not merely seeking props and buttresses for ricketty structures or foregone conclusions, or to display striking theories, are usually calm and quiet observers and reasoners, and we are apt to suspect their scientific competence when they are not so. A very thoughtful writer has recently said, very truly, that "the heroes of science are those who, though capable of the most elevated views, have suppressed in themselves all anticipated generalities, and confined themselves to the part of humble labourers."

We cannot, therefore, concede that the author's earnestness, however confident, is any evidence to experienced thinkers that his theories or his criticisms are right. We must have taken the measure of his abilities, and found them entirely adequate to the task, and unprejudiced in the performance of

it, before we can commit our faith to his keeping. He would consider us superstitious if we should act otherwise, and we think we have some grounds to complain that he seems to have intended to gain this sort of control over our minds; for the confident, boasting, censorious, and rather arrogant manner of the charlatan is not uncommon in his mode of treating his subject and the opinions of others. This may be merely an unfortunate manner, into which really scientific men sometimes fall; but we confess an inclination to defend ourselves against theories and arguments thus presented.

We spare our readers from a discussion of the scraps of history which the author has gathered together, and are willing that it shall be taken for granted that they are all truly stated, so far as they go; because, to our mind, they are all of little consequence. They relate in general to various phases of, what the author would call, the political and religious superstitions of past times in many countries, and do not help us much in understanding the history or philosophy of civilization. In the language of legal practice, we demur to the pleading, as not entitling the author to the judgment which he claims; and to the evidence, as not sustaining his pleading, even if we admit its truth. Our business is with his law, not with his facts; with his philosophy, and not with his history. Though he seems to think that he has drawn all his philosophy from his history, we do not think so.

He evidently sets out in his investigations with many foregone conclusions or prejudices, with many likes and dislikes of a very decided character; and hence he is continually tempted out of the straight line of philosophical investigation, in order to display these feelings. Human nature has to confess a little liking for finding fault, because it furnishes to each individual some relief from his own sense of weakness, and may occasionally divert the mind from a line of thought which is not easily followed out to the end. But a philosopher, in the process of philosophizing, ought to have no likes or dislikes; or at least they ought to stand aside until he has finished his investigation, and come to his conclusions on the exact character of his phenomena, and of their causes and effects. Then his feelings will flow from his knowledge, and not direct or pervert it.

Our author has a great dislike for mental and moral philosophy and theology; and hence, of course, he has never studied them, except to discover their deficiencies; and knows very little about them, and thinks them of very little importance in civilization. On the other hand, he has a great reverence for physical science, and has given it a favourable hearing; and attributes to physical laws the main influence in civilizing human society. He does not, therefore, investigate the phenomena of human nature, to find in man the social elements which fit him for society, and which, by their gradual development, constitute his civilization.

He is very fierce and pertinacious in his assault on the clergy; but as he does not judge them by their accepted standard, and does not offer to show that they have adopted a wrong standard, of course his condemnation amounts only to an expression of his own opinions, which he ought not to have expected the public entirely to adopt. He does not even take a standard admitted by himself, as universal and objective, when he says: "Every institution, whether political or religious, represents the actual working, the form and pressure of the age." And when he says again, of the acts of the clergy: "The real cause was the spirit of their age, and the peculiarities of their position. None of us can be sure that, if we were placed exactly as they were placed, we should have acted differently."

He is almost equally condemnatory of statesmen and publicists, except of Adam Smith, whom he considers "greater than all statesmen and legislators put together," and whose "*Wealth of Nations*" he regards as "the most important book" ever published: but here again he appeals to no standard of merit, and gives us only his own opinions. It is very easy to see that these opinions constitute a peculiar doctrine of political economy, favoured by the school to which he belongs. No doubt he intends to take natural law as the standard in all cases; though he seldom, in any given case, either ascertains or applies it carefully, or seems to know what it is as a general notion. So far as he has any objective standard, it is natural law, and we cannot fairly test the skill of his performance, except by comparing it with his own standard.

We join him, therefore, in his appeal to the standard of natural law, as the sole standard of judgment for the case; and we join him, likewise, in his appeal to the Inductive Method, as the means of ascertaining what that law is in each case. But then we must know what natural law is, before we can know what we are seeking for, and this is a mere question of definition. He does not define it, and does not even appear very clearly to know what it is; for he sometimes seems to regard it as some kind of force or power outside of things controlling their movements; yet it is not a force at all, but is expressive of the mode in which a force acts. Natural law is the general term for all particular natural laws; and a natural law is the expression of the usual order of events in any given circumstances, or of the natural relation of events to each other; and the cause which produces this order is the natural force existing in the things, and producing their movements or events. We would go further, to Creative Cause; but we do not, because we desire to meet our author on his own ground, so far as he seems to have any that is true, even though it be not the Highest Cause.

Of such an inquiry, the method must, of course, be inductive, for the order of nature is a question of fact to be decided on the evidence derived from observation. If, therefore, observation proves, as the author says, that civilization depends upon knowledge, and knowledge upon leisure, and leisure upon wealth, and wealth upon a superabundance given by the earth's fertility, and "solely regulated by the physical peculiarities of the country," or depending "entirely on soil and climate," then, of course, we must accept the conclusion, though it seems to make all the energies of humanity useless, and to run us into a very unpalatable materialism, and though it contradicts our mother-wit, which has always told us that practice gives skill, that "want is the spur of wit," and that "necessity," and not leisure, "is the mother of invention." But the proverbs of our forefathers were often wrong, because founded on insufficient observation; and it may be true, as our author insists, that wit is founded on wealth, or the most abundant product of each country, and that, therefore, civilization in India grows from rice, in Lower Egypt from dates, in Upper

Egypt from the grain called dhourra, in Mexico and Peru from maize and bananas, and in Ireland from potatoes. We prefer, however, our mother-wit to our author's science or philosophy, and do not think that our readers will require us to refer to the evidence to prove that leisure and laziness, ease and idleness, are very apt to be found together in the early stages of life and civilization, and that new inventions and discoveries come in to supply the wants which industry feels in the course of its practice. This may be taken as a sample, by the way, of the author's skill, "bold generalizations," and "comprehensive views" in political economy; a science for which, and especially for the free trade doctrine, of which our author seems to have had a superstitious reverence, which might possibly have been dispelled had he lived long enough to make its full acquaintance.

But still we admit that the true method of arriving at a knowledge of the natural order of events is by observation and generalization of facts, and we are willing to try our hand at this with the author before we are done, if we find occasion for it. We do not expect to have much need to do so after we shall have corrected some of the violations of method into which he has fallen. He sometimes forgets the law of his method by postulating premises, without any proof, because demanded by the necessities of his argument; as when he says that, "in the first formation of society, wealth *must* accumulate before knowledge can begin;" and again, "there *must* be an intimate connection between human actions and physical laws," (he means, the order of physical nature.) We do not refer to these propositions for the purpose of disputing them, but only as samples of the author's resort to supposed aprioral principles when his method fails him. He does not prove them by history and observation, and from their nature they cannot be so proved.

We do not expect him to prove the fundamental principle of all reasoning, which our mind naturally assumes, and which the method of analogy confirms, that like causes produce like effects, like grounds give like consequences, or like things in like relations being given, like movements ensue; for without this we could neither attain nor attempt any science. But we cannot concede that this principle, even deductively, and much

less inductively, employed, can lead to the materialism and fatalism expressed by the author, when he says, that physical laws "invariably kept the vast majority of the fairest portion of the globe in a condition of constant and inextricable poverty;" that the general aspects of nature are the causes "of these innumerable superstitions, which are the great obstacles of advancing knowledge;" "men, being determined solely by their antecedents, must under precisely the same circumstances, always issue in precisely the same results:" in India, "abject, eternal slavery was the natural state of the great body of the people; it was the state to which they were doomed by physical laws utterly impossible to resist:" in Brazil, man is "reduced to insignificance by the majesty (of nature) with which he is surrounded:" in Asia, the general aspects of nature "excite the imagination;" in Europe, they "address the understanding:" "in the moral, as in the physical world, nothing is anomalous, nothing is unnatural, nothing is strange; all is order, symmetry, and law."

The author would have been saved from this extreme of materialism and fatalism, if he had sufficiently recognized that effects always proceed from at least two factors, and can be accounted for only by their combined influence. If he had properly appreciated this principle, he would not have despised metaphysics, by which he means mental science, and resorted so exclusively to soil and climate, and the general aspects of nature, in the study of civilization. He would hardly so despise vegetable physiology and animal instincts, and resort only to soil, climate, and aspects of nature, in the study of agriculture and animal economy. The cosmical force of gravitation is very simple; but we do not study that of the sun alone, but that of the planet-star, in order to understand the motions of a planet. And when we are studying the normal motion of the earth in its orbit, we take into consideration the several attractions of the sun, moon, and earth. Soil and climate would be nothing in vegetation, were it not for the vegetating principles in the seed or plant; nothing in animal life, were it not for the vital principles of the animal; and nothing in spiritual, and therefore nothing in social life, were it not for the mental, moral, and social principles that belong to the nature of man.

The author comes very near catching this principle, when he says, that the normal and more permanent condition of our body ought to be studied before the abnormal and variable, in order to learn the nature of disease; and thus is obtained a standard of easy application; for, though the normal state continually changes with age, and differs according to climate, yet an adequate approximation to the knowledge of it is easily obtained. This view involves the admission that both the factors of the disease must have some notice. And he applies this as an analogy to the study of society; we must study its normal, in order to know its abnormal state. It was, indeed, inconsistent with this, that he had said before that there is nothing abnormal or anomalous; but this is to be expected of a writer who begins to publish before he has completed his study. He was also inconsistent with it, when he says that a growing civilization must depend upon a growing cause; that is, upon increasing intelligence, and overlooks all the natural energies of the mind itself; besides the inaccuracy of making intelligence a cause, instead of element, of civilization. If he had defined the object of his work, civilization, before he began to write, he would have known better what he was writing about, and might have done it more to the satisfaction and edification of his readers. Definition is not easy work; but he might have got aid from Guizot. It is not a disturbed movement, but only the disturbance itself, that demands an unsteady cause.

No reflecting person needed to be told that soil, climate, and the aspects of nature have an influence on individual character and social progress; but this influence would be nothing without the reaction of the mind, and the energies that fit it to react. The mind and the external world are, therefore, in mere natural law, the two factors of all social effects, and both demand to be studied. And studying thus, there is no inductive process that can lead the author to his doctrine of human necessity. We speak not of the deductive process, for the author rejects that altogether. One factor, the mind, is always changing in its desires, purposes, course of thought, and amount of knowledge; and therefore, even in the same external circumstances, or with the other factor the same, the effects change; the relation changes as each factor changes,

and no amount of observation can furnish the evidence to induction of the fatality of individual or of social actions. And back of this again lies the fact, that the mind is continually changing itself, by its own reflections on the materials which it has acquired by observation, and is thereby continually presenting itself in new relations and aspects, and new energies, motives and intelligence, to the influences that come from without, and thus giving to those influences new directions, and always changing the diagonal of their forces. This saves us from materialistic fatalism, and yet does not forbid a reasonable induction of social laws, founded on fundamental principles of human nature, and on the conduct which flows from them.

But, notwithstanding what we have quoted from the author relative to the power of physical laws over the process of civilization, he does often speak of mental laws and faculties and feelings; and yet we are not sure that he does not thereby mean merely the effect produced on the mind by physical influences, without admitting any natural tendencies in the mind itself. Thus in India, Spain, Italy, Mexico, and Peru, earthquakes, volcanoes, and great pestilences excite the imagination, suggest the supernatural, and breed superstition, and this breeds the "contemptible subservience" of the ignorant, which subjects them to slavery. And this slavery means any degree of submission to authority that is incompatible with his notions of political economy, whether it relate to government, commerce, religion, literature, or any other matter. All comes from physical law, and he says "nothing is anomalous, nothing is unnatural," which is true, of course, if we are merely studying the natural laws of physical causes. Induction, in such a study, accepts the physical facts in order to find the law of them, and of course such a law can have no condemnation or approbation of the facts out of which it grows. It is merely the generalization of them. On his ground, therefore, he has no right to find fault with society for its vices and "diseased appetites."

He has, however, a very extensive discussion on "mental laws" and "moral laws," which is worth our notice. His purpose is to show that civilization advances by the growth of our

knowledge, and not of our morality, and he states his proposition thus: "If the advance of civilization, and the general happiness of mankind, depend more on their moral feelings than on their intellectual knowledge, we must, of course, measure the progress of society by those feelings; while if, on the other hand, it depends principally on their knowledge, we must take as our standard the amount and success of their intellectual activity." Now, if he had known a little of mental science, he would have known that all our sentiments depend on our knowledge—that we have no love or hatred, joy or sorrow, without some object perceived by the mind. Our sentiments depend on the manner in which we understand persons, things, and events, and our moral conduct, therefore, depends upon our intelligence, by the very nature of our mental constitution, and are of course subordinate to it. It follows also that our morality must improve in proportion as our intelligence of our relations with our fellow-men increases. We admit therefore that our moral feelings depend upon our knowledge, as an end depends upon its means; but not that no perceptible advance has been made in morality for the last two thousand years, which our author asserts, and not that the means are more important than the end. It is very easy to see that it is the strong dislike of moralists and theologians, entertained by his school of political economists, and imbibed by himself, that is the main argument of the conclusion in his own mind. His whole discussion on this point is totally useless to any scholar in mental science.

We know not how the author can possibly, in political economy and the philosophy of history, confine this "intellectual knowledge" to the knowledge of mere physical laws, and yet it has already appeared that such is his purpose, and he maintains it to the end. Thus he very rightly says that "the only remedy for superstition is knowledge." And considering that he admits that it naturally and inevitably accompanies ignorance, he seems to be wasting indignation in calling it "that plague-spot of the human mind." It would have been much more scientific in him to have regarded it as raising a problem of natural law for his investigation and definition. He says ignorance is the cause of superstition, and therefore,

if any indignation were proper, it ought to have been directed against the cause, and not against the effect. For ourselves, we should regard ignorance as a negative quality, and therefore as not a cause of anything; and we suppose the true cause is to be found in some mental tendency striving for its proper development, and groping its way towards it.

Another of his great evils is war, which he thinks is decreasing, whether because of our knowledge of "physical laws," or because of a higher appreciation of moral laws, we are, not very certain. He says it is because "certain classes of society have an interest in the preservation of peace;" and this may mean either a moral or a physical interest, or both, if we may talk of a physical interest. He says again: "By an increasing love of intellectual pursuits, the military service necessarily declines;" and we do not know how to reconcile this with what he had just before said, and which we have quoted. And again he says, there are "three leading ways in which the warlike spirit has been weakened;" 1. The invention of gunpowder; 2. The discoveries of political economists; 3. The application of steam to travelling.

Gunpowder acts as a cause in the suppression or depression of the military spirit, by making "a separate military profession indispensable." And yet he thinks that it is just in this way that an undue religious spirit and an undue loyal spirit has been maintained, and that political economy has grown to be a science, and that, by the division of labour, all the arts of life have been advanced. His reason does not seem to us conclusive.

Political economy has depressed the warlike spirit, he says, by teaching us that money is "of no possible use, except to measure and circulate riches," and that wealth consists "solely of the value which skill and labour can add to the raw material," and that commerce must be allowed to be free; and, by reason of this intelligence, "the commercial spirit, which formerly was often warlike, is now invariably pacific." If this be so, the military spirit of commerce has become pacific for a very ignorant reason, and will not last long. But it is not so; merchants are much wiser in their business than such political economists, though they may not have learned the philosophy

of it. They know well enough that gold and silver have real value, and that they could not be measures of value without it. The author would seem to be a physical utilitarian, and to pronounce money of no use but as a measure of riches, because we cannot eat or drink it. But thereby he repudiates both the notion and the fact expressed by the words *value* and *wealth*. Both are fixed by the common estimate of the world. The world has a right to its ambition for the ornaments of life, because it is natural, and its demand for gold and silver for this purpose, if no other, necessarily gives it value; for value means the relation which articles of commerce bear to each other in the market of the world; and it depends on the common estimate of society, and political economists are bound so to accept it as an element of their science.

The application of steam to the purposes of travelling has weakened the love of war, by facilitating the intercourse between different countries, and thus aiding "in destroying that ignorant contempt which one nation is too apt to feel for another." Perhaps this is more of a moral than of a physical cause; but we make no question about it. In the discussion of it he makes some very fine remarks, two of which we quote, because they show how unconscious he is of any vain, contemptuous, or denunciatory spirit. "The greatest observer and the most profound thinker is invariably the most lenient judge. It is the solitary misanthrope, brooding over his fancied wrongs, who is most prone to depreciate the good qualities of our nature, and exaggerate its bad ones; or else it is some foolish and ignorant monk, who, dreaming away his existence in an idle solitude, flatters his own vanity by denouncing the vices of others."

The author introduces his views on the subject of the social protective spirit, by referring to the civil wars of England and of France, in the seventeenth century. In England they were settled by a spirit of liberal concession, which was followed by a restoration of harmony, liberty, and progress; while in France they were settled by a centralized despotism, and the suppression of all dissent and freedom, which generated a social disease which festered for more than a century, and then broke out into the anarchy of opinions and institutions, and the despotism and

cruelty and popular excitement of the French Revolution. He says the history of these two events, and their consequences, will show that, "in politics, no certain (we should rather say, fixed, like physical and mathematical, and not vital and social) principles having yet been discovered, the conditions of success are compromise, barter, expediency, and concession. It will show the utter helplessness, even of the ablest rulers, when they try to meet new emergencies by old maxims. It will show the intimate connection between knowledge and liberty; between an increasing civilization and an advancing democracy. It will show that, for a progressive nation, there is required a progressive polity; that, within certain limits, innovation is the sole ground of security; that no institution can withstand the flux and movements of society, unless it not only repairs its structure, but widens its entrance; and that, even in a material point of view, no country can long remain either prosperous or safe, in which the people are not gradually extending their power, enlarging their privileges, and, so to say, incorporating themselves with the functions of the state."

These views very well express the idea that vital principles must have vital forms; that the natural growth of society cannot be set back by state formalism or officialism, or prevented by it; that, however the meddling of arbitrary men, despots, or agitators, may disturb this natural growth, they cannot suppress or permanently divert it. He illustrates it further by the intermeddling conduct of James I. of Scotland, endeavouring to force his theories upon the people: "Like nearly all politicians, he exaggerated the value of political remedies. The legislator and the magistrate may, for a moment, palliate an evil; they can never work a cure. General mischiefs depend upon general causes, and these are beyond their art." A chronic disorder, "having worked into the general habit, might be removed by time; it could never be diminished by violence. Over-action on one side produces reaction on the other, and the balance of the fabric is disturbed. By the shock of conflicting interests, the scheme of life is made insecure. New animosities are kindled, old ones are embittered; and the natural jar and discordance are aggravated, simply because the rulers of mankind cannot be brought to understand, that, in dealing with a

great country, they have to do with an organization so subtle, so extremely complex, and withal so obscure, as to make it highly probable that, whatever they alter in it, they will alter wrongly; and that, while their efforts to protect or strengthen its particular parts are extremely hazardous, it does undoubtedly possess within itself a capacity of repairing its injuries; and that, to bring such capacity into play, there is merely required that time and freedom, which the interference of powerful men too often prevents it from enjoying."

The general spirit of these remarks we most heartily adopt; but it does not seem to us that this was the guiding spirit of the author's mind. His impatience at the tardiness with which society receives what he calls truth, and at the tenacity with which it adheres to old customs and old leaders, seems to us to grow out of a very opposite spirit. He approves of the firm and well-guarded walls within which society shelters itself against invasions; but frets that the men of his school of political economy may not pass the sentinels without giving the watchword. Every society must have its sentinels, and they would be good for nothing without their formalism. If they did not watch and suspect, and cry "Halt; who comes there? advance and give the countersign," they would be unfit for their place, and would soon be shot down, either by those whom they have weakly betrayed or endangered, or by those whom they have foolishly trusted.

Discipline is an essential element of the process of civilization. It is not knowledge or mental growth, and therefore impatient spirits fret at the delays which it requires; but it is the regulation and consolidation of the knowledge and growth already attained, and the fixing of the foundations of a further growth. It does not furnish either knowledge or energy to the mind; but it gives skill and accuracy in the direction of them. In war it is the law that gives organic unity to the army, saves it from disorders within and dangers without, and enables it to move with one mind against the enemy. Soldiers are apt to grow weary of the labour of learning it, and others of the time spent in teaching it; but it is sure in its rewards to those who with patience cultivate it. It may never be as good as it ought to be; but it can hardly ever be as bad as none at

all. In the state it is the constitution and laws by which all the social interests are organized, regulated, and protected; and usually it is as good as society knows how to adopt or practice; and without it there can be no social unity and harmony, no common standard of social action, rights, and duties; not even a common language to make the preservation and propagation of thought possible.

No doubt, disciplines, laws, constitutions, habits and customs are often very defective; but we have never known any systems of them that would be as bad as none at all. They are the forms of systematic unity, and they may become so rigid as to embarrass, but never so as totally to prevent social growth. A tree is sure to crack the bark that does not adequately share in its growth. If it bind too hard, it is better to encourage its growth than to strip it off.

And it is hardly wise to complain of "the interference of powerful men;" for generally their power consists of the trust which society has in them, and we become competent to criticise their measures only by their consequences revealed to their successors, and not to them, and the process of civilization demands such men. All life consists of a variety of functions, each performing its part in the vital unity. Civil society abounds in such functions, each becoming more distinctly marked as intelligence increases, and becoming represented by the different trades, occupations, professions, and classes of which society consists. This branching of thought and division of labour is an essential element of all social growth. And yet it naturally tends to produce confusion; for each function naturally organizes itself to maintain its integrity and force, and naturally tends to encroach on other functions, and the highest science and skill of the statesman and publicist are never able to preserve entire order and adequate freedom among these functions, so as to maintain complete harmony in the social unity which they compose; for all his wisdom must be derived from observing how they do actually operate together. We must have discovered, by the experience of ourselves or of others, that any given form, or institution, or class interest, works badly in society, before we can know how to correct it or supply it by another.

Now it is this very tendency of society to organize its several interests into several departments, and consequently itself into many different classes, that the author calls the protective spirit—"that mischievous spirit which weakens whatever it touches." He proclaims it the great enemy of intellectual movement, "and therefore the great enemy of civilization," and defines that he means by it, "the notion that society cannot prosper unless the affairs of life are watched over and protected at nearly every turn by the state and the church; the state teaching men what they are to do, and the church teaching them what they are to believe." Whenever commerce, or arts, or religion, or science, or literature, or politics is regulated or watched over by kings, nobles, or clergy, by state or church, that is *protection*. And it is easy to see that if the author were an advocate of free love, or concubinage, or polygamy, or free liquor, or free gambling, free forestalling, and free cheating, he would likewise have denounced all state laws and church teaching that should interfere with such liberty, as *protection*. Nearly the whole of these two volumes is occupied, directly or indirectly, with this subject; and the author thinks he has constructed a conclusive inductive argument in favour of his theory.

Now, if the author had really studied history in order to discover the general facts of our social nature, and to generalize its tendencies and their modes of operation and development, instead of studying it in order to produce evidence of his own theories, he would easily have found that what he calls *protection* is one of the most natural, as well as one of the most essential, modes of social action. All the social interests naturally and spontaneously organize themselves for self-defence against conflicting interests, and for propagating and perpetuating the life that is in them; and religion and politics, being the earliest developed of all these interests, and being fundamental to all the others, have always been the first to organize themselves, and have always been the most decidedly organized. That they are imperfect in principle and form may be admitted, because man is imperfect; but how the author, proceeding on strictly inductive grounds, and therefore having no possible standard of comparison but the generalized facts of

each society, how he can condemn them, we are unable to understand.

The more society advances in civilization, the more its moral, intellectual, and physical wants increase, and the more its functions and occupations are divided, and the more these become organized, every class having its own laws, customs, and usages appropriate to its business, and these are its protection. The organizations of the state and of the church are the strongest of all, because they involve the permanent interest of all, and therefore yield not so readily as the other interests, which are weaker, because fractional and dependent on social wants, and therefore sometimes transient, and because they can never be so entirely separated that many of them may not encroach on each other.

No doubt such organizations are embarrassing to hasty and impatient innovators; but philosophers know how to bide their time. It is the organic form, the political, religious, moral, scientific, or practical system that stands in their way; and yet their own favourite principle, if admitted, would demand only a change in the system; for without its proper place in some organic unity, it could have no life nor force. Every principle is worthless while it is out of its proper relations. All the principles admitted by society naturally systemize themselves in the social mind, and then the system must yield more or less before it can admit a new principle. To complain of this, is to complain of that very nature to which the author appeals. The aspiring sprout might as well complain that its growth is obstructed by the overshadowing forest.

There is no natural organism without its correlated parts. In all organisms, except the mind of man and society, nature regulates these correlations; but in these, the will and reason of man have much to do, and they must direct as wisely as they know how to do it. Nature assigns no invariable rule for the forms of individual or of social life. All have their permanent fundamental character, and all have their circumstantial varieties, which no aprioral principles can indicate or control. Every organism must spontaneously or by calculation hold its parts in proper relations. It must maintain its individuality, save itself from encroachment from without, and from anarchy

within. How it shall do so, depends upon inner and outer circumstances, and can be decided by no aprioral law, and by no rule not deduced from those circumstances, and from its own nature. Fences are very costly and inconvenient; but so long as some people may let their swine and cattle run at large, all must keep their fields enclosed. Walls were an obstruction to the light and air, and to the free ingress and egress of the old towns of Europe; but in those disorderly times, they were necessary to the interests and freedom of the people; now the lines of fortification must be set further out. Walls are not to be condemned for being proofs of social disorder.

But the author did not see how far-reaching would be his anti-protection principle, if carried out to its legitimate consequences. It would not only suppress the power and influence of the state and of the church, both of which he regarded with strong prejudice and even hatred; but it would forbid the organization and regulation of any of the great interests of society. War is often a chronic condition of society, and yet his principle would forbid the social readiness for it to be organized and regulated, lest the work of organization should fall into the hands of a military class, who would become protective. Disease is always present in society, and needs to be attended to, and yet his principle would forbid the organization of this social interest, lest the medical faculty should usurp the social thinking on this subject, and thus become protective. And, inconsistent though it is, he is an advocate of "the authority of the intellectual classes," without perceiving that he, everywhere and in every form, attacks the very principle of authority itself and all its foundations; and that no authority can exist in any society without becoming organized and regulated; and that, therefore, the authority of even "the intellectual classes" could not avoid becoming protective, if it is to be any authority at all.

The authority which the state and the church exert is very offensive to the author, because it interferes with "the authority of the intellectual classes," by which he very evidently means the materialistic philosophers, and especially the school or party of physico-political economists to which he belongs; and hence his earnest and rather blind hatred of them. Con-

sidering the great deficiency of his knowledge of them, and of their necessary relations with all the social interests, we think this hatred very natural. There is a necessary antagonism between his system and them, which can be removed only by an increase of intelligence, changing one or the other of them. His certainly cannot maintain its place, for it is easy to see that it is opposed to both state and church; that is, to the organization of the civil and religious interests of the country; and he would, no doubt, have no other organization of society, except the free and transient contracts of socialism, or something analogous thereto. He had not come to the proper place in his work for explaining his system; but this is the character of the system of the political sect to which he belonged.

The author deals largely in antithesis; he is a lover of striking contrasts, and, as is usual with writers who get into this vein, he is continually running them into an extreme that violates truth. Thus he contrasts the intellectual and the military classes, and says that the antagonism between them is evident, and he seems to think it a necessary antagonism. "It is the antagonism between thought and action, between the internal and the external, between argument and violence, between persuasion and force; or, to sum up the whole, between men who live by the pursuits of peace, and those who live by the practice of war. Whatever, therefore, is favourable to one class is manifestly unfavourable to the other." This is false throughout; for force is just as natural to man as intelligence, and therefore, though different, they are not necessarily nor evidently antagonistic. On the contrary, thought is necessary to action; the external is the expression of the internal; argument and persuasion are often used to produce violence and force; and war is often founded on and guided by very high intelligence.

The antagonism between prejudice and impartiality, or between two opposing prejudices, in dealing with facts, is much more evident, and this the author seems not at all to have appreciated. His mission was evidently not to seek for truth, but to propagate the truth which he was sure he had. Hence, though not a military man, he became a warrior when he first took up his pen. His whole work is a war of invasion declared

against the enemies of his system, and is conducted with all the arts of war, and not at all with the ingenuousness and gentleness of philosophy seeking to win its triumphs by the persuasive eloquence of truth. Eloquent he often is, and therefore very attractive, when you concede his premises, by looking at events only from his standpoint; and no doubt his eloquence is honest, so far as it is honest to allow a half look to dictate to his passion. This is a superficial honesty that may suffice in the ordinary affairs of life, but a philosopher ought to be more profound. The common beliefs of mankind have a real foundation in human nature, even where untrue in form, and no seeker of truth is entitled to spurn them from him. When the author frowns upon them or distorts them by his ridicule, he is guilty of using the very force which he everywhere condemns as productive of superstition. This is the spirit of war, and not of teaching.

As leader of a war on existing institutions, he must practice the arts of war, and expect to be met by the same arts; and therefore his passion, his boastful confidence, his censoriousness, and denunciations, are not out of place. He must drum up recruits, and for this he must excite and maintain indignation against the hostile array. But as an investigator and teacher of truth, if he understood his function, and the state of mind that is receptive of truth, he would regard all excitement as standing in his way, and would himself endeavour to rise to the higher mediating principles of truth, where schools and factions find no foothold, or would suffer and invite their excitements to cool, by presenting other views of truth, which have not yet been coated over by their prejudices. When he becomes himself a partisan, even for truth, he only exaggerates excitement and divisions, by shutting the ears of the opposite party; though he is sure of the support of the party that already agrees with him.

There is a natural and legitimate excitement, that accompanies and sustains every earnest effort of mind or body, and makes such efforts pleasant. Let that have its course; to suppress it, we must abandon all effort and all earnestness; without it the mind is dull and inert. Let the teacher be full of it. Our author has this; but it is sadly tainted by an excitement that is

the spirit of party, and which continually prevents him from a careful and candid examination of the position and merits of those whom he regards as obstructing his purposes. He treats them as foolish, ignorant, superstitious, and tyrannical, and is indignant at their crimes, even while apologizing for them, that they could not be otherwise in the circumstances in which they were placed. Such intellectual rudeness may subdue the minds of some, but it can convince no one.

Even truth thus received has no secure support, for it has no inner vitality. It is a law of the occasion, and becomes obsolete when the excitement passes off. Any system thus assailed is sure to arm itself for defence, and perhaps to make reprisals. In times of quietness and of intellectual progress, every system and every interest has its law as well as its philosophy; its law for its general supporters, and its philosophy for the few who investigate its principles, and thus seek its improvement. But when a war of systems and interests arises, their safety consists in unity, and all must stand by the law, and the voice of philosophy is unheard; progress must give way to self-preservation, until the controversy is hushed. And the several interests within each state, not being organized for attack and defence, because relying on the protection of the state, when they are driven to rely on themselves for defeating hostility, spontaneously fall back on the law of necessity which the occasion dictates, and make it, for the time, a law of the organism. It is the law of war, with all its violence and strategy, its watchfulness, suspicion, and rage. It is only the highest wisdom that can combine moderation and vigour in such cases, and thus ensure success, or, at least, avoid defeat.

The great enemies of the author's favourite system, at least as he regards them, are the state and the church; and his war against them is passionate, and sometimes adroit, and even unscrupulous, as it seems to us. According to him, they are the cause of all the wars, persecutions, oppressions, and despotisms, with which the world has been afflicted. Loyalty and superstition are the sentiments on which they are founded, and therefore these are to be suppressed, as the enemies of our race. PROTECTION is their hated name, though, in the estimate of society, it is not yet considered a very hard name. And

yet he admits that these sentiments are natural to men, and that they have been prevalent in all places and all times. As an inductive philosopher, therefore, it was his duty to accept them as elements of our social nature, and to seek, not to suppress them, but to correct their operation. But loyalty is the bond of the state, and an essential element of government; and superstition, by which he means religion, is the vital principle of the church; and therefore these are the special objects of his enmity. He hates both state and church, and therefore he hates the very principles of nature on which they depend.

The author has a strange mode of scientific elimination, which we have not discovered in any other writer. He throws out all those facts and elements of our nature, of society, and of history, which he dislikes, or which complicate his investigation, or interfere with his desired conclusions; and thus he obtains what he calls simplicity in the phenomena, and can more easily arrive at what he regards as the normal conditions of events. This certainly facilitates his calculations; but it does not solve the problem of which all these complications naturally form a part. Instead of the problem which nature presents, the author substitutes one which he likes better; but we confess that, in an investigation of the natural laws of society, we prefer to study social facts as we find them, rather than the hypothetic facts or the residuary facts of our author's elimination.

Loyalty to the social organism, its laws, constitution, and leaders, is a constant element of our social nature; and even the socialistic school of political philosophers must respect it, if they wish to develope it into accordance with their system. It is the natural gravitation of the individual towards the centre of its system, which saves it from mere chaotic or anarchical confusion or meteoric wandering. To reject it as an element of every social problem, is to deny man's social nature, and to declare that men associate only because they find it their interest to do so, and according to the interest which they find in society. And even this does not deny our social nature; but makes it depend on the natural requirements of our wit, rather than on any direct social tendency.

Liberty is the favourite idea of the author, and we prize it

as highly as he does, but perhaps not so passionately. Eager innovators are always passionate advocates of liberty; but history has always found them somewhat tyrannical when the time came for organizing their system. Then no one is right, and every one is wrong who does not adopt their system. Then faith in them is an essential element of a worthy character; all others are condemned, and no liberty is allowed to them that is supposed to interfere with the system. This phenomena is so constant that we must take it as natural, and make the best of it we can. Our author does not understand this.

According to our view, liberty is always a social question and depends on social circumstances. The social principle demands social organization, and therefore individual liberty must be such as is compatible with the functions of the social organism, when this is itself formed in reasonable accordance with its necessities. Liberty is therefore always regulated, controlled by rules, so that it shall not interfere with the liberty of society. When it is regulated by the arbitrary will of rulers, it may be unduly restrained. But when it is regulated by social customs, it is more naturally restrained; very much in the same way that individual liberty is restrained by individual habits; and in both cases we must rather endeavour to correct the customs and habits, than complain of the restraints which they bring with them.

There can be no liberty that is not responsible to society for its social offences; that is, for its acts which society feels to be offences. But an *ex post facto* or punitive responsibility is very far from being sufficient for the order of society; and therefore there must also be a preventive responsibility; and either of these may be unnecessarily exacting and oppressive. The former is in general under the superintendence of the judiciary, while the latter is committed to parents, tutors, guardians, and masters. He that does not pass well through the latter, is seldom fit for the liberty that belongs to the former. Even nations must usually pass through this process in their march from barbarism to civilization, a fact not noticed by the author; though it was an element in every civilization traced

by him, that the nation was brought to social order by centuries of subjection to another nation.

Liberty is the harmonious interaction of the individual and society, by these being so adapted to each other that the interests of each are properly respected by the other. The liberty of the individual must respect the order of society, which is its liberty; and the liberty of society must respect the growth of the individual; and therefore neither of them is absolute, and both of them vary according to intelligence, morality, and surrounding relations. These are fundamental principles of man's social nature which the author has not duly considered. If he had defined liberty according to its actual social nature, by the inductive method, and not followed a loose and unregulated idea of it, formed according to individual wishes, he would have been saved from very many of the errors into which he has fallen; and especially he would not have condemned loyalty as one of the greatest vices of our nature. Like all our other natural tendencies, it needs education, correction, and training, not suppression.

But the author resolves both loyalty and superstition into the sentiment of reverence or veneration, and therefore requires that this be suppressed, though he admits it to be a natural tendency. At one time he traces it to the nervous system, which he thinks he discovers to be affected by volcanoes, earthquakes, and other frightful events, until it falls into a bad habit of timidity, of wild imagination, and tame submission. We rather wonder that he did not think that this might also be the cause of the tame submission of domestic animals to the rule of man; for they too have a nervous system. And he might have examined why the brute creation in India had not become so superstitious as to worship Siva, Vishnu, and Brahma; for they have a nervous system, and are not destitute of imagination. And being in the way of suppressing natural causes, it seems to us it would have been quite as well to have advocated the suppression of the nervous system and of the earthquakes, for if this were done, he would have no trouble with their effects, loyalty, superstition, and reverence.

At another time he traces reverence to ignorance, which, being the absence of knowledge, and therefore a mere nega-

tion, can hardly be admitted by science as a cause of anything. But we admit it as not an improper form of common parlance, and we can hardly expect greater accuracy from so loose a thinker as the author. The meaning is, that our natural tendencies are the causes of all our actions, and that they act differently according to their training, their circumstances, and their degree of energy. A horse is very ignorant, but is not remarkable for reverence; and we are not sure that he has any tendency to it. Of course, where the tendency exists, it may be modified, restrained, developed and trained, for this is the very purpose of mental cultivation. It suppresses no mental tendency, but regulates all of them.

At another time it is good soil and climate that produce reverence, thus: good soil answers labour with abundance, and this produces inequality of wealth, and this gives social and political power, and this produces "tame submission" of the many to the few, and hence habits of reverence. The logical consequence would seem to be that, for the curse of reverence which it inflicts, a rich soil ought to be abhorred, as a sort of moral malarious marsh, breeding moral agues, and even moral death, slavery.

Reverence or veneration for the past is a great disturber of the author's equanimity; but we are sure that, with a little more philosophy, he would have saved his temper. He regards it as "repugnant to every maxim of reason;" though he has not given us even one of these maxims; and he fondly anticipates the time when "veneration for the past will be succeeded by hope for the future." Yet we have never considered these two sentiments as incompatible. With the author it is hatred of the past that has succeeded to reverence for the past, and these are incompatible sentiments. And since the future is ever built upon the past, we do not see how his hopes for the future could be very high. He acknowledges that the English hatred of the French was a mere superstition, founded on ignorance; and his hatred of this reverence may be no less so. He admits that "it is impossible for any man to escape the pressure of surrounding opinions;" and certainly those of his school have pressed him to many very groundless conclusions.

Regard for the past no doubt has its extremes of superstition

and contempt, and we do not admire either of them. But we cannot learn the philosophy of our social history without a respect for the past; and an inductive method that treats it with contempt is fundamentally unphilosophical. To scorn what he calls "the miserable details" of kings, courts, nobles, and wars, is to demand perfection in the first efforts at writing history; and this does not seem wrong if the past is to be despised in the study of the present and of the nature of man. But we must have enough of it to lead us to sympathize with the struggles of by-gone generations so far as to comprehend them and learn from them.

Reverence for the past is always overstated by those who allow themselves to be fretted by the reluctance with which society receives their new, or supposed new theories. It is much more fanciful than real. Society, like individuals, has no reverence for that of which it knows nothing. We know no difference, in respect of reverence, between remoteness in time and remoteness in space. "Distance lends enchantment to the view." Names that come to us from afar, in time or space, are presumed to be connected with great qualities, and we incline to receive all that favours this presumption. Like the rumour of a great event, the fame of them *crescit eundo;* our credulity, which is our natural faith not sufficiently watchful against excited witnesses, prepares us to admit all that is told us, and the very distance from which it comes is apt to shut out all evidence to the contrary. A favourite story continually grows, by the fancies of some narrators and the mistakes of others, in which common events are dropped, and strange ones exaggerated and easily remembered; and as all this is very natural, the author ought not to complain of it.

But it is not reverence for the past, but an inevitable respect for existing opinions and customs, that stands in the way of the schemes of innovators, and requires them to make clear proof of their superior merits, before existing things can give place to them. The usage stands for *prima facie* evidence on one side, and the burden of proof that is to set it aside is cast upon the innovating party. This is the natural law of evidence, and it cannot properly be complained of. Even the opinions imbibed by mere association or respect for associates, and without any

sort of investigation, or study of their tendencies or effects, and especially if they have become habitual, cannot give way before the highest and most respected authority in such matters, until, in some way, the buttresses of affection and habit, by which they are upheld, are thrown down.

And this appears to be a necessary element of social and individual stability of character. Without it, we know not how there could be any social system, or any system of any kind for growing men. No doubt it does interfere with all mere radicalism; and it will save the world from its anarchical principles, except in sudden gusts of popular excitement. It does also interfere with new systems, however sound they may be, just as a beech forest interferes with the growth of oaks on the same ground. New systems must prove their right before they can be received, and that may be a long process; for the jury is very numerous, and not always attentive, and the ladder of the judicial hierarchy consists of many rounds. If they can get their turn in the witness-stand, or a place at the bar, they are sure of a hearing in time. Let theorists allow time for the former growth to complete itself, and then to consolidate its results; then it will be ready for a new growth, and they may present their claim for a share in it. They can gain nothing by tearing down the old, and starting anew. This would only multiply the systematic wants of men, and thereby increase the number of speculators for the supply of them, and leave but little chance to the anarchist, who expected to make his fortune out of the ruins he had caused.

For the benefit of such authors, we quote a passage from Mr. George Field's Analogical Philosophy: "Authors have been more assiduous to controvert error than to promulgate truth, and have regarded it as no less essential to subvert the doctrines of others, than to establish their own; as if the object of philosophy were conquest, and not alliance. Yet, is the wisdom of such a course greater than would be his, who, in attempting to clear a fluid, should disturb its feculence? or his, who would endeavour to drive out darkness from an apartment, in order to admit the light? For truth, like light, shines by its own effulgence, and need but be shown to be acknowledged; and error is but the feculence of philosophy, which

will subside spontaneously, if left undisturbed, or if gently agitated only. This light and clearness of truth, all profess to be the great aim of philosophy; and truth in philosophy is naught but conformity to nature; add to which, that the philosopher need in general give himself little concern about erroneous opinions, since he may often discover truth in its purity with less labour than he can detach it from falsehood and error."

But it is not reverence for the past only, but in all its forms, that the author hates. And this seems to us very unreasonable, since he admits it to be a natural and almost universal tendency of the mind. He may hate the past, because it was there that germinated the seeds from which sprang all existing things; because there are the causes of existing institutions, there the struggles of our fathers for the liberty which we enjoy, and there originated the language that we speak, and the thoughts and principles with which we set out in life; and because he hates all these results. But how, with hopes for the future, he can abhor that reverence with which we look upward towards the infinite and the unknown, and admire and aspire after high intelligence, goodness, and excellence, and thereby make progress in spiritual life; this we are quite unable to comprehend. Even the boys at school must honour the heroes of the campus, or the playground, or the head of their class, if they are to come to anything. If their reverence does not rise so high, it will be apt to find its object in the courage of the leading rowdy of the school. The objects of our reverence change as we advance in intellectual and moral progress, always excepting that Highest Object which must ever be above our comprehension.

In this war waged by the author against loyalty, reverence, superstition, and religion, of course the clergy do not escape. He has devoted a very large portion of these volumes to them, and has discovered many offences committed by them against public order, individual liberty, morality, and science. And he often, or rather generally, makes these offences appear the more striking, by leaving out the main circumstances under which they took place. In a witness on the stand before a court and jury, this would be considered disingenuous; but the

author professes to simplify history by eliminating all complicating circumstances, and we accept that as an apology for the present.

We offer no apology for the clergy, except by suggesting some facts and principles, which he, as a philosophical investigator, ought not to have overlooked. It is especially against the bigotry and disorders of the Scotch clergy, during the fifteenth, sixteenth, and more particularly the seventeenth century, that he shows the greatest spite. But he omits to notice that, during all that period, the church was really part of the state, and that it shared in state functions; that offences against the order of the church were really civil offences, and punishable by law as such; and that the clergy, in being parties to religious persecutions, were truly obeying the law of the land as then understood, and acting according to the spirit of the age, which the author admits could not be resisted. He omits, moreover, the fact that during nearly the whole of the seventeenth century, the Scotch church, though still a part of the state, was the object of a most distressing and nearly destructive persecution by the kings of the house of Stuart, and thus its militant became much more prominent than its mere teaching character. The principles which he omits are, that it is the natural order of human affairs that, when any interest of society finds itself assailed by any other, and without any adequate guaranty or protection, it spontaneously organizes itself in reaction, and even in a militant form, to save itself from harm; that in proportion as the danger is great, this organization becomes more strict, suspicious, and ungenerous, and requires all to submit to great restraints upon their liberty; and that an organism which in this way becomes consolidated by the alarms and persecutions of almost a century, cannot at once relax itself without producing great social disorders.

He omits also to notice that in that day people were much less controlled by law than by the will of leaders; that their attachment was to their feudal and spiritual leaders rather than to any law or constitution; that when war was made on their religion, it was natural that their clergy should be recognized as leaders in the contest, and their advice as law; and

that thus the functions of strategy and politics became very naturally and almost inevitably united to the functions of religious instruction. If these facts and principles had been properly dealt with by the author, he would have written about the Scotch clergy in an entirely different spirit. When the civil department of the state became partisan, by assailing another large and essential interest of the people, or one which they felt to be essential, then a collision became inevitable, and under such circumstances even the church naturally becomes military and imperious, and of course falls into many acts of severity and oppression.

Our readers perceive, that according to the author, the great enemies of mankind are loyalty, superstition, protection, religion, and reverence, and their great supporters are the powerful classes, and particularly the clergy. These are the maladies—or rather reverence, which underlies them all, or ignorance, which underlies it, is the great social malady which he proposes to cure. And, strange as it may appear, scepticism, "the great principle of scepticism," "the necessary precursor of all inquiry," is the remedy which he proposes. "Till doubt begins, progress is impossible." "No other single fact has so extensively affected the different nations." "To it we owe the spirit of inquiry."

Strange that our natural spirit of inquiry should depend for its existence upon the doubts which its own errors suggest; that our natural faith in our intellectual power should be of less use to us than disbelief has been, and that we must begin to doubt before we have made any such progress as to have anything to doubt about! What vicious extremes a spirit of spite is sure to lead men into! With what contemptuous boastings it proclaims the victories it is about to achieve! With what blind and indiscriminating confidence and recklessness it attacks equally the strong and the weak points of its enemies! To have respect enough for enemies to make sure of understanding them, is as valuable in polemics as in war.

We have noticed that authors of much more caution and reflection than Mr. Buckle have spoken favourably of the scientific value of scepticism; but we cannot see that it can possibly be of any value. In its nature, it is a mere withhold-

ing of belief in any given opinion or system. It contributes not even hay or stubble to any of our scientific structures; and when it is studied and perverse, it treats with equal contempt the frail wigwams or clay huts of our savage life, and the more artistic and substantial mansions of the highest civilization; its delight is in weakening and destroying all human systems, and it has no constructive power. In one form it is a pitiable timidity and pusillanimity, that is ever hesitating to act, because it can come to no decided opinions; in another, it is an impudent effrontery, that rails continually at all the common opinions of society, and especially at all those which society regards as sacred, and has no opinions of its own, except that whatever others admit, it must doubt or deny. It is not philosophical or scientific caution, but the two vicious extremes of this; one fearful and the other reckless, both rejecting sufficient evidence, but one timidly rejecting it as insufficient for its own mind, and the other boldly rejecting it as insufficient for any mind; the former cowardly, hesitating, and unconstructive, and the latter impudent, dogmatizing, and destructive.

A watchful experience very early teaches us that our judgments are very liable to be erroneous, and that we ought to be cautious in investigating the evidence from which they arise; but this is rather faith than scepticism, for it admits we must form opinions. No one ever thinks of doubting until after his faith has given him a large stock of opinions, and he has discovered that some of them are erroneous, or in conflict with the opinions of other persons. But suppose that one should adopt scepticism as a principle of thought; how will he apply it? He cannot possibly reject all the opinions he has heretofore acquired or accepted, for they have become a part of the mind itself, and it must be rejected with them. He cannot arbitrarily choose to reject any one of the classes or systems that constitute his stock of knowledge or belief, for they, too, are parts of the mind. He may profess a rejection of them, but nature will assert their power when any necessity seems to call for them. He must discriminate before he can reject, and this requires evidence, and faith in evidence, before it can act, and is therefore not scepticism.

All natural doubting results simply from faith producing a

higher knowledge; we doubt, because evidence has produced another and incompatible belief; and therefore natural doubt is a mere accident of a growing faith, and is not itself a principle of the mind, though it may be cherished and cultivated until it becomes a chronic and diseased habit of mental action. We may suppose that our system of opinions on any given subject is complete, and yet a further advance in knowledge may reveal to us some hiatus in the system, or some incompatibility between it and our new acquisitions, and then it is faith that urges us to a higher knowledge, by which this incompatibility can be removed or corrected. The doubts thus raised are not scepticism, but the perception of logical contradictions, which the very nature of the mind cannot allow to stand together. Scepticism is naturally blind and indiscriminating, not knowing truth or error, and is a mere negation of knowledge; it is not it therefore that raises doubts or corrects errors. Faith alone is adequate to receive evidence, and present it to the understanding for its judgment, and the truth thus obtained is the sole power by which erroneous opinions and systems are to be expelled or modified.

But the space which we have already occupied warns us that we must bring our remarks to a speedy close. We had intended to notice with some detail the author's numerous blunders in relation to the inductive and deductive methods of philosophizing; but we must be brief; he does not understand either of them. He did not need to tell us that he intended to follow the inductive method in writing a history of civilization; for in such an undertaking he could use no other. But he not only does tell his purpose, but boasts of it as something peculiar. He is continually making an ostentation of his method as if he had some peculiar skill in the management of it, though he often unconsciously turns it upside down. He brandishes his instrument with a display that must be truly imposing to inexperienced workmen, and yet with an awkwardness that is quite ludicrous to those who have read the Novum Organum, or the Novum Organum Renovatum. As he calls the methods of mental philosophy and of history "the direct opposite" of each other, because one studies one, and the other

many minds, it would seem very proper to call them by new names—singular and plural methods.

The obtrusive ostentation and confidence with which he pronounces Hutcheson, Adam Smith, Hume, Reid, Ferguson, Leslie, Hutton, and other Scottish authors, to be deductive in their method, when, so far as we recollect, not one of them is so, is really amusing. In treating the subjects which they had in hand, it was impossible for them to be so, and if our author had understood either method he would have known this to be so. He endeavours to prove that Hutcheson's method is deductive from his own language in his complaint against those who "would reduce all our perceptive powers to a very small number, by one artful refinement or another," though this proves nothing of the sort; and if he continued Hutcheson's sentence, which adds, that such persons "depart exceedingly *from nature* in their accounts of those determinations about honour and shame, which are acknowledged to appear universally among men;" others would have seen, if he could not, that Hutcheson was using no other than the inductive method. We quote from *Moral Philosophy*, vol. i. p. 79, 1st ed.

Though he acknowledges that Reid professed the inductive method, and thought he was following it in all his investigations; yet he pronounces Reid's method deductive throughout, and he attempts to prove it by several extracts, all of like tenor, one sample of which will suffice: "All knowledge got by reasoning must be built upon first principles." But the extracts themselves show that Reid is speaking of knowledge got by deductive or syllogistic reasoning, as distinguished from that got by observation and generalization according to the inductive method, and any person may see this more clearly by referring to his *Essay* vii., p. 671, 1st ed.

But with an apology to our readers for this long discussion we must stop. Can any one wonder at the abounding and gross errors of an author who so badly comprehends the very method which he professes to pursue, and which is the true method of historical philosophy, and especially of a young author who treats with a patronizing air nearly all his celebrated predecessors in the same fields of inquiry?

Art. IV.—*The War and National Wealth.*

The opposite extremes of financial opinion in regard to the war, and the vast importance of the subject in every point of view, call for a discussion of it in the light of first principles. This will show whether the war is running us into the vortex of national bankruptcy, as some maintain, or whether it is productive of unequalled national prosperity, and warrants an unprecedented profusion of private expenditure, as others appear, both by words and actions, to believe. We think it easy to show the fallacy of both these extremes of opinion, and that the nation is able to furnish the means to carry on the war, and discharge all the obligations incurred by it, both interest and principal; while, at the same time, it cannot afford an unusual extravagance, or even its ordinary freedom of expenditure in living. Quite the contrary. The only condition on which the people can sustain themselves, or the government, together with the great institutions of religion, education, and charity, through the war, if long continued, is by a stringent and thorough economy, quite beyond any standard which has of late years been necessary. Thus they can, and, when they see its necessity, undoubtedly will do.

It is undeniable, that all war, in proportion to its magnitude and continuance, consumes the treasure and resources of the nation waging it. And, besides the cost of sustaining it, it works incalculable havoc and devastation on the territory occupied by the contending armies. From both these causes, the South has been utterly impoverished by the present war. It has given every sign of financial exhaustion. The country is stripped of all but the barest necessaries of life, and these in such stinted supply, that a large part of the people are on short allowance. The energy with which they protract the contest, is simply the energy of desperation, which, urging them to the sacrifice of the last man and the last dollar, cannot replenish their armies and military stores, after the complete exhaustion now apparently impending.

It is equally certain, that the war, by its magnitude and duration, has been an immense drain on the resources of the United States, though as yet quite within our ability to bear. At the same time, the draught upon our industrial agents and products has been, and still is, and, while the war continues on such a gigantic scale, must be prodigious. For three years an average of probably six hundred thousand men have been in the military service of the government. Including losses in battle and by sickness, it is probable that not less than ten or twelve hundred thousand men have been called from the productive occupations of industry to serve in the army, or in the various civil offices arising out of the war. These have been withdrawn from the population of the loyal states, which amounts in round numbers to twenty millions. Making due consideration of losses in battle, by camp and other diseases incident to military life, by wounds which permanently maim or disable, as compared with the losses which would have occurred in times of peace, and it cannot be questioned that a virtual yearly average of seven hundred thousand able-bodied men has been withdrawn from peaceful occupations to the war. They are at the period of life most robust and capable of efficient labour. We cannot compute, with accuracy, the precise proportion which such a number bears to the entire productive force, or number of labourers in all the spheres of industry—agricultural, mechanical, mercantile, and professional—without reference to statistical tables beyond our reach. But taking into view the number of women, children, aged, and infirm, who must be counted out, and it will probably be a liberal estimate, if we reckon the whole amount of productive labour in the loyal states, as equal to that which could be performed by five millions of able-bodied men between the ages of twenty and forty-five. Each one can satisfy himself in regard to the justness of this estimate, by looking over the sphere of his own acquaintance. If the foregoing estimates are approximately correct, the army absorbs one-seventh of our productive force. We say nothing as to its being provided with food and raiment by the residue; for the same men would require to be fed and clothed out of the products of the industry of the country in time of peace. So far as, from various causes, their support costs more at the seat of

war than at home, this is so much further drain upon the resources of the country.

But, besides the men who constitute the *personel* of our armies, and the increased outlay for their support, a very large proportion of the productive force remaining behind is occupied in preparing the arms, equipments, and munitions of war, or in building and furnishing our great iron navy. If we take into view the immense amount of coal, iron, lead, lumber, horses, forage, required for these purposes, the vast numbers engaged in manufacturing and adapting them for use, we shall find another large draught upon our industry and its products, together with an explanation of the scarcity and dearness of many of these commodities. It is of necessity a conjecture, but far from an extravagant one, we think, that all this, added to the one-seventh of our able-bodied productive force in the army, would increase it to one-fourth—*i. e.*, in round numbers, the war is consuming one-fourth of the annual production of the loyal states. This estimate, if not rigidly accurate, is sufficiently so for practical purposes.

Another process conducted on the footing of figures which we have at hand, leads to results surprisingly similar, *i. e.*, by comparing the value of the annual produce of the country, in all the branches of industry, with the national debt, added to the taxes, caused by the war. We give below the national debt, semi-officially published as we are penning this page.* It appears thus, that the public debt of the United States, contracted during the war, is, in round numbers, $1,700,000,000. If we add to this what is now maturing, and matured, but not

* The following is a statement of the amount of the public debt of the United States on the 10th of May, 1864:

Debt bearing interest in coin.	Principal.	Interest.
4 per cent. Temporary Loan,	$4,450 00	$178 00
5½ per cent. Old Public Debt,	66,429,812 55	3,664,639 69
5 per cent.—5 per cent. 10-40 Bonds,	44,608,100 00	2,230,305 00
6 per cent.—6 per cent. 5-20 Bonds	510,780,450 00	30,646,827 00
6 per cent. 20-year Loan of 1861,	50,000,000 00	3,000,000 00
6 per cent. 20-year Bonds exchanged,	3,857,500 00	231,450 00
6 per cent. Oregon War Debt,	1,016,000 00	60,960 00
7 3-10 per cent.—3 years 7.30,	136,141,850 00	9,638,355 05
Total,	$812,836,162 55	$49,472,714 74

officially ascertained and certified, it will be safe to estimate our public debt on the 1st of July, 1864, due in fact, if not in form, at $2,000,000,000. And it will be safe to assume that, as our expenditures are now on a scale vaster than heretofore, something like $800,000,000 of this has accrued during the present fiscal year. If we add to this the means furnished by the United States tax and excise laws; the debts incurred by states, counties, towns, and cities, in enlisting, equipping, and sustaining soldiers; the donations and contributions of every sort from private liberality, and through the Sanitary and Christian Commissions, the cost of the war for the present year can scarcely be less than $1,000,000,000. How close an approximation to this the outlay of each of the two previous years was, cannot be precisely known; but we doubt whether the war can be maintained on its present scale at a less average annual cost than this. Now we find the total product of the free states for the year 1859 estimated at $4,150,000,000. Our authority is that distinguished statist and financier, the Hon. Robert J. Walker. His computations are founded on the census tables, and appear in the *Continental Monthly* for May,

Debt bearing interest in lawful money.	Principal.	Interest.
4 per cent.—4 per cent. Temporary Loan,	$724,292 22	$43,457 53
5 per cent.—5 per cent. Temporary Loan,	33,313,755 61	1,655,687 71
5 per cent.—1 year Treasury Notes,	43,000,000 00	2,580,000 00
5 per cent.—2 years' Treasury Notes,	180,894,887 40	9,044,744 37
6 per cent. Certificates of Indebtedness,	146,259,000 00	8,775,540 00
Total,	$404,191,935 13	$22,109,429 67
Debt bearing no interest.		
United States Notes,	$441,254,290 12	
Fractional Currency,	20,547,173 85	
Treasury Notes, part due,	77,850 00	
Requisitions,	47,341,000 00	
Total,	$509,220,313 97	

RECAPITULATION.

	Principal.	Interest.
Debt bearing interest in coin,	$812,836,162 55	$49,472,714 74
Debt bearing interest in lawful money,	404,191,935 13	22,109,429 67
Debt bearing no interest,	509,220,313 97	
Total,	$1,726,248,411 75	$71,582,144 41

Washington, Friday, May 13, 1864.

1864. Supposing the war then to cost the nation about $1,000,000,000 annually, and we arrive at the result that it consumes one-quarter of the annual product of our industry. It is true that the loyal slave states add some three hundred million to this annual produce; but the ravages of war on their territory have more than balanced the account, and caused, either by arresting industrial pursuits, or destroying and pillaging their fruits, a diminution of at least one-fourth their annual product—probably much more.

These estimates are confirmed by another class of facts—we mean the comparative scarcity and dearness of all the products of industry. The inflation of the currency accounts only in part for the vast increase of the price of the necessaries, comforts, and luxuries of life. Our opulent classes, and those who have profited largely by the war, including fortunate contractors and speculators, have not generally curtailed their expenditures or their luxuries. Many who have become suddenly rich, have outrun all precedent in voluptuous self-indulgence, vulgar extravagance, and ostentatious expenditure. But the great mass of the people are obliged to procure and consume fewer articles of comfort and luxury, to spend less in constructing and repairing buildings, improvements upon their houses and furniture, their means of culture, refinement, social enjoyment, and harmful self-indulgence, than formerly. The most numerous class of our own or any people, consists of labourers, skilled and unskilled. Now, greatly as their wages have been increased, they have not been advanced at all in proportion to the increased cost of the articles which this class have been accustomed to consume, whether articles of necessity or comfort. If we pass to the farmer, the advanced price of his products is little beyond the increased price he pays for labour and the increase of his direct and indirect taxes. It does not at all approach the increased cost of tea, coffee, and sugar, of imported fabrics, cotton goods—nearly everything he desires to purchase. The result is, that large numbers who once used them freely, now stint their use of some, and have altogether dropped the use of others—of these so recently ranked among the universal necessaries, or at least necessary comforts of life. All have now, without stint, whatever is absolutely necessary to

support life. But the use of these comforts, (tea, coffee, sugar, &c.,) hitherto ranked among the ordinary necessaries of life, is greatly abridged. The great body of the people are earnestly inquiring, not as formerly, what they can have, but what they can do without. But they can bear to task their ingenuity still further in this direction without injury. A vast margin of imaginary wants will yet bear to be pared down, and this without cutting to the quick. But of this, more hereafter. Our present object is to show the inroad which the war makes upon the wealth of the nation, or the products of its industry.

But we are told that the country never exhibited so many evidences of the rapid increase of wealth; that bankers, merchants, manufacturers—the great centres of exchange, trade, and finance—have never grown rich so fast as within the past two years. To which we reply, that temporary phenomena of this sort may arise as well from the impoverishment as from the augmentation of the wealth of the country. This is easily evinced. Suppose that a scarcity of the articles of subsistence, comfort, or luxury in a country be induced by any cause—earthquake, tornado, pestilence, failure of crops, the devastation of war—what is the necessary effect? Prices inevitably rise in consequence of this very destruction or diminution of property. Consequently all dealers in such articles, who have any quantity of them in possession, receive the large profits arising from the rapid rise of the commodities in their possession, and of trading in a rising market. This benefit will accrue to all of every class of producers and dealers, in proportion to the amounts of goods they have on hand, and the period and extent of the business they can do, at rising prices. The impoverishment of the country then may for a time increase the profits of merchants and manufacturers enormously, by enabling them to exact prodigious profits from their customers; in other words, to levy large contributions upon all consumers, for their own aggrandizement. The few are enriched by taxing the many. Extraordinary prosperity, therefore, *for a time*, among traders or manufacturers, so far from proving an increase of national wealth, *may* flow from its diminution. The secret is, *rise of prices*, which always favours sellers of the articles so advanced in price. Whatever causes prices to rise, there-

fore, stimulates for a time speculative and commercial prosperity.

This result often arises from other causes than actual scarcity—especially of domestic productions. In time of war or civil convulsion, several of these causes are apt to concur. Thus prices may be advanced by an increase of duties and imposts. If this be confined to imported goods, it affects only them and such domestic products as enter into competition with them. But none the less it enriches those dealers who bought the goods at the prices ruling before the duties were laid. But, as in the former instance, they are enriched by contributions or increased prices paid by all consumers of the articles. The same principle applies also to excise duties on domestic manufactures. Those who owned the kind of articles so taxed, at such a time that, without being burthened with the tax, they experienced the benefit of the advance in price occasioned by it, of course, profit to that extent. But, after the prices become adjusted to the increased imposts laid upon products, whether foreign or domestic, then the advance is simply a contribution by all consumers to the government. All duties, imposts, taxes, or domestic loans, are simply contributions to that amount of the substance, the earnings, the products, the wealth of the people, to the government and the support of the war. They draw so much upon the resources of the nation.

Another obvious cause of the enhancement of prices, and its consequent effects, for the time, in stimulating trade and speculation to a preternatural activity and prosperity, is found in the expansion and dilution of the currency. The substitution of paper for the precious metals, as a legal tender, of course renders money abundant and cheap, in proportion to its excess beyond what would be in use, if it were kept to a specie basis. So far as it is thus diluted, it falls below the standard of gold-value, and the prices of all things sooner or later rise proportionably. Other subtle and mighty effects of this substitution of paper for gold, as a legal tender, we shall have occasion soon to trace. We are now looking at it as a means of enhancing prices, and consequently, of promoting mercantile and speculative prosperity, while confessedly it adds nothing whatever to the real wealth of the country. Mere engraved bits of paper

are certainly not in themselves any addition to the national resources. But, by enhancing prices, they may enable merchants, and all having stocks of goods on hand, to thrive, by levying a contribution upon all consumers. Of course, when the inflation has reached its maximum, and become stable, then the enhancement of prices from this cause is arrested. The speculative prosperity consequent upon it is also arrested. If merchants sell at high rates, they are obliged to purchase at high rates, and so the account is balanced.

In reality, however, it is impossible to measure the whole effect of the substitution of an irredeemable for a redeemable paper currency, by the mere amount of what is in circulation as money, or by its excess above what would be in circulation, were it redeemable. As we have shown in a former article, on "Money, and Credit as its Substitute,"* bills of circulation, whether of banks or the government, are but a form of credit used as a substitute for money; and they are but one form of credit so used. Checks, bills of exchange, inland and foreign, and all forms of indebtedness, within certain limits, are substitutes for money, and, so far as they possess and exert purchasing power, have the same effect as an increased plentifulness of money, exerting the same purchasing power, would have in inflating prices. Now it cannot be denied, that it is easier to expand credit as a substitute for money in its various forms, on the basis of an irredeemable than a redeemable paper currency, in which the whole is constantly subjected to the strain of contraction to the gold standard. That this has operated so, in our present circumstances, with regard to easing and enlarging credits for stock speculation and gambling, cannot be denied. That it has also given an unprecedented harvest to stock speculators and gamblers, is also past all doubt. But while it has thus inflated stocks, and lifted up the most reckless speculators, it may be questioned whether its influence in other spheres is not less than in normal times. The payments for which no form of checks or other sorts of credit, nothing short of what is legal money will serve, are vastly more numerous than in ordinary times. Of this sort are all the payments to soldiers.

* See number for April, 1862, Art. VI.

Since, too, we have a national currency, it is now often used for travelling, and distant remittances, where drafts were formerly employed. But still further, the ordinary business of the country, which was formerly done on long credits, is now done exclusively for cash, or on short credits, virtually equivalent to money. There is no doubt, however, that the substitution of an irredeemable for a redeemable currency, and the facilities it affords for the expansion of credit, have had a principal agency in enhancing prices, and, during the rise, the prosperity of sound traders and speculators, without in itself adding a dollar to the real wealth of the country.* Other bearings of our present paper-money system on the economics of the war, will soon be considered.

A fourth cause of the unexampled prosperity of certain producing or mercantile interests, is the immense consumption by the government, in the war, of the articles they are engaged in producing. This applies to the whole round of government and army contracts, on which such numbers have suddenly grown rich. Of course, this immense demand for the army has put prices and profits very much under the control of those able to supply it. It has proportionably advanced the cost to all consumers of like articles in the country. This applies with especial force to whatever articles are more largely consumed or wasted by the army, than would be if its soldiers were occupied with peaceful pursuits; and, therefore, in its degree, to nearly all the articles used in our army. But it applies particularly to coal and iron, of both which, in naval and land operations—in iron ships, the munitions of war, in the movement of our navy and the army by steam—the consumption is immense. One great steamship will consume as much coal in a year as a considerable town. The effect is

* It is impossible, however, to determine how far this cause alone is responsible for advanced prices, when viewed aside of other causes, and the influence of speculation in intensifying them. In one sense, the premium on gold is the measure of the excess of the currency; but it must be remembered that gold, and all articles of import and export, and of immediate consumption, are matters of commercial speculation, and have their prices affected by it. If we take lands, buildings, and improved real estate, which is outside of commerce, prices have not sensibly advanced through the country as a whole, beyond the standard of 1859.

to advance prices prodigiously, on the ground of a substantial scarcity, because the vast amount consumed by government reduces the proportion left for the use of the people to the neighbourhood of actual scarcity. All this is known and felt to the quick by the great mass of the people, in regard to those articles of prime necessity, iron and fuel, which are types of a numerous class of things. Of course iron and coal companies thrive on what stints supplies to the people, beyond all former example. But it can hardly be pretended that the nation is enriched in this way, however individuals or corporations may be, at the nation's expense. Many railroads have been made temporarily more profitable by the immense amount of government business done upon them; but the nation pays it, thus reducing its own resources to that extent. In regard to many objects, the whole or a number of the foregoing causes act in combination to enhance prices, and produce the consequent effects.

We will, before leaving this branch of our subject, briefly advert to two other causes of an advance in prices, and the consequent stimulus to trading and commercial prosperity, at the expense of the people generally. The first of these is the blight upon the crop of Indian corn in the West, through the untimely frosts of last year, together with the great injury done to the crop of cereals and hay, by the excessive rains which prevailed through the harvest. This has not operated to raise the price of wheat, as it would in ordinary years, on account of the bountiful grain crops of Europe, which diminished the export demand. This apparent advantage, however, has more than a counterpoise in the fact, that the diminution of exports of the produce of the country leaves so much more of our foreign indebtedness to be liquidated in gold; this increases the demand for gold, and raises its price, and with it, the price of everything imported, and, sooner or later, of every domestic commodity. But the comparative failure of the maize crop not only serves to increase the scarcity and thus the price of the article itself, but the price of whatever is produced from it or substituted for it, such as animals, meats, alcohol, oats, hay, &c., *i. e.*, all these articles become scarcer,

but it will hardly be claimed that the country thereby is made richer. Quite the reverse.

The other cause of enhanced prices to which we refer, is a general rise in the markets of the world in the price of many, if not most, of our chief imports. This we are assured by eminent importers is the case. Indeed, no other hypothesis would be consistent with facts. The premium on gold and the increase of duties will explain the doubling of prices; but it will not account for their being threefold and fourfold what they were, as in the case of coffee and cotton goods. Now this rise in prices may enrich merchants who had large stocks of such articles purchased before the rise, but it is at the expense of consumers. It will hardly be claimed that an advance in what we pay foreigners for goods purchased of them, enriches the country. How far this addition to the prices of foreign commodities and fabrics extends precisely, we are unable to say; and we cannot tell how far it may be due directly and indirectly to our war; but in some cases the connection is very obvious and direct. The destruction of the cotton crop in this country of course advances the price of this article, and all fabrics made of it, or that are substituted for it, and in greater demand, in consequence of its scarcity, in all the markets of the world. It thus directly and indirectly advances the prices of nearly every species of dry-goods. Not only so, but, by greatly increasing the profits of cotton-planting, it may tempt planters in warm and tropical climates to abandon the culture of coffee, fruits, sugar, &c., in order to reap these profits. Analogous effects, in their measure, may proceed from the loss of the export crop of tobacco, rice, and sugar from the South. It is not improbable, moreover, that the increased production of the precious metals in the world may have some influence in rendering money plenty and cheap, and other things proportionally dear. This is, of course, independent of the war. It implies no decrease of the actual wealth of the world, and as our own is a gold-producing country, yields us its share not only of advanced prices, but of compensatory means to meet them. So far, however, as the stock of bullion or coin, which we were wont to employ as money, has been displaced by legal-tenders, and sent to swell

the accumulation of gold, and increase its abundance in the markets of the world, so far it has promoted expansion of prices. This is due to the war; but the effect is slight, probably too much so to be sensibly appreciated.

We have thus far shown that the war is an immense drain upon the industrial resources and products of the nation—consuming at least one-fourth of its annual product. Probably we have estimated rather under than over the reality. We have shown that the temporary prosperity of commercial and financial centres is entirely consistent with this view. We now proceed to show the sources from whence the nation has been able to provide means, to be consumed in the war, equal to one-fourth or one-third of the annual produce of its industry.

1. It has the normal profits of its industry, or the average annual excess of its gains over its expenditures, as a perennial fund upon which to draw. The amount of this cannot be reached with exactness. But the prodigiously rapid increase of the national wealth, coupled with the lavish habits of expenditure among the people, show that the ratio of annual profits beyond these expenses must be very great. Now whatever the ordinary annual increase of wealth is, might be consumed in the war, and still leave the nation as rich as before. The Hon. Robert J. Walker, in the article before alluded to, estimates "the total value of all the property, real and personal, in the free states, in 1860, at $10,852,081,081, and the annual gross profits of capital thirty-nine per cent. This gives, in round numbers, over $4,000,000,000 as the annual gross profit." We suppose that by "gross profit," must be meant the value of the products of the nation before the expenses of living, including all outlays of the people which enter into the consumption of that year, and leave no valuable product behind them, are deducted. This would make the gross annual product equal to about $200 for each man, woman, and child, from which their support is to come first, and their savings next. It is to be considered, that the dollars here in question are gold dollars. Now it is undoubtedly true that great numbers spend on a vastly larger scale than this. But if we look at the cost of living to labourers and artisans, and their families, who constitute the great majority of our people, it will, of course,

fall far below this sum. How, striking the balance, the average cost of living for our people would turn out to be, we have no data for determining. But that a wide margin is thus afforded for the increase of national wealth, and for sparing the surplus in an emergency, without diminishing our previous stock, or our style of living, is undeniable. And if we look at the amount of the gross annual earnings or profits of the nation, is there the shadow of a doubt of its perfect ability to pay with ease the interest, and accumulate a sufficient sinking fund for a few thousand millions of national debt?

2. The previously accumulated wealth of the nation constitutes a vast fund on which it can draw, and has drawn for the support of the war. One obvious item of this is the coin, which being the only legal money of the country, was stored and hoarded to the amount of two or three hundred millions. By the substitution of legal-tender United States notes in its place, this amount is liberated to add to our other means of purchasing what the army or the people need, in the markets of the world. Another item is found in the articles and commodities ready for use, whether agricultural or manufactured, foreign or domestic, in the possession of the country, when the war commenced. This was immense, and has been undergoing a constant reduction until now. Compare the stocks of sugars, teas, coffee, the whole range of groceries, fruits, drugs, dry goods, and other articles of use, comfort, or luxury, imported from abroad, and then in the country, with the amounts of similar articles now on hand, and the truth of what we say will be evident. Compare, too, the amount of domestic produce in the form of food and provisions, or the amount of manufactured goods, whether for clothing, furniture, ornament, implements of utility and convenience, instruments of labour for rendering industry effective, and we shall find the stock of these things greatly reduced. We have been sustaining the war in part by an incessant drain upon these accumulations. The difference is, that their production was ahead of consumption and stocks accumulated. Now production scarcely keeps pace with consumption, and useful commodities are needed and procured by the consumer before they have a chance to accumulate.

Besides this circulative wealth, or capital, which is directly

available for use, and the support of labour, in our own country, and, if in excess, by exchanging it for needful foreign commodities, there is, thirdly, what may be called the fixed capital of the country, which has been made largely tributary to the war. By fixed capital we mean products of labour which, whether in legal technicality ranked as real estate or not, are substantially fixed to the soil, and incapable of transportation, or of being made articles of commerce without partial or complete destruction of value. Of this sort are all buildings, and machinery or instruments of production virtually inseparable from such buildings, manufactories, stores, roads, canals, and railways, mines, all outlays and improvements in farms fitted to increase or preserve their products, or to facilitate their transportation to the points of consumption or distribution. Now this sort of wealth is of two kinds, one of which aids the nation in sustaining itself and sustaining the army; the other belongs to the department of luxury, elegance, refinement, but no way helps the nation to sustain itself or the war: *e. g.* all that immense amount of fixed improvements which consists in magnificent mansions and palaces, elegant grounds, &c. This sort of wealth cannot be drawn upon to support the war or the nation. It is rather a tax on the industry of the people to preserve it from decay or deterioration. More or less of the circulative personal property of the country is of this description, such as splendid ornaments, equipage, furniture, &c. But there is this difference between such luxurious circulative and fixed capital. The former is moveable, and, if new, may be made an article of commerce in exchange for really necessary goods. Or in extremity, many of them may be made to do service in supporting life, health, and strength, or the war instead of luxury; *e. g.*, many horses which were a while ago kept for luxurious riding, are now employed in the army, or other needful service. In the South, even the carpets have been turned into blankets for the soldiers. Now this fixed capital which helps to support the nation, consists either of houses for the shelter, comfort, and health of the people, or of *means of production*, in the shape of agricultural improvements, factories, storehouses, fixed machinery, &c., as above enumerated.

It consists not in products finished and ready for the support of the nation or army, but in the instruments and potentialities for making and multiplying such products. All the buildings and machinery for manufacture, for mining, the railways, the accumulated fertility of the soil, the fences, buildings, and other improvements for turning that fertility to account, constitute a large part of the accumulated national wealth which has been drawn upon during the war. The amount of contribution from this source is, in its very nature, impossible to be estimated; it can be even guessed only approximately. On the one side, we have to look at the extent to which this sort of property has been suffered to decay, wear out, or otherwise become exhausted without renovation; on the other, the amount of improvements and additions to such capital, factories, railways, farm culture and fixtures, which would have been made in three years of peace by the vast body of men now occupied by the war. We can only thus suggest this fund of accumulated wealth which has contributed, and still contributes, to support the war and the nation.

A third source of means to sustain the war is economy, or diminished private expenditure. We are aware that it is said that prosperity was never so great, and extravagance of expenditure never so rife as now. But as we have shown in regard to prosperity, so in regard to extravagance, the remark is true only in certain quarters, and to a limited extent. If meant to be of wide and general application, it is founded on a narrow and superficial view of things. The unwonted extravagance prevails in quarters where the unwonted prosperity prevails, which stimulates it. But the great mass of the people find themselves under the absolute necessity of curtailing their expenditures, of lessening the comforts and luxuries they have been accustomed to enjoy. This, with vast numbers, extends to the quality of food and raiment. But it reaches still more widely to furniture and equipage—especially of an expensive kind. The quantity of these and like things procured for use during the last three years, is immensely less than in any previous three years among the great mass of the people. These strain a point to make their existing supplies of such things answer for the present, and

inquire, not so much what they can have, as what they can do without. This is seen preëminently in the few costly edifices built during the last three years, as compared with any preceding three of the last decade.

All this is entirely consistent with another fact, *i. e.*, that the latter portion of the second and the first part of the third years of the war were characterized by great activity and prosperity in these branches of trade. But the secret is, that to a considerable extent, in these things, the purchases for three years were largely made in one. During the first year of the war, financial timidity and uncertainty prevailed, thus producing an entire stagnation of trade in costly furniture, equipage, and ornaments. After this state of suspense, and the abundance of money following the substitution of paper for specie, the harvest for jewellers, cabinet-makers, etc., came. But now that two dollars will purchase little more of these things than could formerly be procured with one, the tide must ebb again, and the great body of the people will postpone purchases of what is not absolutely indispensable, to a more convenient season. There is a wide margin yet for such economy and retrenchment; and every dollar so saved is so much really added to the ability of the country to maintain the war with continued and unabated vigour; and every dollar that can be so saved is needed for the purpose.

A fourth resource for meeting the unparalleled drain upon our resources, has been the increased efficiency of industry, through improved implements, machinery, and more skilful management and organization. It is impossible even to conjecture the probable extent of this. The present state of things, with its extraordinary demand for the products of industry, stimulates that industry, and the fertility of inventions to render it effective. It would probably be impossible to cultivate and harvest the great crops of the country now, without those machines and utensils which enable animals so largely, rapidly, and economically, to do the work of man.* In manufactures, the unconscious forces of nature are har-

* The public journals state, that if an average crop is harvested the present year in the West, it must be done largely by the labour of females.

nessed on an ever-widening scale, and with continually increasing ingenuity and efficiency, to do the work of man. The extent to which the use of labour-saving inventions has increased during the last few years, we have no means of ascertaining; but it may be added, that there are fewer drones and idlers than ever before. All who can labour are utilized—stimulated to exertion by high prices and dire necessity—and it is, economically considered, some offset for the great drain of men to the war, that it has drawn into itself not only the industrious, but many of the indolent and vicious, who burdened society more than they helped it.

Having pointed out the sources of national wealth which have hitherto sustained the war, we will now inquire how the government has been able to command it.

The first and most obvious resource is taxes and imposts. These have hitherto defrayed but a small part of the expense of the war. They have covered the ordinary expenses of government, the interest on the public debt, and somewhat—we know not how much—of the cost of the war. They are now about to be laid on a scale that will, it is hoped, yield some $400,000,000 annually, and discharge not only ordinary governmental expenses, but the interest on the public debt, and a large fraction of current war expenditures. If continued on the return of peace, they would form a sinking fund which would rapidly discharge the public debt. We have only one criticism to make upon the mode of taxation. It is so framed as to bear with prodigious severity on all salaried and other men of fixed money incomes, not in gold, but in legal-tender. Taxes in all other forms, on articles of consumption, take hold of this class in their full force. The three per cent. income tax upon all annual incomes above $600, added to all this, was sufficiently severe, at the outset, upon all whose salaries and incomes were not above $3000, since, within this figure, they are pretty severely adjusted to the necessary expenses of the position of those who receive them. But now, when $1000 is worth scarcely more than $600 was when the tax was originally laid, and when all other taxes are largely increased, it is to be increased to five per cent. This must cut severely, and often to the quick, into the means of support of a multitude of

families, of widows, orphans, professors, and ministers of the gospel.

The second principal resource of the government for commanding the means of the people, is loans—temporary and permanent, direct and indirect. Of this, $460,000,000 is in the form of circulating notes and fractional currency, which are lawful money, bearing no interest, and the legal substitute for coin in discharging all debts, and redeeming whatever other issues or credits may pass current as money. Something over $200,000,000, in addition, are legal-tender notes, running one and two years, and bearing five per cent. interest in currency. These in reality serve to swell the volume of government paper money. For although holders will incline to keep, instead of circulating them, if convenient, on account of the interest, yet they go to form that reserve fund of ready money so indispensable to banks and individuals. If they require to be paid out, they are good as money at all times for the face of their principal; and if they can be kept for six months, they draw their semi-annual interest. They naturally, therefore, fall into the reserved funds before spoken of, and thus liberate from this predicament, for current circulation, an equal amount of the other species of legal-tenders. We have thus between six and seven hundred millions of government paper money, which is an indirect loan from the people, most of it without interest, and the residue at a very low rate of interest. As this has far more to do with the financial phenomena of the country, and the ability of the government to command the resources of the people, than the simple amount itself involved, we will endeavour to trace its operation somewhat more in detail.

1. It is hardly necessary to reiterate, that mere engraved pieces of paper are not in themselves wealth, and cannot make any addition to the resources of a nation. They may fill the place of money, and pass as money, but they are not money proper. But, inasmuch as they may take the place, and discharge functions of money as a circulating medium and legal tender, as between ourselves, though not as between us and foreign nations, they may and do produce prodigious effects on the production and distribution of wealth, and in rendering it accessible to the government. These effects vary with circum-

stances. They are far different in the incipient stages, and with the moderate expansion of an exclusive paper-currency, from what they are in its later stages, and under its reckless dilution.

2. In the present case, the emission of paper money by the government, when it began, obviously raised the credit of the government, by giving assurance of payment to its creditors. Thus it stimulated activity in producing the supplies needed for the government, and so infused confidence and activity into every branch of industry. The rise of prices, too, due to this and other causes, by which, for a time, the increase of the market value of products was more rapid than the increase of the cost of their production, likewise greatly stimulated production, turning the North into a vast work-shop and laboratory, and bringing its vast accumulation of materials and means of production into active and profitable requisition. It is well known, that prior to the issue of this paper-money, the suspension of specie payments, and the gloomy war prospects, had seriously embarrassed the government, impaired its credit, and rendered it impossible to negotiate loans. The finances of the government were in a dead-lock. This threatened to arrest the production of supplies to the government. If capitalists feared to trust money to the government, others feared to trust commodities. Thus these industries, and others implicated with them, or dependent upon them, were in danger of coming to a pause.

3. Not only did it warm productive industry into fresh life; it also liquefied the capital of the country, so that it would flow freely into the national treasury. The abundance of money rendered it easy to convert all kinds of property into money, to sell other securities at high rates, and invest in government stocks. It has also led to the extensive discharge of mortgages and other forms of private indebtedness, leaving the lenders no resource for investment but United States securities. Another result of the plentifulness of money, aided by the uncertainty and distrust induced by the national convulsions, is, that very little credit is given in sound, ordinary mercantile business. Business is done mostly for cash. Borrowing is resorted to largely for speculation, especially stock-gambling. Hence the

banks, and other lenders, have been perplexed to find any sound borrower but the government. A large part of the capital of banks, insurance, savings, and other like companies, and indeed of the productive funds of most public institutions, has been invested in United States securities. Men are putting their savings, accumulations, and unproductive funds in these securities, as the only sound ones to be had at less than exorbitant prices. Thus, while private debts are so largely cancelled, government becomes the great debtor. The nation is indebted to its own members—the whole people to such individuals as have lent them their savings, secured by a lien on all the property and future earnings of the whole. Amid all the evils incident to a great national debt, there is one, indeed there are many, compensating benefits. But that to which we especially refer, is the wide-spread interest which it must beget, to preserve the integrity and stability of the government. We have heard gentlemen of Southern origin and proclivities say, that had there been a large national debt, extensively owned among the people of the South, the present rebellion would not have been organized. We believe this to be true. The immense national debt of Great Britain, onerous as it is, yet being due chiefly to her own citizens, is a mighty bond of national stability and perpetuity. Another advantage is, that it is a great stimulus to public economy, and a check to corrupt expenditure on the part of the national legislature and executive.

4. The effects of paper money on the distribution of property are curious. What under a normal currency is deemed the most secure and solid form of productive property, bond and mortgage, becomes not only largely liquefied, but evaporated, under this magic influence. The income is shrunk to the full extent of the premium on gold. But this is not the worst. They are sure to be paid unless put at a low rate of interest. The only alternative is either government stocks, or other securities at an enormous price. On the other hand, fancy stocks of mere nominal, fluctuating, speculative, capricious value, become suddenly elevated to the very summit—and often bear enormous premiums. A vast quantity of railroad securities have gone through this metamorphosis, and raised their holders to sudden and unexpected wealth. So universally, the rise in

prices of all commodities, as we have before remarked, goes to make the owners of them richer, and the buyers so far forth poorer. It also obviously favours debtors whose obligations were contracted when money was at its normal value, at the expense of their creditors, who are compelled to accept payment in a depreciated currency. Thus vast amounts of indebtedness have been liquidated.

Closely connected with this facility of raising money and paying debts, is the remarkable fact that church-debts have been liquidated during the last two years to an unprecedented extent. Indeed, there are comparatively few churches in debt that have not been relieved of these depressing, often crushing and fatal burthens. In connection also with the spirit of self-sacrificing beneficence, which has been developed, on a scale the most stupendous and unparalleled, during the war, more has been done for the endowment of literary, religious, and charitable institutions, than during any equal period in the nation's history. This is explained by the fact that some of these institutions were so shaken by the war, in their finances, that their friends were thoroughly convinced of the imperious and overbearing necessity of coming to their rescue, and straining a point to ensure their safety; by the habit of giving, which has so grown upon the people during the war; and by the large prosperity of individuals, from causes already mentioned, who have been led to discern the blessedness of doing good, and devote large sums to the noble purpose of endowing the great institutions of Christian charity and high education. This development of Christian liberality to relieve soldiers and others suffering from the war, has been immense. These calls were indeed too imperious to admit of refusal. Yet they have never been so met, or begun to be so met, in any previous wars. And, so far from drying up the streams of beneficence to other objects, they have only given these a larger volume and swifter current. It is to be hoped that one of the national virtues which will be permanently invigorated by the war, and long survive it, will be this free and large Christian liberality.

An obvious consequence of the substitution of paper money for gold, is the premium at which gold is held over currency

in the market—a premium variously fluctuating, but, on the whole, continually rising with the progress of the war, until it has now reached a serious and appalling magnitude—as we now write, oscillating from 190 to 200. This premium represents the redundancy of paper money, or various credit substitutes for money, above the specie standard, that is, above the amount that would be current if all paper money were convertible into coin. That is to say, if the amount of paper currency that would be in circulation, if redeemable in coin, be represented by unity, then the relative amount of irredeemable paper money now current, is represented by the fraction $\frac{19}{10}$. This, however, cannot be taken absolutely; it is qualified by certain conditions. Sometimes trade is inactive; very little property is exchanged—a diminished amount of money is sufficient for all transactions. Then, again, when it is brisk, sometimes it is done very much by money; sometimes by checks in place of money; sometimes by notes of hand, or other forms of credit. Thus, even at the specie standard, the same amount of money may at one time amount to a scarcity; at another, to a glut in the market. The same phenomena, of course, are possible under a currency exclusively metallic. Our impression is, that at present, and thus far through the war, real estate has been inactive, taking the whole country over, and a small amount of money has sufficed for all transactions in it. On the other hand, business was never so much done for cash. Payments to the army require to be made in cash; and speculation in stocks and commodities, never so rife, absorbs large amounts of money—all the larger, let it be observed, as it succeeds in inflating prices. How far these and other elements may mutually balance each other, and leave the present premium on specie a true exponent of the excess of our present irredeemable currency over the normal amount, is uncertain. There is a single disturbing element, however, of prodigious power to produce a temporary interference with this relation between the market premium on gold and the excess of irredeemable currency. We refer to speculation and gambling in gold. It is enough to call attention to the fact, that the premium on gold fluctuates ten or fifteen per cent. every few days, through the reckless and gambling manœuvres of specu-

lators, through fictitious sales, long and short, "cornering" operations, and false rumours in regard to the war, and everything else that can further their nefarious schemes, by producing public distrust. Still further, very much depends upon the habitual feeling of the public mind in regard to the speedy termination of the war, and the probable future expansion or curtailment of the government issues of paper money. Thus, last summer, after the battle of Gettysburg and the capture of Vicksburg, the premium on gold, having been at seventy per cent., worked rapidly down to the neighbourhood of twenty per cent., whence it has been steadily ascending to its present height. All this shows that the premium on gold is not the sure barometer it is supposed to be of the dilution of the currency at any given time. Yet it is, as a whole, and taking any considerable periods together; for the prices of all imports, all imported and all exportable articles, are made up of their cost in gold, with its premium added. Now if this premium be permanently larger than the intrinsic difference in value between gold and paper, then there will be a profit in sending gold from foreign countries, or mining it here, to realize this excessive premium, until the equilibrium is restored. In other words, if gold is unduly dear, or will purchase more commodities here than elsewhere, it will flow here until this condition ceases, and there is no longer a profit on its importation. It is impossible for speculators permanently to impart a fictitious price to gold, any more than to butter or beef; but they may and do work the greatest mischief, by causing groundless fluctuations in the price, subjecting all business to the dominion of a ruinous caprice, which subverts all rational calculation, and making the interests of the community the sport of their own greed.

But as we have said, speculation in gold, as in other things, would soon collapse, unless supported by other and deeper causes. One dollar of gold commands nearly two dollars of currency, because it is wanted at these rates to do what nothing else will do—pay for our imports not paid for by our exports, and discharge custom-house duties; and because, in addition to articles of prime necessity, which the people and government must have at whatever price, there are innumerable articles of another sort, which people will have at this cost, rather than

go without them. As we have indicated, the plentiful supply of government legal-tenders, and of other paper money, checks, and credits, founded upon it, has made our currency cheap, and, along with other causes, other commodities high. The vast consumption and diminution of production caused by the war, creates a need and a demand for the productions of foreign countries, to the utmost extent of our ability to pay for them, while the diminished harvest here, and bountiful harvest of Europe for the last year, have thrown us back more especially on our gold reserves to pay for them. The high price of gold and other commodities, with the small purchasing power of our money, or the reduced amount of goods we can procure with it, are all so many diverse manifestations or symptoms of the comparative scarcity induced by the war, and the consequent necessity, on the part of the people, to use a plain phrase, of getting along with less than they have been wont.

Nor would it be otherwise for the better, if money had been kept rigorously to the specie standard. It would rather have been worse, although the privations and retrenchments might have been differently distributed. We do not mean by this to intimate that in peace or any normal state of things, we are advocates of a currency not on a strict specie basis. Quite the reverse. But in this matter preëminently war reverses the natural order of things, and *inter arma leges silent.* We wish it to be further understood, that even when it is necessary to suspend specie payments, every interest requires that the currency be kept at the closest approximation to the specie standard practicable; and that all divergence from this standard should be regarded as an evil, to be submitted to only for the prevention of greater evils, and to be restricted within the narrowest possible limits and the shortest possible time.

But the effect of adhering to specie payments through the war, would have been a constant panic or series of panics, which would have been fatal to public confidence. The drain of specie to pay for imports, would have obliged the banks to take in all their circulation, to refuse their wonted accommodations, in order to protect themselves. Thus government would have been unable to borrow, as it came to be, immediately before the first issue of legal tenders. Distrust and

alarm, would have destroyed business, paralyzed industry, and checked production; thus vastly aggravating the diminution and scarcity of products, which is the real cause of our present straits, in whatever form it may show itself—whether in the form of an increase of paper money and a still greater increase of prices; or in the form of diminished prices, and a stil greater scarcity of money to pay them. This will be apparent if we examine the matter more closely.

How is it that the price of gold, and with it of all things else, at least all exportable commodities (and in due time of all others) are now forced up? It arises from the amount of our foreign imports, which must be paid for in coin or in exported goods, in either or both, and so far as either falls short, in the other. Now if the exported goods are insufficient, specie must be had for the balance, whatever it costs. In proportion then to the deficiency to be supplied, the price of gold must be forced up. But suppose it be too scarce to meet the whole deficit, what then? The price of gold goes up until other home products are so raised in price that only a smaller number of people can afford to use them, while still the price of them, if reduced to the gold standard, is no more than in foreign countries, and so renders them exportable. For example, if butter is selling at 25 cents in currency per pound, on the basis of the domestic supply and demand, and if it will command that price in gold across the seas, and expense of transportation, then if gold is stiffened to 160, butter will rise to 40 cents per pound here, being in demand at this rate for export. This actually occurred this last season, and on this basis speculators for a time forced the price up to 50 and 60 cents per pound, which widely arrested consumption, and suddenly precipitated them to a righteous destruction.

What now would have been the course of things on a specie currency? As has been shown, in this state of things the circulating medium would have experienced the most stringent contraction. Distrust, alarms and panics, would have greatly checked production, and aggravated the existing scarcity. The necessity for large importations would have been still more urgent. This would have caused the exportation of specie to pay for it, until the banks, to prevent its efflux, refused to

renew their loans, and thus still further increased the scarcity of money, and of credit as its substitute. This would have gone on until the prices of commodities sunk to the point at which they could be profitably exported. This would reduce prices, but it would be because the amount of money wherewith to purchase was much more reduced than the prices, so that far fewer persons would have the means of purchasing, since there would in fact be fewer commodities to purchase, than in the present state of things. But there would be a still greater difference in the distribution of the losses and privations. They would fall on another class of persons entirely. Those who had money would gain, while those who had commodities would lose. Those who owed money would suffer. Those to whom it was payable and paid would have had the vantage—the reverse of the existing condition of things. It must not be understood, however, that creditors gain by circumstances which bear with crushing severity upon their debtors. If it goes so far that debtors are unable to pay, then debtors and creditors alike are whelmed in a common ruin. This often happens in commercial panics, and would be constant in such a chronic panic as would arise from the attempt to enforce specie payments through a war of such unparalleled magnitude and continuance as the present.

We wish, however, to say very explicitly, that while we think the country can bear the strain of war, and stimulate production, and command its resources, better with than without an irredeemable paper currency, yet every consideration requires that this currency be kept as close to the normal specie standard as possible. Every effort should be made to accomplish this. The cost of interest-bearing loans, even to the government, is as nothing, compared with that of an excessive dilution of the currency. Such a currency may pay debts, but it loses its purchasing power. When this is gone, the sinews of war are gone. Financial confusion and disaster reign among the people. Let us beware of battering out our money to the thinness of Confederate currency.

In carrying this discussion out to its practical conclusions, we observe,

1. It inspires the fullest confidence in the ability of the

nation to pay punctually the interest, and ultimately extinguish the principal of whatever national debt may be incurred by the necessary outlays of the war. This is evident in various ways. The amount of taxes imposed by the proposed law of Congress would discharge the present debt, interest and principal, in a dozen years. Yet they will be borne—nay, they are demanded by the people, however severely they may press. Those classes who complain that they are loaded with an undue proportion of the tax, nevertheless, not only bear it, but, notwithstanding any injustice to themselves, greatly prefer the tax as it is, to any weakening of the faith and credit of the government. But, if this be so now, what will be the state of things when our great armies are returned to productive occupations? when those now employed in fabricating instruments of destruction are occupied in producing means of subsistence, comfort, and luxury, adding to the national wealth, developing the immense agricultural and mineral resources of the country, which only await the hand of enterprise and industry to bring them forth? And, if we add to this the future inevitable rapid growth of the country, by natural increase and foreign immigration, as measured by the past, a growth all the more free and rapid when no longer hampered by the fetters of slavery, including also the prodigious productiveness of the South, as reclaimed and placed under the quickening regimen of free labour, it will have the amplest ability to carry the national debt without staggering. And if it can, it will. Every instinct of national pride and honour, every aspiration for national glory, every pulsation of the public conscience, every dictate of self-interest, will prompt and ensure the ready payment of the interest on this debt. Moreover, as we have already seen, the debt is so widely diffused, directly and indirectly, the property of the people so largely consists in it, that its repudiation would involve a catastrophe and a ruin at which the nation would stand aghast, and which it will never suffer to come.

A similar result is reached on the basis of figures already presented. The gross property of the free states in 1859 amounted to $10,852,081,081. The product of the same year from agriculture, manufactories, mines, and fisheries, was

$4,150,000,000, or thirty-nine per cent. on the capital. Now one-seventh of this annual income, in round numbers, paid in the form of taxes direct and indirect, would yield about $600,000,000. This sum would discharge the interest of $10,000,000,000, at six per cent., and $12,000,000,000, at five per cent, at which, and even lower rates, loans can readily be obtained, when the permanent stability and solvency of the government are indisputably established. Now the proportion of the annual product of Britain paid in taxes, is three shillings on a pound sterling, or more than one-seventh. Of course, most of these taxes are indirect and unobserved; but the same is true of our own. Are we less willing and able to pay for the cost of the benefits and privileges of our own government, than the British for theirs? Besides, the income of the labour of the country will, in all probability, be immensely increased; but, whether this be so or not, we find a demonstrated ability to discharge the interest and principal, not only of our present national debt, but of triple that amount. The same view has constrained the assent of British economists, that have shown the most groundless and exuberant prejudices against our cause.*

* Not having within reach the *London Economist* and the *Saturday Review*, we quote an abstract of their views on this subject, as presented in the *New York Times* of May 31.

"The *London Economist* and the *Saturday Review*—neither of them at all partial to this country—have taken occasion lately to call attention to an important economical fact, developed by this war—the immense wealth of the population of the free states. The *Economist*, in a recent able article on the subject of our "ability to bear taxation," demonstrates, as if against the popular opinion of England, our capacity to bear easily $600,000,000 annual taxation. The writer states that the great peculiarity of American society has not been understood in Europe—that is, the large number of people with an income say of $500. There are not, he admits, a body of men representing, for instance, such an amount of property as is represented by the British Parliament, but there are a far larger number of small property-holders with taxable incomes than in England. Reckoning the average wages of the American labourers and small farmers at $1.50 per day, which he believes to be a low estimate, and the number of families in the Union at five and a half millions, he thinks the wage-income of America would be equal to the property-income of Great Britain. The income of our middle class he estimates as equal to that of the British middle class, though the former possesses less accumulated property. Supposing a tax laid corresponding to the English, of three shillings on the pound, he concludes that £120,000,000 could be raised here from direct taxes, without counting the indirect taxes on

2. The real difficulty is, to obtain the means now needed to prosecute the war to a successful issue. The extent to which this has been, thus far, accomplished, almost entirely from the resources of our own people, and without spreading among them any serious privation, is one of the marvels of history. No instance can be found of such immense armies so long maintained in the field, so well fed, clothed, paid, and supplied, such a vast simultaneous increase of the navy, all without any appreciable aid from foreign loans, without faltering in the credit of the government, and with the prevalence of general plenty and comfort amongst the people. As we have seen, this plenty, and the surplus on which we have been drawing, begin to be seriously impaired. We are approaching that point in which retrenchment of superfluities, and a general economy among all classes, constitute the condition of a continued supply of the means for the prosecution of the war on its present vast scale, without oppressive stinting of the subsistence of the people. If the requisite means can be furnished to the government now, we feel little concern about the ability to pay hereafter. How shall these means be obtained? It can easily be done by the practice of an economy, it may be in some cases severe, but in very many simply salutary. In this way, the means could be furnished to sustain our present immense war expenditure, without in the least interfering with the supply of the substantial wants of the people. If tobacco and intoxicating drinks were given up by all to whom they are worse than useless, would not enough be saved to defray a

luxuries. With respect to the willingness of our people to pay, he entertains little doubt that where a debt is so universally held, and where a population is so well off, the tax would be paid with but little grumbling. He does not see why an American "farmer" or artisan should not be willing to pay for the American nationality, or dignity, or safety, or whatever we consider it, as much as the British banker's clerk for the British—namely, three shillings on the pound. Grumblings there would be, but there are grumblings also from English rate-payers, and yet the poorest pay with little opposition. There might be many difficulties in collecting, but experience and ingenuity would gradually perfect modes of raising the taxes which would be the most effective and the least annoying. And, as he justly argues, it is hard to fix a limit to the amount of indirect taxes on luxuries which might be raised from so rich a people. His final candid conclusion is, that the European public have not at all estimated correctly the American ability to bear taxation."

very considerable part of the expenses of the war, and generally with great advantage—certainly without injury to the people in their highest interests? But if those who indulge in the use or abuse of these, feel under an iron necessity of using them, what shall be said of theatres, operas, luxurious living, and extravagant outlays innumerable? What shall be said of those enormous expenditures for ostentatious dress, equipage, ornaments, which cost enough to support an immense army in the field, or to relieve the sufferings from poverty among the people? It has been said that an unexampled extravagance in these things has been prevalent of late. We think this has been very much confined to localities and parties where the war has concentrated sudden wealth; but all this flashy and dazzling display is the price of blood. It is a contribution towards disabling and dispiriting our own armies, and to "aid and comfort" the enemy in the most decisive way. It detracts so much of our means from the support of the people, or the uses of the government, thus embarrassing it with all those perplexities which are involved in the growing scarcity of useful commodities, and the rise in the price of gold. If it is thus unchristian and unpatriotic, it is none the less unseemly, and at war with all good taste and proper sensibility. Nero fiddled while Rome was burning, and all history signalizes this act as the climax of imperial brutality; but is not ostentatious extravagance, pompous gayety and frivolity, dazzling brilliancy of dress and equipage, among us, at this awful juncture, quite as monstrous? Is it not like dancing, frolicking, and parading brilliants at a funeral?

When the flower of our nation are mowed down, mangled, maimed, by thousands and tens of thousands, week after week, desolating so many households, filling the land with widows and orphans, and spreading over it a funereal gloom; when the nation is making such stupendous sacrifices, pouring out its best blood, in this dire struggle for existence, can sane persons luxuriate in a vain display, in ministering to the lust of the eye and the pride of life, thus aggravating the perils of the nation as really as the traitors in arms against it? Whoever occupies what is equivalent to the labour of a man in useless extravagance, virtually withdraws one soldier from the field,

or the services of one man in producing or forwarding supplies for the defence of the country. And this effect is inevitable, whether first seen in the increased premium on gold, or the enormous price of provisions.

This view is, we are glad to say, beginning to touch and sway the female heart of the country, always alive to high motives, when properly presented. We have no doubt that the same patriotic and Christian spirit, which has led them to so many errands and ministries in behalf of our imperilled country, and the soldiers who are bleeding for it, will lead them to the further easy self-denial which foregoes all expensive or avoidable display and ornamentation at such a time as this. We are sure that when they come to understand the bearings and effects of it, their Christian principles and kindly impulses, will combine with elevated patriotism to overpower the pride of life in the premises. This is of fundamental importance. The standard of fashion and style, which involve so much of the expenses of living to which we are constrained, is mainly determined by ladies. And, inasmuch as these things derive their highest fascination, as much from being regarded as symbols of rank and social position, as from the love of beauty, so potent in the female mind, it follows that no movement in this direction can be successful, unless led by ladies uppermost in wealth and social position. So far as this whole matter is concerned, they are largely "masters of the situation," and on them devolves proportionate responsibility. What they treat as respectable, all classes will regard as respectable. We cannot doubt that, by example as well as precept, they will effectually promote the movement which has been inaugurated.

We have a single suggestion to offer in the hope of guarding against misdirection and failure. The movement thus far has been prominently, if not exclusively, against the use of imported finery and luxuries, prompted by the very natural impression that these add enormously to that foreign balance against us, which enhances the demand for gold to meet it, and therefore its price; and with it the price of all imported and exportable commodities. Hence, it is inferred with great confidence, that, if this class of importations were greatly re-

duced, there would be a corresponding reduction in our foreign indebtedness, the price of gold, with all its beneficial consequences. This reasoning is just on one simple condition: viz., that we do not undertake to replace foreign finery and luxuries with equivalent extravagance in articles of domestic manufacture. In order to afford real financial relief to the country, *the extravagance must be discarded altogether.* To continue it, simply by substituting the products of domestic industry for foreign importations, so far from mitigating, will only aggravate the evil. For why are they now imported from abroad, instead of being made here? Simply because they can thus be procured more cheaply, because our industry is more efficient and lucrative when employed in producing other things, and sending them abroad to pay for these fabrics, than in making them here. This is because of the greater facilities of every kind for producing them in other countries. Now if we undertake to fabricate them or their equivalents here, we divert so much industry from other useful products for the people or the army, in which it is now employed. This aggravates the present scarcity of those articles, and forces up prices in proportion—the very evil we are trying to lessen. A probable result would be importations of these articles from abroad to fill the void created by this diversion of our domestic industry from them. This would simply leave us where we were before, with only this difference, that we have the disadvantage of turning our labour out of channels of greater, to those of less efficiency —*i. e.*, so as to produce less for us, or leave us poorer than before. And indeed something like this would be inevitable, because the greater scarcity of useful products of our own industry would lift up prices so as to render it profitable to import them. The true remedy then, is not in any crusade exclusively against foreign luxuries and finery, but against all expensive display, and "shabby splendour," and luxurious indulgence in products of whatever origin. Nothing less than GENERAL RETRENCHMENT of both sexes and of all classes will meet the crisis—such retrenchment as may easily be borne, and leave us still a people more largely supplied with all needful things than any nation on the globe. Can we hesitate to do this, which, at the worst, is but a tithe of what is borne by

our brothers who yield up not only every comfort of life, but life itself on the battle-field? If we refuse, do we deserve success? And have our people, as a whole, begun to suffer, or to feel the pressure of the war in their own comforts and privileges as yet? Is it not wonderful how little they have been obliged as yet to give up the substantial blessings of life? If we would know what war means, or what sacrifices it involves, let us go over the territory, and look at the homes and firesides of the rebellious states! Indeed, what could be so beneficial to our nation as to rid it of that profuse, luxurious indulgence, which so enervates and corrupts it?*

Another obvious remark is, that the financial calamities and losses so often and so lugubriously predicted from the return of peace, are groundless. Of course, we do not know what unforeseen events are in the womb of the future to baffle all human calculations. We only refer to causes now visible, or in prospect, from the operation of which such a catastrophe is predicted. What will be the effect of peace? Surely to release most of the productive force now in the field, and occupied at home in providing supplies for the army and navy, for the production of national wealth—for the subsistence, comfort, elevation, and refinement of the people. Is not this labour, and are not its products, now needed, and would they not diffuse among the people vastly more to use, enjoy, and accumulate against future want?

But it is said that prices would be brought down, money would be scarcer, and many traders would lose. What then? Even if some suffer, are not the great mass of the people enriched thereby? The reverse of the present course of things which enriches the few at the expense of the many. Besides, who are

* The following from Edward Everett is quite to the point. No person could say it better, and there could be no fitter person to say it:

"A reform is needed, on the part of both sexes, and in many things besides foreign luxury. Extravagance in the general style of living, in building, furniture, equipage, entertainment, amusements, hotels, watering-places,—*extravagance often as tasteless as it is otherwise reprehensible*,—is growing upon us, and consuming, worse than unproductively, the substance of the country. The waste at a fashionable private entertainment would support three or four men in the ranks of the army for a twelvemonth, and provide for the relief and comfort of a hundred wounded soldiers in a hospital."

to lose? Honest and prudent merchants, in an unsettled state of the market, and with strong prospects of a decline in prices, are careful to avoid accumulating large stocks. They merely provide for present wants. Their course is the opposite when they anticipate a rise in prices. They therefore will lose little. And this little they can generally well afford to lose, after the rich harvests they have reaped from the rising markets of the last three years. Reckless speculators, who have blown up fortunes, consisting in fictitiously inflated stocks, which they have purchased with borrowed money for a larger inflation; who are striving to force up gold, and profit by depreciating the credit and strength of the government; who try to add to the distress of the people and difficulties of the government by forcing beyond their natural to a fictitious height the unavoidable cost of the necessaries of life, may totter to ruin and come to grief. And would not this be an unspeakable benefit to the country? The sooner the whole army of "operators" is broken up, the better for the nation. If they should be conscripted into the national armies, the national industry and resources would suffer no loss—but would be relieved of a foul parasitic growth which is consuming and withering them. It is a fair question for our national lawgivers, whether they can do a better or more righteous thing than to make the penalty of gambling speculations, particularly in gold and necessaries, immediate conscription into the national army. One of the conditions which always underlies every widespread commercial panic and collapse, is now wanting—viz., a wide-spread commercial and personal indebtedness among the people. Whatever speculators may owe, the great mass of the people, beyond all former example, have been paying their debts, although often at the expense of mortgagees. Sound business is done mainly for cash. The great mass of indebtedness in the country is in the form of public securities, national, state, municipal, and corporate. Other debts and investments have flowed mostly into this channel. While the war, therefore, has largely consumed the national resources, yet the very uncertainty engendered by it has led to that general prudence and caution among the people, which guard against the exposures arising from large liabilities. Inasmuch as government is the great borrower, and so much of the property

of the people lies in its securities, the return of peace would certainly enhance the value of those securities, and with it general financial soundness and confidence. The conditions, therefore, aside from unforeseen contingencies, of an all-pervasive financial collapse, on the return of peace, seem to us to be wanting. This we deem important. For while we sustain the war, to all lengths and at whatever cost requisite to destroy the rebellion, we think it one of the worst of fallacies to suppose its continuance a source of national wealth, or condition of abiding prosperity. It may be so to speculators and those who thrive on government contracts. To the body of the people, peace cannot be otherwise than a blessing—unless purchased at the sacrifice of the national life, integrity, and honour, which would be the climax of evils.

We add, that since the foregoing went to press, the public statement of Senator Wilson, that one million eight hundred thousand men have been raised for the national armies—six hundred thousand within the past year—more than sustains the leading positions we have taken. We also see statements which give to our estimate of the cost of the war to the nation, for this current year, the look of extravagance. But it must be understood, that the present is the culminating year of the war, in regard to the vastness of its operations and expenditure; that it is conducted on the basis of prices nearly doubled; and that we estimate not only the outlays from the national treasury, but from states, counties, towns, cities, corporations, and all forms of public and private contributions to the cause—all which have been vast during the current year. This is but partially represented by the increase of the national debt.

ART. V.—*Christian Baptism spiritual not ritual.* By ROBERT MACNAIR, M. A. Eph. iv. 5, 1 Pet. iii. 21. Edinburgh: 1858. 16mo., pp. xi. 202.

THE design of Macnair's treatise is to establish the position, that the baptism spoken of in Christ's commission to the apostles,—"Go, disciple all nations, baptizing them;"—was not water baptism but that of the Holy Spirit,—that baptism with water is without divine warrant under the gospel dispensation, and that its administration is a pledge of ignorance and corruption in the Christian Church. The book, we understand to have acquired considerable reputation among the Society of Friends; and it has, within our knowledge, been the means of great perplexity in the minds of young inquirers on the subject. We propose, therefore, to present, with some particularity, the teachings of the Scriptures in contrast with those of the author.

Here, however, in the outset, we would guard against the mistake of any who may suppose the question at issue to involve, in any measure, a competition between water baptism and that of the Holy Spirit,—any sanction to the unscriptural pretence of baptismal regeneration,—or any, the least, disparagement of the baptism of the Spirit. Of the latter, it is impossible to describe the importance, in exaggerated terms. Without it, salvation is impossible. Possessed of it, salvation cannot fail. The question is not, therefore, whether water baptism is to be accepted as a substitute for the other, or, as inseparably identified with and imparting it, in any sense, or to any degree. All such ideas, whether veiled under the name of baptismal regeneration, or in whatever guise, we repudiate with horror; as derogatory to the high and incommunicable prerogatives of the Spirit of Christ.

But the question is, whether the Lord Jesus,—having promised the baptism of the Spirit to all his people,—has appointed the baptism of water to be an ordinance of perpetual obligation in the church, as a sign and symbol to the world, and seal to believers, of the blessings conferred by the spiritual baptism. That such is the clear and unequivocal testimony

of the Scriptures, will appear before we close. In fact, we shall see that Macnair himself distinctly recognizes that such was the doctrine of the apostles, as deduced both from their teachings and example. And he only succeeds in reaching the conclusions at which he aims, by taking the ground that they were in error on the subject.

The questions, therefore, at issue in the pages of this writer, involve the very foundations of our eternal hopes. To the apostles was the commission given by the Saviour, to organize the gospel church and establish its ordinances,—to preach the gospel and baptize all nations. To them the promise was given of the Comforter, to guide them into all truth, to bring all the instructions of the Master to their remembrance, and take the things of Christ, even all that the Father hath, and show them unto them, for their guidance in this office. Their names are written on the foundations of the New Jerusalem; and they, with the prophets of the Old Testament, resting on Christ the chief corner-stone, are its foundations. If they, then, could be mistaken, in a matter so plain yet so important as the meaning of the very commission by which they were sent forth to preach and baptize, we must be compelled to admit that the whole gospel of the Son of God, as proclaimed and recorded by them, may be a tissue of errors, and the great and precious promises, upon which we have been caused to hope, may all be delusive and vain.

In the present argument, we shall, in most cases, refer without reciting them, to the Scriptures relied upon; partly for the sake of brevity, and partly that they may be sought out by the reader, in the "more sure word," and studied in the light of their connection there.

Macnair admits that the meaning of the word *baptism* must be realized more or less distinctly alike in the application of water and of the Spirit. *Macnair*, p. 11. He further states that it appears from such places as Isa. xliv. 3, 4, Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27, and Mal. iii. 1—3, that the essential idea is the bestowal of life-giving, refreshing, and cleansing influences. According to this view, then, the baptism of the Holy Ghost signifies his outpouring from on high, (Isa. xxxii. 15,) for the renewal and cleansing of the soul; and by the baptism of water

is meant the application of water to the person, so as to bring into view the other. This statement is true, so far as it has respect to the ordinary renewing gift of the Holy Spirit. But there is another baptism of the Spirit,—the baptism of power, which is to be broadly distinguished, although by Macnair, under the necessities of his position, insidiously confounded with the other.

We will first examine into the nature of these baptisms of the Spirit.

In all baptisms there are four things of essential importance. These are, the administrator; the matter of the baptism, or substance poured out; the subject of it; and the end or design of the administration.

1. In the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the substance poured out is the Spirit itself, the third person of the Godhead; who is personally imparted to dwell in the subject of it. Isa. xxxii. 15; Joel ii. 28—32; John xiv. 16, 17; Acts ii. 17.

2. The only administrator of this baptism is the Son of God. The power of shedding forth the Spirit of God from on high, can, manifestly, in the very nature of the case, be in none but God; and hence, in no man but Him who is also the Son of God. To argue, as does Macnair, that, as John was not the only one who baptized with water, therefore, others as well as Jesus may baptize with the Holy Ghost,—is to trifle with the subject. If it is possible for language to express a peculiar prerogative, John does it, with respect to Jesus's power of baptizing with the Spirit. "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: [which is no extraordinary display of power,] but he that cometh after me is mightier than I; whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire." Matthew iii. 11. (Compare this and the twelfth verse, with Mal. iii. 1—3.) Again, "I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God." John i. 33, 34. Thus John distinctly contrasts his own power, as a baptizer with water, with that mightier power which was displayed in the baptism of the Holy Ghost; and attributes the

latter to the omnipotence of Christ, recognizing it as a distinguishing attribute of the Son of God. As soon as, *ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*, "the Baptizer with the Holy Ghost," is pointed out to him, John at once recognizes him, although veiled in flesh, as the eternal Son of God. Not only so, but although the gracious influences of the Spirit did unquestionably accompany his own ministry, and the extraordinary baptism of the Spirit which Jesus received, took place under it—a baptism more abundant and remarkable than any other—yet does John deny to himself and attribute to Jesus the prerogative of baptizing with the Spirit. In so doing he equally denies it to the apostles, whose relation to the outpouring of the Spirit, in regenerating grace, upon the hearers of the gospel, was of precisely the same nature as was that of John.

Macnair asks, "Whether would his [Christ's] glory most conspicuously appear, in making an immediate gift of the Spirit to each follower; or, in causing that one disciple should be the channel through which his influence should flow to another; —in giving to each such a measure of his influences as would serve his own needs; or in imparting the Spirit so copiously as that they who had freely received, might freely give?"—*Macnair*, p. 65. Thus, if the doctrine of this writer be true, we are to expect the baptism of the Spirit—his renewing and sanctifying influences—not from the ascended Son of God, but from some fellow worm, who possesses a superfluity of the Spirit beyond "his own needs," with power to impart it to others at pleasure! Here have we the worst form of priestly usurpation and mediation between God and the sinner. That is the very spirit of antichrist itself, which would interpose a human medium between the one Mediator and the soul; or point lost men to any second-hand fountain of grace. And, to attribute to a mere man the power of pouring out the Spirit upon men, is little short of blasphemy. Where is the living man who will venture to arrogate to himself such a power? And how will he go about to exercise it? Yet is the command, "Go, baptize all nations."

3. There are two several baptisms of the Spirit spoken of in the Scriptures, which are discriminated from each other, alike,

as to the subjects of them, the effects produced, and the end had in view.

The baptism of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, is common to all the elect of God, and was enjoyed under the Old Dispensation as well as under the New. See Psalm li. 2, 7; Isa. vi. 6, 7. In fact, salvation is impossible to any man of any age without it. John iii. 5, 6. Its immediate effect is to unite the subject of it to the Lord Jesus Christ, and its design and end is the renewal and sanctification of those to whom it is given,—their imbuement with the Spirit of Christ, and formation after his image. It is given, ordinarily, in connection with the preaching of the word, without any visible sign, or outward manifestation, other than the transformation which marks the subsequent lives and characters of the renewed. See Tit. iii. 5; Rom. viii. 9; 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13; Gal. iii. 27, 28; John iii. 8.

The baptism of power was peculiar to the apostolic age, and bestowed upon none but the apostles and certain of the converts of their personal ministry. Its immediate effect was to confer upon the subjects of it the gifts of miracles and tongues. Its design and end was the miraculous attestation of the gospel proclaimed by the apostles. In the beginning of the gospel it was imparted to the apostles on the day of Pentecost, by the immediate agency of the Son of God, accompanied with visible tongues of flame, thus confirming the gospel which then began to be preached. Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4, 5, 8; ii. 1—4, 16—18, 43; Heb. ii. 4. In like manner it was imparted to the house of Cornelius, to attest the opening of the door of the gospel to the Gentiles. Acts x. 44—47; xi. 15—18. In other cases, it was conferred through the laying on of the apostles' hands; thus identifying it with that testimony of which they were the chosen witnesses. Acts viii. 14—18, 25; xix. 6.

We repeat, that the baptism of power is not, and was never designed to be, administered to all the people of Christ. This, the experience of the church testifies. Since the apostolic age it has entirely ceased, and at the present day there is no trace of it in the church, even where the most abundant evidence of the presence of the Spirit is given. Even in the times of the apostles, it was not given to all believers. All had the Spirit, in his renewing and sanctifying graces, but all were not

endowed with tongues nor power. See 1 Cor. xii. 4—11, 28—30. Nor was its general bestowment necessary to the ends for which this baptism was given. Heb. ii. 3, 4.

Another point, to be distinctly marked is, that whereas faith is a fruit of the Spirit—a consequence of the baptism of regeneration—(see Gal. v. 22; John i. 12, 13,) the baptism of power was given to believers, subsequent to their faith, and to the fruits of regeneration working in their lives. Compare John vi. 68—70; Matthew xvi. 16, 17, and Acts ii. 1—4; viii. 12, 14—17. xix. 2—6.

We have said, that the baptism of regeneration was common to all ages of the church, administered by the Son of God alone, and by him bestowed upon all his people. The question is here raised by Macnair—Wherein then consisted the peculiarity of the baptism which John announced, when he declared that Christ should baptize with the Holy Ghost? It consisted in several things. 1. The baptizer thus announced, did not exercise a new prerogative; but himself assumed a new form in its exercise. The Son of God was now clothed in flesh, and it was by the Son of Mary, the Son of Man that the baptism of the Spirit was thenceforth to be administered. Compare Luke iii. 15—17; John i. 29—34; xv. 26; xvi. 7; Acts ii. 33. 2. It was no longer to be limited to the nation of Israel, but to be bestowed upon all flesh. Acts ii. 17, 39; x. 44; xi. 15—18. 3. It is now given in more abundant measure than ever before. 2 Cor. iii. 7—18. 4. In testimony of this, and assertion of the exaltation, glory and power of the incarnate Son, it was to be introduced by the miraculous scenes of the day of Pentecost, and the baptism of power, promised by Christ before his ascension, and dispensed after it. 5. It was to be followed by a baptism of fire, an outpouring of wrath, consuming his enemies; a baptism fulfilled in the desolation of Jerusalem, and the ultimate destruction of all the rejectors of Christ. Mat. iii. 10—12. Compare Psalm lxxix. 6, xi. 6.

Macnair urges that the Spirit was imparted by the laying on of the apostles' hands, and hence concludes that it was their privilege to baptize with the Spirit, and that this was what was commanded them in their commission to baptize all nations. But in the first place, as we have seen, the laying on of the

apostles' hands was for conferring, not renewing and sanctifying grace,—but miraculous powers, to those who were already possessors of grace; it was not given to all believers; and, we may add, was not administered by any but the apostles alone. Acts viii. 18. It could not then be that baptism which is to be dispensed by the hands of Christ's servants, in all ages, even to the end of the world; and to be administered to all who receive the gospel. Second. On the day of Pentecost, the apostles and disciples themselves were the subjects of the baptism, and declared it to have been dispensed by Jesus. Acts ii. 32, 33. The baptism of Cornelius and his house with the Spirit, was in like manner independent of all human agency, and attributed to the same Divine power. Acts xi. 15—17. The gifts conferred upon the saints of Samaria were conferred, it is true, through the laying on of hands, but in answer to special prayer; in which, the apostles not only sought the gifts for the disciples, but recognized their own incompetence to confer them. When Simon the sorcerer thought this to be a "power" belonging to the apostles, and sought to purchase it, he is rebuked by Peter, for conceiving such an idea respecting "the gift of God." Acts viii. 14—20. And Paul declares these gifts of the Holy Ghost to have been God's own witness to the testimony of the apostles concerning the great salvation. Heb. ii. 3, 4.

We will now examine the testimony of the Scriptures as to water baptism. Of this two kinds are traceable in Macnair's own admissions; the first is the baptism of preparation, in the name of ὁ ἐρχόμενος, "the coming One;" and was administered not only by John, but also by the apostles, under the direction of Jesus. John iii. 22, iv. 2, Matt. iv. 17, Mark i. 14, vi. 12. On ὁ ἐρχόμενος, compare Matt. xi. 3, Acts xix. 4. In this baptism there was no specific mention of the Persons of the Godhead. The distinct manifestation of these was yet to take place through Jesus Christ. See John i. 9, 18, xvii. 6, 1 Tim. iii. 16. Hence some who were baptized of John did not know that there was a Holy Ghost—a fact which assured Paul that they had not received Christian baptism. Acts xix. 2—5.

The burden of this baptism was, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord." "Repent, for the kingdom is at hand." Its message

proclaimed "the coming One." Hence, its administration by the disciples, after Christ's ascension to heaven, would have been a denial that he was the Christ; as it would have taught the people to expect a Christ yet to come.

Besides this baptism, which he acknowledges to have been with water, it is admitted by Macnair, that there were unquestionable instances of water baptism, by the apostles and disciples, after the day of Pentecost. With respect to it, the evidence will appear in what follows. Its burden is that the King Messiah has come, and that Jesus is the Christ. Its administration is in the name of the blessed Three, of whom the Lord Jesus was the messenger, revealer, and mediator. Matt. xxviii. 19, Acts x. 48, xix. 2—5. Its testimony is, that the kingdom of heaven has come,—that Jesus now occupies the throne. Acts v. 31.

Let us now look at the history of facts, as bearing on the present inquiry;—and first, for the present purpose, we will accept Macnair's own answer to the question: How is it that until the ascension of Christ the word *baptism*, standing alone, designates that with water? *Answer*—The writers are speaking of baptism as an existing institution. The baptism heralded by John was yet future; and water baptism alone was then in being. "Till the time when the Spirit is given, they were safe in using the word *baptism*, even without an adjunct, as equivalent to water baptism." *Macnair*, pp. 19, 20. Such, then, is the fact, and the reason of it; our author being witness. Now, no rule is more imperative, nor manifestly reasonable and necessary, than that which forbids the historian or writer to depart from his own established usage, as to the application of words, without notice to the reader. We have found that, by admission, the Evangelists used the word, baptism, by itself, in all their narrations of the ministry of John, and the former part of the life of Jesus, to designate water baptism, whilst adjuncts or explanatory phrases are used with it, to indicate spiritual influences. Unless, therefore, we have notice of a change in this mode of expression, or find something in the context forbidding us, we are bound to regard the word as unchanged in its significance,—as meaning water baptism, —wherever we find it.

As bearing upon the present question, one of the most signal testimonies occurs in the early ministry of our Lord. John and Jesus, and their disciples, were employed in preaching that the kingdom of heaven was at hand; and administering the baptism of repentance, in preparation for its coming. Whilst engaged in these labours, Jesus was visited by a man of the Pharisees, Nicodemus, who indicates the object of his coming by his salutation, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a *teacher* come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him. Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see" (he cannot apprehend in its true spiritual nature) "the kingdom of God," which is at hand,—which I come to establish. "Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John iii. 2—5.

Here, we accept the designation of Macnair as to "the kingdom of God." "It is hardly necessary to make the remark that the expression [Mat. xi. 11—15, Luke vii. 28—30,] cannot mean the kingdom of grace, for that would be to exclude the father of the faithful, and the man after God's own heart, from a participation in its citizenship. It must point to the gospel dispensation,—the form which the kingdom of grace assumed when the day of shadows passed away, and Jesus Christ assumed the government as king over His own house." *Macnair*, p. 23. In short it is the gospel church, imperfect and of mixed elements, here; but to be perfect, hereafter. Compare Matt. xxi. 43, xxiv. 30, xiii. 47—50, Luke ix. 27. Of this kingdom, Jesus declares, that no man can truly apprehend it, except he be born of the Spirit, (compare Luke xvii. 20, 21;) and that, in order to entrance into it, the birth of water must be superadded to the other. What was meant by this allusion to water, the employment of Jesus and his disciples, shortly after indicates, with abundant evidence. John iii. 22. That the spiritual baptism was the principal thing, the whole tenor of the discourse shows. That the water baptism is of imperative obligation as a symbol and seal of the other, Jesus testifies,

here; as, with equal emphasis, in the final commission given to the apostles.

When the preaching of the coming of the kingdom had been finished, and the King was about to assume the throne of grace, he gives the new and great commission to his disciples. You have heretofore proclaimed the kingdom at hand; but now it is set up. "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Matt. xxviii. 19. Here notice:

1. Jesus had already taught his disciples to baptize with water.

2. He had declared that the birth of water was necessary to entrance into the kingdom now to be set up, the visible gospel church.

3. He never hints that his apostles and disciples shall baptize with the Spirit. On the contrary, he and John had both taught them to recognize that as the prerogative, and demonstration of the power, of Jesus himself; and he promises that they, instead of baptizing, shall be baptized, with the Spirit.

4. Their powers were adequate to water baptism, but not to that of the Spirit.

5. No other than water baptism had yet been given, and the usage still held, which Macnair admits, of designating water baptism by the single word, *baptism*. They could not, therefore, have understood the words in any other sense than as enjoining them to baptize with water. How in fact they did understand them, we will presently see.

Here, however, it is necessary to notice the nature and significance of water baptism.

1. Its design is twofold;—to seal to the subjects of it the blessings of the covenant of grace; and, to testify to the witnessing world of the manner in which the blessings of grace and salvation are bestowed,—to wit, by the outpouring of the Spirit. Both of these designs appear in John's baptism; as well as in that of the Christian church.

2. Hence none are entitled to it except those who are embraced in the covenant, that is, believers and their households;

and it is to be administered to none who do not give scriptural evidence that they are heirs of the promises of the covenant. See Matt. iii. 7, 8. Hence, to hearers of the word, the conditions of the covenant are repentance and faith. Mark xvi. 16, Acts ii. 38, (comp. 41), xvi. 31—34.

3. These graces are fruits of the renewing of the Holy Spirit, and being made antecedent conditions of baptism, it is hence evident that the baptism which is enjoined as subsequent to faith, is not the baptism of the Spirit; since the latter precedes faith, and is its cause. It must, therefore, mean baptism with water, the seal of the blessings of the covenant. But to return:

"Tarry at Jerusalem," said Jesus, "until ye be endued with power from on high." The day of Pentecost comes, and the baptism of power descends. The multitude are gathered, and, under the preaching of Peter, cry, "What shall we do?" Peter replies, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost, for the promise [of Joel] is to you and to your children, &c." Acts ii. 38. Thus Peter utters the very testimony which he and the other apostles and John had been accustomed to deliver when they baptized with water, and preached "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Mark i. 4. Compare Mark i. 15, John iii. 22, iv. 2. The only change in the language is, that instead of *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, the coming One, Peter now proclaims the name and kingdom of the Lord Jesus, as already come. Acts ii. 33—36.

Thus, we have still no hint of a change in the use of the word *baptism*. On the contrary, the phraseology, identical with that of John's preaching, must have suggested to the hearers a similar baptism,—a washing with water.

Further, the baptism and the gift of the Holy Ghost are broadly distinguished from each other. The one is urged as a duty, conjoined with repentance. The other is announced as a promised gift from God,—that gift of which Joel spake, as conveying miraculous powers. The baptism enjoined, and the promise given, cannot, therefore, be the same thing. The one is antecedently conditional to the other.

Macnair's interpretation presents Peter absurdly saying, Acquire the Holy Ghost, and thereupon ye shall receive it!

Upon condition that ye become sanctified, ye shall then receive sanctifying grace!

In short, the fact that the gift of the Spirit, here spoken of, is that extraordinary outpouring promised by Joel, (compare vs. 17—20, and 38, 39,) shows this not to be the baptism which is to be administered to all believers.

Thus far, we have no hint of a change of usage, as to the word which formerly designated water baptism; of the Saviour commissioning his followers to administer any other; or, of their pretending to baptize with the Spirit.

We will now notice the cases in which it is acknowledged by Macnair, that water baptism was used by the disciples, after the ascension of our Lord.

First is the case of the Samaritans who were baptized by Philip,—Acts viii. 12—17,—with which is properly to be associated that of the Ethiopian eunuch,—vs. 26—39. Upon these cases the following points are to be observed:

1. Macnair insinuates a doubt whether Philip was especially endowed with the Holy Ghost. Nothing could be more conclusive evidence of unwillingness to receive the truth, contrary to his own opinions. When the apostles directed the multitude of disciples to select "seven men full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom," to superintend the ministration to the widows, Philip was the second man chosen by the multitude, and approved by the apostles, at a time when the whole body of disciples was realizing the full baptism of the day of Pentecost. Compare Acts iv. 31, v. 32, vi. 3. Upon the persecution following Stephen's martyrdom, Philip was driven from Jerusalem; and at Samaria preached Christ, the Spirit attesting his ministry with signs and wonders wrought by him. An angel of the Lord commanded him to go to the place where he met the eunuch; the Spirit directed him to join with the Ethiopian; and, immediately after the baptism, the Spirit caught him up and bore him away, so that the rejoicing eunuch saw him no more. And yet Macnair questions whether he was a man taught of the Holy Ghost!

2. Peter and John were sent by the apostles at Jerusalem, to Samaria, to confer upon the believing Samaritans the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost. They found that they were all

baptized; and laying their hands upon them, the Holy Ghost was given. If the water baptism had been wrong, surely it would have been condemned by Peter and John. Certainly, they had the Holy Spirit, in the fullest measure. Compare Acts ii. 14—40; iii. 1—26; iv. 8, 31; v. 1—10, 15, &c. Yet, upon the visit of the apostles to Samaria, we have not a hint of the mistake of Philip being corrected by them. On the contrary, immediately after, Philip baptizes the eunuch in the same mode; and, in like manner, Peter baptizes Cornelius.

3. Here, then, we have the concurrent testimony of Peter, John, and Philip, in favour of water baptism. In the case of the eunuch, the Holy Spirit adds his authority, as a party to the baptism. He brings Philip to the eunuch, awaits his preaching of the gospel and administration of the baptismal seal, and then immediately bears him away; thus exhibiting to the eunuch a miraculous pledge of the Divine authority of the ministration of Philip. And yet we are told that the evangelist blundered in a cardinal point, and this in founding the gospel in Ethiopia. For the question between water and Spirit baptism must be fundamental. The assertion is an impeachment of the Holy Spirit, by whom Philip's ministry was so emphatically endorsed.

4. "The place of the Scripture" which the eunuch was reading, was in Isaiah liii. 7, 8. The section of Isaiah's prophecy in which this occurs, begins with chap. lii. 13, and includes that declaration, "So shall he sprinkle many nations," (chap. lii. 15)—language which points to baptism, and accounts for the request coming from the eunuch.

5. The testimony is express, that the Samaritans "had (*ὑπῆρχον*, upon their first believing*) been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus," although the Holy Ghost was not fallen upon any of them. The command, therefore, to baptize into that name was fulfilled in the water baptism, and not in that of the Holy Ghost.

6. Macnair's argument from the case of Simon the sorcerer is futile. That there is a dead faith—a mere rational conviction, which is not saving—we are abundantly assured: Matt.

* Compare Phil. ii. 6: "Who, *ὑπάρχων*, being, at first,—originally,—in the form of God."

iii. 7, 8; James ii. 14—26; John xii. 42, 43. This kind of belief, however, is never called faith. Upon Macnair's own theory, he must admit that Simon's belief was not true faith; and the declaration of Jesus is emphatic: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." Mark xvi. 16. Thus he teaches us—upon failure of salvation—to look, not to a defective baptism, but to a failure of faith in the heart. And in the case of Simon, this is precisely where the defect was, Peter being witness: "Thy *heart* is not right in the sight of God."

7. In the history of Philip's ministry, we find the word *baptize* still employed, always to signify water baptism, as it was before the Spirit was given.

The next case of water baptism admitted by our author, is that of Cornelius and his house, by Peter. Macnair objects to Philip, that he was not an apostle; but he has as little respect for the authority of Peter as of Philip. He insists that the very vision which Peter had, in connection with his call to the house of Cornelius, shows him to have been steeped in a ceremonial spirit. Let us look at the facts.

1. Early in the ministry of our Saviour, upon occasion of Peter's profession of faith—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God"—Jesus had said to him, "On this rock I will build my church; and [inasmuch as thou art first to recognize and profess this faith] I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," &c. Matt. xvi. 16—20. This promise was fulfilled, with respect to Israel, by the preaching of Peter on the day of Pentecost; and, with respect to the Gentiles, by the baptism of Cornelius. See Acts xv. 7. The transactions, therefore, connected with the case of Cornelius, have respect, not to him merely, or chiefly, but to the whole Gentile world. The door which the keys in Peter's hand opened to Cornelius, must be entered by all who desire a part with Cornelius in the son of David.

2. Proportionate to the importance of the occasion was the preparation for it,—the vision seen by Peter, giving him divine instruction as to what he should do; and the vision of Cornelius, directing him to send for Peter, and hear from him "what he ought to do." Acts x. 6.

3. Whilst Peter preached, the Holy Ghost fell upon his hearers; yet he is so far from recognizing that, as the baptism which he was commanded to administer, that he exclaims,—"Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we." Acts xi. 47. The baptism of the Holy Ghost was not, then, that which the apostles were appointed to administer.

4. This case,—as well as those by Philip, which we have seen to have been acquiesced in by Peter and John,—shows the view taken of the subject by the apostles; especially by the pentecostal preacher; and consequently confirms our understanding of the baptism then administered, to those who believed at the preaching of Peter.

5. In the case of the Centurion we find every circumstance which should preclude a possibility of mistake as to the will of God. In answer to his continual prayers, Cornelius is directed by an angel to send for Peter, who should tell him what he ought to do, "whereby he and his house should be saved." Peter receives special Divine instruction in preparation for his mission to Cornelius. The Spirit, already resting in fulness on him, is poured out upon the Centurion and his house. In the midst of such a scene, Peter commands the baptism of water to be administered. And yet we are told that, in so doing, he showed his ignorance of the meaning of the commission to baptize, given him on Olivet, by the ascending Saviour, —that he was controlled by a carnal and Judaizing spirit! If this be so, the Centurion was instructed by the Spirit of God to lean on a broken reed,—to receive and obey, as the voice of God, the mistaken requirements of an erring man!

Our next example occurs in the ministry of Paul, an authority of the highest importance, as his apostleship and his doctrine were derived immediately from the ascended Saviour, independent of any intercourse with the other apostles, and free from liability to have imbibed from them any errors which they may be supposed to have fallen into. See Gal. i. 1, 11—24, ii. 1—10. This apostle rejoices that he had baptized but few of the Corinthians, for, says he, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." 1 Cor. i. 17. Here Macnair thinks Paul asserts water baptism to be an ordinance of

man, and not of Christ, and that he yet admits himself to have sometimes administered it. But,

1. Whatever the word *baptize* properly means, that it is of which, if we suppose him to have understood his own words, Paul speaks. Our author admits that he did mean water baptism.

2. Paul rejoiced, not that the Corinthians were unbaptized; —to admit that some were, and yet deny it to have been administered to all, were preposterous;—but his joy was, that he, personally, had not administered the ordinance, but had left it to the hand of others.

3. The apostles had it as their distinctive office to bear witness to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, as a demonstration of his Messiahship. Whilst, in common with all ministers of the gospel, they were commanded to baptize,—they had special commission to proclaim the gospel of the risen Saviour; to testify as eye-witnesses to the fact of his resurrection, and confirm that testimony by miracles. See Acts i. 3, 8, 21, 22, ii. 32, x. 39—41, 1 Cor. ix. 1, 2 Cor. xii. 12, Heb. ii. 3, 4.

4. Hence, it would seem to have been common with the apostles to commit the baptizing of their converts to the hands of any other authorized persons, who might be present; thus recognizing the fellowship of the ministry. See Acts x. 48.

5. In thus doing, the apostles as fully complied with the terms of their commission, as though each one had, with his own hands, baptized all who were converted under his ministry.

6. This, further, restrained the tendency of carnal disciples to attach some importance to the person by whom they had been baptized.

7. Macnair attempts to find support in the language of Paul, (1 Cor. i. 22,) "For the Jews require a sign," which he would interpret, "The Jews require baptism,—a ritual symbol or sign." But such is not the meaning of the word *σημεῖον*, which signifies a demonstrative proof. See Matt. xvi. 1, xxiv. 3, 30, xxvi. 48, &c. Paul, therefore, has no reference, in that word, to baptism; but to that trait in the Jewish character, of which Jesus says, "Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe." John iv. 48.

The conclusion, therefore, is, that Paul, the great opponent of Judaizing ritual and ceremonial observances, did baptize with his own hands some of the Corinthians with water,—an observance to which he could not have been led, but by the express authority of Christ. Gal. i. 1, 11, 12, ii. 6. This, too, in perfect consistency with the fact that he rejoiced in having cultivated the fellowship of the gospel, by committing the ordinance, in most cases, to the hands of other ministers; thus providentially cutting the Corinthians off from that ground of boasting of his name.

Further, we have thus an unquestionable exposition of the language of Acts xviii. 8, respecting the baptism of those who believed at Corinth. If Paul understood what the word *baptize* meant,—if Luke, the writer of the Acts, truly records the facts,—the baptism of the Corinthians was water baptism. And when, in the very next chapter, we find it stated of certain believers at Ephesus, that they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus, (Acts xix. 5,)—when this baptism is expressly contradistinguished from the baptism of power by the Holy Ghost, and brought into immediate connection with the baptism of John, both being expressed by the same word, baptize, the conclusion is inevitable, that the Ephesians were baptized as were the Corinthians, with water.

In this connection are to be included two additional places, in which it is admitted that the words *baptism* and *baptize* signify the application of water, viz., 1 Cor. x. 1, 2, and Heb. ix. 10.

And now let us glance at the leading points of the conclusions to which we have, thus far, come.

1. We have seen that baptism with water is a type and seal of that with the Holy Ghost.

2. That whilst the latter is essential in order to true conceptions respecting the kingdom of God, the baptism with water, our Saviour being witness, (John iii. 5), is essential to admittance into the visible organization of that kingdom.

3. That throughout the ministry of John and Christ, until the coming of the Spirit, the words, *baptize* and *baptism*, when used without adjuncts, designate baptism with water.

4. That at a time when this usage confessedly still existed, the Saviour commanded his disciples to baptize all nations.

5. That the baptism of power, promised by Christ to his disciples and realized by them on the day of Pentecost, and by others subsequently through the laying on of their hands, was an extraordinary influence, not to be confounded with "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost;" which is common to all the elect, whilst the other was peculiar to the apostolic age, and to certain chosen persons.

6. That this extraordinary, miraculous, and occasional baptism of the Holy Spirit, which disappeared from the church with the death of the apostles, is the only spiritual baptism of which the Scriptures speak, as attendant upon the laying on of hands.

7. That on the day of Pentecost, the reception of baptism was urged as a duty correlative with repentance; whilst the miraculous gift of the Spirit was announced as a promise, to be realized subsequent to repentance and baptism.

8. That Peter, John, Philip, and Paul, did confessedly baptize with water; and that, too, when under the extraordinary influence and guidance of the Spirit, who gave evidence of his approval, by miracles wrought in immediate and marked connection with the baptisms.

9. That especially was this the case in connection with the baptism of Cornelius; which was the opening of the doors of the kingdom to the whole Gentile world.

10. That by Peter, Philip, the Eunuch, and Paul, the word *baptize* is recognized as significant of water baptism,—is familiarly employed to express it, and, when so employed, is never accompanied with an explanatory adjunct, as though it might mean, of itself, something else.

11. That Luke, both in his Gospel and in the Acts, uses the same mode of expression wherever water baptism is alluded to.

12. That in one place (Acts xviii. 8,) in which no express mention is made of water in the history given by Luke, Paul himself testifies, as Macnair acknowledges, that water baptism was administered.

13. That the usage in respect to the words baptize and bap-

tism, as expressive of water baptism, is acknowledged by Macnair to prevail throughout the Gospels;—that no notice of a change in this usage occurs anywhere;—and that it in fact prevails throughout the Acts, in every instance of water baptism admitted by Macnair, and is still retained even in the Epistles. See 1 Cor. x. 1, 2, Heb. ix. 10.

Baptism is spoken of about eighty times in the New Testament. Of these about forty-one occur in the Gospels, where it is admitted that the word, by itself, signifies water baptism; some twenty-six are in the Acts, where in two instances an adjunct is used, to express spiritual baptism; in sixteen, it is admitted by Macnair that the circumstances render it unquestionable that water baptism is meant; in the other cases no adjunct is used; and yet Macnair asserts that they all mean spiritual baptism, although there is nothing in any one of the places to imply such a deviation from the universal usage as to the phraseology; and one of them is the case of the Corinthians, of whom we have Paul's testimony that they were baptized with water,—a testimony the more significant, as the apostle does not in terms name water at all, but Macnair is compelled from the nature of the apostle's argument to admit that he speaks of water baptism. The remaining instances in which the words occur, are in the epistles. In some of them, water baptism is unquestionably meant, and in others the adjuncts employed and the statements made show that the baptism of the Spirit is intended.

In short, in about sixty-six instances in which the words occur in the history of the beginning of the gospel, as given in the Evangelists and Acts, we have inspired interpretations which are admitted by Macnair to be conclusive in fifty-seven cases. Among these, a solitary case does not occur, in which the word baptism or baptize is used alone to express spiritual baptism. In no case is either word accompanied with an adjunct, when water baptism is meant; except where the design is to emphasize the distinction, where it is brought into immediate contrast with that of the Spirit. In the remaining places in which the word occurs, in the history of the apostolic age, there is nothing to forbid the word to be interpreted as in all the other places. Further, our Saviour,—speaking at a time

when the word, used without adjunct, is admitted by Macnair to have meant water baptism and nothing else,—uses it alone in the commission, "Go, baptize all nations;" the apostles go forth in fulfilment of this commission, and baptize all who received their testimony. In repeated instances, we have incidental proof that, by baptism, they understood that with water to be meant, and did in fact administer it; and, in no case, is there anything inconsistent with this interpretation.

THE CONCLUSION IS INEVITABLE, to those who take the Scriptures as their guide, that in the church which is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, there are two baptisms,—the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and that with water; the one, promised by the Son of God, and administered by him alone; the other, commanded by him, and administered in his name, and as a testimony to his saving grace, by his apostles and other ministers; and to be administered by his servants, until his second coming;—the one, in its own nature, essential to salvation; the other, a duty commanded by Christ, neglect of which is a sin, which, if wilful, implies destitution of renewing grace, and consequently loss of the soul;—the one, constituting a bestowal of eternal life upon the soul; the other, a public testimony to the source of that life, the manner of its bestowment, and the effects thence resulting.

Macnair appeals to the "one baptism," of Eph. iv. 5, as excluding that with water. The apostle, as Macnair states, is insisting upon the unity of believers, as an argument of mutual love. "I beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Eph. iv. 1—6. The question present to the apostle's mind brings up such points as attest the unity of believers, and, in respect to baptism determines nothing more than that they are not separated by diverse kinds of baptism, one being baptized into one thing and another into something different; but "by one

Spirit are we all," (with one baptism) "baptized into one body." 1 Cor. xii. 13. To assert, as does our author, that this language is inconsistent with the supposition that there is a typical baptism, with water, as well as the essential baptism of the Spirit, is to ignore and contradict the fact that, Macnair himself being witness, Paul did himself unquestionably administer baptism with water, as did the other apostles; and that he designates that ministration by the bare word, baptism. If, indeed, we were to admit as Macnair pretends, that some of the early converts were baptized with water, and others were not, we should then have a diversity of baptisms, contrary to the apostle's statement, and inconsistent with the unity of the church; which is the point of his appeal. The phrase "one baptism," as used by the apostle probably comprehends both that of water and that with the Spirit. "One Lord, one faith, a baptism one in the Spirit given, and the graces conferred, and one in the visible sign and seal." The argument of Macnair is puerile, in which he asserts that "baptism with water is not one, but manifold, administered sometimes in infancy, sometimes in manhood, sometimes by sprinkling, sometimes by immersion, sometimes with other ceremonies, and sometimes without," &c. He might have added the difference of sex to that of age. But are all cases of spiritual baptism at the same age? Then, in the first place, the assumption is altogether unwarranted, that it ever was administered, in the apostolic age, otherwise than by affusion; and, in the second, if water baptism be, as our writer himself represents it,—such an application of water as shows forth the renewing influences of the Spirit upon the soul,—the distinctions mentioned above are merely circumstantial,—the baptism is one.

In short, by the direct admission of this writer, the baptism which is spoken of in the last command of the ascending Saviour is to be administered to all believers, and dispensed to them by the hands of Christ's disciples. From the ministry is the baptism to be received; and to them, therefore, must men come to enjoy it. The alternative is, that lost sinners are to look,—not to the Son of God, himself, for the Spirit of renewing, cleansing, and sanctifying grace,—but to men like themselves, upon whose faithfulness, and superabundant investiture

with the Spirit, their salvation is made to depend;—or, that the baptism which the ministry is to dispense is that of water; whilst, as at first, so still, the Son of God himself is the baptizer with the Holy Ghost, to whom men must come for salvation, and from whom alone is to be obtained "the Spirit of life." The one theory invites men to trust in an arm of flesh; the other, in the love of Christ. The former system is antichrist. The latter is the gospel of the Son of God.

Faithfulness to the truth of Christ forbids us to close, without distinctly marking the sceptical spirit which inspires Macnair's entire book. Whilst professing to accept the word of God as the infallible guide, he does not hesitate to reject the testimony of those very apostles to whom Jesus expressly says, "Whoso heareth you, heareth me." He quibbles about the vision and misrepresents Peter, as though he was hard to persuade to call no man common or unclean. Whereas, the simple fact is, that the vision and expostulation of Peter was respecting the eating of all manner of wild beasts and reptiles. The meaning of this vision was not at first revealed to Peter, (Acts x. 17,) and was only imparted to him, upon the coming of the messenger of Cornelius, with whose summons Peter, without a moment's hesitation, complied. But what must be the writer's estimate of the wisdom, faithfulness, and power of God, whom he admits to have used such special care, in preparing Peter for his mission to Cornelius, and inducing in Cornelius an implicit trust in Peter, as one who would "tell him what he ought to do;" and yet permit Peter to commit a signal blunder, which implies utter mistake as to the meaning of the very commission under which he went forth to preach, given him by the ascending Saviour, on Mount Olivet! In one word, either were the apostles protected from all error in their official instructions and actions, or the Bible is to be rejected as a rule of faith; since we have no criterion of truth, if there be error there. Either are they infallible guides, or they are nothing, and the Bible a fable. It is said that they did sometimes err, as Peter at Antioch, (Gal. ii. 11;) but, in the first place, the case was of private, and not of official conduct. As an apostle, he had the pledge of guidance into all truth. As an individual, he was not yet perfect. And, in the second

place, we should never have known of that error, but for the inspired record condemning it. Thus we are assured, that had the apostles erred in more important matters, the mistakes would have been distinctly pointed out, and not left on the sacred page, to ensnare and mislead the people of God.

In one word, by the distinct admission of our author himself, he and the apostles differ on the subject of baptism. They administered it with water, in the name of the blessed Three, as commanded by Jesus. He thinks they ought not so to have done. The authority of Christ and the apostles is on one side. On the other is our author. The reader will choose between them.

ART. VI.—*The General Assembly.*

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States met agreeably to appointment in Newark, New Jersey, May 19th, 1864; and, in absence of Dr. Morrison, the Moderator of the last Assembly, was opened by a sermon by William L. Breckinridge, D. D., on 2 Cor. viii. 9. After the usual preliminary services, James Wood, D. D., of Indiana, was chosen Moderator and Ravaud K. Rodgers, D. D., of New Jersey, Temporary Clerk.

Report on Psalmody.

J. Trumbull Backus, D. D., chairman of the committee on this subject, made a report included in the following resolutions, which, after protracted and desultory debate, were adopted.

Resolved, 1. That a selection of psalms and hymns be made from our present book, and from other sources, and published with suitable tunes; and that all the new hymns in this new selection, which are not in our present book, be published as a *supplement*, for the use of those who prefer it; and that the hymns in the new selection, in addition to their own numbers, shall

retain the numbers in the old book, so that both may be used in the same congregation without embarrassment.

Resolved, 2. That in accordance with the recommendation of previous Assemblies, and responsive to the wish of many in the church, there shall be made a careful selection from the Bible, of passages to be arranged for chanting; and that this shall be fitted to be bound both with the selection of hymns and tunes, and with the supplement, at the option of the churches.

Resolved, 3. That the volumes thus provided for, shall be furnished with ample indices, after the style of the best improvements in this respect.

Resolved, 4. That a committee of five be appointed by this Assembly, who shall have power to employ all needful talent and means, at the expense of the Board of Publication, for the accomplishment of these ends, as perfectly and speedily as possible, and report the result to some future Assembly.

Resolved 5. That the Board of Publication be instructed to defray the personal expenses of the present Committee, incurred in performing this service.

Dr. Krebs, J. T. Backus, R. Davidson, W. Lord, and J. E. Rockwell, were appointed the committee to prepare a new Hymn Book.

Increase of Salaries.

Judge Ryerson introduced at an early period the following preamble and resolutions, which were unanimously adopted, viz.

Whereas, By reason of the greatly enhanced prices of every article of family consumption, averaging fully fifty per cent. more than two years ago, the salaries of the great majority of our ministers have become entirely inadequate to the comfortable support of their families—causing in many cases much of destitution and suffering; therefore,

Resolved, That a committee of five ruling elders be appointed, to consider what steps it may be proper for this General Assembly to take, to remedy this crying evil.

The Judge said that he thought no remarks were necessary to enforce the importance of this proposal, as the facts were

obvious. He had proposed that the committee be composed entirely of laymen, in view of the delicacy that ministers might feel in acting upon a subject of that nature; and he hoped the proposal would meet with the favour of the Assembly.

The committee appointed in virtue of the foregoing resolution, prepared a letter to be addressed to the churches, by the General Assembly. This letter was adopted, and is as follows:

Letter of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, to the Ruling Elders, Deacons and Trustees of the churches under the care of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church.

Beloved Brethren—We have, on various occasions, addressed our churches on the subject of providing an adequate support for the ministers of the gospel, and are happy to know that this obligation has been generally recognized in our communion.

Under ordinary circumstances, it might have been superfluous to advert to the subject again. But the calamitous war, which has been so recklessly and causelessly forced upon our country by unscrupulous and wicked men, bringing with it so many new duties, trials, and sorrows, and affecting in various ways the vital interests of the church, is telling with extreme severity upon the comfort and usefulness of the Christian ministry. Many, very many, worthy, faithful, and devoted pastors, while they and their families have been suffering for want of the comforts, and often the necessaries of life, have most sensibly been caused to realize some of the consequences of the great sin of rebellion.

It would be but a waste of time to dwell upon the greatly increased expenses of living; you have but too many proofs of it already. The inevitable consequence has been a corresponding advance in wages and salaries, and a corresponding loss to all dependent upon fixed incomes. Families have increased the wages of their domestics; farmers and mechanics, of their workmen; merchants, commercial institutions, corporations of every kind, and public offices—municipal, state, and national—of their clerks and agents. A movement so general and comprehensive must have had an adequate cause; the necessity which compelled it must be one reaching all classes of society—all,

at least, dependent upon fixed salaries for a livelihood—and none should be denied a participation in these measures of relief.

We have, however, reason to fear that up to this period, with some rare and honourable exceptions, the claims of the ministry have been overlooked. The salaries of pastors, always small, always much less than they could have earned in secular pursuits, and too often insufficient for even a meagre support, remain in a large majority of cases stationary, while the price of living has advanced fully fifty per cent. We believe this is the result, not of design, but of inadvertence. Pastors shrink from asking an increase, and it is not the way of the world to enlarge salaries where there is neither demand nor complaint. But we are sure that our people would not willingly subject their ministers to the mortification of *supplicating* an increase of their stipends. We cannot doubt their readiness to act in the premises, whenever it shall be properly brought before them. To believe otherwise would be a reproach to their intelligence, their sense of justice, their appreciation of Christian ordinances, and their fidelity to the Saviour. They are not yet prepared to contemn His wise and equitable decree, "that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." What our congregations need, is that some competent authority should bring the subject to their notice.

It is with this view, beloved brethren, that we address this letter to you, the respected ruling elders and trustees of our churches. We ask you to bring the subject before your respective congregations *with the least possible delay*. We beg you to have it candidly and prayerfully considered. Deal justly, nay, generously, by your pastors. Your liberality to them will not be a lost investment, but will yield a rich return to you and your families; for in this, as in other relations, "he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully." You will begin to reap at once, for a congregation always finds its own present advantage in relieving its pastor of all perplexity about his support, and placing him in a position where he can work with comfort, his mind free from anxious and harassing cares about his temporal support. And then, if other motive still be needed, you have it in those touching and wonderful words of our Lord and Saviour, "Inasmuch as ye have done it

unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it *unto me.*" If the Saviour were here, is there a church bearing his name that would not covet the privilege of ministering to his wants?

We are deeply impressed with the importance of this subject. It is not at all in the light of a personal favour to the ministers of the gospel that we bring it before you. It is vital to the church, and vital to our afflicted country. Our most precious interests, secular and spiritual, ecclesiastical and national, demand that the hands of the evangelical ministry be strengthened in every practicable way, and the ordinances of the sanctuary clothed with the highest degree of efficiency. We are now being punished most grievously for the past wickedness of the nation, and it cannot be too often, nor too strongly, impressed upon the minds and hearts of our people that there cannot be any rational hope of maintaining our free institutions except by the all-pervading influence of the gospel. "Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people." "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." All history abundantly confirms these clear teachings of the Bible, and we must heed them if we desire to escape the fate of the many great and powerful nations that have perished from the earth. How is it possible to produce these blessed results, so dear to the heart of every Christian, of every true patriot, unless we maintain the Christian ministry, and the ordinances of the gospel, in a condition of the highest practicable efficiency? And how can that be done without an adequate support of the ministry?

We leave the matter in your hands, dear brethren, satisfied that you will deal with it in a spirit of Christian kindness to your pastors, and of unfeigned love to our common Lord and Master.

P. S. This letter relates to pastors. But the policy it recommends pertains, with equal reason, to ministers who are faithfully serving the church in her Colleges, Seminaries, and Boards, and in this view we invite attention to it on the part of all concerned in the management of these institutions.

JAMES WOOD, *Moderator.*

A. T. MCGILL, *Stated Clerk,*

W. E. SCHENCK, *Permanent Clerk.*

The ground taken in the above letter is self-evidently just and proper. The increased price of the necessaries of life has forced upon all employers a corresponding increase in the rate of compensation. As ministers are salaried officers, though not exactly hired servants, they are very apt to be overlooked in the application of the rule which is recognized not only as just, but indispensable, in other cases. We hope great good may result from the Assembly's kind appeal. That good can, however, at best, be only temporary. The evil lies much deeper than any passing condition of our monetary affairs. It is rooted in our system, which is radically wrong in principle, contrary to all Divine appointments, and to the usage of the church in all ages except our own. Our whole theory of ministerial support is founded on the denial of the unity of the church. It resolves itself into Congregationalism. The minister is the servant of a congregation, and they only are bound to support him. Against this system we have written and protested for years; and some of the best men of our church have argued and laboured to subvert it; but to no purpose. In this, as in so many other points, Presbyterianism has been congregationalized (*i. e.*, adulterated and weakened by the introduction of the principles of Independency) in this country to such a degree, that the public mind has become fixed. The people are set in their present way of thinking. They will acknowledge that they are bound to support their own minister; but what have they to do with supporting the ministers of other congregations, in Iowa, or Kansas? We are glad of every opportunity of bringing up this subject. The truth will at last prevail. *Gutta cavat lapidem.* Let the brethren, clerical and lay, think of these things, viz., 1. The obligation to support the ministry, so far as it rests on the law of Christ, that "those who preach the gospel shall live by the gospel;" or, on the general principles of moral and religious duty, binds the whole church, and the church as a whole. We are bound to sustain and comfort the soldiers fighting on the Chickahominy or the Chatahoochie, as well as those who garrison the forts in our city harbours. 2. Under the old dispensation, the obligation to sustain the temple, its services, and the priesthood, rested on the whole people. It was a lien on the property of

the whole land. 3. The same principle has been the general law of Christendom. 4. Throwing the support of the clergy on the particular congregations to which they minister, is very much an Americanism. It is one of the new principles which have sprung up among us, some of which principles are good, and some evil. 5. It works great injustice to the people. It imposes on the few and the poor the same burden which in other places rests on the many and the rich. 6. It works grievous injustice to the ministry. Hundreds of them are labouring on a salary which does not afford them even the necessaries of life, to say nothing of its comforts. Nearly twenty years ago, Mr. James Lenox, of New York, caused to be reprinted and widely circulated, a pamphlet on Christian Economics, by the late Dr. Chalmers, of Edinburgh, in which the Free Church plan for an equitable, and, within certain limits, an equable ministerial support, was ably advocated. It would be well if the facts and arguments therein presented could once more be brought before the mind of the church.

Vacant Churches.

The Rev. Dr. Krebs, from the Committee appointed by the last General Assembly, to report upon the subject of vacant churches and unemployed ministers, and bringing them to a union, made a report, reciting the difficulties that environ the subject, and making some suggestions. The report was accepted, and placed on the docket. It was a lucid and interesting report.

Prayer for the Country.

At an early period of the sessions, the Rev. S. Miller introduced a resolution contemplating the appointment of a day for fasting and prayer, in relation to the state of the country. After some debate, a substitute was offered by Dr. Nevin, recommending that the Assembly devote the afternoon of the next Wednesday, to special thanksgiving and prayer in reference to our national affairs. It was also resolved, that notice should be sent to the General Assembly in session at Dayton, Ohio, apprising them of this action of our Assembly, and requesting them to unite with us in the appointed services. To this a cordial assent was signified; and the two assemblies united

their prayers in behalf of our beloved and suffering country. The Rev. Dr. McMaster introduced a paper which was read and made the order of the day for the evening of the fifth day of the sessions of the Assembly. In this paper he recounted the national sins for which we are now suffering, especially our sins in connection with slavery, and urged the appointment of a general fast. The adoption of this paper was urged by its author in an earnest speech, occupying most of the evening in its delivery. On motion of Dr. Musgrave, the paper and its proposals were referred to the Committee of Bills and Overtures. On their recommendation, the first day of September next was designated as a day for fasting and prayer, in case the President of the United States should not previously appoint another day.

Revised Book of Discipline.

The Rev. Dr. Beatty moved that the Assembly take up the consideration of the Revised Book of Discipline, commenced in the last Assembly, and by it referred to this body. He proposed the adoption of the eighth chapter of the New Book, with a view to its being sent down to the Presbyteries. The Rev. Dr. Rice moved that the consideration of the subject be referred to the next Assembly. This motion was warmly seconded by Dr. Musgrave, and sustained by Drs. Elliott, Junkin, Nevin, and Messrs. Haskell, Kempshall, Miller, and others. It was opposed by Dr. Beatty, who urged that as the work had already been seven years on hand, it ought to be finally disposed of. Drs. Krebs, Lowrie, and Backus took the same view, but Dr. Rice's motion to postpone was adopted by a large majority. We do not know that any surprise need be felt at this decision. In the first place, the General Assembly is a large body. Its *vis inertiæ* is great. It requires a great and continued force to set it in motion. In the second place, in every such body, and in every community, there is a party opposed to all change. They are wedded to old ways, and cannot be persuaded that anything new is good. The old naval officers of England and America opposed the introduction of steam into the navy. It is not surprising, therefore, when a man has trod the quarter deck as long as Dr. Musgrave has

done, that he is disposed to pitch any new sailing orders into the sea without even looking at them. He has sailed in all weathers, and always got into port; he is therefore satisfied with things as they are. This class of men are very respectable, very strong, and very confident. With *them*, seeing is believing. It is no use to tell them that steam is surer and better than wind as a motive power. They have sailed too long to believe that a ship can go ahead against wind or tide, no matter how large "a tea kettle," (as an English Admiral called a steam-engine,) she may have on board. These good men can be moved only by a *vis à tergo*. But move they must. Still for the time being they keep things steady. In the third place, not one in ten of the General Assembly knew anything of the New Book. They had, therefore, no ground for judging of its merits. More effective than any other consideration was no doubt the desire to get rid of business. There is so much more to be done by every Assembly than can be done deliberately, that every item is stricken from the docket which can with any show of propriety be got rid of. There is also a latent consciousness that the General Assembly is not a fit body to frame a book of discipline, or to discuss its several provisions. Its members change year by year. Every question comes up new to every mind. It must decide on the first impression, or not at all. Congress might as well be expected, in the midst of the pressure of all other business, to frame a constitution, as the General Assembly wisely to frame a new Book of Discipline. There are only two ways, as it seems to us, that this work can be well done. The one is, to have a convention called for the purpose, to sit two or three weeks; and when they have settled everything to their satisfaction, send it down to the Presbyteries to be ratified or rejected. Thus our national constitution was framed. The other method is, for the Presbyteries to take the Revised Book and carefully consider, amend, or reject it; and then for the Assembly to act definitively under their guidance. The work of deliberation must be done either in a convention, or in the Presbyteries. It cannot be done in the Assembly; and the plan of having it done by a committee of eight or ten, experience shows will not answer. The reasons for the alterations are presented to too

few minds. The mass of those who are called to judge and decide have not considered the several points to be determined, and they cannot be expected to act blindly. That something must be done, we are fully persuaded. Our present Book is confused, contradictory, and impracticable. It cannot be acted upon without a consumption of time that is intolerable. In every Assembly where judicial business is to be transacted, there are confusion, and disorder,—decisions which shock and offend, first one party and then another, all because the Book itself is what it is. It is no answer to this to say that our present Book was framed by great and good men. So was the constitution of England the work of great men. But it must be altered or overthrown to suit the change in men and things. And our old Book, we are persuaded, must be altered, or our whole system will utterly break down. That a church of three thousand ministers shall be occupied, as it may be for days, or even weeks, in its General Assembly, in determining the merits of a petty slander case, in any village in the Union, is a solecism not to be longer endured.

Board of Church Extension.

The Committee on the Board of Church Extension report to the General Assembly, that they have examined the Annual Report and the Minutes of the Board, and find them worthy of approval; and in relation to the important work of this Board, they recommend the adoption by the Assembly of the following resolutions, viz.

Resolved, That the Assembly, with devout gratitude, acknowledge the good measure of prosperity which God has bestowed on this Board during the past year, in inclining a number of churches larger by one hundred and forty-seven than last year, to contribute to this cause, from this and other sources raising its receipts to $24,847, a sum greater by $5622 than last year received, enabling it thus to increase both the number and the amount of its appropriations; and yet to report an encouraging balance.

Resolved, 2. That the Assembly cherish and express entire confidence in the wisdom, zeal, and prudence with which its operations have been conducted during the past year, and that

in these respects the Board be commended to the prayerful affection and support of all the churches.

Resolved, 3. That the increase of one hundred per cent. in the cost of building, together with the diminished pecuniary resources of many of our new and frontier churches, and the dismantling and destruction of many church edifices by the presence and ravages of war, combine to enhance, to a great degree, the importance of this cause, and give it a claim more powerful than ever upon the interest of Christians.

Resolved, 4. That the Assembly regret to contemplate the large number of churches under its care which as yet have failed to make any contribution to this cause, and that it earnestly asks from all a support for the coming year, which shall be proportioned to the exigencies of the present crisis.

Resolved, 5. That the Board be directed to appropriate its resources during the coming year, with the utmost liberality which is consistent with prudence, trusting to that goodness of God, and that liberality of his people, which have characterized so largely the year past.

The following is an abstract of the Report of the Board of Church Extension:

We must open our Ninth Annual Report with a record of death. On the 31st of January, 1864, Hamilton R. Gamble, Governor of Missouri, and one of the original members of the Board, entered into his rest. By his removal, the country has lost one of its wisest and purest statesmen, the church one of its brightest ornaments, and the Board one of its most liberal and judicious friends. Saddened as we are by this great calamity, we yet find abundant cause for thankfulness in the favour of God shown towards the work entrusted to us. He has increased the receipts of the Board $5622.27 over those of last year, and inclined 713, instead of 566 churches, to remember the cause of Church Extension.

Applications.—The number of applications for aid filed from April 1, 1863, to April 1, 1864, was seventy. These applications were from churches in the bounds of twenty Synods, thirty-six Presbyteries, and fifteen states and terri-

tories. These seventy churches ask for aid amounting in the aggregate to $31,054.02, averaging $442.91 each.

Besides these new applications, there were thirty-two previous applications, calling for $12,750, undisposed of April 1, 1863. The Board therefore had before it during the period covered by this Report, one hundred and two applications, calling for nearly $44,000.

During the year, seven applications, calling for $7100, were stricken from the file because they had not furnished the requisite information in the two years allowed for that purpose.

There remained on file, undisposed of, April 1, 1864, applications from forty-two churches, requesting aid to the amount of $22,210.

Appropriations.—During the year under review, appropriations amounting to $11,557.27 were made to forty-seven churches, in the bounds of seventeen Synods, thirty-one Presbyteries, and fourteen states and territories.

Cost of Church Edifices.—Since the organization of the Board, July, 1855, appropriations have been made to five hundred and seventeen different churches. Of these, seventy-one churches were aided by special appropriations, for which the Board took no responsibility. As nearly as we can ascertain, the remaining four hundred and forty-six churches cost $874,847, or $1961 each.

Receipts and Expenditures.—The balance on hand April 1, 1863, was $20,506,58. The receipts from all sources during the year were $24,847.49, of which sum $14,936.52 was from churches. The available means of the year therefore were $45,354.09.

The expenditures of the year, as shown by the Treasurer's statement in the appendix, were $12,302.81. The balance in the treasury April 1, 1864, was consequently $33,051.26. There were, however, unpaid at that time liabilities amounting to $15,552.71, leaving as the unpledged balance at the close of the fiscal year, $17,498.55.

Rev. H. I. Coe, Secretary of the Board, advocated its claims, and explained its operations, and was followed by Drs. Musgrave, Tustin, and Candee.

Board of Education.

The Committee on the Board of Education respectfully report that they have examined the Annual Report, with an abstract of the Treasurer's accounts, and the several record books of the Board and the Executive Committee, and finding in them evidences of correctness, fidelity, progress, and success, cordially recommend approval, and the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, 1. That the continued success of the operations of the Board of Education during the past year furnishes occasion for the reiteration of fervent thanksgiving to God for his approving smiles; that amidst the grievous desolations of an unprecedented civil war, which has filled our Zion and our land with sorrow, the Board of Education has been enabled to meet all the authorized demands upon their treasury, and retain a balance sufficient to enter upon the new fiscal year with an encouraging promise of efficiency.

Resolved, 2. That the General Assembly rejoice to know that progress has been made during the last year towards a higher standard of ministerial qualifications, and that so much evidence is afforded of the good which has resulted from the greater caution exhibited on the part of the Presbyteries in receiving and watching over the candidates under their care.

Resolved, 3. That the General Assembly learn with gratitude and commendation of the evidence of increasing interest manifested by the courts of our church, in the schools, academies, and colleges under their supervision, in connection with the Board; especially the growing confidence of the church in the Ashmun Institute, the only institution of our church in our country, whose sole object is the education of coloured students for the Christian ministry, and other important positions.

Resolved, 4. That whereas a large number of the African race in our country, known as the Freedmen, are in great need of both moral and intellectual culture, the General Assembly do hereby instruct the Board of Education to endeavour to supply these wants for them at all such points as are now or may in the future become accessible, and the funds which are now or may hereafter be in the department of schools may authorize,

and that the necessary and long-established rule for the organization of parochial schools be considered as no hinderance to this important and pressing work.

Resolved, 5. That although the number of candidates received during the last year is larger than it was the year previous, yet this General Assembly cannot fail to notice with deep concern the alarming disproportion existing between the increase of candidates for the gospel ministry and the increase of the membership of our churches, which fact prompts them again to urge most affectionately this vital subject upon the prayerful attention of the ministers, elders, and membership of our entire Zion.

Resolved, 6. That the General Assembly most cheerfully concur in the recommendation of the Board, and do hereby ordain that the maximum of the scholarships, for the present, be increased from $80 to $100 to academical students, and from $100 to $120 for college students, and from $120 to $150 for theological students, and that the Board be requested to make it $175, if in their judgment the funds will warrant it.

Resolved, 7. That this Assembly renew with increased earnestness the recommendation of previous General Assemblies, that the last Thursday of February may be designated as a day of special prayer for the children of the covenant, and the youth of the world—especially those gathered in our various educational institutions; and that it also be recommended to all the churches to take up collections on that occasion for the fund devoted to the aid of parochial schools, academies, and colleges.

Resolved, 8. That the securities which came under the name and control of the Board of Education by the acts of the Agent or Standing Committee of the Presbytery of Chicago, the proceeds of which are to be devoted to the cause of Education among the French-speaking Canadians of St. Anne and Kankakee in Illinois, be returned by the Trustees of the Board of Education to the Presbytery of Chicago, to be applied by them as intended by the original donors of said funds.

Dr. Chester, Secretary of the Board, made the following remarks in setting forth its plans and operations:

The courtesy of the Assembly puts restraint upon a Secretary in regard to complaints, or he would deplore the fact that

the number of candidates for the ministry has greatly diminished. That was the most discouraging fact to which the Report called the attention of the Assembly. They had also to complain of deficient means, at least in one department of the operations of the Board—that of fostering schools, academies, and colleges. The method which was relied upon—the scheme of systematic benevolence—for replenishing the Boards of the church, had measurably failed. It was a scheme which might be well adapted to the *millennium*, and to a more perfect state of the church; but as things are, and as men are, and ministers, it was not likely that the voluntary offering of the people would suffice, unless greater efforts were made to call it forth. He was perfectly satisfied that this system will not accomplish what the church and the cause need, until there is created a public sentiment that will rebuke, as derelict in duty, the minister and the church that fails to make regular collections for the several Boards of the church. Owing to the diminution of the number of candidates, the Board had not a deficiency of means for ministerial education; but in the school and college enterprise, the means were far in the rear of the calls upon the Board. There is a tendency, however, in a direction that he hoped would relieve this ground of discouragement. One of the evils of our educational appliances was that of too many small and illy sustained colleges. There now was a disposition to concentrate into one large and well-appointed institution the means and efforts of many colleges. He thought it likely that five states of the Northwest would unite in the endowment of one great collegiate institution.

In regard to the diminution in the number of candidates, the chief cause, he thought, were the public troubles. Seventeen youth from a single institution had taken their muskets and gone forth to battle, and are now numbered with the dead. In another, the whole senior class had gone to the war, and that year there were no graduates. This is the point upon which the war has struck us—not so much the lack of funds as the decrease of candidates. Something must be done, or the church will suffer for labourers. It is a divine revelation and command, "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest that he will send

forth labourers into his harvest," and that prayer should be regarded as incomplete that does not embrace this request.

Dr. Chester wished to bear testimony to the happy effects of the increased care which the Presbyteries bestowed upon the examination of candidates. The best effects had followed this increased diligence. The standard of qualification had been lifted up; if fewer candidates were received, they were better qualified, and less likely to prove failures. The injunction of the Assembly upon the Presbyteries to exercise greater vigilance and care, works well. He was aware that prejudices had arisen against the cause of this Board on account of the fact that from time to time some failures had occurred. It is true that when the enterprise was new, and the Board, and the church, and the Presbyteries inexperienced, some candidates had not turned out well; but the per centage was annually diminished, until under the care of the Board and the faithfulness of the Presbyteries, it is a rare thing for a candidate of improper character to be taken on our funds. Of one hundred and thirty recently passing through the care of the Board to the ministry, not one had been a failure.

Dr. Chester spoke of a wide and interesting field of education lately opened before the Board, in the vast numbers of freedmen that had been and were being delivered from slavery, and whom the church ought to meet with proffers of education. He thanked the General Assembly and Committee for commending them to the notice of the Board, and proposing to authorize the Board to make efforts to send teachers to them. He mentioned the case of the Ashmun Institute, Chester county, Pennsylvania, which had been established for the purpose of educating coloured men for teachers and ministers. The Board assisted in the support of the president, and gave to students in it five hundred dollars last year. The beloved Van Rensselaer had taken a lively interest in this institution, so long as he lived; and the Board desired, as they could get the means, still to cherish it. It had lately sent forth three coloured ministers, with the Hebrew Bible under one arm, and the Greek Testament under the other, to occupy three important positions of usefulness. Scores of individuals, male and female, were ready to go and teach the freedmen, if protection

and bread were furnished. He spoke in feeling and earnest terms of the condition of the coloured population, and plead for their education.

The recommendation to increase the allowance to the beneficiaries of the Board, on account of the great increase of the cost of living, was cheerfully complied with by the Assembly. The resolution respecting the instruction of freedmen gave rise to some discussion, in which Dr. Musgrave, Dr. Nevin, Mr. Logan, Mr. Dubois, and others, took part. The importance of the work, and the obligation of the church in the matter, were fully recognized; but some doubts were expressed whether it fell properly within the province of the Board of Education. On motion of Mr. Logan, sustained by Dr. McMaster, a resolution and a memorial in the hands of Dr. McMaster, on the same subject, were referred to a special committee, who subsequently reported that schools for freedmen were too great a burden to be added to the duties of the Board of Education, and recommended that special committees be appointed to take charge of this business. Agreeably, Messrs. W. P. Breed and Samuel F. Colt, ministers, and Morris Patterson, John McArthur, and Wilfred Hall, ruling elders, were appointed as such committee in Philadelphia; and Messrs. J. H. Nixon and S. C. Logan, ministers, and James M. Ray, C. W. Todd, and Jesse L. Williams, ruling elders, the committee in Indianapolis.

Board of Publication.

The first order of the day was taken up, and Dr. Backus, from the Standing Committee on the Board of Publication, presented a report. After discussion, the report was unanimously adopted, as follows:

After careful examination of the books of minutes of the Board of Publication and of its Executive Committee, and their balance-sheet exhibited to us, it is recommended that these records be approved.

The Committee with pleasure report that they discover abundant evidence of fidelity and success in the prosecution of this important work of our church. Particular attention is invited to the fact that the Board promptly and cordially conformed

to the directions of the last Assembly, and that they are enabled to say in their Report that they find themselves, "at the end of the first year after, in a condition of comfort and prosperity," hoping that "the future progress" of the Board may be marked by an experience of "generous confidence from all sides." The Board were, unfortunately, not able to effect the purpose of the Assembly in respect to the annuity for the family of whatever Secretary might die in office, the company with whom the deposit was made declining to permit the withdrawal of the funds, on the ground that it is a permanent investment.

But the hopeful view of the Report appears to be fully authorized by the facts, so far as your Committee have discovered, and the following action is recommended to the Assembly in relation to this subject.

Resolved, 1. That the growing importance of this work is recognized by the Assembly, and urged upon the churches, as a means of supplying our people, and especially our youth, in this day of prevalent pernicious literature, the facilities afforded by our Board of Publication for healthful efforts in the direction of congregational and Sabbath-school libraries, and for those forms of parish colportage now becoming more and more manifestly the essential auxiliary of our ministry in their work, are commended to our pastors and churches. That the Assembly approve of and highly appreciate the successful efforts of the Board to enlarge its list of Sabbath-school books, affording (as we believe) an invaluable supply for the church, in their excellent character and superior attractions. And that the recommendations of previous Assemblies be earnestly reiterated in regard to the circulation of the *Home and Foreign Record* in our families, and of the *Sabbath-school Visitor* in our church schools. At the same time the Assembly say to the Board, that in these respects, and preëminently in regard to reading matter for Sabbath-schools, their motto more than ever should be "Excelsior;" that here, under the Divine blessing, is the hope of our church in the efficiency of this Board for developing our peculiar resource and power as a denomination.

Resolved, 2. That the liberal outlay of the Board on behalf

of our young men in the army and in the navy, and of our sick and wounded in the hospitals, and the gratuities to our military prisoners, and to the freedmen, are warmly approved; and that the duty and privilege of a zealous coöperation in this work of love and mercy, so greatly owned and blessed of God, is urged upon all our churches. Especially is it advised, that the efforts of our people, through that noble and well-named enterprise, the Christian Commission, recognize the preëminent suitableness of our own publications for the religious purposes of the camp and the hospital.

Resolved, 3. That the Assembly direct the Synods and Presbyteries, at their next regular meeting hereafter, to take order upon these suggestions, and consider the expediency of appointing a committee to secure regular and proper coöperation from the churches with the Board.

Resolved, 4. That the Assembly approve of the temporary increase of salaries allowed by the Board in consequence of the times, and regard it as not inconsistent with the directions of the last Assembly upon the subject of remunerations. And they also recommend, for the same reason, a fair addition to the pay of our colporteurs.

Dr. Schenck addressed the Assembly on the operations of the Board, giving a very encouraging view of its history during the past year. He was followed by Mr. Hayes, Dr. Junkin, Mr. Colt, Dr. Musgrave, Dr. Beatty, Mr. C. O. Waters, Rev. Mr. De Lancey, and Rev. Mr. Cleland; and the report of the Committee was unanimously adopted.

Board of Foreign Missions.

The first order of the day was taken up, and Dr. Candee presented a report from the Standing Committee on the Board of Foreign Missions, which was adopted, and is as follows:

The Committee to whom was referred the Report of the Board of Foreign Missions, beg leave respectfully to present to the Assembly the following suggestions and resolutions:

They have examined with care both the Report of the Board and the Minutes of the Executive Committee; from the latter deriving the strong conviction of the care and caution with

which, in these times of unusual pecuniary derangement, they have managed the funds committed to their trust.

The duty of the church in the spread of truth, is not bounded by her own families or firesides, nor is it limited to her own churches and neighbourhoods. The wide world is her field; and in carrying out her plans of evangelization, her agents must traverse every land, and become inured to every clime.

The Report encourages us to go forward in the great work of furnishing to the whole world the means of salvation. It is not needful that your Committee should review, in this report, the whole field of the Board's operations, nor would time permit. But we are glad to say that in nearly all the fields occupied by our missions, there are strong encouragements to go forward.

Among these encouragements we may mention

The missions to those of the Indian tribes which the rebellion has left within our reach, among whom a great work is being done, at very small expense.

In South America, especially in Bogota, in consequence of certain governmental action, a collision has arisen between the clergy and state authorities, which has tended to turn the attention of the people toward the truth.

We may mention here, also, the encouragement which our missionaries receive from the authorities in India; and also the protection extended to them in China—a mission having been established, and a missionary actually residing in Pekin, the capital of that vast empire.

We are happy to state, also, that there has been, during the past year, an increase, both in the amount of contributions from the churches, and in the number of churches that have contributed. Of the twenty-six Synods whose churches have sent up their offerings, all but four have very considerably increased their donations. The income of the Board during the year now closed, has been larger than that of the previous year, by a large amount. This fact is encouraging, as showing the deeper hold this cause is taking upon the hearts of the people.

Thus the greatly increased expense of transmitting funds to our foreign missionaries, has been met by a corresponding

increase in the contributions to the cause. But we must not forget that probably even a greater increase of cost in this direction is to be met another year, and that no provision has been made to meet it. We would say to the churches, whose servants we are for Jesus' sake, *let* not these interests languish.

The increase in the number of native helpers, and the growth of the native churches, is an encouraging and animating feature of this work. In every field the work is progressing. There are, of necessity, loud calls for men to occupy these opening harvest-fields. Are there not in all our tens of thousands of families, and in our hundreds of thousands of purses, men and money enough to answer all these calls? The silver and the gold are the Lord's, and the cattle upon a thousand hills.

In view of these facts, the Committee recommend to the Assembly the adoption of the resolutions following, viz.

Resolved, 1. That our earnest thanks are due to the great Head of the church—1st. For the raising up of so many efficient native helpers in the foreign field. 2d. That the work is progressing in every field now occupied by the missions of our church. In this we recognize the tokens of the Divine blessing on this cause.

Resolved, 2. That our felt dependence on the Spirit of God, for carrying on this work, and giving success to our efforts, does not lessen our obligation to pray and give of our substance to this end, but rather increases our obligation thereto.

Regarding the means and agencies bearing on our work,

Resolved, 3. That the periodicals issued by the Board of Foreign Missions be commended to our church-members and Sunday-school pupils, as well adapted to stir up a spirit of prayer, and excite increased efforts for the promotion of the cause.

Resolved, 4. That as the way opens, and the fields expand, we do earnestly encourage the Board to enter in and occupy.

New missions are needed. Shall they be established? Is it inquired, Where are the means? We answer, They are in the hands of Christians, who are God's stewards. Let a proper demand be made; let this Assembly call on the churches in the

name of the Lord, and that call will be answered. The response will come to us in the spirit of that consecration in which all God's people have laid themselves and their all upon his altar.

Resolved, 5. That this Assembly say to the Board of Foreign Missions—*Go forward* in the great work to which God and this church have called you.

Resolved, 6. That, in the opinion of this General Assembly, the Presbyterian church under its care should, during the ensuing year, increase the amount of funds put under the command of the Board of Foreign Missions, for the spread of the gospel among the heathen, to not less than *three hundred thousand dollars.*

The Rev. J. C. Lowrie, D. D., Corresponding Secretary, referred to the severe bereavement which the Board had experienced during the past year, in the death of valued missionaries; to the peculiar difficulty arising from the high rate of foreign exchange; to the encouragements which, in the midst of these trials, God had given them in their labours. Messrs. Platt, Haskell, Walsh, W. Rankin, Hughes, Rodgers, Spears, Dr. Junkin, Dr. Nevin, and Robert Carter, Esq., spoke, more or less at length, words of encouragement and counsel.

Board of Domestic Missions.

The Committee to whom was referred the Annual Report of the Board of Domestic Missions, and also certain papers relating to the Board, from the Presbyteries of New Lisbon and Louisville, respectfully state: That they have examined the Report of the Board with care, and find in it matter of deep and sacred interest. It furnishes evidences of substantial progress during the year, both as it respects the resources of the Board, and the extent and efficiency of its operations. It also furnishes evidence that our people, as well as the Board, are gaining a truer and more influential conception of the vast home-work committed to the church, to attempt and to do. That work is no less than the subjection of our whole country to the evangelical truth, and to Christ.

The Committee have also given due attention to the additional papers referred to them.

That from the Presbytery of New Lisbon contemplates prompt and vigorous missionary efforts in the South, as the progress of our arms may open the way; and especially the religious care and instruction of that large and constantly increasing class, once slaves, but now freedmen. This matter seems to the Committee one of great moment, and they would commend it to the favourable consideration and action of this General Assembly.

The paper from the Presbytery of Louisville is of a different character. It complains of the Board for obtaining from the War Department certain facilities for the prosecution of its missionary work, in various portions of the country, now in military possession and under military rule; and calls upon the General Assembly "at once to disavow this action of the Board, and so save the church from the sin, reproach, and ruin which this thing is calculated to bring upon her." The Committee regard this paper as a misconception and misstatement of the real facts in the case. In their judgment, the course of the Board, in the matter referred to, was eminently proper, and indeed indispensable, if in those portions of the country they would carry forward their great and holy work.

In view then of the Report of the Board, and of the papers referred with it, the Committee recommend for adoption, by this General Assembly, the following resolutions, viz.

Resolved, 1. That the Sixty-second Annual Report of the Board of Domestic Missions be accepted and published; and that an abstract of the Report be inserted in the Appendix to the Minutes of this Assembly.

Resolved, 2. That the Assembly recognizes with devout gratitude the goodness of God, in the enlarged means placed by his people at the disposal of the Board, and also in the increased favourable results of its sacred labours during the year. Let the praise be given to His adorable name.

Resolved, 3. That in view of the greatly increased cost of living, and the consequent embarrassment and even suffering of many of our missionaries, the Board be instructed to increase its appropriations to such extent as its means will permit, in all cases of real need; and also, while exercising a just liberality towards churches truly feeble and dependent, to

consider whether there are not some now receiving aid, which have the ability, and therefore ought to be self-sustaining.

Resolved, 4. That the Assembly regards with favour the plan of the Board touching the appointment of District Missionaries, to act in connection with Synods and Presbyteries, as detailed on pages 13 and 14 of the Annual Report; but would also direct the Board, while carrying out this plan with all due vigour, to remember that it is an experiment, and to be ready for such changes or modifications of it as actual trial may show to be necessary or expedient.

Resolved, 5. That in the wonderful providence of God, spreading out before us so immense a work; in the increase of our home-born population; in the swelling tide of emigrants from the old world; in the desolations resulting from the present stupendous rebellion; and in the condition and wants of the long-oppressed children of Africa—this Assembly has a most imperative and a Divine call to redoubled zeal, labour, and sacrifice; and it hereby enjoins upon the Board, and upon the churches under its care, to put themselves, by Divine grace, in a posture of thought, feeling, and effort, corresponding to the greatness and urgency of the work.

Resolved, 6. That the Assembly commend to the careful attention of the Board, all those claims on its sympathy and its active efforts, which arise in connection with the progress and the results of this gigantic war with rebellion; and especially to coöperate, so far as practicable, with the other Boards of the church, in carrying the light, and all the various blessings of religion, to the multitudes emancipated from slavery; that so their sufferings may be alleviated, their ignorance dispelled, their character transformed, and they be fitted for the duties and privileges of American citizenship, and made heirs of the kingdom of God.

T. L. Janeway, D. D., dwelt on the extent of the field and on the difficulty of procuring suitable men. Mr. B. J. Low, of California, Judge Ryerson, Mr. Hay, Dr. Musgrave, and Mr. Fraser, of California, discussed the various points included in the Report.

Disabled Ministers' Fund.

The Rev. Dr. Beatty, Chairman of the Committee on Disabled Ministers' Fund, reported thereon, and asked the Assembly to hear their Secretary.

The Rev. Dr. J. H. Jones, the Secretary, then read the Report of the Board, which would furnish the members with more information than any speech he could make. The Report says: The first Report of the Board was made in 1856. At that time there were eight ministers, eleven widows and orphans, to about the number of sixty persons. The amount expended was $1580. When this is compared with the present, it will show the great increase in the operations and usefulness of the Board. For the year ending May 1st, 1863, the increase was nearly fourfold. There were forty-eight widows, thirty-seven ministers, and a number of orphans—amounting in all to one hundred and eighty persons who have received appropriations from the Board. The sum of $13,160 had been distributed. The contributions have never been as large as during the present year. Dr. Jones read a number of letters from persons who had received aid, thanking the Board for their timely support.

There are $8000 in the treasury. The treasurer has given his services gratuitously, and the expenses of the Secretary are paid by private contributions. The results of the last year show a cheerful advancement of the usefulness of the Board.

The following is the report of the Committee:

The Committee on the Report of the Trustees of the Assembly in relation to Disabled Ministers, have carefully considered this Report, and learn from it, with great satisfaction, that the contributors to this good cause have been increased, and that its affairs have been managed with wisdom and efficiency.

The Committee would submit the following resolutions to the consideration of the Assembly.

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

Resolved, 2. That the Assembly rejoices to learn that this

important cause is gaining a stronger hold on the churches, and that the contributions to it during the past year have been greatly increased.

Resolved, 3. That while, in the judgment of this Assembly, a fund, accruing from legacies and other sources, may in some respects be desirable, the chief dependence of this scheme of benevolence should be placed—as it is in the case of the several Boards of the Assembly—on the annual contributions made by the churches in this behalf.

Resolved, 4. That the Report be appended to the Minutes of this Assembly, and be printed by the Board of Publication; and that a copy of the same be sent to each pastor and stated supply, and the session of each vacant church, with a request that this important subject be laid before their several congregations.

Resolved, 5. That this Assembly earnestly calls upon the churches in its connection to consider their responsibility and duty to contribute to this cause; and in view of the extreme reluctance on the part of the most needy and deserving to make application for aid, urges upon the several Presbyteries the duty of searching out those within their bounds who are proper subjects of relief, and of making the requisite application to the Trustees in their behalf.

Resolved, 6. That in consideration of the urgent wants of those needing relief, and of the increased expenses of living, the Assembly recommends that the yearly appropriations to the recipients of this Fund be, if possible, largely increased.

Resolved, 7. That the Assembly acknowledges with gratitude the kindness of those friends of the cause by whose liberality a large proportion of the expenses of this important agency is provided for.

Remarks were made by Dr. Jones, the Secretary, Judge Linn, Messrs. Foster, C. Henry, Robert Carter, Osborn, and other ruling elders; Dr. Junkin, Dr. Burtis, Rev. Mr. Miller, &c. The principal point of discussion was the propriety of the establishment of a fund for this benevolent object. Judge Linn advocated with earnestness the establishment of such a fund. After a few amendments, the report of the Committee was unanimously adopted.

Parsonages.

Overture No. 2 was taken up and adopted, which is as follows:

A memorial from J. M. Wilson, of Philadelphia, Pa., in behalf of Parsonages, or comfortable homes, for Presbyterian ministers.

Whereas, the importance of providing parsonages for the comfortable accommodation of Presbyterian ministers and their families, is a duty, the performance of which cannot be much longer delayed, but the magnitude of the operation demands a careful scrutiny of the state of the church, and a thorough knowledge of her condition, therefore

Resolved, That the churches under the care of the General Assembly be requested to reply to the following questions:

1st. Please give the name of your church, with the year of its organization.

2d. What has been (about) the annual rent paid by your minister for a house to live in? or

3d. Have you a parsonage for your minister, thereby securing him a comfortable home?

4th. If you have a parsonage, how long has it been finished, and (about) what amount in rent does your minister annually save by living in the parsonage?

5th. What was the plan you adopted to awaken the interest of the people, and thus secured the means to build your parsonage? You will please let your answer to this question be as full as possible, (as these replies will be published,) and you thereby aid your brethren who have not yet erected a parsonage, but who will do so as soon as they may see how it can be done, by showing them how it has been done.

6th. Have you a glebe attached to your parsonage? If so, what is saved to a minister's family by tilling a few acres?

7th. Please give a description of your parsonage, its size, and accommodations, with specifications of its cost, as far as possible, with diagrams of the arrangement of the rooms, the attention paid to ventilation, the capacity of its library or study, together with such other suggestions as may tend to increase the value of these returns.

Resolved, That the ministers, ruling elders, deacons, trustees, or members of the churches under the care of this General Assembly, be earnestly requested to make early and full replies to these questions, adding any information or making any suggestions that may awaken an interest in behalf of parsonages, or comfortable homes for Presbyterian ministers.

Resolved, That said replies, suggestions, and information, be sent to Joseph M. Wilson, Philadelphia, Pa., to be by him arranged and classified in time to be presented to the next General Assembly of the Presbyterian church.

Resolved, That Joseph M. Wilson be authorized to supply the Stated Clerks of the Presbyteries in connection with this General Assembly, with a sufficient number of copies of this overture as there are churches within the bounds of said Presbyteries, with the understanding that the Stated Clerks will attend to their distribution among the churches.

Resolved, That in order to the fulfilment of the objects contemplated, the Presbyteries be enjoined to make inquiries from time to time, testing the diligence of the churches in replying to the questions contained in this overture.

Theological Seminaries.

Dr. Junkin then read the report of the Committee on Theological Seminaries.

The Princeton Seminary reports that since the last report, 65 new students have been received, and the whole number connected with the institution during the last year is 186, five more than last year. The Directors report improved regularity in attendance, also good attention to study, devotion and other duties, and also very satisfactory examinations—42 members of the Senior class received certificates of having finished the whole course of three years. Three others received specific certificates. Of the whole number nearly one-half are at work as pastors or ministers.

The number of volumes in the library is 19,684.

The report of the Treasurer exhibits a balance of $7,999.12.

The Trustees during the past year received from Mrs. Isabella Brown, of Baltimore, the magnificent gift of $30,000, to

erect an edifice to be called "Brown Hall," which is in process of erection.

Allegheny Seminary reports 34 students admitted within the year, the whole number on the roll 114, the number in attendance 100; 23 received diplomas, having completed the prescribed course. The report speaks in terms of high commendation of the piety, Christian earnestness, and general good deportment of the students. Two of the Senior class have offered themselves to the work of Foreign Missions.

The Board of Directors ask the General Assembly to fill the vacancy in the chair of Theology.

The Treasurer's report exhibits a balance of $1,104.74, and the Librarian acknowledges some valuable donations to the library.

The report of the Seminary of the Northwest, at Chicago, acknowledges the gift of 25 acres of land, and also of a $2000 scholarship, and of handsome gifts from others. The library numbers 7,000 volumes. The financial report shows a balance of $1,479.37.

At the Danville Seminary six new students were admitted. Whole number 14; two have received certificates, having finished the full course of the college. 120 new volumes have been added by gift from the Board of Publication.

The exhibit of its financial account shows a balance of $1,416.05.

After reading the report, the Rev. Dr. Elliott moved that nominations be made for a Professor of Theology in the Western Theological Seminary. Rev. Dr. Krebs nominated Rev. Dr. A. A. Hodge, of Wilkesbarre, and spoke in favour of his merit as a scholar and a fit person to occupy that important position. Dr. Nevin nominated Rev. Dr. John M. Lowrie, of Fort Wayne, and also spoke of his merits.

Rev. Dr. Burt nominated the Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D.D., of Philadelphia. The Rev. Dr. Candee nominated Dr. E. D. McMaster, of Indiana, and spoke of his nominee's ability as a theologian and a scholar, in every way fitted to fill this important chair in the Seminary. The Moderator requested Rev. Dr. Elliott to offer prayer for Divine guidance in the selection. Dr. McMaster's name, at the request of his brother, was with-

drawn from nomination; and subsequently Dr. Lowrie withdrew his name. When the election was made, it appeared that A. A. Hodge, D. D., had received 154 votes, and Jonathan Edwards, D. D., 29. Dr. Hodge was then declared elected, and a committee appointed to inform him of the fact.

Reunion of the Old and New-school.

A communication was received from the General Assembly now sitting in Dayton, Ohio, in regard to the action of that Assembly upon memorials from the Presbytery of St. Lawrence, on the subject of the union of the two bodies represented by these Assemblies; and is as follows:

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, in session at Dayton, Ohio, May 25, 1864.

The Committee on the Polity of the Church, to which was referred the overture of the St. Lawrence Presbytery, upon the reunion of two General Assemblies of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America, propose the following declaration, viz.

1st. That this Assembly cordially welcome all signs of increased love and union among those who hold to the same facts and doctrines of the gospel, and bears its solemn testimony, with self-humiliation, against whatever fosters alienation and genders strife among the disciples of our Lord.

2d. That the tendencies of modern society, the condition of Protestant Christianity, the increase of infidelity, the progress of Romanism, and the present and prospective state of our country, afford powerful arguments against further subdivisions, and in favour of that union and unity of the church, into which it is to grow, and which is to be its consummation; and that we record with unfeigned gratitude our profound conviction that the spirit of disunion and of sectarianism is waning, and that the spirit of brotherly kindness and mutual confidence is largely on the increase.

3d. That in an especial manner are those churches bound to foster this spirit, which adopt the same standards of faith and order, and whose divisions are local, personal, and incidental, and for whose reunion there is only needed a wise deference to each other's rights, and a higher measure of Christian charity.

Adopting the same formulas of faith and Form of Government, all that is needed is to receive them in the same spirit.

4th. That as the churches represented by this Assembly did not inaugurate the separation, so, too, they hold to no principles and views, and would impose no terms inconsistent with a full and cordial reunion, whenever and wherever the will of the Great Head of the Church, as indicated by Divine Providence, may open the way for us all to meet together again on the same basis on which of old our fathers stood; and that we should rejoice in such reunion as a pledge of the future prosperity, and an augury of the accelerated growth of the kingdom of Christ through the length and breadth of our land; and that it is our united and fervent prayer to our common Master, that he would so remove all hinderances as to make a plain path for our feet whereon we may walk together, being of one heart and mind, in the ways of the Lord.

5th. That while we do not deem it expedient now to appoint such a committee as that asked for in the memorial of the St. Lawrence Presbytery, yet, that this expression of our principles and convictions, with our heartfelt Christian salutations, be transmitted to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church now in session in Newark, New Jersey.

The report and recommendation were unanimously adopted.

A true extract.

EDWIN F. HATFIELD, *Stated Clerk.*

In our own Assembly the following action was taken.

The Committee to whom was referred an overture from the Presbytery of Miami, and certain resolutions of the Presbyteries of Ogdensburg and Buffalo City, in relation to a union of the two great branches of the Presbyterian church, submit to the Assembly the following resolutions for their consideration and adoption, viz.

Resolved, 1. That this Assembly have witnessed, with unalloyed satisfaction, the happy influence of the correspondence initiated by a former Assembly between the two bodies, in promoting fraternal and Christian affection, and thus preparing the way for a still closer union at some future day, (if such should be judged best for the promotion of the glory of God, and of the spiritual interests of the whole church.)

Resolved, 2. That in view of the pleasing results which have already been developed from the plan of correspondence now in successful operation, the Assembly do not deem it expedient at present to propose any additional measure towards the consummation of the object contemplated by the Presbyteries whose action has been submitted to their consideration.

Resolved, 3. That with a view still further to attain and strengthen that "unity of the spirit" which is so essential to organic unity, the Assembly express their concurrence with the suggestions and counsels of the Assembly of 1863, as contained in the third resolution adopted by that body, (page 39 of their *Minutes*,) and recommend them to the prayerful consideration of the parties concerned.

The Rev. Dr. D. Elliott proposed an additional resolution, referring the Assembly at Dayton, in answer to their proposal of union, to the foregoing resolutions, viz.

That while this Assembly receive in the spirit of fraternal kindness the "Declaration" transmitted to them, and thank their brethren for the courtesy thus promptly extended to them, yet, having so fully expressed their views on the same general subject in the foregoing resolutions, they deem it unnecessary to add anything further, and recommend that those resolutions, together with this minute, be transmitted by the Stated Clerk to the Moderator of the General Assembly in session at Dayton, Ohio, and reciprocate the feelings manifested.

We rejoice that this subject was left as it was. On the principles which should regulate the reunion of the two branches of the Presbyterian church in this country, there can be little diversity of opinion. All must admit that the gospel requires that the church should be one, not only in faith and love, but in fellowship and organization. If the inward unity of believers were perfect, their external union would be complete. But as the church, in this world, always has been, and probably will ever continue to be, imperfect in other respects, its normal or ideal state of union cannot be perfectly realized.

In the second place, it must also be conceded that error has been, and still is, committed, on the one hand, in requiring too

much, and on the other, of requiring too little, as the condition of Christian and ministerial fellowship.

Thirdly, the Scriptures clearly teach, that in order to Christian fellowship and church communion, nothing but agreement in essentials should be required. In other words, we are bound to receive and treat as Christians, all whom Christ receives. The conditions of Christian fellowship can be neither more nor less than the conditions of salvation. With regard to ministerial communion, the case is different. There are two aspects of this subject. First, Whom are we to recognize as ministers of Christ? and, secondly, Whom are we to admit to the office of the ministry among ourselves? All that can be said on this point on this occasion, is, that it is evident that much more should be required of those who are admitted as authorized teachers in Christ's church, than of those who are simply recognized as his disciples.

Fourthly, that in order to justify or demand the union of believers in the same organized body, there should be such agreement in doctrine, worship, and discipline, (or order,) as will admit of their acting together in harmony, and effectively.

Fifthly, that where this agreement does exist, organized union should take place, so far as geographical considerations admit of united action. The mere size, or number of the members of the church, does not seem to be a legitimate consideration in the determination of this matter.

Sixthly, as to the question of fact, whether the two branches of the Presbyterians in this country are sufficiently agreed in opinion and spirit as to order, doctrine, and worship, as to render their reunion desirable, we have no doubt that some would answer the question confidently in the affirmative, and others as confidently in the negative. We suppose that the truth is, that in some parts of the country they are thus agreed, while in others they are not. This being the case, all efforts for an immediate general union would probably produce much more evil than good.

Report against Slavery.

In the Presbyterian General Assembly, on Tuesday, the Hon. Stanley Matthews, from the Committee on Bills and

Overtures, presented the following report, founded on an overture from the Presbytery of Newton. It was read, and made the order for Wednesday evening.

The Committee on Bills and Overtures report

Overture No. 12, from the Presbytery of Newton, reciting the former deliverances of the General Assembly upon the subject of slavery in this country, and the duty of emancipation, and asking this General Assembly to take such action as in their wisdom seems proper to meet the present aspects of human bondage in our country, and recommend the adoption of the following:

In the opinion of the General Assembly, the solemn and momentous circumstances of our times, the state of our country, and the condition of our church, demand a plain declaration of its sentiments upon the question of slavery, in view of its present aspects in this country.

From the earliest period of our church the General Assembly delivered unequivocal testimonies upon this subject, which it will be profitable now to reaffirm.

In the year 1787, the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, in view of movements then on foot looking to the abolition of slavery, and highly approving of them, declared that "inasmuch as men introduced from a servile state to a participation of all the privileges of civil society, without a proper education, and without previous habits of industry, may be, in many respects, dangerous to the community, therefore they earnestly recommend to all the members belonging to their communion to give these persons who are at present held in servitude, such good education as to prepare them for the better enjoyment of freedom." * * * "And, finally, they recommend it to all their people to use the most prudent measures consistent with the interest and the state of civil society in the countries where they live, to procure eventually the final abolition of slavery in America."

In 1795, the General Assembly "assured all the churches under their care, that they view with the deepest concern any vestiges of slavery which may exist in our country."

In 1815 the following record was made: "The General Assembly have repeatedly declared their cordial approbation

of those principles of civil liberty which appear to be recognized by the federal and state governments in these United States. They have expressed their regret that the slavery of the Africans and of their descendants still continues in so many places, and even among those within the pale of the church, and have urged the Presbyteries under their care to adopt such measures as will secure, at least to the rising generation of slaves within the bounds of the church, a religious education, that they may be prepared for the exercise and enjoyment of liberty, when God in his providence may open a door for their emancipation."

The action of the General Assembly upon the subject of slavery, in the year 1818, is unequivocal, and so well known that it need not be recited at length. The following extracts, however, we regard as applicable to our present circumstances, and proper now to be reiterated:

"We consider the voluntary enslaving of one portion of the human race by another as a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature, as utterly inconsistent with the law of God, which requires us to love our neighbour as ourselves, and as totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the gospel of Christ, which enjoins 'that all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.' Slavery creates a paradox in the moral system. It exhibits rational, moral, and accountable beings in such circumstances as scarcely to leave them the power of moral action. It exhibits them as dependent on the will of others, whether they shall receive religious instruction; whether they shall know and worship the true God; whether they shall enjoy the ordinances of the gospel; whether they shall perform the duties and cherish the endearments of husbands and wives, parents and children, neighbours and friends; whether they shall preserve their chastity and purity, or regard the dictates of justice and humanity. Such are some of the consequences of slavery—consequences not imaginary, but which connect themselves with its very existence." * * *

"From this view of the consequences resulting from the practice, into which Christian people have most inconsistently fallen, of enslaving a portion of their brethren of mankind, . .

. . it is manifestly the duty of all Christians, who enjoy the light of the present day, when the inconsistency of slavery, both with the dictates of humanity and of religion, has been demonstrated, and is generally seen and acknowledged, to use their honest, earnest, and unwearied endeavours to correct the errors of former times, and as speedily as possible to efface this blot on our holy religion, and to obtain the complete abolition of slavery throughout Christendom, and if possible, throughout the world."

They earnestly exhorted those portions of the church where the evil of slavery had been entailed upon them, "to continue, and, if possible, to increase their exertions to effect a total abolition of slavery, and to suffer no greater delay to take place in this most interesting concern than a regard to public welfare truly and indispensably demands;" and declare "that our country ought to be governed in this matter by no other consideration than an honest and impartial regard to the happiness of the injured party, uninfluenced by the expense or inconvenience which such a regard may involve;" warning "all who belong to our denomination of Christians against unduly extending this plea of necessity; against making it a cover for the love and practice of slavery, or a pretence for not using efforts that are lawful and practicable to extinguish this evil."

Such were the early and unequivocal instructions of our church. It is not necessary too minutely to inquire how faithful and obedient to these lessons and warnings those to whom they were addressed have been. It ought to be acknowledged that we have all much to confess and lament as to our shortcomings in this respect. Whether a strict and careful application of this advice would have rescued the country from the evil of its condition, and the dangers which have since threatened it, is known to the Omniscient alone. Whilst we do not believe that the present judgments of our Heavenly Father, and Almighty and Righteous Governor, have been inflicted solely in punishment for our continuance in this sin; yet it is our judgment that the recent events of our history, and the present condition of our church and country, furnish manifest tokens that *the time has at length come, in the providence of God, when it is His will that every vestige of human slavery among us*

should be effaced, and that every Christian man should address himself with industry and earnestness to his appropriate part in the performance of this great duty.

Whatever excuses for its postponement may heretofore have existed, no longer avail. When the country was at peace within itself, and the church was unbroken, many consciences were perplexed in the presence of this great evil, for the want of an adequate remedy. Slavery was so formidably intrenched behind the ramparts of personal interests and prejudices, that to attack it with a view to its speedy overthrow appeared to be attacking the very existence of the social order itself, and was characterized as the inevitable introduction of an anarchy, worse in its consequences than the evil for which it seemed to be the only cure. But the folly and weakness of men have been the illustrations of God's wisdom and power. Under the influence of the most incomprehensible infatuation of wickedness, those who were most deeply interested in the perpetuation of slavery *have taken away every motive for its further toleration.* The spirit of American slavery, not content with its defences to be found in the laws of the States, the provisions of the Federal Constitution, the prejudices in favour of existing institutions, and the fear of change, has taken arms against law, organized a bloody rebellion against the national authority, made formidable war upon the Federal Union, and in order to found an empire upon the corner-stone of slavery, threatens not only our existence as a people, but the annihilation of the principles of free Christian government; and thus has rendered the continuance of negro slavery incompatible with the preservation of our own liberty and independence.

In the struggle of the nation for existence against this powerful and wicked treason, the highest executive authorities have proclaimed the abolition of slavery within most of the rebel states, and decreed its extinction by military force. They have enlisted those formerly held as slaves to be soldiers in the national armies. They have taken measures to organize the labour of the freedmen, and instituted measures for their support and government in their new condition. It is the President's declared policy not to consent to the reorganization of civil government within the seceded states upon any other

basis than that of emancipation. In the loyal states where slavery has not been abolished, measures of emancipation, in different stages of progress, have been set on foot, and are near their consummation; and propositions for an amendment to the Federal Constitution, prohibiting slavery in all the states and territories, are now pending in the national Congress. So that, in our present situation, the interests of peace and of social order are identified with the success of the cause of emancipation. The difficulties which formerly seemed insurmountable, in the providence of God, appear now to be almost removed. The most formidable remaining obstacle, we think, will be found to be the unwillingness of the human heart to see and accept the truth against the prejudices of habit and of interest; and to act towards those who have heretofore been degraded as slaves, with the charity of Christian principle in the necessary efforts to improve and elevate them.

In view, therefore, of its former testimonies upon the subject, the General Assembly does hereby devoutly express its gratitude to Almighty God for having overruled the wickedness and calamities of the rebellion, so as to work out the deliverance of our country from the evil and guilt of slavery; its earnest desire for the extirpation of slavery, as the root of bitterness from which has sprung rebellion, war, and bloodshed, and the long list of horrors that follow in their train: its earnest trust that the thorough removal of this prolific source of evil and harm will be speedily followed by the blessings of our Heavenly Father, the return of peace, union and fraternity, and abounding prosperity to the whole land; and recommend to all in our communion to labour honestly, earnestly, and unweariedly in their respective spheres for this glorious consummation, to which human justice, Christian love, national peace and prosperity, every earthly and every religious interest, combine to pledge them.

Judge Matthews argued to show that the time had come, when the Assembly was called upon to pronounce clearly its judgment on slavery and its relation to the war in which the country is involved. He said that the objection that this was a political question, was no valid ground against the action of the church. The same question was often moral as well as

political. It was only in its moral aspects that the church presumed to utter her judgment in relation to it. In answer to the objection, that the adoption of the paper would commit the Assembly to the approbation of the President's proclamations, and other acts of the government, about which good and loyal men differed, he said this was not a fair construction of the paper. It gave simply a narrative of the facts, which did not imply approbation of them. The adoption of this paper does not involve an expression of opinion on the part of the Assembly. "It does not bind the opinion of the church-member—it does not bind his conscience." This is very true, and very important. But the Judge further said, that every man is "bound to presume that the laws and the measures of the government are right, and binding." "They may be otherwise," he adds, "but the private citizen is not the judge." This is very loosely stated, and would justify the whole doctrine of passive submission to the authorities of the church and state, against which Puritans and Presbyterians have ever, and ever will contend, to the death. The private citizen *is* the judge as to what binds his conscience; and he renounces his allegiance to God, and his right to the name of Christian, whenever he renounces this right of private judgment. If the government should make a law that we should blaspheme Christ, or turn Papists, would that bind our conscience? Must the private citizen presume and assume that such a law is right, and binding? This was doubtless only a *lapsus* on the part of the worthy Judge; but the principle is too important to be allowed to pass without a protest.

This paper was further sustained, at length, by Judge Ryerson, Dr. Nevin, and other leading members of the Assembly. Drs. Rice, Maclean, and Junkin, succeeded in obtaining certain modifications in the language used, which secured an almost unanimous vote in favour of its adoption. The best spirit was manifested, as we are informed, not only by Judge Matthews, but by all the more immediate friends of the measure; and every concession was freely made, in order to meet reasonable objections.

Dr. Rice delivered a very effective speech in the course of the debate on this subject, of which we have seen only a very

meagre outline. The first thing which will impress the public mind, in this action of the Assembly, is the remarkable unanimity with which this important manifesto was adopted. The Assembly is a representative body; not only technically, in that it is composed of delegates freely chosen by the Presbyteries in every part of the country, but because it really reveals and expresses the opinions and feelings of our whole church. There cannot be a doubt that the sentiments of this paper are the sentiments of the Presbyterian church in these United States. And as that church does not now, and never has, belonged to any one political party—as its members represent all the prevalent phases of public opinion, on every subject of general interest—we think it may safely be assumed, that the report unanimously adopted by the Assembly expresses the opinions and feelings of the vast majority of the people in the Northern, Western, and Middle States. In this view of the matter, we regard the adoption of such a paper a matter of great public importance. It is the revelation of a spirit of loyalty, and of devotion to the great cause for which the nation is now contending as for its life. In this view, it is matter for gratitude and encouragement.

In the second place, although the spirit of this paper may be new; although its animus, so to speak, may be more distinctly pronounced than that of previous declarations on the same subject, its sentiments are not new. It teaches nothing which the General Assembly has not heretofore openly avowed and distinctly taught. It asserts indeed slavery to be "an evil and guilt," a moral wrong, which ought to be abated and abandoned. But this was the language of our fathers in the church and in the state. It was the form of expression constantly used by the founders of our national Constitution, and by the early and venerated members of every body of Christians in the country. By slavery, however, they meant that concrete system with which the people of this country are familiar; a system which is designed and adapted to keep a certain class of our fellowmen in a state of degradation in order to retain them in the condition of slaves. It is the system which declares, with the force of law, that a slave cannot marry; which forbids his

being taught to read and write; which allows of the forcible separation of husbands and wives, (that is, of those who in the sight of God are husbands and wives, although the law denies them to be such); which separates parents and their minor children; and which denies to the slave a just compensation for his labour. With regard to this system it is undeniable—1. That it has prevailed in our country. 2. That it is known and designated as slavery, or the slave system. 3. That it is essentially and inherently unjust and wicked. 4. That these slave laws ought to be at once and universally abrogated. 5. That those who enacted, and those who sustained those laws must have contracted great guilt in so doing. 6. That such guilt rests, in a measure, on all who acquiesced in the system thus established, or who failed to protest against it, and to use all lawful efforts to secure its abolition.

It is only by taking the word slavery in this sense, that the former and present deliverances of our church on this subject can be reconciled either with truth or with the word of God. It is however greatly to be lamented that the word was ever used in this wide sense. 1. Because it is not the proper meaning of the term. Slavery is nothing more nor less than involuntary bondage—that state in which one man is bound without his own consent to labour for another. 2. Because what is true of slavery in the wide and improper sense of the word, is not true of it in its true and proper meaning. There is the same impropriety in confounding slavery with any particular system of slave laws, as there is in confounding despotism in the state with the despotic laws and acts of a Nero, Peter the Great, or Louis XIV. To say that despotism is in itself and under all circumstances sinful, because certain despotisms have been cruel and oppressive, would be absurd. The family government is of necessity a despotism. The possession and exercise of despotic power is therefore a thing right or wrong according to circumstances. 3. Confusion, error, and contradiction inevitably result from using the same word in such diverse senses. It is not true that slavery, in the sense of involuntary bondage, is morally and universally wrong. It is not true that it should be always, everywhere, and immediately abolished. It is not true that all slaveholding is sinful, or that slaveholders as such

should be denounced as wicked men and excluded from the fellowship of the Christian church.

Two enormous evils have long afflicted our church and country in connection with this subject. On the one hand, because all slaveholding is not sinful, a large class of men have maintained that the slave-laws, or that concrete system of slavery which has existed at the South, is not sinful. They have been thus led to defend that system; and to insist on its continuance and extension; and have denounced all those who condemned it as "infidel abolitionists." On the other hand, because the existing form of slavery in this country, (or the slave-laws of the South,) is unjust and antichristian, another large class of men have declared all slavery, or involuntary bondage, to be sinful; they have denounced all slaveholders as wicked men, and demanded universal and immediate abolition of slavery in all its forms as an imperative duty. These are "the abolitionists," technically so called. Their doctrine, as palpably in opposition to the teachings of the Scriptures, both in the Old and New Testament, cannot be maintained in consistency with due subjection to the authority of God's word. The fact is undeniable, that slaveholders were received into communion with the Christian church, and that the apostles did not enjoin the immediate manumission of all slaves as a Christian duty. For any man therefore to assume the ground that slaveholders should not be received into the church, or that all slavery is sinful, is to place himself above the Bible. It matters not from what motive this is done. It is as much the expression of an unbelieving spirit as the rejection of the doctrine of the incarnation, because we cannot understand it; or the denial of the doctrine of endless future punishment of the finally impenitent, because we cannot reconcile it with infinite benevolence. We are Christians, and as Christians we must submit our faith and practice to the supreme authority of the word of God. It is specially important in times of great public excitement, that good men should be upon their guard, and not allow themselves to adopt principles or to use expressions which bring them in conflict with the holy Scriptures, the only infallible standard of moral and religious truth. While, therefore, we can adopt the language of this

paper in the sense in which we doubt not it was intended to be used, and in which similar language has been before used by our General Assembly, we must protest against the assumption that in so doing we adopt the doctrine of the abolitionists, technically so called, viz., that all slaveholding is sinful, or that immediate emancipation is everywhere and always a Christian duty. Those only are entitled to freedom who are able to use it to their own advantage, and with safety to others. Paul tells us that a child, so long as he is a minor, (νήπιος,) differs in nothing from a slave, (δοῦλος.) It is morally right that he should be restricted in the use of his liberty, so long as he is unfit to use it aright. So it may be morally right to restrict a class or tribe of men who are in the condition of children intellectually and morally, in the use of their liberty, so long as they continue in that state. But as it would be atrociously unjust to keep a child in the imbecile condition of an infant, in order that others might enjoy his labour or his property, so it is equally unjust to prevent any class of men from elevating themselves into the condition in which they can be safely made free. One of the saddest proofs of the injustice of Southern laws, is, that after more than a century, the vast body of the slaves of the extreme Southern states are in a condition of the greatest degradation. That this is not to be attributed to their inferiority as a race, but to the systematic effort to prevent their improvement, is clear, because it is only the "field hands" who are thus degraded. Household servants, and those living in cities, where they have the opportunity of learning mechanic arts, are as much improved, as intelligent and moral, as any other class of men of no higher advantages. This, however, is not the time to enter anew on questions which have been repeatedly discussed in this journal. We wish, however, to have it distinctly understood, that we have not changed our ground on the subject of slavery. We hold now precisely what we held in 1836, when the subject was first argued in these pages. What is far more important, it should be known that the Old-school Presbyterian church has not changed her doctrinal teaching by the recent action of the General Assembly. God and truth are immutable; and a church vacillates in doctrine only when deserted by God. The General Assem-

bly has not declared all slaveholding to be sinful; it has not contradicted, retracted, or modified its formal and explicit teachings of 1845; it simply declares that slavery, as it exists in this country, (that is, the slave-laws of the Southern states,) is an unjust and antichristian institution. This it has ever taught, and this is self-evidently true.

Thirdly, the Assembly clearly pronounces in favour of the entire abolition of slavery within the limits of the states and territories of this Union. Is this a declaration in favour of abolitionism? Does this justify the assertion that the Assembly has joined hands with the abolitionists? Nothing is more important, and nothing is more necessary to truth and righteousness than the use of words according to their established meaning. Usage, not etymology, determines that meaning. The signification of a word is one thing, its meaning another thing. The word Jacobin *signifies* a member or frequenter of the convent of St. James. It *means* a man who adopts the principles and sentiments of the atheistical and anarchical faction so denominated during the French revolution. The word Jesuit *signifies* "a follower of Jesus." It *means*, either a member of the society founded by Ignatius Loyola, or one who adopts the principles and practices of that society. An abolitionist, according to the signification of the word, is one who is in favour of the abolition of slavery. In this sense nine-tenths of the good men on the face of the earth are abolitionists. In this sense the late Dr. Thornwell was an abolitionist. It is not many years since he said to us that slavery was a low state of civilization, and must of necessity come to an end. But for the last thirty years there has been a party, of which Garrison, Wendell Philips, and others, are the acknowledged representatives, who call themselves, and are called by others, abolitionists. So that by abolitionist is now meant one who belongs to that party. The meaning of words thus fixed by usage cannot be arbitrarily altered. It would be obviously untrue and slanderous to call a Christian, law-abiding man, a Jacobin, because he lived in a convent of St. James; or to call him a Jesuit, because he professed to be a follower of Jesus. It is no less untrue and slanderous to call a man an abolitionist, in the sense in which modern and American usage has attached to

that word, simply because he favours the abolition of slavery. We deny, therefore, that our venerable Assembly has enacted abolitionism, because it has unanimously declared that, in their judgment, the time has come when every vestige of slavery should be effaced from this country. The reason assigned for this declaration is not the characteristic and essential idea of abolition, viz., that all slavery is sinful, and therefore should be immediately abolished; but the conviction that the continuance of the system of slavery among us is "incompatible with the preservation of our own liberty and independence," as a nation. This reason we hold to be valid and sufficient.

We fully believe that the leaders of the present rebellion, years ago, determined on the overthrow of the Constitution, and the erection of a southern confederacy, in order to perpetuate and extend the system of African slavery as it now exists; that for this purpose they not only systematically misrepresented the opinions and purposes of northern men, in order to prejudice and inflame the southern mind; but that they made extensive military preparations, by fraudulently amassing public arms in southern arsenals; and by leaving the national forts in the slave states without adequate protection. We believe that without any just, or even plausible provocation, and against the advice and warning of the wisest and best of the slaveholders themselves, they threw off their allegiance to the United States government and to the Constitution which they had sworn to support, seized the public forts and arsenals, fired on the flag of their country, and inaugurated a civil war, which has already cost hundreds of thousands of lives and many thousands of millions of money. During the three years which this war has continued, the President and Congress have repeatedly and authoritatively proclaimed that if those in revolt against the Constitution and Union would lay down their arms, return to their allegiance, and submit to the laws of the land, the war should cease, and the states be restored with the right to determine their own institutions, each for itself within its own limits. These overtures have been contemptuously rejected, and the war has been carried on, and, in many cases, with savage barbarity. The issue has thus been fairly presented. Either our national life or slavery must be extinguished. This issue

our General Assembly has met, by declaring unanimously that the time has come when slavery should be at once and for ever abolished in the states and territories of this Union. In this declaration our understanding, heart, and conscience, fully concur.

Although thus in favour of the abolition of slavery, we do not wish to see it abolished by servile insurrections, by violence, or by the arbitrary exercise of power, but by the alteration of the Constitution, legally effected.

Fourthly, the only other remark which we feel called upon to make in reference to this subject, is that the declaration of the Assembly is patriotic and not partisan. It takes sides with neither of the great parties into which the country is divided. It would be a sad thing for the Church of England, or for the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to declare itself either Whig or Tory; but a very just and proper thing for either of those bodies to declare in favour of the constitution of Great Britain, and to denounce all measures designed for its overthrow. So it would be a sad thing for our General Assembly to declare itself either Democratic or Republican, or to take sides with any particular party. It has done no such thing. It has taken part with the country. The paper which it adopted can be received as cordially by an opponent, as by a supporter of the present administration. It is only upon the assumption that patriotism is not a moral virtue, that the patriotic declarations of the Assembly can be condemned as unbecoming a religious body. If the law of God requires us to love and honour our parents, on whom we are dependent and by whom we are protected, it requires us to love our country, on which we are still more dependent, and whose protection we enjoy from the cradle to the grave. And therefore, if a church court can enjoin its people to honour their parents, it may enjoin them to love and stand up for their country.

Complaint of the Rev. Dr. McPheeters.

The papers in the case were read, viz., a memorial from certain members of the Pine Street Church, St. Louis; the action of the Presbytery upon that memorial. The complaint of W. W. Green and others; the complaint of Samuel B.

McPheeters, D.D., against the Presbytery of St. Louis, in relation to himself and the Pine Street Church. This complaint embodied a certain military order of Major-General Rosecrans, requiring a particular oath to be taken by members of ecclesiastical bodies, before being permitted to sit and deliberate, with other correspondence bearing upon the same subject.

This case was in form perfectly simple. It was merely a complaint against the Presbytery of St. Louis, for prohibiting Dr. McPheeters from preaching in the Pine Street Church. It would seem therefore to present only two possible questions. First: Had the Presbytery the right to pass the act complained of? And was the act itself wise and just? But although thus simple in form, it was, in reality, one of the most comprehensive cases in facts and principles, and one of the most important in its bearings that ever claimed the attention of the General Assembly.

It appears from the several papers submitted to the Assembly, and from the arguments before that body, that the Rev. Dr. McPheeters, pastor of the Pine Street Church, St. Louis, was, at the breaking out of the war, residing in New Mexico on account of his health. Hearing of the outbreak of hostilities, he determined to return home; and knowing that the people of Missouri and those of his own charge were likely to be greatly excited and divided on the momentous question at issue, he addressed to his church and congregation a pastoral letter, in which he exhorted them to mutual forbearance and kind feeling, and announced his own purpose, while he faithfully performed all his duties as a citizen, to abstain from taking any part in the controversies and conflicts by which the whole country was distracted. On his arrival in St. Louis, he resumed his pastoral functions, and the church continued in a quiet and prosperous state until the spring of 1862. In May of that year, Dr. McPheeters attended, as a delegate from his Presbytery, the General Assembly which met in Columbus, Ohio. While there, he spoke and voted against the adoption of a paper on the state of the country, presented by the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, D.D., on the ground that it was inconsistent with the nature of the church and the proper functions of its judicatories to express any judgment on political questions

and that such expression would tend to increase the distractions under which many of our churches were suffering. His course in this matter seems to have given offence to some of his own people, and to have increased the misgivings which more or less prevailed as to his loyalty to the Government and Union. One of his elders, George H. Strong, Esq., and one or two others, addressed to him a letter requesting him to express clearly his opinions and feelings in relation to the great struggle in which the country is engaged. This he refused to do, not only because he denied their right to interrogate him as to his political opinions, but specially, because he had always opposed "the introduction of civil, secular, and political questions into the house of God. As a pastor," he said, "and because I was a pastor, I have stood aloof from these things, even in my private relations." The unpleasant feeling awakened by these circumstances continued to increase, and on December 19th, 1862, by a military order issued by Major-General Curtis, he was banished from the state, forbidden to exercise any ministerial functions within its borders, and the church with all its records given over to a commission. This act was promptly disavowed and corrected by the authorities at Washington, but, from some misunderstanding, it remained in force, except so far as the sentence of banishment was concerned, from December 19, 1862, to March 4, 1863. A *pro re nata* meeting of the Presbytery of St. Louis, called at the request of three ministers (two of whom had no pastoral charge,) and four elders, was held on the 15th of May, 1863, "to take measures to remove the grievances under which the Pine Street Church has been labouring for some months past, and to dissolve the pastoral relation between that church and Samuel B. McPheeters, D. D., and in general to take such action as the interests of that church may seem to require." When the Presbytery met, Dr. McPheeters placed his resignation of his pastoral charge into its hands. Whereupon the Pine Street Church and congregation were cited to appear on June 3d, by their commissioners, "to respond to the resignation of their pastor," and to this end they were directed to meet on the 27th of May, to take action in the premises. The congregation met agree-

ably to this direction, and by a vote of ninety-one to fifty-six adopted the following resolution, viz.,

"*Resolved*, That this meeting do not agree to, and protest against, the dissolution of the existing relation with the Rev. Dr. Samuel B. McPheeters, as pastor of Pine Street Church, and that we request him to withdraw his resignation offered to St. Louis Presbytery."

After this resolution, a majority of the meeting left the house, and near midnight Mr. George P. Strong, the leader of the minority, was appointed the commissioner to represent the church in Presbytery, and instructed to urge the dissolution of the pastoral relation. The Presbytery met on the 3d of June, and on some technical difficulty, adjourned to meet on the 23d of that month. On the 22d, the Pine Street Church met on the call of the session, and on motion of the Hon. W. T. Wood, ruling elder, the following preamble and resolution were adopted by a large majority:

"*Whereas*, at a meeting on the 27th of May, 1863, at a late hour of the night, after a vote had been taken in full meeting of ninety-one (91) to fifty-six (56) against the resignation of Dr. S. B. McPheeters, pastor of the church, and against the dissolution of the pastoral relation, and after a majority of the members had left, and gone home; as it appears by the proceedings of the persons who remained, it was resolved, that this meeting now appoint a commissioner to represent this church in Presbytery, and that he be instructed to urge Presbytery to accept Dr. McPheeters's resignation, and to dissolve the pastoral relation between him and Pine Street Church; and whereas, the resolution was offered and passed, without even a motion to reconsider the vote that had been taken and entered on the subject, in violation of all rule and order, and against the known voice of the church and congregation; therefore,

"*Resolved*, That said resolution does not express the voice and wishes of Pine Street Church and congregation; and further, *resolved*, that the true voice of the church and congregation was expressed in the resolution adopted at that meeting on motion of Captain Greene; and unless George P. Strong, as the Commissioner from this congregation, can, and will, in

good faith present and urge upon Presbytery the voice and wishes of the congregation, as expressed in the resolution adopted on the motion of Captain Greene, on a fair vote of 91 to 56, he be requested to resign his trust as Commissioner."

The Presbytery met, Mr. Strong was received as the Commissioner of the congregation, and strenuously urged the dissolution of the pastoral relation between Dr. McPheeters and his church. "After Mr. Strong had concluded, it was moved that *the request of the Pine Street Church be granted*, and the pastoral relation dissolved." Pending the motion, the Rev. J. H. Brookes presented a paper from Dr. McPheeters, in which "he asked leave to withdraw his resignation." This paper was returned to him without being put on the minutes. The motion to dissolve the pastoral relation recurring, it was put to vote and carried, *ayes* eleven, *noes* ten. This motion was carried by the votes of eight ministers and three elders, "out of about sixty in a full Presbytery." The absence of Dr. McPheeters, and of many other ministers, was owing to conscientious scruples. General Rosecrans had issued a general order requiring a stringent oath of allegiance to be taken by all members of any ecclesiastical body. The objection was not to the oath, for they, or many of them (and Dr. McPheeters among the number) had voluntarily taken oaths equally stringent. But they believed that it was incompatible with their allegiance to Christ, as King of his church, to recognise the right of any civil or military authority to prescribe the terms on which they should attend the meetings of courts of his appointment. In this belief some of the members of the Assembly, as, for example, the venerable and zealously loyal President Maclean of Princeton College, concurred. When the vote dissolving the pastoral relation between Dr. McPheeters and the Pine Street Church was adopted, Mr. W. W. Green, the elder from that church in attendance on the Presbytery, and a member of that body, entered an appeal from the decision to the Synod of Missouri. The Synod received the appeal, declared it in order, and entered it upon their docket for trial.

During all this time, it had, on all hands, been assumed that the military order of December 19th, 1862, forbidding Dr.

McPheeters to exercise any ministerial function in the state of Missouri, was still in force. This turned out to be a mistake. The President of the United States had revoked or annulled the order from the beginning, and intended so to do, although his intention seems to have been misapprehended by his subordinates at St. Louis. At last, however, this misapprehension was corrected, and all legal or military disabilities were removed from the Doctor, as appears from the following extract of a letter addressed to him by Mr. Bates, the Attorney-General at Washington.

"The President, in substance answered, that it was always his wish and purpose to hold individuals responsible for their own acts, without any reference to the fact that they happened to be members or officers of particular churches; that the fact of being a member or pastor of a church was no excuse for personal misdemeanour; but that he never intended to assume, or to permit his subordinate officers to assume, any power to govern or control the churches; or in any manner to determine who may, or who may not preach or minister in them. You say that you are in full function of your civil rights; the President considers you in the full enjoyment of your ecclesiastical rights. I write this with the express permission of the President; and I presume to advise, that you quietly resume the exercise of all the rights, duties, and functions of your office, as if no interruption had occurred."

All pretence being thus removed, that Dr. McPheeters was not sufficiently loyal to preach the gospel, even in the disturbed state of Missouri; as the Pine Street Church was without preaching, as six out of seven elders composing the session and the great majority of the people desired him to preach there; as he was invited to do so by the committee of supplies; as he considered the act of Presbytery dissolving his pastoral relation to that church suspended by the appeal of its elder, Mr. W. W. Green; and as, whether that act was suspended or not, he had the right of every other minister in good standing, to preach wherever, in the providence of God, he might be called to do so, he complied with the invitation of his former people, and commenced preaching in the pulpit of the Pine Street Church. At the meeting of the Presbytery, April 6th, 1864,

"which was attended by only eighteen out of about sixty ministers and ruling elders, because of the military order touching ecclesiastical assemblies," a memorial was presented, signed by nine members of the Pine Street Church, asking "that such action may be taken in the premises as to compel Dr McPheeters to respect the decision of Presbytery, and retire from Pine Street Church, and that such other relief may be afforded, as to your body may seem meet and proper." Mr. George P. Strong, being present, was invited to address the Presbytery on the subject, after which the following minute was adopted.

"1. By action of Presbytery of June, 1863, the pastoral relation between Dr. McPheeters and Pine Street Church was dissolved, and Dr. McPheeters ceased to be the pastor of that church, and ceased to have the right to exercise discipline or perform the functions of the pastoral office in that church.

"2. *That, inasmuch as this action was taken by Presbytery, in the exercise of its power to ordain whatever pertains to the spiritual welfare of the churches under their care*, and is its solemn judgment that the interests of Pine Street Church require that Dr. McPheeters shall cease to exercise the functions of ministry to that church; therefore, resolved," that Dr. McPheeters be required to cease preaching in the Pine Street Church,* of this act Dr. McPheeters complained to the General Assembly.

One of the great difficulties of this case, and one of the great sources of the injustice, as we regard it, which Dr. McPheeters has experienced at the hands, both of the military authorities and of the ecclesiastical courts, is the confusion of mind prevailing on this subject of loyalty. The word has two very distinct meanings, which men commonly fail to distinguish, and yet the distinction is essential to the administration of justice, and to the intelligent and proper decision of what is due to our fellow-citizens and to our ministerial and Christian brethren. Loyalty is properly fidelity to law. A man is loyal who complies with every legal obligation resting upon him; who recognizes the constitutional authority of the magistrates, who obeys their

* The precise words of this last resolution are not given in the document before us. But it appears from the complaint of the whole discussion, that the substance was as above stated.

lawful commands; who pays his taxes, and who, not only abstains from giving aid or comfort to the enemies of his country, but is ready at all times to defend and support it. In this sense of the word, Dr. McPheeters is, and was, thoroughly loyal, his opponents being witnesses. He had taken a stringent oath to do all that a loyal citizen could be required to do. No man pretended that he had violated that oath. But in another sense of the word, loyalty is a feeling. It is love and zeal for a person, for a cause, or a country. A man may, therefore, be loyal in one sense and disloyal in another. He may faithfully perform all legal duties to his sovereign or to country without love and zeal for either. It is perfectly apparent that, so far as all courts, military, civil, or ecclesiastical are concerned, they can take cognizance only of what is outward—of the acts and of the words of men. They cannot hold him responsible for his feelings. The grand difficulty in Dr. McPheeters's case was, that the military authorities and the church court undertook to punish him for his feelings. No one charged him with disloyal acts. General Curtis, when he wished to test his loyalty, did not ask him what he did, but, how he felt. The absurdity and injustice of such a course, President Lincoln, with his usual sagacity, detected in a moment, and ordered his subordinates, in substance, to let the man alone; so long as he acted properly, it was no concern of theirs how he felt. There are hundreds, and we doubt not thousands, of men in the rebel army doing the work of good soldiers, who, if you asked them about their feelings, would say, they hated the whole affair, disapproved of the war, and heartily desired the restoration of the Union. It would surely be preposterous for the rebel authorities to summon these men before a court martial, dismiss them from the army, and banish them from the country because they did not feel right.

While we say this, we can easily see and readily admit that a man who is strictly loyal, in the proper and legal sense of the word, and who did nothing that any court, military or ecclesiastical, could properly take hold of, might simply on the ground of what he did not do, be so unacceptable to a zealously loyal people, as to justify a Presbytery for separating him from his charge. But then the ground of such action must be not his

disloyalty, but the dissatisfaction of the people. The people might be dissatisfied with a pastor because he was a dull preacher, or a disagreeable man. These are not grounds for Presbyterial action. A minister cannot be tried for poor preaching, or for not being agreeable. But he may be dismissed because the people dislike him and desire his removal. We do not know how Dr. McPheeters feels, or what are his sympathies in our national controveries, but we do know—1. That he is free from all charge or suspicion of disloyal conduct in word or deed. 2. That the highest national authorities declared that there was no reason, so far as they were concerned, why he should be interfered with, either in his rights as a citizen or in the exercise of his ministerial functions. 3. That he so conducted himself as to secure, not only the respect and affection of the whole community, but the full confidence of the great body of his people, embracing, as is certified by the majority of the ministers and elders of his Presbytery, many of the most devoted Union men of St. Louis. Under these circumstances, we expected fully that his complaint would be sustained and his rights vindicated. In this, we were disappointed. The great majority of the Assembly took a different view of the matter, although his cause was advocated by many of the wisest, ablest, and best men of the House. Arguments of great clearness and power in support of the complaints were made by Hon. Judge Wood, Rev. Drs. Rice, Maclean, W. L. Breckinridge, and Craven, by Judge Ryerson, H. Murray Gradon, Esq., Rev. Messrs. Samuel Miller, Thomas Cleland, and others. When the roll was called, the vote stood 46 to sustain, 2 to sustain in part, and 117 not to sustain. The views of the majority are summed up in the minute reported by a committee, consisting of Drs. Beatty, Musgrave, Elliott, Tustin, Craven, and Judge Linn, and adopted by the House, which is as follows:

"The Assembly does not sustain the complainants, because the proceedings of the Presbytery of St. Louis in this case appear constitutional and regular, and, so far as we can perceive, were judicious, equitable, and for the edification of the church.

"These complaints, both in their language and the necessity

of the case, brought the whole proceedings under our review. The question of a dissolution of the pastoral relation between Dr. McPheeters and the Pine Street Church was originally brought in an orderly manner before the Presbytery, by petition from a minority of said church, and a personal tender of resignation by the pastor; and after all the constitutional steps were taken with care and deliberation, was decided by the Presbytery, acting for the peace and welfare of that church. That which was called an appeal and complaint to Synod against that action could not so suspend all further proceedings as to prevent the Presbytery from considering and acting upon the continued disturbed state of that congregation; and when, at a subsequent stated meeting of that body, this subject came before them, they did, almost unanimously, deem it unadvisable that the late pastor should continue ministerial labours in that congregation. Against this decision of the Presbytery, Dr. McPheeters and others have uttered these complaints, which we do not sustain.

"The Assembly has patiently listened to the history of this case from the opposite points of view taken, but in their decision have strictly confined themselves to the facts on record. The resignation of the pastoral relation, and the distracted state of the church, seemed plainly to call for the action of the Presbytery; and being upon the ground, and conversant with all the circumstances and demands of the case, they seem most competent to understand and decide what that action should be. The question of the pastor's loyalty to his national government, which seemed to be so largely a disturbing element in the church, has not been properly before the Assembly, as it was not pronounced upon in any Presbyterial action. They judged it best for the peace and prosperity of that particular church that the late pastor should retire altogether, and cease from his public ministrations to them; and this Assembly cannot decide otherwise. And though many of the members of the Presbytery were absent from that meeting which so decided, this could not invalidate their proceedings, as it was a regular and lawful meeting of that body.

"The right and duty of the Presbytery 'to order whatever pertains to the spiritual welfare of the churches under their

care,' and especially to heal dissensions, by seeking to remove the occasions of them, is a distinctive and important feature in our Presbyterian polity. And when the pastor himself so far recognized the propriety of his withdrawal as to tender to the Presbytery his resignation, it was clearly competent for that body not only to grant his request, but to order, if necessary, that he cease his ministrations to that people, if they believed that by longer continuing to serve them the dissensions would be fomented, the strife become embittered, and the spiritual interests of the church endangered. And when the Presbytery did, at length, so interfere and direct, without pronouncing upon the rumours and side issues which were the occasions of the strife and unhappy condition of the church, they simply undertook to control the relations of pastor and people for the welfare of the church, without impeaching, by any expression, the moral character and ministerial standing of that pastor. They only ordered, as a prudential measure, that the resignation which he had himself voluntarily tendered to them, should properly and entirely be carried out, by his ceasing in any way to keep up this unhappy state of things, and by ceasing to minister to them as their pastor."

We do not dissent from any of the principles stated in the above minute, but as we are so unfortunate as to differ from the Assembly as to the justice and wisdom of their decision, we claim the privilege of presenting in few words the view which we have been constrained to take of this important case. Before doing this, there are some preliminary points which demand consideration.

We think Dr. McPheeters committed some very grave mistakes, which were the source of all his difficulties. In the first place, he adopted the new, exaggerated doctrine as to the spirituality of the church and the limited range of her prerogative as a teacher. He says he had always resisted the introduction of what he calls "politics" into the house of God, and on this ground opposed all deliverances on the part of church courts touching the present rebellion, and the introduction into the services of the sanctuary of anything which implied a decided opinion as to the controversy which now rends the

country. In the year 1859, Dr. Thornwell opposed the recommendation of the Colonization Society, on the principle above stated. In private, if not in public, he took the ground that the division of the country was a certain event. He, however, wished to prevent the division of the church as consequent on the disruption of our national Union. To secure that end, he said, it was necessary to adopt the principle that the only duty of the church as a teacher, was to preach the gospel, to labour for the salvation of men. He said in his public speech that if the Government chose to re-open the slave-trade, the church would have no right to open her lips against it. This new doctrine excited great attention and feeling. When the Assembly met in 1860, the subject was again brought up, and caused for a time great anxiety. A resolution was prepared and presented by the Committee on Bills and Overtures, affirming the directly opposite doctrine, and asserting that the church as God's witness on earth is authorized and bound to reprove all sin and to support all truth and righteousness. This resolution was adopted by a unanimous vote of the Assembly.

There is indeed a sense of the words in which the church has nothing to do with politics. She has no right to pronounce judgment on purely secular matters, or upon such questions which ordinarily divide men into political parties. But politics, in the wide sense of the word, include the science of government, the policy of states, and the duties of citizens. The plain principle which determines the legitimate sphere of the action of the church, is, that it is limited to teaching and enforcing moral and religious truth; and to such truths as revealed and determined by the sacred Scriptures. The Bible gives us no rule for deciding the litigated questions about public improvements, a national bank, or a protective tariff, or state-rights. But it does give us rules for pronouncing about slave-laws, the slave-trade, obedience to magistrates, treason, rebellion, and revolution. To shut her mouth on these questions, is to make her unfaithful to her high vocation. The authors of this new theory soon repudiated it; and while those who agreed with them at the North were protesting against church courts saying a word against the rebellion, the pulpits, conventions, synods, and assemblies at the South, were resounding with

exciting appeals to inflame the spirit of rebellion.* We think that a great part of Dr. McPheeters's difficulties have arisen from his adopting a principle which prevented him from uniting with his brethren in church courts in condemning the rebellion.

A second error, as it seems to us, into which he fell, relates to the independence of the church. His zeal for the authority of Christ and for his rights as the King of the church, led him to regard certain military orders as entrenching on Christ's prerogatives. He does not appear to have joined in the clamour against arbitrary arrests, or to deny the authority of the Government in times of rebellion and invasion, to suspend the writ of habeas corpus, or to proclaim martial law where necessity calls for it. On all these points his views appear to be just and reasonable. But his conscience would not allow him to recognize the right of the military authorities to interfere with his ministerial duties, or to prescribe any condition for attendance on church courts. On this principle he and his friends declined to attend certain meetings of the Presbytery, because General Rosecrans had issued a general order requiring all the members of any religious convention to take an oath of allegiance to the Government. It was not the oath he objected to, for he had voluntarily taken a similar oath before. But it was the making that oath a condition of membership in a church court. This he said was inconsistent with the independence of the church. Had it not been for scruples of this kind, preventing a full attendance of the members of Presbytery, the

* The Rev. Dr. Rice, in his speech on the floor of the Assembly, seemed to intimate that Dr. Hodge in the Assembly of 1861, and Dr. R. J. Breckinridge in the Synod of Kentucky, had placed themselves on the same ground as to the prerogative of the church, as that occupied by Dr. McPheeters. This is a great mistake. Dr. Hodge in his review of the Assembly of 1859, argued strenuously against the new doctrine. In the Assembly of 1860, being a member of the Committee on Bills and Overtures, he drafted the resolution condemning that doctrine, which resolution was adopted unanimously. In the Assembly of 1861, he stated publicly that his objection to Dr. Spring's resolution was not founded on the assumption that the church had nothing "to do with politics," and that if those resolutions were presented to the Synod of New Jersey, he would cordially support them. And accordingly he has repeatedly voted for similar resolutions in Presbytery and Synod. The real grounds of his objection to the Spring resolution were stated in the protest in which he joined with other members of the Assembly of 1861.

pastoral relation between Dr. McPheeters and his church would not have been dissolved in June, 1863, nor he forbidden to preach in the pulpit of that church in April, 1864; and this complaint would never have troubled the Assembly or the church. To us it seems that these unfortunate scruples are founded in error. There was no just ground of complaint against General Rosecrans's order. There was nothing therein inconsistent with the independence of the church or true allegiance to Christ. Suppose the small-pox had been prevalent in that region, and the authorities of the city had issued an order that no one should attend any public meeting, ecclesiastical or secular, who did not produce evidence that he had been vaccinated. Would this be an interference with the liberty of the church? Not at all—because the object sought, (viz., the public health), was a lawful object; and because the thing demanded (vaccination), was something the authorities had a right to demand. So in General Rosecrans's order, the object sought, the public safety, was a legitimate object; and the thing demanded, allegiance to the Government, was admitted to be obligatory. In our view, therefore, the order in question presented no lawful or reasonable objection to a free attendance on the Presbytery.

A third and still more serious error committed by Dr. McPheeters, was his adoption of the principle of neutrality. He avowed his purpose in his letter to his people, written before his return from New Mexico, to have nothing to do with the great conflict in which the nation was engaged. When called upon, in writing, by one of his elders and certain other persons, to say on which side were his own personal sympathies, he refused on principle to answer. And again, when General Curtis requested him to say whether he *wished* the rebellion to be suppressed, he declined to give the desired information. He constantly declared that "as a pastor, and because he was a pastor," he felt bound to be neutral, to abstain from all expression of his feelings or wishes in regard to our national difficulties. This was a very serious mistake, and arose from the same false theory to which the errors before mentioned are to be referred. There are occasions in which neutrality is improper and impracticable; occasions on which our Lord's

declaration, "He that is not for me, is against me," has its full application. And there are occasions on which neutrality is more offensive and irritating than open hostility, as our Lord in another place says, "I would thou wert either cold or hot." Such occasions are these—1. In which great questions of right and wrong are concerned. 2. In which great interests are involved, and 3. Those in which strong and right feelings are implicated. Our present national conflict involves all these elements. The attempt to destroy this Union, and to overthrow the Constitution for the purpose of establishing a great slave empire, is a stupendous wrong. In such a cause no man can be neutral. He might as well be neutral between God and Mammon, Christ and Belial. That such is the object of the present rebellion, the great body of the Northern people fully believe. It has been avowed over and over by the Southern leaders. The Richmond papers not long since told the slaveholders that as the war was made for them, they were bound to bear its burden. But whether on this point Northern sentiment and conviction be correct or incorrect, the fact that it is the conviction of the people makes neutrality in the matter an impossibility. In the second place, vital interests, personal and national, for this and for future generations, for America and for the world, are confessedly involved in the issue of this great struggle. And thirdly, it calls forth our strongest and best affections. The love of country is a virtue. We are bound to seek its honour and its welfare. It is our common parent, and we are under the strongest obligations to live, labour, and suffer, in its behalf. We cannot be neutral in a conflict which involves our national existence.

It is no wonder that Dr. McPheeters, adopting, as he did for his guidance, the three false principles above mentioned, should have trouble. In such times as the present, these false principles would bring a saint to grief; and it is due to Dr. McPheeters's uncommon excellence as a minister and as a man, and to the remarkable amiability of his temper and loveliness of character, that his troubles did not come sooner. It is a question of conscience how we ought to act towards those who do not sympathize with us in our national struggle, or who try to maintain a neutral ground. In answer to this important ques-

tion it may be remarked—1. That it is undeniable that good men do differ in their sympathies on this subject. We must take human nature as it is. A good, and even pious, mother may be blinded to the character of a wicked son; she may take his side in her heart even when he is wrong. A man, therefore, either from the adoption of wrong theories, or from having been born at the South, or from the associations of friendship and kindred, may be led into the great moral error, as we regard it, of taking sides in his feelings and wishes with the Southern revolutionists, and yet be a good man. We are not, therefore, to withdraw our confidence in such men as Christians, because they do not think and feel as we do in these times of trial. 2. If such a man is in a private station, and abstains from any thing in word or deed, that is hostile to the government, or designed to aid the rebellion, he is entitled to remain unmolested in the enjoyment of all his rights, civil and ecclesiastical. 3. If he occupies any public position which renders the avowal of his feelings and wishes unavoidable or necessary, he has a right to make such avowal, as is freely done by so many of our public men on the floor of Congress. 4. If such a man, however, be a pastor, his situation is peculiarly difficult. He is the organ of the people in presenting their prayers and thanksgiving to God. They have the right to have their hearts' desires for their country brought before his throne. If the pastor's principles or feelings prevent his doing this; if he cannot pray for the success of our arms, and for the suppression of the rebellion; if he cannot heartily thank God for the victories he may grant our armies, he cannot satisfy the just demands of the people. The want of agreement or congeniality may be such as to demand a separation. If those who are dissatisfied be the minority, they should withdraw; if the majority, the pastor should withdraw. What, in such a case, should be done, is a question fairly within the province of the Presbytery to decide. These principles appear to us plain and reasonable. How far they apply to the case of Dr. McPheeters will be seen from what follows.

In relation to his case, we have to remark, in the first place, that, in our judgment, the whole course of the Assembly was singularly unfair. The Presbytery of St. Louis had three

courses open to them when the memorial was presented to them in June, 1863. They might have proceeded judicially to try Dr. McPheeters on the charges included in that memorial, if they were such as admitted of a judicial investigation; or they might dissolve the pastoral relation between him and this church at his request, or on application of the people; or they might decree that dissolution on the ground that the interests of the congregation required it. They declined to adopt the first of these courses, and took the second, in June 1863, and the third, in April, 1864. Now, as the Presbytery did not give the case a judicial character, it was not competent for the Assembly to do so; and yet this is what they virtually did. In the first place, they admitted Mr. Strong to appear before them as "one of the original parties." But, if he were one party, Dr. McPheeters must have been the other—one the accuser, the other the accused—and then there must have been charges, testimony, and judicial decision. But in fact there was nothing of the kind. We agree, therefore, with Dr. Rice, who pronounced the admission of Mr. Strong as a party, and allowing him all the privileges without any of the responsibilities of an accuser, was something unheard of in the history of our church. In the second place, Mr. Strong, in his able seven-hour speech, acted not only as accuser but as witness. The greater part of his speech was of the nature of testimony, a statement of fact designed to prove that Dr. McPheeters is disloyal. Here was testimony not before the lower court, not on record, given without the sanction of an oath, without the opportunity of cross-examination or contradiction. When Dr. McPheeters denied one of the statements of a member of the Presbytery, he was told by the Moderator, that he had not then the right to deny anything. He had a right to deny every assertion which he believed to be unfounded, but he had no opportunity to rebut all this testimony thus irregularly adduced. H. Murray Graydon, Esq., had good reason for saying, "Accustomed as he had been to the pleadings of civil courts, where nothing was admitted that might affect the decision, except sworn testimony or official records, he was amazed, as he listened, to hear all the forms of law disregarded, and persons admitted here to make long and rambling statements of fact,

and of rumour and hearsay,—all of which, it is evident, are looked upon as testimony, and have produced their effect upon the minds of the judges of this court of Christ. . . . Why, Sir, if professional counsel should attempt, in a civil court, to argue before Judge Linn as parties have done here, he would silence them, he would turn them out of court; and he was surprised to hear the judge and others seem to vindicate and justify the strange irregularities of this case." It was this irregular testimony, we doubt not, that decided the judgment of the house. The form which the matter evidently took was—Here is a disloyal minister and a loyal Presbytery, whose side will you take? There could, of course, be but one answer to that question. In allowing the case to take that form, we think the Assembly did Dr. McPheeters great injustice.

In the second place, it may be said however, admitting the mode of procedure to be liable to objection, substantial justice was, after all, done by the vote of the Assembly. To this we cannot agree. We think grave injustice was done, not only to Dr. McPheeters, but to the whole Presbyterian church; and that the sanction of the Assembly has been given to principles and acts deserving universal reprobation.

The complaint of Dr. McPheeters and of his session, is technically against the action of the Presbytery in April, 1864, forbidding him to preach in the Pine Street Church. But that act cannot be separated from the act of the Presbytery in June, 1863. The two are related as effect and cause; and the Presbytery assign their action in June, 1863, as the ground of their action in April, 1864. The two were united in the judgment of the Assembly. We do not dissent from that judgment, 1. On the ground, taken by some distinguished members of the house, that the Presbytery was not a free body; that the military order then in force put its members under duress, and therefore its acts are invalid. We have already said that we cannot agree with that view of the matter. We believe the members who absented themselves on account of that order, acted under a mistaken view of duty; and consequently that the integrity or validity of the Presbytery was not thereby impaired. 2. Nor do we agree with Judge Ryerson, Mr. Graydon and others, that the Presbytery were bound, if they acted

at all, to proceed judicially on the charges presented in the memorial of Mr. Strong and others. Judge Ryerson and others voted to sustain the complaint, because Dr. McPheeters had been virtually silenced without a trial. The dissolution of the relation, however, between a pastor and his church, or the forbidding a minister to preach in a particular church, is not an act of discipline. It involves no censure. It leaves the minister perfectly *rectus in ecclesia.* The Presbytery could legally do all they did without a trial. They were not bound to take up the vague charges against Dr. McPheeters's loyalty, which, it is probable, they saw to be mere complaints that he did not feel properly, presenting no grounds for a judicial investigation.

3. Nor do we place our objection on the assumption that Mr. Green's appeal from the decision of the Presbytery, dissolving the pastoral relation, was valid; or that it suspended the operation of that decision, leaving Dr. McPheeters in the possession of all his rights as pastor. This is one of the grounds taken by Dr. McPheeters himself. He argued that he had a right to preach in the Pine Street Church, because Mr. Green's appeal, being valid, he was still its pastor. Mr. Strong made it one of the main points of his argument, that Dr. McPheeters had no right to preach in that church, because that appeal being invalid, he was no longer its pastor. We cannot see that this argument has any force on either side. Dr. McPheeters's right to preach in the Pine Street Church did not depend on the validity of Mr. Green's appeal. He preached there because he was regularly invited to do so. He had the right to preach in any church in the land. It was not because he was the pastor of the church, but because he was a minister in good standing, free from all disabilities, military, or ecclesiastical, that he accepted the invitation to occupy that pulpit.

4. Nor do we think the ground taken by the Rev. Samuel Miller valid. He says, the question is, "Were the Presbytery right in prohibiting a minister of the gospel, in good standing, and a member of their body, from preaching in a certain church? 1. Had they the power? 2. Was it expedient to exercise it?" The former of these questions, he answers in the negative. The Presbytery, he says, had no right to prohibit Dr. McPheeters from preaching, (of course he means in that

church,) without trying him. But why not? If, as he properly admits, they had the power for cause to dissolve the pastoral relation without the request or consent of either pastor or people, why should they not have the power to prohibit his preaching? If they could do the greater, they could do the less. The principle is the same in both cases. If the Presbytery believe that the interests of religion demand that a pastor leave his church, they may decree the separation. If they believe that a minister's preaching in a particular church would distract, and divide it, or be otherwise hurtful, they may prohibit such preaching. For the exercise of these discretionary powers, they are responsible to the higher courts. But the power clearly belongs to every Presbytery.

The reasons why we should have voted to sustain the complaint of Dr. McPheeters, are—1. That he is a good man and a faithful minister of Christ. Had he been a factious, ill-tempered, contentious man, our sympathies would not be so much enlisted on his behalf. But it is acknowledged that he is a remarkably amiable, faithful, spiritual, and devoted man and minister. It is a duty and privilege to stand by and support such a man, as far as a good conscience will permit. This is specially incumbent when such a man is persecuted and unjustly abused. That Dr. McPheeters has been the object of persecution and ill-usage is undeniable. The military order by which he was banished from the state, forbidden to preach within its borders, and the charge of his church taken from its trustees and session, was an unjust and tyrannical proceeding. We say this, not because we deny the right of summary arrest and of martial law. We admit the right. We are surprised that the exercise of that right has been so sparingly made. But it is not a matter of surprise, that, while in many cases its exercise has been just and useful, in others it has been uncalled for and impolitic; and in others, grossly unjust and oppressive. That it was unjust in the case of Dr. McPheeters is plain. 1. Because the order itself gives no adequate and even plausible reasons for this extreme exercise of power. Dr. McPheeters was one the best men in St. Louis; he had by word or deed broken no law of the land; he had failed in no social or civil duty; he had taken and kept a stringent oath of

allegiance to the provisional government of Missouri and to the Government of the United States. There are hundreds and thousands, and, we fear, hundreds of thousands of men in the land more deserving of arrest and banishment than he. 2. We are authorized to speak of this order as we have done, because the authorities at Washington immediately annulled it. Either General Curtis was wrong in issuing it, or Mr. Lincoln was wrong in annulling it. We only agree with the President and the Attorney-General in condemning the order in question. Notwithstanding the action of the national authorities, however, this oppressive mandate remained in force against Dr. McPheeters, except as to banishment from the state, for a whole year. It weighed him down. It declared him to be so disloyal that it was not safe to allow him to preach, and this in a community so excited that Governor Gamble, General Curtis, and President Lincoln himself were denounced as traitors. Dr. McPheeters submitted to all this quietly. He made no opposition or complaint. Such a man is entitled to the sympathy and support of all good men.

3. But the consideration just mentioned, although in our judgment of no slight importance, justifies only sympathy and support so far as higher obligations permit. We are not authorized to justify even a good and persecuted man in doing wrong, or to condemn those who censure his wrong-doing. We should have sustained the complaint of Dr. McPheeters, because we regard the acts of which he complains as deserving of universal condemnation. The committee of the Assembly who framed the judgment adopted by the House, say that they refused to sustain the complaints against the Presbytery of St. Louis: 1. Because the dissolution of the pastoral relation between Dr. McPheeters and his church, and forbidding him to preach in that pulpit, were acts of the Presbytery in the regular exercise of its authority; and 2. Because the members of that Presbytery, being on the ground, were the best judges of what the spiritual interests of the Pine Street Church required. Were these facts true, we should have nothing to say. Had we been a member of the Assembly, we should have been very slow to put up our private opinion against that of the Presbytery on a matter concerning which they were the best judges.

But we deny, that in the true and proper sense of the words, the Presbytery of St. Louis did separate Dr. MePheeters from his church, or did forbid him to preach. On the contrary, they condemned both these acts and protested against them. And yet the General Assembly, in opposition to their protest and to their better judgment, sanction and endorse the action which the Presbytery condemn. The Presbytery of St. Louis is a permanent body, consisting of over sixty members. Who separated Dr. MePheeters from his church? eight ministers and three elders. Are they the Presbytery? In a technical, legal, constitutional sense, they are entitled to be so regarded; but in a fair, honourable, moral, and righteous sense, they are not. Suppose a Presbytery should be called to meet, and by a storm, railroad accident, or other providential event, only three out of sixty members should come together. Suppose those three should perform an act, (depose a minister or divide a church), which they knew to be contrary to the judgment and wishes of the absent members; and suppose further, that those absentees, nineteen-twentieths of the body, should memorialize the Assembly, stating that they condemn the act of the technical Presbytery, and protested against it; and suppose the Assembly should refuse to hear that memorial, and should sanction the act because it was the act of the Presbytery, and because the Presbytery was the best judge. We do not hesitate to say that every honest man on earth would condemn such a judgment. The Assembly might say they thought the three right, and the fifty-seven wrong; but to say they sustained the three because they were the Presbytery, (that is the sixty), and because they, being on the ground, they were the best judges, is something hardly conceivable. And yet it is into such a judgment as this, our good, wise, and we add with all sincerity, venerated Assembly, have allowed themselves to be bewildered and cajoled. They rest their decision on the wishes and judgment of the Presbytery of St. Louis. One-fifth of that Presbytery wish one thing, four-fifths another. Why should one-fifth be preferred to the four-fifths, simply because they voted? They were not wiser, better, more fully informed, or more impartial. It is to sacrifice substance to form, justice to technicality; to take the act

of the small minority of a body against which the majority protest, as the act of the body itself.

3. This fraction of the Presbytery came together June 3d, "to dissolve the pastoral relation between the Pine Street Church and the Rev. Samuel B. McPheeters, D. D.," without being requested to do so, either by the pastor or the church, and against the known wishes and judgment of the great majority of the Presbytery. They knew the majority would not attend. It matters not whether that absence arose from an epidemic, from stress of weather, from the disturbed state of the country, or from conscientious scruples. The minority knew the majority would not be there; and they announced their purpose to do, what they could not do, had their brethren, who had equal rights with themselves, been able to attend. As Dr. McPheeters placed his resignation into their hands, their mode of proceeding was changed. Instead of dissolving the pastoral relation of their own motion, they proceeded to cite the church to appear by their commissioners to signify their wishes in the case. The pastoral relation involves a contract to which there are two parties, pastor and people. Neither can dissolve it at his, or their, option. There must be a mutual agreement, unless the Presbytery see cause to act contrary to the wishes of either or of both the parties. The church met, and by a large majority protested against the resignation of their pastor being accepted. When near midnight, a great part of the meeting having withdrawn, Mr. Strong, the only elder who favoured the dissolution of the pastoral relation between Dr. McPheeters and his church, was, by the minority that remained, appointed commissioner to the Presbytery. When this was known, the church again met, at the call of the session, and protested against Mr. Strong's acting as the representative of the church, unless he would in good faith carry out their wishes and oppose the separation between them and their pastor. The Presbytery met. Mr. Strong was recognized as the commissioner representing the church; was heard at length in favour of the dissolution; and the Presbytery resolved, that "at the request of the Pine Street Church,"* the connection between it and

* This statement was made on the floor of the Assembly, and is contained in the memorial addressed to the Assembly by the majority of the Presbytery.

Dr. McPheeters as its pastor should be dissolved. Nothing need be said in reference to this record. If it is not condemned by the instinctive moral sense of every honest man, there is no help for it. Mr. Strong was legally, to be sure, the commissioner of the church; in justice, morality, and honour, he was not. It was in violation of all moral right that he was so received and recognized. This action of the Presbytery was one of the grounds of Dr. McPheeters's complaint, and this action the Assembly is made to endorse.

4. We have already admitted that a man may be legally loyal, one who so discharges all his obligations to his country, that no court, civil, military, or ecclesiastical, can have just ground of action against him, and, nevertheless, may be so hostile in feeling as to render him an unsuitable and even an intolerable pastor of a loyal congregation. With regard to Dr. McPheeters, however, the undeniable facts are these— 1. He was a man universally respected and beloved. 2. He had taken, and faithfully kept, a stringent oath of allegiance to the Government. 3. The highest authorities in the land, the President and Attorney-General, pronounced themselves so satisfied with his loyalty that they forbade his being interfered with on the part of the authorities, either as a citizen or as a minister. 4. Whatever were his private feelings, he so conducted himself, and so performed his ministerial duties, as to retain the affection and confidence of the community, of six out of seven of the elders of his church, of the vast majority of its members and attendants; and of four-fifths of the members of his Presbytery. That such a man should be dismissed from his church and forbidden to preach in its pulpit, by a mere fragment of the Presbytery to which he belongs, who knew him and all the circumstances of the case, seems to us an injustice which has few, if any, parallels in the history of our church.

It seems, however, incredible that any body of men should say that the church requested, what they knew it not only did not request, but formally protested against. If any correction of this statement, as a clerical error, was made before the Assembly, it has escaped our notice. If the record be correct, it is a millstone about the neck of that technical Presbytery.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Works of Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, &c. Collected and edited by James Spedding, M. A., Robert Leslie Ellis, M. A., Douglas Denon Heath, Barrister at Law. Vol. X. Being translations of the Philosophical Works. Vol. III. Boston: Taggart & Thompson. 1864.

This is the concluding volume of fifteen, which constitute this edition of the works of one of the most illustrious writers England has ever produced. The advantages of this edition are: 1. That it is conducted under the supervision of competent and scholarly men. 2. It is comprehensive. 3. It is in a most convenient form. 4. It is published in the finest style, as to paper, printing, &c. 5. It is cheap, not only in view of the present cost of material and labour, but also relatively to the price of the English edition.

Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, from the German of G. V. Lechler, D. D., and R. Gerok. Edited by J. B. Lange, D. D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Bonn. Translated by the Rev. Paton J. Gloag. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. Dublin: John Robertson & Co. 1864.

This is another of the numerous and valuable volumes of Clark's Foreign Theological Library, of which such frequent mention has been made in these pages. This Commentary on Acts is part of Lange's Bibel-Werk, or popular commentary on the Bible, which has for some years been in the process of publication in Germany, and which has attained a very high reputation. Professor Philip Schaff has undertaken the translation of the whole work, aided by numerous literary associates in this country. This elegant edition of the part relating to the Acts, (including the first twelve chapters,) will of course be specially acceptable to those who have other parts of the Foreign Theological Library.

The Life of the Lord Jesus Christ: Being a complete critical examination of the Origin, Contents, and Connection of the Gospels. Translated from the German of J. P. Lange, D. D. In six Volumes. Vols. I. II. III. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, and the same publishers in London and Dublin as the work above noticed.

The Life of Christ by Lange, is the most complete and thorough work which the infidel book of Strauss has called forth. To those who have not access to German books, this,

and other books of this series, are of inestimable value. They open to the theological student a new field, and supply ministers with materials of thought and knowledge which they cannot elsewhere obtain.

Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. By C. F. Keil, D. D., and F. Delitzsch, D. D., Professors of Theology. Translated from the German by the Rev. James Martin, B. A. Vol. I. The Pentateuch. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. London: Hamilton & Adams. Dublin: John Robertson & Co. 1864.

Keil and Delitzsch are already extensively known in this country as among the most distinguished modern German theologians of the evangelical school. This work will be a great storehouse of useful matter for students of the Bible. The present volume includes Genesis and a few chapters of Exodus.

The Golden Censer: Thoughts on the Lord's Prayer. By John S. Hart, LL. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 144.

The late highly gifted and lamented missionary, Lœwenthal, when a student in the Theological Seminary in Princeton, delivered in the Oratory, a discourse on the word "Our," in the preface to the Lord's Prayer. It filled all who heard him with surprise and delight. Surprise, that one word could contain so much, and delight, that the truths involved in that one word were so precious. Numerous works have been written on this wondrous compend of petitions. The volume before us, as might be expected from the ability and elegant culture of its author, is replete with excellent thoughts felicitously expressed.

Memorial of the Rev. John N. Campbell, D.D. Late Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in the city of Albany. Compiled by a Member of the Congregation, and published by order of the Trustees. Albany: 1864. Pp. 70.

Dr. Campbell was a remarkable man. With a physical constitution unusually delicate and refined, he had an extraordinary firmness of will and force of character. The writer of this notice was a companion of his early childhood in Philadelphia. He had then the appearance of a delicate little girl. As he grew to manhood, the general impression was that he would be effeminate and feeble through life. He soon, however, put an end to such forebodings. He showed himself to be a man of marked ability, of indomitable perseverance, of unflinching courage, of extraordinary efficiency. Very few of our ministers have accomplished more, or attained to greater influence in the sphere in which he moved. This affectionate tribute to his memory on the part of his people contains a brief memoir of his life; the excellent address by the Rev. Dr. Sprague, delivered

at the funeral of his friend, and numerous notices and testimonials of respect gathered from the public journals.

The Blennerhassett Papers; embodying the private journal of Haram Blennerhassett, and the correspondence, hitherto unpublished, of Burr, Tyler, Devereaux, Dayton, Adair, Emmet, Theodosia Burr Alston, &c., &c., developing the aim of the attempted Wilkinson and Burr Revolution, &c. &c. By William H. Safford. Cincinnati: Moore, Wilstach, and Baldwin, 26 West Fourth St. 1864. 8vo., pp. 665.

This fine large volume (received as our last sheets are going to the press), relates to one of the most interesting and least understood portions of our national history. Consisting of authentic documents, most of them hitherto inaccessible to the public, it must command general attention among all students of history, and those fond of romantic adventures.

The Book of Common Prayer, &c., as amended by the Westminster Divines in Royal Commission, 1661, and in agreement with the Directory for Public Worship of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. Philadelphia: William S. and Alfred Martien, No. 606 Chestnut Street. 1864. Pp. 637. To which is added, *Liturgia Expurgata; or the Prayer-Book amended according to the Presbyterian Revision of* 1661, and historically and critically reviewed. By Charles W. Shields, D. D. Philadelphia: Wm. S. and Alfred Martien.

As this volume has come into our hands at the last hour, we have not had time even to note its contents. The public has been aware that Dr. Shields has been long devoting his attention to the history of the liturgical services of the Reformed churches. Many among us have so associated Episcopacy and Liturgies, that the two can hardly be separated. This arises from very limited historical knowledge. Most of the non-episcopal churches of the Reformation, the Scotch among the number, used liturgies more or less extended, and most Protestant churches on the continent of Europe do so to the present day. The labours of Dr. Shields will, we trust, awaken interest in this subject, and direct attention to a most important part of public worship.

The Charge and Inaugural Address delivered on the occasion of the Induction of the Rev. W. G. T. Shedd, D. D., as Professor of Biblical Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, January 11, 1864. Published by request of the Board of Directors. New York: Charles Scribner. 1864.

The charge delivered on this interesting occasion was by the Rev. William Adams, D. D. This is a sufficient guarantee of its character. It displays in a high degree the learning, culture, taste and piety, which have won for its author so honourable a rank among our metropolitan pastors. The following is a true index of its spirit and tone:

"When we have emphasized the pre-requisite of a sound

judgment, familiarly known as common sense, in distinction from all mystic and mythical methods, let us remember that there is a spiritual discernment which is more than erudition, and which God has promised even unto babes. The true interpretation of Scripture must be that which the Author of Scripture puts upon his own words, and which he communicates to him who seeks it with filial prayer. This 'quick understanding' is a temper, rather than a faculty. It is like *antennæ* to the mind, a sensitive power by which it feels its way easily and promptly through passages manifold and labyrinthine, when pride and self-confidence grope and stumble." P. 16.

Dr. Shedd's address is also quite worthy of himself and the occasion. He treats of the influence of biblical exegesis upon the theologian and the preacher. He shows with his wonted depth and richness of thought, and in his classic, vigorous, clean-cut style, that the thorough Exegesis of the Scriptures tends to impart to the mind of the expositor, whether preacher or theologian, the truest originality and authority, those great sources of convictive and persuasive power.

Letters to a Theological Student. By Leverett Griggs, Pastor of the Congregational Church, Bristol, Connecticut. Published by the American Tract Society, 28 Cornhill, Boston.

These letters, by an earnest, judicious, and successful pastor, to his son in Lane Theological Seminary, are brief, plain, pithy, and every way to the purpose. They can be read in one hour. It would be difficult for a theological student to spend an hour more profitably than in reading them.

Annual of Scientific Discovery; or, Year-Book of Facts in Science and Art, for 1864. Exhibiting the most important discoveries and improvements in Mechanics, Useful Arts, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology, Zoölogy, Botany, Mineralogy, Meteorology, Geography, Antiquities, etc., together with notes on the Progress of Science during the year 1863. A list of recent Scientific Publications, Obituaries of Eminent Scientific Men, etc. Edited by David A. Wells, A. M., M. D., author of Principles of Natural Philosophy, Principles of Chemistry, First Principles of Geology, etc. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1864.

It is difficult to give a better account of this valuable work than is furnished by the above title-page. The value of such a book, if well executed, must be obvious. Scientific men can hardly afford to do without it. To all educated and inquiring persons, it is a thesaurus of information to which they need access, and which they cannot easily find elsewhere. So far as we have been able to examine, the volume is made up with great labour, care, and judgment. Its materials are very abun-

dant, from the highest sources, judiciously selected, and well arranged.

The Freedom of the Will, as a Basis of Human Responsibilty and a Divine Government; Elucidated and Maintained in its issue with the Necessitarian Theories of Hobbes, Edwards, the Princeton Essayists, and other leading advocates. By D. D. Whedon, D. D. New York: Published by Carlton & Porter. 1864.

Notwithstanding the elaborate assaults upon Edwards's great Treatise on the Will, which almost every decade brings forth, it still remains to be assaulted: like the storm-smitten rock which serenely and sublimely awaits all the tempests that may vainly dash against it, to the end of time. Dr. Whedon's book has unquestionable acuteness and dexterity, along with great zeal and assurance, and an amazing fecundity of huge and unusual words. But it will require more than all this to demolish Edwards; however an occasional fallacy may be detected in his reasonings. It will be seen from the title-page, that Dr. Whedon honours us with special consideration. We wait an opportunity for a closer examination of his volume, before concluding whether there is any occasion for us to reciprocate the compliment.

The Influence of the Bible in improving the Understanding and Moral Character. By John Matthews, D. D., Professor of Theology in the Theological Seminary of Hanover and New Albany, Indiana; Author of "Letters on the Divine Purpose," etc., with a Memoir of the Author, by James Wood, D. D., President of Hanover College, Indiana. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

This work bears the impress of the author's force and originality as a thinker. The topic speaks its own importance, and the ability with which it is treated will be its passport to public acceptance and usefulness. The Memoir prefixed is well done, and will add to the value and interest of the book, as a memorial of one of the lights of our church.

The Memorial Hour; or, the Lord's Supper, in its relation to Doctrine and Life. By Jeremiah Chaplin, D. D., author of "The Evening of Life," etc. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1864.

This book consists of a series of chapters on the Lord's Supper, as to its meaning and intent, its proper observance and due improvement. It is both didactic and devotional. For the most part, the several chapters are enriched with choice selections of evangelical poetry, and some of them are illustrated by the examples of eminent saints. We welcome whatever is suited to promote the earnest and fit observance of this sacrament among evangelical Christians, many of whom fail duly to appreciate it, and fall below the standard of scriptural and edifying observance.

A Memorial of Bird Wilson, D. D., LL. D., late Professor of Systematic Divinity of the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. By W. White Bronson, A. M. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1864.

Dr. Wilson is shown here to have been a wise and good, but quiet and unobtrusive man. As the son of one of our most eminent revolutionary statesmen, and the first principal professor in the oldest Episcopal Theological Seminary of our country, who filled his station with credit and success, he was an historical character, who deserves some fit memorial. He was the bosom friend of the venerable Bishop White. His biographer, from time to time, lets his light, as a high-church exclusive, shine. He attributes Dr. Wilson's warmth in vindicating the validity of lay-baptism "to the fact that he had himself received lay-baptism, and therefore felt a deep personal interest in its thorough vindication. A supposition not entirely destitute of weight, inasmuch as he was, in all probability, baptized by one of the rigid Scotch school, then presiding over a congregation in Philadelphia." Pp. 73—4. The English of this is, that baptism by Presbyterian ministers is lay-baptism, and that circumlocution must be employed to avoid calling them ministers or pastors. They may well defend the validity of Presbyterian baptism, call it lay, or what they will, unless they would class a large part of their bishops and ministers as unbaptized; and so, if we are to accept their dogma of baptismal regeneration, as unregenerate. We will add another suggestion. It is quite fortunate for our Episcopal brethren that they have such sources of supply and replenishment as the great Presbyterian communion. Were it otherwise, were they deprived of all their clergy and laity who had a Presbyterian training, whence would the void be filled? And is not that a perennial fountain of life and strength, which not only supplies the losses and provides for the rapid increase of the Presbyterian body, but so largely replenishes other communions?

Light in Darkness; or Christ discovered in his true character. By a Unitarian. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Blakeman. 1864.

The struggles of minds emerging from destructive error into the truth are usually profoundly instructive and interesting. The present is no exception. As the writer, a clergyman, unfolds the progress of his recovery from the sceptical negations of Socinianism to the positive, soul-sustaining verities of the everlasting gospel, we feel more deeply than ever the folly of

all human wisdom, and the incomparable excellence of that wisdom of God which is foolishness with men.

Helen Maurice; or the Daughter at Home. Published by the American Tract Society.

The Weed with an Ill Name. By the author of "The Story of a Pocket-Bible," "Mackerel Will," etc. Published by the American Tract Society.

These are additions to the excellent story books for children and youth, illustrating and enforcing some point of truth and duty, of which the Tract Society has been so prolific.

Grace-Culture, or Thoughts on Grace, Growth, and Glory. By Ezra M. Hunt, M. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

It is altogether delightful when those whose vocation it is to medicate bodily distempers, address themselves to spiritual maladies, and look after the health and vigour of the soul. It has been observed that, contrary to a very prevalent opinion, there is a mutual congeniality between the study of medicine and psychology, and that the habits of observation and reflection, of seizing and analyzing subtle and tenuous phenomena, which are requisite in the physician, are also essential in the metaphysician. High authority has attributed Locke's success as an analyst of the mind to his medical training. And we have often observed that truly Christian physicians are among the most skilful in treating certain departments of experimental and casuistical divinity, especially those implicated in the connection of the mind with the body. All this is illustrated, in this copious, well-packed volume, by one of the promising young physicians of our church. It abounds in doctrinal and practical insight, and is well adapted to promote that growth in grace which it so happily elucidates.

The Old Parsonage, or Recollections of a Minister's Daughter. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 18mo. pp. 236.

"From the storehouse of early recollections, I have endeavoured to depict a few of the scenes which have taught me many a salutary lesson, and I trust they will not be to others utterly useless. If there be any charm in the plain narrative of truth, they will not be wholly devoid of attractive interest."—*Preface.* They are delightful, and deserve a circulation far beyond the Sabbath-School Library.

Several books have been received too late for notice in this number.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

Keil and Delitzsch, Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, 4th Part. The Book of Job, by Dr. F. Delitzsch. 8vo. pp. 543.

F. Hitzig, The Psalms, translated and explained. Vol. II. Part 1. 8vo. pp. 240.

A. Brechei, The Psalms metrically translated. 8vo. pp. 312.

J. Gärtner, Explanation of the Prophet Daniel and the Revelation of John, as well as Ezekiel's Prophecy of Gog. Chaps. 37—39. 8vo. pp. 576.

The 24 Books of the Bible in the Hebrew Text, with a German translation, continuous exposition, and homiletic remarks, by Rab. S. Herxheimer. Vol. I. The Pentateuch. 8vo.

J. E. Löwy, Critical Talmudic Lexicon. In Hebrew. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 494.

The Hagada, illustrated and translated by A. V. Morpurgo. Hebrew and Italian. 4vo. pp. 66.

A. Nager, The Religious Philosophy of the Talmud. 8vo. pp. 44.

M. Duschak, The Mosaic and Talmudic Law of Marriage. 8vo. pp. 750.

E. Bernhardt, Critical Investigations respecting the Gothic version of the Scriptures. A contribution to German literary history and to the criticism of the New Testament. 8vo. pp. 31.

P. de Lagarde, The Four Gospels in Arabic, from a Vienna Manuscript. 8vo. pp. xxxii and 143.

M. A. Levy, Phenician Studies, No. 3. 8vo. pp. 80. Phenician Lexicon. 8vo. pp. 51.

T. Nöldeke, On the Amalekites, and some other nations neighbours of the Israelites. 8vo. pp. 42.

E. Riehm, On the Nature and Symbolic Conception of the Cherubim. In Latin. 4vo. pp. 26.

J. Pietraszewski, German Improved Translation of the Books of Zoroaster. Part 1. 8vo. pp. 248.

The Creation of the World, a Cornish Mystery, edited with a translation and notes, by Whitley Stokes. 8vo. pp. 208.

Monachi Anonymi Scoti Chronicon Anglo-Scoticum. E codice Durlancensi primum integrum edidit C. W. Bouterwek. 8vo. pp. 48.

H. Pabst, De Ariberto II. Mediolansensi, primisque medii ævi motibus popularibus. 8vo. pp. 46.

L. Morgenstern, The Life of Galileo Galilei. 8vo. pp. 40.

P. Pressel, John Calvin. 8vo. pp. 264.

Corpus Reformatorum. Vol. XXX. 4to. Vol. II. of the complete works of John Calvin. Pp. 1118.

C. A. Brandis, History of the Developement of Greek Philosophy and its subsequent effects in the Roman Empire. 8vo. pp. 430.

E. Alberti, The Question concerning the spirit and order of the Writings of Plato, illustrated from Aristotle. 8vo. pp. 115.

H. Steinthal, Philosophy, History and Psychology, in their reciprocal relations. 8vo. pp. 76.

T. Vanderhausen, Ideas toward a new system of Historiography. 8vo. pp. 46.

Shakespeareiana, List of Writings of and about Shakespeare. 8vo. pp. 16.

W. Peters, Scientific Journey to Mozambique, at the command of his Majesty, King Frederick IV. in 1842—1848. Botany. 4vo. pp. 584.

H. Barth, Travels through the Interior of European Turkey, from Rustchuck, by Philippopel, Rilo, Bitolia, and the Thessalian Olympus, to Saloniki, in the autumn of 1862. 8vo. pp. 232.

FRANCE.

The Holy Bible, New Translation from the Hebrew and Greek, by a union of Pastors and Ministers of the two National Protestant Churches of France. No. 1. To be completed in ten numbers.

E. de Pressensé, the Church and the French Revolution, a History of the Revolutions of Church and State from 1789 to 1802. 8vo.

F. Monnier, Alcuin and Charlemagne, with fragments of an unpublished Commentary by Alcuin on St. Matthew, and other pieces published for the first time. 32mo.

H. Guys, The Nation of the Druses, their History, Religion, Manners, and Political Condition. 8vo.

History and Description of Lower Cochin China. Translated for the first time from the original Chinese by G. Aubaret. 8vo.

The Spouse from beyond the Tomb. The Chinese Text with a French Translation by L. de Rosny, followed by a Bibliographical notice of the principal Chinese Romances. 12mo.

S. Julien, San-Tsen-King, composed by Wang-Pe-Heou,

toward the end of the 13th Century. Chinese Text, a table of 214 keys, and a Latin Translation. 8vo.

Mansala Parva, the 16th book of the Mahabharata, Translated and Annotated by E. Wattier. 8vo.

P. E. Foucaux, Buddhism in Thibet. 8vo.

F. Baudry, The Science of Language and its actual Condition. 8vo.

F. Baudry, The Brothers Grimm, their Life and Labours. 8vo.

Christopher Columbus, Complete Collection of his Writings, to illustrate the Discovery of America, in Italian, corrected with notes, and an introduction by G. B. Torre. 8vo.

Note to the article on The War and National Wealth.

Since this article went to press, the publication of the Secretary of the Treasury more than confirms our estimate of the cost of the war for the present year. The rise in gold to the neighbourhood of $2.50, also shows that the excess of our consumption above production is represented by foreign fabrics which we have not gold enough to pay for, consequently the price of gold is forced up until it raises the price of other things, so as to constrain a diminished consumption. This goes on, until enough is in this way liberated for export, to pay our foreign debt. The enormous income tax to be paid the current year, also lessens, like other taxes, the amount of commodities which the people can pay for and consume. All this is enforcing what we have insisted on, the absolute necessity of strict economy, and that equilibrium between consumption and production, without which, in the absence of foreign loans, the war cannot continue, on its present scale; and towards which equilibrium, however disturbed, there is always an inevitable *nisus* in the very nature of things.